

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256096723>

Cultural Memory Studies

Book · August 2008

CITATIONS

2

READS

19,069

1 author:



[David Manier](#)

City University of New York City - Lehman College

47 PUBLICATIONS 774 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Buddhism and Psychology [View project](#)

Cultural Memory Studies



Media and Cultural Memory/ Medien und kulturelle Erinnerung

Edited by/Herausgegeben von
Astrid Erll · Ansgar Nünning

Editorial Board/Wissenschaftlicher Beirat

Aleida Assmann · Mieke Bal · Marshall Brown · Vita Fortunati
Udo Hebel · Claus Leggewie · Gunilla Lindberg-Wada
Jürgen Reulecke · Jean Marie Schaeffer · Jürgen Schlaeger
Siegfried J. Schmidt · Werner Sollors · Frederic Tygstrup
Harald Welzer

Cultural Memory Studies

An International
and Interdisciplinary Handbook

Edited by
Astrid Erll · Ansgar Nünning

in collaboration with
Sara B. Young

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cultural memory studies : an international and interdisciplinary handbook / edited by Astrid Erll, Ansgar Nünning.

p. cm. — (Media and cultural memory ; 8 = Medien und kulturelle Erinnerung ; 8)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-018860-8 (alk. paper)

1. Culture — Handbooks, manuals, etc. 2. Memory — Cross-cultural studies — Handbooks, manuals, etc. I. Erll, Astrid. II. Nünning, Ansgar.

HM621.C8534 2008

306.01—dc22

2008017708

ISSN 1613-8961

ISBN 978-3-11-018860-8

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© Copyright 2008 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany

Cover design: Christopher Schneider, Berlin

Preface and Acknowledgements

Cultural memory studies came into being at the beginning of the twentieth century, with the works of Maurice Halbwachs on *mémoire collective*. In the course of the last two decades this area of research has witnessed a veritable boom in various countries and disciplines. As a consequence, the study of the relations between culture and memory has diversified into a broad range of approaches. Today, the complex issue of cultural memory is remarkably interdisciplinary: Concepts of cultural memory circulate in history, the social and political sciences, philosophy and theology, psychology, the neurosciences, and psychoanalysis, as well as in literary and media studies. Sometimes these concepts converge; at other times they seem to exclude one another; and all too often, researchers in one discipline seem to take no notice of the work done in neighboring disciplines.

Moreover, cultural memory studies is a decidedly international field: Important concepts have been generated in France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Canada, the United States, and the Netherlands. At the same time, however, we have seen how nationally specific academic traditions and language barriers have tended to impede the transfer of knowledge about cultural memory.

The handbook project proceeds from the assumption that, more often than not, the meaning and operational value of concepts of memory in general and cultural memory in particular differ between diverse disciplines, disparate academic cultures, and different historical periods. With the move towards greater interdisciplinarity, the exchange of such concepts has considerably intensified. Through constant appropriation, translation, and reassessment across various fields, concepts of cultural memory have acquired new meanings, opening up new horizons of research in the humanities as well as in the social and in the natural sciences. To the extent that their meaning must, therefore, be constantly renegotiated, a sustained enquiry into these concepts and a survey of the latest research in cultural memory studies can foster a self-reflexive approach to this burgeoning and increasingly diverse field, providing a theoretical, conceptual, and methodological backbone for any project concerned with questions of cultural memory.

The aim of this handbook is to offer the first truly integrated survey of this interdisciplinary and international field of cultural memory studies. The concise presentation of the main concepts of cultural memory studies is intended not only to offer readers a unique overview of current research in the field; it is also meant to serve as a forum for bringing together ap-

proaches from areas as varied as neurosciences and literary history, thus adding further contour and depth to this emergent field of study.

Our debts are many, and it is a great pleasure to acknowledge them. Our thanks go, first of all, to the many individual authors who contributed to our handbook. It was a wonderful experience to collaborate on this project with researchers from numerous countries and disciplines. We are grateful for their willingness to present their research in the admittedly very concise format of this handbook and also for their great patience during the production process. Moreover, we would like to thank Heiko Hartmann and his colleagues at de Gruyter for their encouragement and assistance in establishing the series *Media and Cultural Memory*. Four years after the appearance of its first volume, this handbook represents the attempt to chart the very field—international and interdisciplinary memory studies—that this series is committed to exploring and further developing.

We are also very grateful to Anna-Lena Flügel, Meike Hölscher, and Jan Rupp, who helped prepare the manuscript for publication. Many articles had to be translated into English, and we thank Anna-Lena Flügel for her translation from French, Stephanie Wodianka for her counsel on all things Italian, and Sara B. Young for providing all the translations from German. To Sara go our most cordial thanks: Without her, this volume would not exist. She did an absolutely excellent job, from the critical reading and careful editing of the articles to her well-crafted translations and skilled guidance in the overall language and style of the volume.

Wuppertal and Giessen, April 2008
Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning

Table of Contents

ASTRID ERLI: Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction	1
---	---

I. *Lieux de mémoire*—Sites of Memory

PIM DEN BOER: <i>Loci memoriae</i> — <i>Lieux de mémoire</i>	19
MARIO ISNENGHI: Italian <i>luoghi della memoria</i>	27
JACQUES LE RIDER: <i>Mitteleuropa</i> as a <i>lieu de mémoire</i>	37
UDO J. HEBEL: Sites of Memory in U.S.-American Histories and Cultures	47
JAY WINTER: Sites of Memory and the Shadow of War	61

II. Memory and Cultural History

ALON CONFINO: Memory and the History of Mentalities	77
DIETRICH HARTH: The Invention of Cultural Memory	85
ALEIDA ASSMANN: Canon and Archive	97
JAN ASSMANN: Communicative and Cultural Memory	109
JÜRGEN REULECKE: Generation/Generationality, Generativity, and Memory	119
VITA FORTUNATI AND ELENA LAMBERTI: Cultural Memory: A European Perspective	127

III. Social, Political, and Philosophical Memory Studies

JEAN-CHRISTOPHE MARCEL AND LAURENT MUCCHIELLI: Maurice Halbwachs's <i>mémoire collective</i>	141
JEFFREY K. OLICK: From Collective Memory to the Sociology of Mnemonic Practices and Products	151
ANDREAS LANGENOHLE: Memory in Post-Authoritarian Societies	163
ERIK MEYER: Memory and Politics	173
ELENA ESPOSITO: Social Forgetting: A Systems-Theory Approach	181
SIEGFRIED J. SCHMIDT: Memory and Remembrance: A Constructivist Approach	191
MAUREEN JUNKER-KENNY: Memory and Forgetting in Paul Ricœur's Theory of the Capable Self	203

IV. Psychological Memory Studies

JÜRGEN STRAUB: Psychology, Narrative, and Cultural Memory: Past and Present	215
WULF KANSTEINER AND HARALD WEILNBÖCK: Against the Concept of Cultural Trauma	229
DAVID MIDDLETON AND STEVEN D. BROWN: Experience and Memory: Imaginary Futures in the Past	241
DAVID MANIER AND WILLIAM HIRST: A Cognitive Taxonomy of Collective Memories	253
GERALD ECHTERHOFF: Language and Memory: Social and Cognitive Processes	263
HANS J. MARKOWITSCH: Cultural Memory and the Neurosciences	275
HARALD WELZER: Communicative Memory	285

V. Literature and Cultural Memory

RENATE LACHMANN: Mnemonic and Intertextual Aspects of Literature ..	301
HERBERT GRABES: Cultural Memory and the Literary Canon	311
MAX SAUNDERS: Life-Writing, Cultural Memory, and Literary Studies	321
BIRGIT NEUMANN: The Literary Representation of Memory	333
ANN RIGNEY: The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts Between Monumentality and Morphing	345

VI. Media and Cultural Memory

JAMES E. YOUNG: The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History	357
JENS RUCHATZ: The Photograph as Externalization and Trace	367
BARBIE ZELIZER: Journalism's Memory Work	379
ASTRID ERLI: Literature, Film, and the Mediality of Cultural Memory	389
MARTIN ZIEROLD: Memory and Media Cultures	399
Index of Names	409
Index of Terms	423
Notes on Contributors	427

Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction

ASTRID ERLI

1. Towards a Conceptual Foundation for Cultural Memory Studies

Over the past two decades, the relationship between culture and memory has emerged in many parts of the world as a key issue of interdisciplinary research, involving fields as diverse as history, sociology, art, literary and media studies, philosophy, theology, psychology, and the neurosciences, and thus bringing together the humanities, social studies, and the natural sciences in a unique way. The importance of the notion of cultural memory is not only documented by the rapid growth, since the late 1980s, of publications on specific national, social, religious, or family memories, but also by a more recent trend, namely attempts to provide overviews of the state of the art in this emerging field and to synthesize different research traditions. Anthologies of theoretical texts, such as *The Collective Memory Reader* (Olick et al.), as well as the launch of the new journal *Memory Studies* testify to the need to bring focus to this broad discussion and to consider the theoretical and methodological standards of a promising, but also as yet incoherent and dispersed field (cf. Olick; Radstone; Erll). The present handbook represents the shared effort of forty-one authors, all of whom have contributed over the past years, from a variety of disciplinary perspectives, to the development of this nascent field, and it is part of the effort to consolidate memory studies into a more coherent discipline. It is a first step on the road towards a conceptual foundation for the kind of memory studies which assumes a decidedly cultural and social perspective.

“Cultural” (or, if you will, “collective,” “social”) memory is certainly a multifarious notion, a term often used in an ambiguous and vague way. Media, practices, and structures as diverse as myth, monuments, historiography, ritual, conversational remembering, configurations of cultural knowledge, and neuronal networks are nowadays subsumed under this wide umbrella term. Because of its intricacy, cultural memory has been a highly controversial issue ever since its very conception in Maurice Halbwachs’s studies on *mémoire collective* (esp. 1925, 1941, 1950). His contemporary Marc Bloch accused Halbwachs of simply transferring concepts from individual psychology to the level of the collective, and even today scholars continue to challenge the notion of collective or cultural memory, claiming, for example, that since we have well-established concepts like “myth,” “tradition,” and “individual memory,” there is no need for a

further, and often misleading, addition to the existing repertoire (cf. Gedi and Elam). What these criticisms overlook, of course, is that it is exactly the umbrella quality of these relatively new usages of “memory” which helps us see the (sometimes functional, sometimes analogical, sometimes metaphorical) relationships between such phenomena as ancient myths and the personal recollection of recent experience, and which enables disciplines as varied as psychology, history, sociology, and literary studies to engage in a stimulating dialogue.

This handbook is based on a broad understanding of cultural memory, suggesting as a provisional definition “the interplay of present and past in socio-cultural contexts.” Such an understanding of the term allows for an inclusion of a broad spectrum of phenomena as possible objects of cultural memory studies—ranging from individual acts of remembering in a social context to group memory (of family, friends, veterans, etc.) to national memory with its “invented traditions,” and finally to the host of transnational *lieux de mémoire* such as the Holocaust and 9/11. At the same time, cultural memory studies is not restricted to the study of those ways of making sense of the past which are intentional and performed through narrative, and which go hand in hand with the construction of identities—although this very nexus (intentional remembering, narrative, identity) has certainly yielded the lion’s share of research in memory studies so far. The field thus remains open for the exploration of unintentional and implicit ways of cultural remembering (see Welzer, this volume) or of inherently non-narrative, for example visual or bodily, forms of memory.

But if the range of themes and objects of memory studies is virtually limitless (everything is, somehow, related to memory), then what makes our new field distinct? With Alon Confino, I would argue that it is not the infinite multitude of possible *topics* which characterizes cultural memory studies, but instead its *concepts*: the specific ways of conceiving of themes and of approaching objects. However, despite two decades of intensive research, the design of a conceptual toolbox for cultural memory studies is still at a fledgling stage, because (to quote Confino in this volume) memory studies is currently “more practiced than theorized”—and practiced, at that, within an array of different disciplines and national academic cultures, with their own vocabularies, methods, and traditions. What we need is to take a survey of the concepts used in memory studies and, in doing so, cross intellectual and linguistic boundaries.

Even a cursory look at the host of different terminologies which have emerged from memory studies since Maurice Halbwachs will shed light on the challenges faced by those who are searching for a conceptual foundation for the field: *mémoire collective*/collective memory, *cadres sociaux*/social frameworks of memory, social memory, *mnemosyne*, *ars memoriae*, *loci et*

images, lieux de mémoire/sites of memory, invented traditions, myth, *memoria*, heritage, commemoration, *kulturelles Gedächtnis*, communicative memory, generationality, postmemory. The list could go on.

What this wealth of existing concepts shows, first of all, is that cultural memory is not the object of one single discipline, but a transdisciplinary phenomenon. There is no such thing as a privileged standpoint or approach for memory research (for the systematic and historic reasons for this, see sections 2 and 3 of this article). Cultural memory studies is a field to which many disciplines contribute, using their specific methodologies and perspectives. This makes for its terminological richness, but also for its disjointedness. At the same time, it has been clear since its very inception that the study of cultural memory can only be successful if it is based on cooperation among different disciplines. Cultural memory studies is therefore not merely a multidisciplinary field, but fundamentally an interdisciplinary project. Many exciting forms of collaboration have already been fostered. And indeed, the strongest and most striking studies in cultural memory are based on interdisciplinary exchange—between media studies and cultural history (J. Assmann; A. Assmann), history and sociology (Olick), neuroscience and social psychology (Welzer; Markowitsch), cognitive psychology and history (Manier and Hirst) or social psychology and linguistics (Echterhoff; all this volume). An even more intensified dialogue among disciplines will help uncover the manifold intersections of memory and culture. This, however, requires a very sensitive handling of terminology and a careful discrimination of the specific disciplinary uses of certain concepts and of their literal, metaphorical, or metonymical implications (see section 2).

2. Establishing the Framework: Dimensions, Levels, and Modes of Cultural Memory

If we want to establish a framework for cultural memory studies, working on concepts is inevitable. In the following I will propose some basic definitions and conceptual differentiations which may help to prevent misunderstanding and resolve some of the controversies which have been sparked time and again within and about cultural memory studies.

(a) *Dimensions of Culture and Memory: Material, Social, and Mental*

Arguably the most important and by far most frequently used key concept of cultural memory studies is the contentious term *mémoire collective* (collective memory), which was brought into the discussion by Maurice Halbwachs in the 1920s. Our choice of “cultural memory” for the title of

this handbook is due, in the first place, to the highly controversial nature of Halbwachs's term and the many wrong associations it seems to trigger in those who are new to the field. Secondly, according to the definition given above, the term "*cultural* memory" accentuates the connection of memory on the one hand and socio-cultural contexts on the other. However, the term "*cultural*" does not designate a specific affinity to Cultural Studies as conceived and practiced by the Birmingham School (although this discipline has certainly contributed to cultural memory studies). Our notion of culture is instead more rooted in the German tradition of the study of cultures (*Kulturwissenschaft*) and in anthropology, where culture is defined as a community's specific way of life, led within its self-spun webs of meaning (cf. Geertz).

According to anthropological and semiotic theories, culture can be seen as a three-dimensional framework, comprising social (people, social relations, institutions), material (artifacts and media), and mental aspects (culturally defined ways of thinking, mentalities) (cf. Posner). Understood in this way, "*cultural* memory" can serve as an umbrella term which comprises "*social* memory" (the starting point for memory research in the social sciences), "*material* or *medial* memory" (the focus of interest in literary and media studies), and "*mental* or *cognitive* memory" (the field of expertise in psychology and the neurosciences). This neat distinction is of course merely a heuristic tool. In reality, all three dimensions are involved in the making of cultural memories. Cultural memory studies is therefore characterized by the transcending of boundaries. Some scholars look at the interplay of material and social phenomena (for example, memorials and the politics of memory; see Meyer); others scrutinize the intersections of material and mental phenomena (as in the history of mentalities; see Confino); still others study the relation of cognitive and social phenomena (as in conversational remembering; see Middleton and Brown; all this volume).

(b) *Levels of Memory: Individual and Collective*

It is important to realize that the notions of "*cultural*" or "*collective*" memory proceed from an operative metaphor. The concept of "*remembering*" (a cognitive process which takes place in individual brains) is metaphorically transferred to the level of culture. In this metaphorical sense, scholars speak of a "*nation's* memory," a "*religious community's* memory," or even of "*literature's* memory" (which, according to Renate Lachmann, is its intertextuality). This crucial distinction between two aspects of cultural memory studies is what Jeffrey K. Olick draws our attention to when he maintains that "*two radically different concepts of culture are involved here, one that sees culture as a subjective category of mean-*

ings contained in people's minds versus one that sees culture as patterns of publicly available symbols objectified in society" (336). In other words, we have to differentiate between two levels on which culture and memory intersect: the individual and the collective or, more precisely, the level of the cognitive on the one hand, and the levels of the social and the medial on the other.

The first level of cultural memory is concerned with biological memory. It draws attention to the fact that no memory is ever purely individual, but always inherently shaped by collective contexts. From the people we live with and from the media we use, we acquire schemata which help us recall the past and encode new experience. Our memories are often triggered as well as shaped by external factors, ranging from conversation among friends to books and to places. In short, we remember in socio-cultural contexts. With regard to this first level, "memory" is used in a literal sense, whereas the attribute "cultural" is a metonymy, standing for the "socio-cultural contexts and their influence on memory." It is especially within oral history, social psychology, and the neurosciences that cultural memory is understood according to this first aspect of the term.

The second level of cultural memory refers to the symbolic order, the media, institutions, and practices by which social groups construct a shared past. "Memory," here, is used metaphorically. Societies do not remember literally; but much of what is done to reconstruct a shared past bears some resemblance to the processes of individual memory, such as the selectivity and perspectivity inherent in the creation of versions of the past according to present knowledge and needs. In cultural history and the social sciences, much research has been done with regard to this second aspect of collective memory, the most influential concepts to have emerged being Pierre Nora's *lieux de mémoire* and Jan and Aleida Assmann's *kulturelles Gedächtnis*.

The two forms of cultural memory can be distinguished from each other on an analytical level; but in practice the cognitive and the social/medial continuously interact. There is no such thing as pre-cultural individual memory; but neither is there a Collective or Cultural Memory (with capital letters) which is detached from individuals and embodied only in media and institutions. Just as socio-cultural contexts shape individual memories, a "memory" which is represented by media and institutions must be actualized by individuals, by members of a community of remembrance, who may be conceived of as *points de vue* (Maurice Halbwachs) on shared notions of the past. Without such actualizations, monuments, rituals, and books are nothing but dead material, failing to have any impact in societies.

As is always the case with metaphors, some features can be transferred with a gain in insight, others cannot. The notion of cultural memory has quite successfully directed our attention to the close connection that exists between, say, a nation's version of its past and its version of national identity. That memory and identity are closely linked on the individual level is a commonplace that goes back at least to John Locke, who maintained that there is no such thing as an essential identity, but that identities have to be constructed and reconstructed by acts of memory, by remembering who one was and by setting this past Self in relation to the present Self. The concept of cultural memory has opened the way to studying these processes at a collective level. More problematic is the migration of concepts between the individual and social levels when it comes to trauma studies. Wulf Kansteiner and Harald Weinböck (this volume) show the (ethical) pitfalls of attempting to conflate processes of the individual psyche with the medial and social representation of the past.

To sum up, cultural memory studies is decidedly concerned with social, medial, and cognitive processes, and their ceaseless interplay. In the present volume, this fact is mirrored not only by the dedication of different sections to (clusters of) different disciplines (history, social sciences, psychology, literary and media studies) which have an expertise with regard to one specific level of cultural memory, but also by the incorporation of as many approaches as possible which go beyond those boundaries. Readers will therefore discover numerous cross-connections between the paths taken in the individual parts of this book.

(c) *Modes of Memory: The "How" of Remembering*

The last distinction to be made in this introduction—that between different modes of remembering—is one which aims to confront another source of vehement dispute within and about memory studies. One of Halbwachs's less felicitous legacies is the opposition between history and memory. Halbwachs conceives of the former as abstract, totalizing, and "dead," and of the latter as particular, meaningful, and "lived." This polarity, itself a legacy of nineteenth-century historicism and its discontents, was taken up and popularized by Pierre Nora, who also distinguishes polemically between history and memory and positions his *lieux de mémoire* in between. Studies on "history vs. memory" are usually loaded with emotionally charged binary oppositions: good vs. bad, organic vs. artificial, living vs. dead, from below vs. from above. And while the term "cultural memory" is already a multifarious notion, it is often even less clear what is meant with the collective singular of "history" (cf. Koselleck): Selective and meaningful memory vs. the unintelligible totality of *historical events*? Methodologically unregulated and identity-related memory vs. scientific,

seemingly neutral and objective *historiography*? Authentic memory produced within small communities vs. ideologically charged, official *images of history*? Witnesses of the past vs. academic *historians*? The whole question of “history and/or/as memory” is simply not a very fruitful approach to cultural representations of the past. It is a dead end in memory studies, and also one of its “Achilles’ heels” (see Olick, this volume).

I would suggest dissolving the useless opposition of history vs. memory in favor of a notion of different *modes of remembering* in culture. This approach proceeds from the basic insight that the past is not given, but must instead continually be re-constructed and re-presented. Thus, our memories (individual and collective) of past events can vary to a great degree. This holds true not only for *what* is remembered (facts, data), but also for *how* it is remembered, that is, for the quality and meaning the past assumes. As a result, there are different modes of remembering identical past events. A war, for example, can be remembered as a mythic event (“the war as apocalypse”), as part of political history (the First World War as “the great seminal catastrophe of the twentieth century”), as a traumatic experience (“the horror of the trenches, the shells, the barrage of gunfire,” etc.), as a part of family history (“the war my great-uncle served in”), as a focus of bitter contestation (“the war which was waged by the old generation, by the fascists, by men”). Myth, religious memory, political history, trauma, family remembrance, or generational memory are different modes of referring to the past. Seen in this way, history is but yet another mode of cultural memory, and historiography its specific medium. This is not at all to lessen its importance or the merits of generations of historians. Since the early nineteenth century, the historical method has developed into the best-regulated and most reliable way of reconstructing the past (even though its specific operations have been justifiably criticized by Foucault and others, and may be complemented by other modes).

3. Genealogies and Branches of Cultural Memory Studies: The Design of This Handbook

This handbook has a historic and systematic (or diachronic and synchronic) layout. Although its main focus is on *current* research and concepts of cultural memory studies, it also provides insights into the different roots of the field. Whereas a history of thought about memory and culture would have to go back to Plato, the beginnings of a modern notion of cultural memory can be retraced to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (see Olick; Straub; Marcel and Mucchielli; all this volume). The present field of research is built on the emergence of a “new

wave” of cultural memory studies since the 1980s (see Confino; Harth; Fortunati and Lamberti; all this volume).

Maurice Halbwachs was the first to write explicitly and systematically about cultural memory. If one reads through the essays of this volume, there can be little doubt that his studies of *mémoire collective* have emerged as the foundational texts of today’s memory studies—unequivocally accepted as such no matter what discipline or country the respective researchers call home. Halbwachs not only coined the fundamental term “collective memory”; his legacy to cultural memory studies is at least threefold. Firstly, with his concept of *cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (social frameworks of memory) he articulated the idea that individual memories are inherently shaped and will often be triggered by socio-cultural contexts, or frameworks, thus already pointing to cultural schema theories and the contextual approaches of psychology. Secondly, his study of family memory and other private practices of remembering have been an important influence for oral history. And thirdly, with his research on the memory of religious communities (in *La topographie légendaire*) he accentuated topographical aspects of cultural memory, thus anticipating the notion of *lieux de mémoire*, and he looked at communities whose memory reaches back thousands of years, thus laying the foundation for Jan and Aleida Assmann’s *kulturelles Gedächtnis*.

However, although Halbwachs’s work is rooted in French sociology, memory studies was an international and transdisciplinary phenomenon from the very beginning. Around 1900, scholars from different disciplines and countries became interested in the intersections between culture and memory: notably Sigmund Freud, Henri Bergson, Emile Durkheim, Maurice Halbwachs, Aby Warburg, Arnold Zweig, Karl Mannheim, Frederick Bartlett, and Walter Benjamin (see also Olick, this volume). Sometimes those scholars critically referred to one another’s work (for example Halbwachs to Durkheim, or Bloch and Bartlett to Halbwachs), yet more often this early research remained unconnected. Early memory studies is thus a typical example of an emergent phenomenon, cropping up at different places at roughly the same time—a process which would be repeated in the 1980s, with the “new memory studies.”

If Halbwachs is the best remembered founding father of memory studies, then Aby Warburg is arguably the most forgotten one. The German Jewish art historian was an early and energetic ambassador of the interdisciplinary study of culture (cf. Gombrich). He famously pointed out that researchers should stop policing disciplinary boundaries (*grenzpolizeiliche Befangenheit*) in order to gain insight into processes of cultural memory. Warburg—whose writings are more a quarry providing inspiration for subsequent scholars than the source of clear-cut theoretical con-

cepts—drew attention, moreover, to the *mediality* of memory. In a great exhibition project called *Mnemosyne* (1924–28) he demonstrated how certain “pathos formulae” (*Pathosformeln*, symbols encoding emotional intensity) migrated through different art works, periods, and countries. Whereas the sociologist Halbwachs and the psychologist Frederick Bartlett (who popularized the notion of cultural schemata) laid the foundations for cultural memory studies with a view to social and cognitive levels, Warburg’s legacy to present-day research is to have given an example of how cultural memory can be approached via the level of material objects.

The interest that the works by Halbwachs and others had sparked in a small community of scholars dwindled away after the Second World War. It was only in the 1980s (after the “death of history,” the narrative turn, and the anthropological turn) that “collective memory,” first slowly and then at breathtaking speed, developed into a buzzword not only in the academic world, but also in the political arena, the mass media, and the arts. The “new cultural memory studies” was, again, very much an emergent phenomenon, taking shape more or less concurrently in many disciplines and countries. The 1980s saw the work of the French historian Pierre Nora on national *lieux de mémoire* (see den Boer) and the publications of the German group of researchers around Jan and Aleida Assmann, who focused on media and memory in ancient societies (see Harth). In psychology, meanwhile, behavioral and purely cognitive paradigms had been superseded by ecological approaches to human memory and the study of conversational and narrative remembering (see Straub; Middleton and Brown). Historical and political changes became a catalyst for the new memory studies. Forty years after the Holocaust the generation that had witnessed the Shoah began to fade away. This effected a major change in the forms of cultural remembrance. Without organic, autobiographic memories, societies are solely dependent on media (such as monuments; see Young) to transmit experience. Issues of trauma and witnessing were not only discussed in the context of Holocaust studies, but more and more also in gender studies and postcolonial studies (see Kansteiner and Weinböck). More recently, major transformations in global politics, such as the breakdown of the communist states and other authoritarian regimes, have brought new memory phenomena to the fore, such as the issue of “transitional justice” (see Langenohl). More generally, the shape of contemporary media societies gives rise to the assumption that—today perhaps more than ever—cultural memory is dependent on media technologies and the circulation of media products (see Esposito; Rigney; Erll; Zelizer; Zierold; all this volume).

In keeping with the double focus of this handbook—on genealogies and disciplinary branches—each of its six parts is concerned with historic *and* systematic aspects of cultural memory studies. Part I is dedicated to the one concept that has arguably proved most influential within the new, international and interdisciplinary memory studies: Pierre Nora’s *lieux de mémoire*, which he introduced in a multivolume work of the same name, featuring French “sites of memory” (1984-92). The notion of *lieux de mémoire* quickly crossed national borders and was taken up in books about sites of memory in Italy, Germany, Canada, Central Europe, and the United States. The ubiquity of the term cannot belie the fact, however, that the *lieu de mémoire* is still one of the most inchoate and undertheorized concepts of cultural memory studies. On the one hand it lends itself particularly well to the study of a wide array of phenomena (from “places” in the literal sense to medial representations, rituals, and shared beliefs), but it is precisely because of its sheer limitless extension that the term has remained conceptually amorphous, and it would be well worth initiating another round of scholarly scrutiny (cf. Rigney). In this volume, Pim den Boer traces the roots of the *lieu* metaphor back to the ancient art of memory, its founding myth about Simonides of Ceos, and the method of *loci* and *imagines* (places and images) as we find it described in the rhetorics of Cicero and Quintilian. He uncovers the French *specificité* of Nora’s concept, comments on its translatability, and considers the prospects for a comparative study of *lieux de mémoire*. Some elements of such a comparative perspective on sites of memory are provided by the following articles: Mario Isnenghi gives an insight into Italian *luoghi della memoria*; Jacques Le Rider writes about *Mitteleuropa* (Central Europe) as a site of memory; Udo J. Hebel distinguishes literary, visual, performative, material, virtual, and transnational memory sites of the United States; and Jay Winter provides a comparative view of the sites that commemorate twentieth-century wars.

Part II presents memory research rooted in cultural history. Alon Confino reveals the intellectual and methodological affiliations between memory studies and the history of mentalities, reaching back to the fathers of the Annales school, Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch, and shows how Pierre Nora’s *lieux de mémoire* emerged from this tradition. He then takes a critical look at present-day memory studies and the chances and pitfalls it offers to historians. The next three articles form a unity in many ways, not surprisingly, as they are written by members of the interdisciplinary, Heidelberg-based group of scholars who have been working on cultural memory since the 1980s. Dietrich Harth reconstructs the “invention of cultural memory” in this research context; Jan and Aleida Assmann present some of their eminently influential concepts, among them, for example, the distinction between “cultural” and “communicative” memory and

between “canon” and “archive.” Jürgen Reulecke delineates recent approaches to generational memory, which also have their source in the 1920s: Karl Mannheim’s writings belong to the foundational texts of cultural memory studies, since memory within and between generations is a significant form of collective remembering. With the development of terms such as “generationality” and “generativity,” his legacy has been updated. Vita Fortunati and Elena Lamberti complete this second part of the volume not only by giving a comprehensive overview of the wide array of concepts, but also by providing an insight into the actual practice of international and interdisciplinary cultural memory studies as carried out within the European thematic network ACUME.

Part III directs attention towards the different kinds of memory studies that have emerged in philosophy and the social sciences. Here, again, the history of memory studies and its protagonist Maurice Halbwachs get their due: Jean-Christophe Marcel and Laurent Mucchielli provide an introduction to Maurice Halbwachs’s works on *mémoire collective* as a “unique type of phenomenological sociology.” Jeffrey K. Olick then delineates in a grand sweep the development from Halbwachs’s beginnings to the current “sociology of mnemonic practices and products.” The articles by Andreas Langenohl and Erik Meyer address specific social, political, and ethical questions which have arisen out of contemporary memory politics. Langenohl provides an overview of forms of remembrance in post-authoritarian societies and elaborates on the issue of transitional justice; Meyer develops a policy studies perspective on cultural memory. The articles by Elena Esposito and Siegfried J. Schmidt represent the contributions of systems theory and radical constructivism to cultural memory studies. Esposito theorizes the powerful other side of cultural memory, namely social forgetting. This part ends with Maureen Junker-Kenny’s critical recapitulation of the philosophical and hermeneutical perspective on memory, forgetting, and forgiving that was introduced by Paul Ricœur.

The inclusion of psychological concepts in part IV provides a bridge from memory studies in the humanities and the social sciences to the natural sciences. Representatives of different disciplines (including the neurosciences; psychotherapy; and narrative, social, and cognitive psychology) provide insights into their work on cultural memory. An historical perspective is assumed by Jürgen Straub, who traces the genealogy of psychological memory studies back to the late nineteenth century and charts the history of narrative psychology, up to and including its current state. Wulf Kansteiner and Harald Weinböck take a strong stand “against the concept of cultural trauma.” From a psychotherapy studies perspective they reconstruct and criticize the various uses and abuses of the concept of trauma in cultural memory studies. David Middleton and Steven D.

Brown introduce their work on conversational remembering and stress the important connection between experience and memory. David Manier and William Hirst outline what they call a “cognitive taxonomy of collective memories,” thus showing how group memories are represented in individual minds. Gerald Echterhoff presents new interdisciplinary research on the relation of language and memory, which lies at the very basis of cultural memory. Hans J. Markowitsch provides an introduction to memory research in the neurosciences and discusses how the social world shapes the individual brain. Harald Welzer rounds off this part of the volume by presenting the key concepts of his inherently interdisciplinary research, which spans the field from oral history to social psychology and to the neurosciences.

Parts V and VI move on to the material and medial dimension of cultural memory. The articles in part V represent the main concepts of memory found in literary studies (cf. Erll and Nünning). Renate Lachmann shows how the ancient method of *loci imagines* is linked to literary imagination and describes her influential notion of intertextuality as the “memory of literature.” With Herbert Grabes’s article on the literary canon, the perspective on literature and memory moves from relations between texts to the level of the social systems which select and evaluate literary works. Max Saunders’s article on “life-writing” is concerned with those literary works which are most obviously connected to cultural memory: letters, diaries, biographies, autobiographies, memoirs, etc. However, he also shows that life-writing extends beyond these genres and that individual and cultural memory can indeed be found in most literary texts. Birgit Neumann provides an overview of how memory is represented in literature, using a narratological approach to describe the forms and functions of a “mimesis of memory.” Ann Rigney stresses the active and vital role that literature plays as a medium in the production of cultural memory. She understands memory as a dynamic process (rather than a static entity), in which fictional narratives can fulfill an array of different functions—as “relay stations,” “stabilizers,” “catalysts,” “objects of recollection,” or “calibrators.”

With its focus on mediality and memory, Ann Rigney’s article already points to the last part of the volume, which is concerned with the role of memory in media cultures. Here more than ever disciplines converge. Scholars from literary studies, history, media studies, journalism, and communication studies introduce their views on a set of questions which has emerged as one of the most basic concerns and greatest challenges of memory studies: the intersections between media and cultural memory (which, of course, also give this series its title). Cultural memory hinges on the notion of the medial, because it is only via medial externalization

(from oral speech to writing, painting, or using the Internet) that individual memories, cultural knowledge, and versions of history can be shared. It is therefore no accident that many articles which have made their appearance in earlier parts of this volume could just as easily have been included in the media section. This certainly holds true for the entire section on literature, which can be viewed as one medium of cultural memory. Many other articles of this volume, such as those written by Udo J. Hebel, Jan Assmann, Aleida Assmann, Siegfried J. Schmidt, Elena Esposito, Gerald Echterhoff, and Harald Welzer, are characterized by their strong media perspective—ranging from medial sites of memory to the role of communication technologies for social forgetting and to language as a basic medium of memory.

Part VI begins with a contribution by James E. Young on what is arguably one of the most important artistic media of cultural memory—and its most intricate: the Holocaust memorial. Jens Ruchatz scrutinizes the double role of photography as medial externalization of memory and trace of the past. Barbie Zelizer writes about the connection between journalism and memory, identifying journalism, despite its strong emphasis on the present, as a memorial practice. I look at literature and film as media of cultural memory. Martin Zierold concludes this volume with a more general perspective on how memory studies might develop its focus on media cultures.

We hope that in bringing together many different voices from interdisciplinary and international memory studies and providing an overview of its history and key concepts, we will be able to give some definition to an emerging field. Most importantly, the aim of this volume is to inspire further sophisticated and exciting research by addressing scholars who are as fascinated by the possibilities of “thinking memory” as we are.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Ann Rigney for her critical reading and constructive comments on an earlier version of this introduction.

References

- Assmann, Jan. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. Munich: Beck, 1992.
- Bartlett, F. C. *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1932.