



# Editorial

James Beresford

---

Rooted in and inspired by the work of Halbwachs (1992), Aleida Assmann (2011), Jan Assmann (1997, 2000), Nora (1996), and many others, memory studies has become one of the quickest growing interdisciplinary fields in the humanities and social science (Tamm, 2013). While at different points open to critique of its developments and suggestions for remedy (see Olick and Robbins, 1998), social scientific analysis of memory has been taken up in numerous disciplines; be they philosophy (Trigg, 2012); geography (Jones, 2011, Jones and Garde-Hansen, 2012); anthropology (Berliner, 2005); cultural studies (Loveday, 2014); amongst others. It has even gained its own journal *Memory Studies*, as well as a body of different handbooks and readers (see Erll *et al.* 2010, Kattago, 2015)

The foundation for this growth rests on a distinction between that now termed 'memory studies' and what is framed as a traditional, biologized and naturalised understanding of memory. This has been granted many names; the 'storage bin' (Rowlinson *et al.*, 2014) or 'original plenitude and subsequent loss' (Rigby, 2005) model of memory. All denote an understanding of remembering as an automatic practice of retrieval, as a natural process of recalling previous acts. Memory studies, in the humanities and social sciences, criticises this model through locating remembering *as social*. This scholarship elucidates how remembering the past is an act of narration bringing new realities into being rather than simply reflecting an objective past (Antze and Lambeck, 1996, Kantsteine, 2002, Kuhn, 2002, Loveday, 2014).

An early iteration of this was Halbwachs (1992) writings on collective memory. Collective memories are those possessed or reproduced by multiple actors (Adorisio, 2014, Assmann, 2000, Assmann and Czaplicka, 1995, Azizi, 2011, Coser, 1992, Halbwach, 1992, Loveday, 2014). This encountered criticism; some noting the problematic nature of the idea of collective derived from Durkheim's (1933) *The division of labour in Society*. However, it has been used in innovative and more



different ways acknowledging such initial pitfalls while at the same time modifying it (see Serazio, 2010, Szpunar, and Szpunar, Loveday, 2014), others modifying the idea slightly to look at 'collected memories' (see Kantsteine, 2002).

Early Ideas of collective memory and remembering have also been expanded and re-worked, showing them to be a component not total description of memory enactment. Tamm (2015) discusses this as a cultural turn in memory studies; moving from a disciplinary monopoly of sociology toward the entrance of cultural historians. Most notable in ideas of cultural memory Assmann develops (see Assmann, 2011, Assmann and Czaplicka, 1995).

Later writing expand on memory through understanding its relation to forgetting; arguing the **sybiosis and constitutive link** of the two has been marginalised in earlier scholarship. In this vein Connerton (2008) advocates for a re-envisioning of forgetting; stressing the need to stop understanding forgetting as a failure and see it as productive, doing things. Connerton (2008) created an extensive typology of different kinds of memory. This includes: forgetting as a repressive erasure; prescriptive forgetting; forgetting constitutive in formatting a new identity; structural amnesia; forgetting as annulment; forgetting as planned obsolescence; and finally forgetting as humiliated silence (Connerton, 2008). Others criticise the language of forgetting in memory studies. Singer and Conway (2008) argue that it enacts a false impression of total loss. Rather, they advocate, scholars should talk about accessibility, certain memories becoming less so do to social enactments (Singer and Conway, 2008).

While a fast growing and expanding field, memory studies is yet to become a mainstream and fully established, and has displayed discrepant degrees of growth in different disciplines. Despite it's growth, Segesten and Wüstenberg (2017) argue that memory studies has tended to be multidisciplinary rather than interdisciplinary. The connections between different disciplines that is need for further blossoming of the field is absent; instead most researchers work in the disciplinary silos of their own respective subjects. This special issue addresses Segesten and Wüstenberg (2017) call by showcasing the work of postgraduate and early career researchers, introducing some of the new work in the field to broader social science audiences; as well as mapping the disciplinary genealogies and spatial development of this. It focuses on how a growing but not fully developed field will be added to by the next generation of memory researchers.

**Struzziero Maria Antonietta** addressees explores enactments of memory a literary standpoint. Adopting Jeanette Winterson's memoir *Why Be Happy When You Could Be Normal?* as a point of analysis, the insights of memory studies (as well as psychoanalysis and trauma scholarship) here are used to understand the intricacies of the self representation the memoir performs. Drawing upon Lacanian theory, Antonietta concludes that vectors of desire and memory are employed to re-assemble different memory images.

**Katharine G. Trostel and Avigail S. Oren** astutely demonstrate the way memory studies can elucidate new orientations to studying the spatial. Focussing on the Venice Ghetto, Trostel and Oren use the idea of psycho-geography and look at how this geography in Venice can be studied to elucidate relations between Venice and other areas.

Drawing upon qualitative interview data, **Inci Unal** furthers this by looking to Turkey. Unal asking participants for their memories a particular institute where they lived. Unal centralises the Turkish elite and their civilising missions in the Republic's early years. These schools social position in the westernising of the Anatolian periphery requires significant focus.

**Anikka Toots**, coming from an art background, takes the case of Estonian memory politics within the 1990s. She looks to how technological developments allowed different patterns of memory politics within the Post- Soviet context.

## References

- Antze, P. and Lambek, M. (1996). "Introduction: Forecasting Memory". In: P. Antze. and M. Lambek. (eds). *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*. London: Routledge.
- Assmann, J. (2000). "Introduction: What Is "Cultural Memory"?. In: J. Assmann. (ed) *Religion and Cultural Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Assmann, A. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Western Civilisation: Functions, Media, Archives*. New York : Cambridge University Press.
- Assmann, J. (1997). *Moses the Egyptian: the memory of Egypt in western monotheism*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Assmann, J. and Czaplicka, J. (1995). "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity". *Cultural History/Cultural Studies*. 65, 125–133.

- Berliner, D. (2005). "Social Thought & Commentary: The Abuses of Memory: Reflections on the Memory Boom in Anthropology". *Anthropological Quarterly*, 78(1), 197–211.
- Connerton, P. (2008). "Seven Types of Forgetting". *Memory Studies*. 1(1), 59–71.
- Durkheim, É. (1933). *The division of labor in society*. Glencoe, Ill: Free P.
- Erll, A., Nünning, A., & Young, S. (2010). *A companion to cultural memory studies*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Jones, O. (2011). "Geography, memory and non-representational geographies". *Geography Compass*. 5(12), 875–885.
- Jones, O., & Garde-Hansen, J. (2012). *Geography and memory: Explorations in identity, place and becoming*. Springer.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). "The Social Frameworks of Memory". In: L. A. Coser. (ed). Maurice Halbwachs: On Collective Memory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kantsteine, W. (2002). "Finding Meaning in Memory: A methodological critique of collective memory studies". *History and Theory*. 41, 179–197.
- Kattago, S. (2015). (ed). *The Ashgate Companion to Memory Studies*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Kuhn, A. (2002). *Family Secrets: Acts of Memory and Imagination*. London: New York: Verso.
- Loveday, V. (2014). "'Flat-capping it': Memory, nostalgia and value in retroactive male working-class identification". *European Journal of Cultural Studies*. 17(6), 721–735.
- Nora, P., & Kritzman, L. D. (1996). *Realms of Memory: Conflicts and divisions* (Vol. 1). Columbia University Press.
- Olick, J.K. and Robbins, J. (1998). "Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices". *Annual Review of Sociology*. 24, 105–140.
- Rigby, A. (2005). "Plentitude, scarcity and the circulation of cultural memory". *Journal of European Studies*. 35(1), 11–28.
- Rowlinson, M., Booth, C., Clark, P., Delahaye, A., & Procter, S. (2009). "Social remembering and organizational memory". *Organization Studies*. Online First.
- Singer, J. A. and Conway, M. A. (2008). "Should we forget forgetting?". *Memory Studies*. 1(3), 279–285.
- Segesten, A.D., & Wüstenberg, J. (2017). "Memory studies: The state of an emergent field". *Memory Studies*, 10(4), 474.
- Szpunear, P. M. And Szpunar, K. K. (2015). "Collective future thought: Concept, function, and implications for collective memory studies". *Memory Studies*. 9(4), 376–389.

- Tamm, M. (2013). "Beyond History and Memory: New perspectives in memory studies". *History Compass*. 11(6), 458–473.
- Tamm, M. (2015). "Semiotic Theory of Cultural Memory: In the Company of Juri Lotman". In: S. Kattago. (ed). *The Ashgate Research Companion to Memory Studies*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Trigg, D. (2012). *The Memory of Place: A Phenomenology of the Uncanny*. Open University Press.