After a period of intense work on national memory cultures, we are observing a growing interest in memory both as a social and an individual practice. Memory studies tend to focus on a particular field of memory processes, namely those connected with war, persecution and expulsion. In this sense, the memory – or rather the trauma – of the Holocaust is paradigmatic for the entire research field. The Holocaust is furthermore increasingly understood as constitutive of a global memory community which transcends national memories and mediates universal values. The present volume diverges from this perspective by dealing also with everyday subjects of memory. This allows for a more complete view of the interdependencies between public and private memory and, more specifically, public and family memory.
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The recent development of memory research that, similar to earlier developments in other research fields, brought about a near dominance of the subject in the social sciences and the humanities, has now reached a stage in which the symptoms of a crisis are becoming more than obvious. While the phrase “memory boom”, which has been popular for quite a while, already implies a certain criticism, we are currently encountering unmistakable characterisations such as the “hypertrophy” of memory (Huyssen 2003: 3), an “avalanche” of memory discourses (Crownshaw 2010: 3), the “metastasizing growth” of research endeavours (Olick 2007: 22), and references to the fact that anything and everything is branded with the label “memory”. A feeling of uneasiness is taking hold of memory researchers – not only because the topic seems to be more or less exhausted in the social sciences and humanities, but also because some believe that the enormous amount of research is not accompanied by an adequate progress in conceptual thought.¹ Jeffrey Olick, for instance, characterises “social memory studies” as a “non-paradigmatic, transdisciplinary, and centerless enterprise” that reinvents the wheel over and over again (Olick 2009).²

Against the backdrop of this impending stagnation, the turn towards a hitherto neglected aspect of memory seems to promise fresh momentum. Although slightly delayed compared to other fields, memory research is now performing a

¹ See, for example, Kansteiner 2002.
² With this comment, Olick endorses his earlier diagnosis, namely that memory studies “[…] have – from a scientific point of view – been a rather unproductive hodgepodge” (Olick 1999: 338, see also Olick & Robbins 1998).
“spatial turn”.3 By addressing the spatial dimension of memory processes – an aspect of memory that had been previously assessed as more or less unproblematic – researchers beat a path for the investigation of more complex units of memory. Apart from the issue of the conditions and the functioning of “cosmopolitan memory”, as examined in Lévy and Sznaider’s much discussed volume (Lévy & Sznaider 2001), the question of “European memory” has become an important subject of debate.4 This new perspective is not only considered to be a political and societal desideratum but also a requirement in terms of the theory and pragmatics of research that is met with increasing acknowledgement in social sciences and humanities and finds its current expression in the term “transcultural memory”.5

The contributions in the present collection are likewise meant to be a complement to the majority of research that was and is dedicated to national memory; however it extends this discourse by taking on a reverse perspective to the one described. Most of the articles included here deal with the particular – with small, local, or regional memories – and with memories that can be labelled “peripheral” – “peripheral” in the sense that they were neither the focus of national or transnational (transcultural) memory culture nor a privileged subject of research.6

The contributions are based on presentations delivered at the international conference “Grand Narratives and Peripheral Memories” which assembled researchers from different disciplines in autumn 2009 at Luxemburg University in order to investigate both “big” and “small” memories.7 Presentations were given

3 On the “spatial turn”, see for example the volume published by Döring &Thielmann, which includes contributions from cultural studies, social sciences, and human geography (Döring & Thielmann 2008).
4 See Assmann 2007; Leggewie & Lang 2011; see also the contributions in Knigge et al. 2011 that go back to a conference in the context of the debate about the “House of European History” which is coming into being in Brussels. On “European memory sites”, see for example Majerus et al. 2009; see also Assmann & Conrad 2010, on the problem of “memory in a global age”.
5 See parallax 17(4), special issue on “Transcultural memory”, especially the introductory article by Astrid Erll (Erll 2011).
6 Of course, “peripheral” is not to be understood in the sense of geography, for example as the peripheral regions of Europe; on those, see for instance Leggewie & Land 2011.
7 The conference was held in the context of the research project “Collective experiences, intergenerational memory and identity constructions in Luxembourg. Witnesses of World War II, peasants, industrial workers, immigrants” (http://wwwfr.uni.lu/...
on the Second World War and German occupation, as well as on the Holocaust and the Chilean dictatorship, while others dealt with migration experiences, social transformation, political biography, and the everyday culture of “ordinary people”. The articles have in common that they pay particular attention to personal, and especially familial forms of memory and their representation.

One of the objectives of the conference was to examine conceptual problems based on the example of these very different fields of memory. The conference thus started from the assumption that new insights about the transmission of memories and the emergence and perpetuation of memory collectives might by gained if, alongside the “big” memories and their narratives that have dominated research so far, different stories, narrative forms, and media would be addressed.

Even though the present volume emphasizes “small” or “peripheral” memories, the major research issues in the field are nonetheless present. The collection is inspired by the following question: in what way is the field of memory – its academic investigation as well as its immediate practice – shaped by the basic notions of memory theory that were predominantly developed in the context of research on the Second World War and the Holocaust? The articles are thus, among other things, concerned with the “framing” of these (small) memories through memory studies. Or, in other words, they are concerned with the fact that the analysis of memory processes might in turn impact these processes. Research itself is an element of and a factor in (global) memory culture. Although memory research has not yet, as Olick states, been able to establish a conceptual and methodological canon\(^\text{8}\), it has succeeded – to an astonishing extent – in shaping notions that are capable of making individual and collective memory needs plausible to a broader public, and that can be translated into diverse memory practices.

As Sarah Radstone noticed, memory research displays three interwoven characteristics: “its urgent and committed engagement with varied instances of contemporary and historical violence, its close ties with questions of identity – and relatedly, with identity politics – and its bridging of the domains of the personal and the public, the individual and the social” (Radstone 2008: 33). While memory research, according to Radstone, shares these features with other research fields such as cultural studies, feminist studies, and ethnicity studies, its singularity can be located elsewhere: it explains the processes that take place within and between the different “memory spaces” that are constructed by re-

---

\(^8\) In this context, see also Olick et al. 2011.
search itself – individual, social, cultural, and public – in a way that transcends the borders between the disciplines. In other words, its distinctive character is a result of the transdisciplinary generation of certain “travelling concepts”, that is, concepts that can be linked to different phenomena and that are applicable in different contexts.9

In recent memory research, the notion of “trauma” in particular has become such a “travelling concept”. Traumatic memory seems to create a link between individual and collective processes and different cultural phenomena (ibid., p. 35). Jeffrey Olick, for example, argues that traumatic experiences do not only, as William James formulated, represent “thorns in the spirit” of the individual. Traumas can also be genuinely collective “insofar as historical events cannot easily be integrated into coherent and constructive narratives.” (Olick 1999: 344). 10 However when looking at the notion of trauma, it becomes also apparent that the appealing universality and the alleged explanatory power of such “travelling concepts” might obliterate the differences between these processes, and therefore they might be detrimental to an adequate analysis of diverse memory processes and forms of expression.11

Will the aforementioned reorientation of research claimed by Astrid Erll and others help to counteract the negative impacts of this conceptual nivellation? Such claims state that memories are moving across cultural and social borders, which is why it is necessary to turn away from “memory cultures” and rather try to focus on transcultural memory processes or “memories on the move”. This change of perspective not only leads to an acknowledgement of larger collectives – such as “Europe” or “humanity” – but also to the incorporation of all kinds of specific memory collectives, for instance those that grow out of music cultures or soccer (see Erll 2011a: 8).12

9 See also Said’s notion of “travelling theory” (Said 1983); on the issue of nomadising analytical concepts, see in particular Bal 2002.

10 This explains why Olick uses the example of traumatic events in order to explain the “multi-dimensional rapprochement” between “individualist” and “collectivist approaches to collective memory” or, as he also calls it, between “collected” and “collective” memory (Olick 1999); see also Giesen 2004.

11 See, among others, Luckhurst 2003; Radstone 2007; see also the contributions in Crowshaw et al. 2010; on a “theory of cultural trauma”, see Alexander 2004.

12 Erll explains elsewhere that memory represents a “soft skill” when it comes to attempts at regional integration, a capacity that can be enhanced, among other things, through the results of memory research (Erll 2010).
However, the approach of “transcultural memory” does not address the problem of how different memory spaces or temporalities relate to one another in a satisfying way. Erll describes transcultural memory as, “the incessant wandering of carriers, media, contents, forms, and practices of memory, their continual ‘travels’ and ongoing transformations through time and space, across social, linguistic and political borders” (Erll 2011a: 11). In fact, this brings another “travelling concept” into play, namely, “mobility”. Under the influence of this notion, the memories themselves emerge, as it were, as mobile subjects. Their figurative, transcultural peregrination makes it possible to talk about transcultural memory and transboundary remembering, while the mechanisms of the transcending memory processes such as they take place in the actual subjects of memory remain vague and indeterminate.

The demand to clarify the transmission processes between individual and collective memory – between intrapsychic, cognitive processes on the one hand and public, cultural processes on the other – is not becoming obsolete in the context of transcultural memory. On the contrary, it is becoming even more pressing since, due to additional translation processes, the emerging memory framings are becoming ever more complex.

As stated above, the present volume is the result of an inverse perspective, insofar as our point of departure is the “locatedness” of memory. This does not mean that the contributing authors ignore or deny the movements of objects, practices, and media related to memory. However, in the following articles they do not seek to perform a cultural, historical, and spatial “tracking” of these elements. Instead, they attempt to analyse the processes that result in a “concretisation” of memories – processes that “locate” them due to the fact that our capacities to perceive and comprehend are “shaped by our inescapable histories and locatedness and culture” (Radstone 2011: 111).

The volume is divided into three sections. The first section contains articles that are explicitly concerned with the relationship between memory and family

---

13 Erll tries to counter this problem by criticizing Halbwachs’ notion of “collective memory” which, as she says, is essentially linked to notions of similarity and identity. According to Erll, this “non-transcultural concept” mistakes “usable fictions which the groups believe in” for an analytical category (Erll 2011a: 10).

14 On the “new mobility paradigm”, see for example Sheller & Urry 2006; Canzler et al. 2008; Büscher & Urry 2009.

15 In this context, see Middleton & Brown on territoriality as an element of the “physiognomy” of collective memory frameworks as described by Halbwachs (Brown & Middleton 2005: 118-137). See also Langenohl 2005.
relations. The authors take very different perspectives and use a variety of memory objects as examples. The French sociologist Anne MUXEL begins the section with an article in which she briefly summarizes the results of her study on *la mémoire familiale* (Muxel 1996), thus making her work accessible to English-language readers. When recent memory research in the social and cultural sciences investigates the topic of the family, it mostly does so in the context of the remembrance of significant historical events. Here, the family is understood as a kind of hinge or relaying mechanism between individual remembrance and public (in particular, national) memory. However in French research we are more likely to find studies informed by a genuine interest in the family and transmission processes within families than in Anglo-American or German research. Muxel’s work, which analyzes the function of familial memory with regard to individual identity construction, is an example of this. On the one hand, it is based on the results of an empirical study – qualitative interviews with members of different social groups – and on the other hand, it is grounded in the analysis of the author’s own family history, that is, on a self-reflective remembrance process. This makes her article particularly interesting.

Muxel starts from Halbwachs’ notion of the collective framing of memories, but turns her attention to the individual and her or his complex remembrance needs. She distinguishes between three basic functions of remembrance, and in this way constructs what she calls a “general framework which might be termed a ‘sociology of intimacy’”. The three functions – “transmission”, “revival”, and “reflexivity” – differ from each other in terms of their specific narrative modes, temporalities, and memory uses. This clarifying distinction of functions undoubtedly enriches memory research in the social and cultural sciences, since this research as yet has barely been concerned in a systematic way with the complexity and changeability of individual remembrance needs, for instance, with the way age can impact memory. Muxel’s framework moreover shows that the question of which memory collective we mean when we talk about “family” needs further examination as well. For example, her work shows how, as a rule,

16 See Lenz & Welzer 2007; see also Erll 2011b.
17 See, for example, Zonabend (1980) on familial time and historical time (*temps événementielle*); Gaulejac (1999) on the function of familial remembrance; Attias-Donfut et al. (2002) on different types of familial transmission; Segalen & Michelat (1991) on the growing interest in genealogy among considerable parts of the population; Oeser & Gollac (2011) on the results of an interdisciplinary German-French comparative survey on familial transmission; however also see Keppler’s (1994) and Coenen-Huther’s (1994) works on German and Swiss families respectively.
relationships between siblings were neglected in research in favour of relationships between generations and thus, to a certain degree, in favour of a certain function of memory.

The book’s second article nonetheless investigates intergenerational transmission processes using the example of the very object that is essential to this entire field of research: the remembrance of National Socialist crimes. Social scientist Jan LOHL delivers a critical analysis of Harald Welzer and his colleagues’ work at the Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut Essen (see primarily, Welzer et al. 2002). Starting from psychoanalytical concepts of emotional dynamics within families, and based on the corresponding studies about the problem of remembering the “Third Reich”, Lohl calls for a deeper examination of familial loyalty. Welzer et al. refer to the latter in their attempt to show how children and grandchildren do not want to hear about their parents’ and grandparents’ crimes. According to Lohl, this attitude of loyalty should not simply be understood as a correlative or a product of familial closeness; instead it should be interpreted as an “aggressively induced obligation”. The mechanisms Lohl discusses have been most clearly described when reflecting on the remembrance of National Socialism in German families. However, they are equally crucial when it comes to understanding processes of intergenerational transmission in general.

In a way, sociologist Daniela JARA’s contribution about the “post-coup second generation” in Chile adds to Lohl’s psychoanalytically inspired criticism of the abovementioned analysis of memory narratives. Jara focuses the second generation and the experience of state violence this generation inherited from their parents. This heritage, she argues, is overshadowed by the first generation’s traumatic experiences, and therefore cannot be “worked through”. In her analysis of three life histories, she does not only consider the silence of the “post-coup” generation – the “children of Pinochet” – and their inability to talk about the experiences of violence and fear they inherited from their parents; moreover, she discusses the bodily dimension of memory, the physical experience and the remembrance of threat and fragility, and the associated feelings of weakness and shame that are also inscribed on the body.

Similarly, the article by Renée WAGENER, a social scientist, is also concerned with experiences of transmitting violence and oppression. Her research is dedicated to the passing on of memories of the Second World War and of the German occupation in Luxembourgian families, and centres upon fundamental questions of methodology and conceptualisation that are generally important for memory research. Wagener conducted a three-generation study that shows, among other things, how both the first generation’s individual war memories as
well as the historical knowledge that is passed on in the national master narrative are handed down in a very rudimentary form through family memory, especially when it comes to grandchildren. These results prompt Wagener to question the notion of the family as the most important functional framework of memory processes and as an instance of conveyance of historical knowledge. Apart from the overall problem of younger generations’ “historylessness”, she claims that in view of transformed family structures, it is time to review the “three-generation family” model that still dominates research on social memory.

One could say that Elisabeth BOESEN, a cultural anthropologist, takes the inverse position in her article when she makes the case for expanding the traditional notion of family from the direct line of descendents to collateral relatives (uncles, aunts, etc.). At first glance, one might think that this argument is specific to the object of her research: rural families in Luxembourg. However, her reflections – like those of Wagener – are meant to be a general criticism of the concept of “family” within memory research. Moreover, Boesen uses the example of farming families in order to show that familial memories are individual and collective “commentaries” on other transmission processes, especially on the transmission and on the more or less successful appropriation of material and immaterial heritages (namely, in the case of the farmers, the house and the farm) – and therefore they need to be investigated as such. This insight also has conceptual and methodological implications. The example of the farming milieu serves to emphasise the importance of particular social and cultural conditions for familial transmission processes, and consequently, the need for a specific hermeneutic preunderstanding.

Part two of the volume explores the nexus between public and private objects of memory. The first two articles inquire into the memories of “ordinary people”, and into attempts to turn these memories into public objects, i.e., to create or facilitate the appropriate modes of remembrance. While the authors choose very different approaches, both texts look into the fundamental questions of whether it is possible to represent “ordinary lives” and what impacts these public portrayals might have.

The first article is yet again concerned with the farming and rural milieu. The historian Rita GARSTENAUER presents her study on farmers’ autobiographies that were not only collected, but also partly published and even solicited by the Dokumentation lebensgeschichtlicher Aufzeichnungen (Collection of Biographical Records) at the University of Vienna. The results of her analysis of the metadata of this extensive body show that the very diverse reception contexts in which these autobiographies originated – and above all the various degrees to which they are public – have a clear impact on the texts both in terms of content
and form. Garstenauer’s work is remarkable, not least because she succeeds in combining her historical interrogation with sociological and philological concepts such as “intertextuality” and “interdiscourse”.

Cultural anthropologist and museologist Elizabeth CARNEGIE’s essay then addresses the attempts made by several museums in the United Kingdom to uncover the “difficult” and painful aspects of “ordinary people’s” lives in their exhibitions. The author comments primarily on the questionable aspects of these attempts; for instance, the fact that the collective of “ordinary people” is only created by means of its public representation. She also asks what kind of impact this way of fixing life histories and living conditions has or might have on the “exhibited” people’s individual development potentials, as their participation in these endeavours – in contrast to academic research – is not anonymous.

Sociologist Delyth EDWARDS draws on the results of her doctoral thesis to examine the cultural representation of orphans in public life in the Republic of Ireland, as well as the question of how these representations influence orphans’ autobiographical memories. In many respects, her research topic represents a very specific case of remembering “the difficult lives of ordinary people”. First, the orphan child has been an object of cultural imagination at least since the 19th century. As Edwards argues, the orphan child represents “the ‘grotesque other’ and the ‘moral dirt’ of Irish society”. Second, this case is also noticeable because orphans are more than non-orphans dependent on public narratives, and may even be at their mercy. In many cases, they do not possess their own family memories. Therefore, “absent memory” – also their own absence in the memory of their biological family of origin – can represent to them the very core of their existence.

Edwards also touches upon the question of how these missing memories are transferred onto the “post-orphan generation”, and in this way makes her own “inherited” memories an object of her analysis. Fellow contributor Daniela Jara, who is a member of the Chilean “post-coup generation”, makes a similar move when she investigates this group in her dissertation. The absence or impossibility of familial remembrance is the focus of both these authors’ research. Even though Jara, in contrast to Edwards, only incidentally notes that she shares her interview partners’ experiences, it becomes clear with both authors that their particular affinities to their objects of research represents an important basis for understanding.

The final contribution of the second section is similarly dedicated to memories of “the people”. Historian Denis SCUTO presents the results from a study on Luxembourgian steel worker families and on the question of the transmission of the experience of social change, in particular regarding the declining steel
industry and the associated history of the affected workforce. Based on the results of this empirical study, Scuto analyses the nexus between the public discourse of the state, the collective memory of the workers’ movement, and the private, familial processes of remembrance. Using the example of two three-generation families, he shows, among other things, that familial memories are substantially impacted by structural conditions, such as the education level and the factual social advancement of family members, and how both the “grand narrative” about the national steel industry as well as the mémoire du mouvement ouvrier are passed on from the perspective of the small and local social spaces.

The third section of this collection consists of articles that investigate the problem of the social constitution of memory collectives. In the first text, historian Joseph MASLEN examines the family memories of British communists, thus providing a complement to Scuto’s contribution. While Scuto is interested in the impact of the (national) steel industry and workforce’s public narrative, Maslen examines familial history as an element of national political history. Based on the example of one family, he demonstrates that the family memories of British communists, and more precisely, the memories of the generation of children born in the 1940s, challenge the grand narrative about the “sixties” as a time of fundamental sociocultural change and therefore do not fit into the collective memory of the “children of the revolution”.

The contribution of the cultural anthropologist Daniela KOLEVA is similarly concerned with the nexus between the family and other memory collectives. However, she investigates social conditions that seem to be more complex than the ones mentioned before, where two memory frameworks – familial memory and public memory (that essentially corresponds with a national history and remembrance culture) – were opposing each other or interacting with one another. Koleva presents the example of a family that is part of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria, and therefore belongs to an ethnic “mnemonic community”. Moreover, the two analysed generations – mother and daughter – spent decisive periods of their lives in different politico-societal entities, namely, socialist and post-socialist Bulgaria. Koleva analyzes the question of to what extent familial memory is a “contested terrain” on which different versions of the past – that result from belonging to different mnemonic communities and particularly from belonging to different generations – compete with each other. This article, which is about the possibilities to individually disengage from familial traditions – from memory as habitus – represents in a way a counterpart to Lohl’s contribution, where he shows how familial dynamics oblige the children to adhere to their parents’ memories. Koleva’s article is also noteworthy in that it is the only contribution included here that addresses the gender specifics of memory processes.
INTRODUCTION

Sociologist Alena PFOSER also dedicates her article to a plural setting, namely, memories and the historical consciousness of adolescents from migrant families in Austria. Starting from an empirical study that examined how young people receive national historical memory through schooling and the media and incorporate it into their identity constructions, Pfoser uses the example of a young man born in Vienna to a family of Bosnian Serbs in order to demonstrate how different memory frameworks and narratives interact with one another. She emphasises the adolescents’ multiperspectivity, and the strategic nature of their appropriation of particular narratives and myths from Austrian history, for example the idea that Austria was Hitler’s first victim.

This volume concludes with Jeanette HOFFMANN’s contribution. Hoffmann presents the results from her pedagogical dissertation on the subject of Holocaust remembrance among German and Polish secondary school students. Hoffmann also focuses on the multiperspectivity of adolescent historical consciousness. Yet, in contrast to Pfoser, she is mostly interested in “forms of narrative presentation”, or rather, in different narrative contexts. On the one hand, she identifies the family and the street, and on the other hand, literature and the school. These four forms correspond more or less to the distinction between communicative and cultural memory. In her study, Hoffmann draws the conclusion that the literary form of transferring historical memory is of essential importance since it allows people “to approach the past from different perspectives and to experience its contradictions”. For this reason, she suggests a third category of memory processes that is situated between communicative and cultural remembrance, namely, memory in “lingua-cultural and institutional contexts”.

The contributions collected in this volume demonstrate that studies on memory processes that are concerned with “the peripheral” as defined above are inspiring for memory research in general, and can provide new impulses with regard to conceptual and methodological questions. Of course, this volume can only supply a very limited impression of the diversity of such memory processes and of possible ways to investigate them. Apart from a few exceptions, the contributions are based on the results of empirical, qualitative studies where memories are primarily elucidated by means of interviews. Artistic and other symbolic forms of expression are almost entirely left out of consideration. The same applies to the field of sensorial remembrance, to name but two more manifestations of memory.

18 See for example Seremetakis 1996; Koureas 2008.
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