CONCEPTS AROUND SELECTED PASTS: ON 'MNEMONIC TURN' IN CULTURAL RESEARCH

Ene Kõresaar

Abstract: The aim of this article is to outline the main concepts used in cultural research, which denote the use of the past, to look into the trajectories of their mutual relationships, and to discuss the causes and development potential of the multi-faceted landscape of concepts that has emerged. Serving as an introduction to this thematic volume, this article creates the necessary conceptual framework for reading the following case studies. Two pairs of concepts are observed, which provide information on the modern cultural research of selected pasts: history culture and memory, and tradition–heritage. It is concluded that all the observed concepts could in the current situation be dealt with not only as fields of research, but as perspectives relevant for all areas of cultural research. Whether and to what extent the research of history culture, memory, tradition and heritage are entangled, is dependent on problem settings and objects of research, to which the respective research directions were originally related, but also connected with disciplinary contexts and academic traditions in different countries. In addition to impulses arising from inside research directions, the reason for the greater engagement of these directions could be the rise of interdisciplinary fields, which are not anchored to any specific concepts. A situation in which cultural research concepts with solid trajectories become replaceable occurs also in the case of transdisciplinary 'turns'. The research perspectives behind different concepts are best engaged within a specific field of research, which in turn have made way to the emergence of new concepts that bridge the established ones. In the context of this thematic volume, it is meaningful to refer to the increased cross-disciplinary interest in how the representation of the past in a variety of public spheres takes place. In this respect, concepts have been taken into use that refer to the 'public' at different levels: from official, state-sanctioned institutions to less formal, often locally based settings, and to particular, individualised contexts.

Keywords: cultural heritage, history culture, memory turn, social and cultural memory, tradition

INTRODUCTION

The starting point for this thematic volume was the History Culture and Selected Pasts panel organised at the 32nd Nordic Conference of Ethnology and Folkloristics in Bergen in 2012. This brought together twelve panellists from ethnology, folkloristics and history research, to discuss the representations of the past in museums, archives, local industrial companies, tourism, social media, autobiographic narratives and the print media. It is significant to note that only two of the twelve panellists actually used the concept 'history culture'. The landscape of concepts that was outlined as a result of the panel turned out to be varied, yet still intriguingly interrelated. At the same time, the abundance of different concepts did not cause problems in understanding each other or objections from other schools, which indicates that the meanings of the concepts are overlapping or at least sufficiently similar. The aim of this article is to outline the main concepts used in cultural research, which denote the use of the past, to look into the trajectories of their mutual communication, and to discuss the causes and development potential of the multi-faceted landscape of concepts that has emerged. Serving as an introduction to this thematic volume, this article creates the necessary conceptual framework for reading the following case studies and deals with the analysis categories selected by the authors of the articles in their mutual relationships.[1]

From time to time it has been said that social sciences and the humanities have undergone a 'mnemonic turn' (see, e.g., A. Assmann 2002: 27; Bachmann-Medick 2006: 381). As it is a real conceptual leap from the object level to the level of analysis categories, and therefore a novel 'turn' with a transdisciplinary potential, it is a question to which answers must be looked for in the future (Bachmann-Medich 2006: 382). So far, it is clear that the mnemonic turn has neither taken place simultaneously in all disciplines – and in some of them there has been no direct need for such a turn – nor has it followed a common trajectory. Also, the concepts developed for denoting mnemonic practices are by far not uniform. Quite the opposite, there is an abundance of them across fields and disciplines as well as across national borders.

Astrid Erll in the introduction to her book *Memory in Culture* maintains, "[t]he heterogeneity of the concepts and disciplinary approaches to possibly identical objects of research represents one of the most important challenges of contemporary memory studies" (Erll 2011a: 6). This could be applied more generally to social sciences and humanities. On the other hand, it is not certain whether the diversity and overlapping of concepts is a problem, i.e., whether we do inevitably need one concept to denote all these phenomena of using the past. Opponents of memory studies, for example, have criticised the fact that

one concept denotes a multitude of diverse phenomena (ibid.: 7). Therefore, it could be useful to periodically revisit concepts that are used both intra- and cross-disciplinarily to study the uses of the past, as well as the relationships between these concepts.

In the following, two pairs of concepts are observed, which provide information on the modern cultural research of selected pasts. Focusing on the approaches that are included in this thematic volume, a comparative analysis of the trajectories, uses and mutual relationships of the concepts is made.

HISTORY CULTURE & MEMORY

The concept of history culture as it appears in the title of this special issue was coined by German historian and history theorist Jörn Rüsen in the late 1980s and early 1990s. He postulated the term '*Geschichtskultur*' in order to position historical thinking in everyday life, by arguing that it is through the category of culture that historical thinking becomes rooted in everyday practice (Rüsen 1994b). Rüsen conceptualised history culture as a set of temporal interpretations articulated in the practice of historical remembering. Every society needs to interpret time in order to compare itself to others, to adapt to social changes, and activate changes in turn. Hence, the main keywords of history culture are experience, interpretation, communication and identity. Rüsen was certainly not the first one to come up with the concept of history culture. In the 1980s, the terms 'historical culture' and '*Geschichtskultur*' already existed, either in a more limited meaning, as a tool for analysing specific discourse of historical research, or in a broader sense, designating various forms of representation of the past in the present.[2]

The term 'history culture' is related to another important concept – historical consciousness (German *Geschichtsbewusstsein*). The starting point for Rüsen's fundamental discussion of history culture is the analysis of historical consciousness, which through the treatment of historical methods eventually leads to the conceptualisation of history culture (Rüsen 1994a). Historical consciousness, which was conceptualised already in the first half of the 19th century (Hegel 1970 [1832–1845]), became the central category in the renewing didactics of history in the 1970s–1980s (see, e.g., Jeismann 1980; Pandel 1987). It was understood as an experience-based "individual mental structure" (Pandel 1987: 132), which involves different, individually and complexly combined dimensions and categories. The classic differentiation of the dimensions of historical consciousness was provided by Hans-Jürgen Pandel (1987). Within historical consciousness, he also distinguished between the consciousness of time (*Bewusstsein für*

die Zeit), the consciousness of reality (*Bewusstsein für die Wirklichkeit*) and the consciousness of historicity (*Historizitätsbewusstsein*). The dimensions of historical consciousness are made more complex by social categories: (group) identity, political consciousness, social-economic consciousness and morals. Later, Bodo von Borries differentiated the historical consciousness theory still further, distinguishing coding levels (biographical experience, social memory, cultural heritage, science methodology), types of meaning creation, temporal relations (past, present, future), and modes of processing (information, moral decision, emotion, aesthetic contemplation) (Borries 2001).

According to Rüsen, "history culture is only a little step away from historical consciousness" (Rüsen 1994a: 213). In other words, as he later maintained, "history culture is practically effective articulation of historical consciousness in the life of a society" (Rüsen 1994b: 5; Rüsen 2001: 2). This means that the relationship of historical consciousness and history culture consists in the relationship between the individual and the public (collective). In other words, if historical consciousness is an individual mental process, history culture is its materialisation, containing manifestations that accompany the usage of the past, historical images, events, places and products. Hannu Salmi treats history culture as an extensive concept, embracing all kinds of ways that the past exists in the present: as memory and experience, customs and rituals, artefacts and other materialised realms of memory, marketable "products of the past" (Salmi 2001). The same approach is used in this volume by **Anna Sivula**, who under history culture means "the entirety of generations, modifications, transformations, and utilisations of the images of the past". For her, "[h]istory culture is an umbrella term that refers to all types of use, production, formation and transmission of historical images". In the light of a microhistorical case of Porin Puuvilla Oy, Sivula demonstrates how and why the different actors select one past to be historicised and leave another to be obsolete. She introduces an analytical four-field of the internal and external dimensions of history management.

The study of historical consciousness was somewhat influential in the ethnological research and folklore studies of the 1980s and 1990s. The term 'historical image' was applied successfully in German oral history and *Erzählforschung* (Heins 1993). Elsewhere, however, established disciplinary concepts were often modified rather than new concepts adopted. The concept of 'collective tradition' in folklore studies, for example, can be understood in terms of history culture which, as a part of national culture, offers support and order, as well as leaves scope for varying individual reminiscences (Eriksen 1997; Heimo 2010: 40).[3]

Already this brief excursion into the practice of the neighbouring disciplines demonstrates how in the 1990s concepts related to selected pasts started to

'travel' between disciplines and relate more to each other. The same goes for the relationship of 'history culture' and 'memory'.

The 1980s and 1990s were the time of very influential research which later became memory studies. After the works of the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs (1925, 1950) were translated into German (1985, 1990) and English (1980, 1992), the term 'collective memory' gained a wider theoretical ground.[4] Under collective memory, Halbwachs meant the social entwinement of individual memories, including their relations with handing down cultural knowledge and intergenerational communication. His ideas have been generative for much of the subsequent scholarship, most notably in France and Germany (Olick & Vinitzky-Seroussi & Levy 2011: 25). In France, the re-emergence of the memory problematic in the 1980s was led by Jacques Le Goff (1992) and ultimately by Pierre Nora, whose monumental work *Les Lieux de mémoire* (1984–1992) introduced the concepts of 'realms of memory', 'sites of memory' and '*Erinnerungsorte / räume*'. Nora understood the latter as geographical places, buildings, monuments, works of art, but also historical figures, anniversaries, cultural texts, rituals, etc.[5] A realm of memory in Nora's sense is broader cultural objectivisation that fulfils a certain function in society (intentionality) and holds a meaning that is symbolic for society, be it right from the moment of its emergence or in retrospect. Parallels with how history culture was perceived by the turn of the century are obvious here.

With Nora's work – and other historical studies on the role of collective memory in the making of national identity[6] – the history and memory debate started and the understanding emerged that it is not appropriate to define a distinctive contrast between history and memory; the two (notions) should overlap and 'discipline' each other.

At the end of the 1980s and in the 1990s, Jan and Aleida Assmann in Germany developed the concepts 'communicative memory' and 'cultural memory'. They used these two concepts to distinguish between the collective memory, which is based on everyday intergenerational communication, and the collective memory, which is based on cultural objectivisations with symbolic meanings, respectively (J. Assmann 1988; 1992). Aleida Assmann (1999) elaborated the concept of cultural memory in the theory of dynamics between its actuality and potential (the concepts *Funktionsgedächtnis* and *Speichergedächtnis*) (see also Assmann & Assmann 1994).[7] In Germany the concept of communicative memory became popular both in oral history, especially in studies on family memory and intergenerational transmission, and also in social psychology in conversational remembering and communicative unconsciousness/unconscious communication studies (Welzer 2005).[8] Later, Aleida Assmann (2004) has referred to communicative memory also as social memory. The use of the social memory concept

has become most heterogeneous and varying, due to both national and language borders as well as disciplinary borders. For example, in the German-language academia, differentiation is made between Assmanns' concept of social memory and the social-psychological 'social memory'. In Harald Welzer's approach, 'social memory' is an implicit and unintentional sphere of memory, and its media – interaction, documents, pictures/images and spaces – are not inevitably meant for trading the past, but they still "transport" history and represent the social use of the past in everyday life (Welzer 2001). In this sense, the 'social memory' concept in the German research area differs considerably as compared to social memory studies in the Anglo-American research area (cf. Fentress & Wickham 1992; Olick & Robbins 1998; Climo & Cattell 2002; Misztal 2003). The latter is not concentrated on a specifically defined type of memory, but represents a common name for the increased number of approaches across all disciplines that recognise "the importance of social frameworks and contexts in the process of remembering" (Misztal 2003: 1). Here 'social memory' is synonymous with 'collective memory' (Olick & Robbins 1998; Olick & Vinitzky-Seroussi & Levy 2011).

Hence, by the end of the 1990s there was a large variety of memory concepts, behind which usually also separate research fields formed. Returning once again to how history culture and (collective) memory as fields of research relate to one another, the table below matches the three dimensions of history culture by Jörn Rüsen (Rüsen 1994a) with different directions in memory studies, using Aleida Assmann's differentiation of types of memory to denote them (A. Assmann 2004; 2010).

History culture (Rüsen 1994a)	Memory (A. Assmann 2004; 2010)
Cognitive	Personal memory / social memory
Political	Political memory
Aesthetic	Cultural memory

In Rüsen's sense, cognitive or experiential dimension of history culture is centred on knowledge of the past and orientation in time. This is where the parallel term, historical consciousness, comes up more often and where oral history and life story research as well as social (and communicative) memory studies are more in dialogue. Political dimension means that history culture is analysed from the viewpoint of political discourse, asking what the key agencies and powers are that intervene in the production and dissemination of the symbolic constructs of historical culture. In memory studies there is a special branch, Politics of History and Memory, with the terms 'collective memory', and 'political memory' in its focus. The aesthetic dimension of history culture includes its aesthetic

manifestations and artistic objectifications: media, art, literature, museum, etc. In short, this is the field of what is known as cultural memory studies.

In addition to the similar development processes concerning the differentiation of concepts in history culture, and (collective) memory studies and their changing into separate fields of research, memory studies have approached history culture research by paying increasingly more attention to the category of culture. While in the late 1990s *Erinnerungskultur* was more a German phenomenon (cf. from the cultural-historical point of view Erll 2005: 34–39; from the aspect of recent history, e.g., Hockerts 2001), then by the mid-2000s the term 'memory culture' was already a transnational term (Radstone & Hodgkin 2005). Such rapprochement of history culture and memory culture is, on the one hand, connected with the central position of German schools in memory studies. Erll, when postulating cultural memory studies as a dialogic space of diverse memory studies, dwells on the same notion of culture as Rüsen did – the German *Kulturwissenschaft* – as well as the anthropological understanding of culture as a specific way of life, led within its self-spun webs of meaning (Erll 2008: 4). On the other hand, it has to do with the ongoing transcultural turn in cultural research and with a search for concepts, which avoid tying memory to clear-cut territories and social formations (Erll 2011b).

Still, the relations between 'history culture' and 'memory culture / cultural memory' continue to be characterised through the tension of approaching and distancing. A sign of the former process is the synonymous use of concepts or, even the "swallowing" of one concept by another. For example, around the turn of the century Rüsen admits that there is no dialogue between history culture and memory culture studies (Rüsen 2001: 4–5), but five years later he uses these concepts as synonyms (Rüsen 2006: 70). By means of the semiotic model of cultural memory that Erll elaborated at the same time, relying on the Assmanns (Erll 2005), she tried to embrace the whole of all the processes related to the relationship of the present and the past in the social and cultural context. Later she sees the concept 'cultural memory' as an umbrella term that draws the disciplines together:

> It is exactly the umbrella quality of the term 'cultural memory' which helps us to see the (sometimes functional, sometimes analogical, sometimes metaphorical) relationships between phenomena which were formerly conceived of as distinct, and thus draw connections between tradition and canon, monuments and historical consciousness, family communication and neuronal circuits. Therefore, the concept of cultural memory opens up a space for interdisciplinary perspectives in a way none of these other (albeit more specific) concepts can. (Erll 2011a: 99)

It seems, however, that disciplinary borders (still) play a relatively clear role in whether and how certain concepts are used. For example, in history writing and particularly in history didactics studies there is no need for a new concept of memory; yet, there is a need to deal with the confusing variety of concepts with partly synonymous, partly overlapping meanings. A recent book on Nordic history culture defines memory culture narrowly as a field of commemoration and as a part of history culture which, in turn, is to signify "the whole spectrum of ways the past is addressed and used in a society" (Bjerg & Lenz & Thorstensen 2011: 8). At the same time, a book from the same academic cultural area, but with a more interdisciplinary authorship, does not concentrate directly on the concepts of (collective) memory or history culture, although it admits to originating from them, but focuses on the nature of activities connected with using the past, studying how negotiations of the past are performed and what strategies are employed (Eriksen 2009). **Tuomas Hovi** in this volume adopts a similar position, when he poses a question about the use of history and tradition in Dracula tourism. Although he distinguishes between the concepts of history (as the interpretation of the past), (legend) tradition and fiction, he combines them from the point of view of an agent, and treats them as (analytical) parts of the use of history.

TRADITION & HERITAGE

When introducing the concepts of tradition and heritage, and their relations to memory, one has to start differently. There is no use postulating the beginnings of the term 'tradition', as it has such an exhaustive and elaborated trajectory in ethnology, folkloristics and anthropology (cf., e.g., Boyer 1990; Noyes 2009; Howard & Blank 2013; Oring 2013). Even when memory studies have evoked an enthusiastic response in anthropology – and perhaps a less enthusiastic response in folklore studies – the question for the critics of the popularity of memory studies remains as to its capacity of replacing established concepts. In 2005, anthropologist David Berliner, when criticising the obsession for memory in anthropology, asked: "What is actually new in our current fascination with memory?"– and answered: "The success of memory among anthropologists is an avatar of the never-ending debate about the continuity and reproduction of society" (Berliner 2005: 203); "memory is [---] an ideal entry point to engage with issues of cultural continuity" (ibid.: 2005: 204). A few years later Erll noted in her introduction to the *Handbook of Cultural Memory Studies*:

> [---] even today scholars continue to challenge the nation of collective or cultural memory, 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. (Erll 2008: 1–2)

The fundamental question about the continuity and reproduction in society, as Berliner specified the main question of anthropological disciplines, as seen from the position of folkloristics, is solved by the concepts 'genre', 'transmission', and 'tradition', which make up the folklore researcher's toolbox (McNeill 2013: 175). The central concept signifying cultural continuity – tradition – has taken many forms and the trajectories of using it reach back to the beginnings of the disciplines of folklore studies, ethnology and anthropology.

Lynne McNeill (2013: 176) maintains that 'tradition' is the key to mark the boundaries of folkloric inquiry. Dorothy Noyes distinguishes three main "traditions" of the concept 'tradition': tradition as communication, as temporal ideology, and as communal property (Noyes 2009). Such approaches in studying tradition have clear touching points with the different directions of memory studies. The study of tradition as communicative transaction has shifted from the original understanding of tradition as inheritance to the one of migration, then after the turn to context in the 1960s and 1970s to the community-centred view, and finally, beginning in the 1990s, to the category of circulation accelerated by the "metacultures of newness": "Whereas earlier scholarship assumed continuity and tried to explain change, today flux is assumed…" (Noyes 2009: 239). If we compare this dynamics of the concept of tradition to what has taken place in cultural memory studies, obvious parallels in development can be seen. Let us take, for example, "travelling memory", a cultural memory research-centred metaphor, which points to the fact that "in the production of cultural memory, people, media, mnemonic forms, contents, and practices are in constant, unceasing motion" (Erll 2011b: 12). The touching point between tradition as circulation and travelling memory is particularly clear, when the issues of transmission and media(tisa)tion are problematised and new fields of research are captured, for example, communication via the Internet and other ways of technological mediation.

The connection of tradition and memory studies actually extends much further, being elaborated in tandem with the theory of modernity, to which both concepts provide a binary contrast (Noyes 2009: 239). Just to mention the salvage fieldwork that was in the centre of early folkloristics and ethnology, and the Western popular traditionalist movements since the 1960s, which arose in defence of traditions and which somewhat later became objects of cultural analysis. In this volume, **Coppélie Cocq** studies the emic uses of 'tradition' as

well as the process of traditionalisation in the context of revitalisation of Sámi languages and culture. She approaches traditionalisation as a basic cultural process, in which people select valued aspects of the past considered traditional within the community for cultural attention and custodianship. It is a self-conscious process that takes place in the community at different levels. Cocq's view of 'tradition' stresses its power and ability to define a culture, categorise communities, and establish common grounds and boundaries.

The process that later on became critically called the 'memory boom', is rooted in the same turn towards the past as a crucial concern of the Western societies from the late 20th century modernity (Huyssen 2000: 57). Earlier on, influential collective memory studies used the concept of tradition to emphasise the primary role of the state in shaping collective memory. Hobsbawm and Ranger defined tradition as "a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of arbitual or symbolic nature, which seek to incalculate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition which automatically implies continuity with the past" (Hobsbawm 1983: 1). Hence, their understanding of 'invented tradition' conveys the meaning of tradition as temporal ideology (cf. Noyes 2009: 243–244). As Barbara Misztal (2003: 56) suggests, the invention of tradition approach promoted the development of the study of the institutionalisation of remembrance within national ritual and educational system. While folkloristics and ethnology featured an attempt to democratise Hobsbawm and Ranger, arguing that communities themselves continually reinterpret the past for the present purposes (Noyes 2009: 243–244)[9], Pierre Nora's 'tradition' as a *lieu de mémoire* (in English: Nora & Kritzman 1997) provided a broader model for scholarship. Nora regarded the realms of memory as the remaining points of intersection between memory and history, and he understood them in a really broad sense: as symbolic elements of the memorial heritage of any community. This also extended to the concept of tradition, which encompassed both songs, books, cafés, and wine, as well as places imbued with national symbolism such as Notre Dame.

The part in the monumental work edited by Nora, which was dedicated to traditions, was later on translated into English as *Legacies* (Nora 2009), and reflects a frail distinction between the concepts of 'tradition' and 'heritage'.[10] Heritage is a tradition as communal property; it no longer serves ordinary social purposes but is a monument of cultural identity (Noyes 2009: 245).

The concept 'heritage' gained importance especially since the 2000s, in the context of globalisation (Harrison 2012: 5). The scope of the concept 'heritage' can be considered as ambiguous as that of the concept of memory (Lowenthal 1998). Some authors would define heritage (or at least 'official' heritage) as those objects, places and practices that can be formally protected by using heritage

laws and charters. But there are many other forms of official categorisation that can be applied to heritage sites at the national or state level throughout the world (Harrison 2012: 14). As Kristin Kuutma argues, "heritage is a value-laden concept that can never assume a neutral ground of connotation" (Kuutma 2012: 21). Her discussion of cultural heritage focuses on the practices of arbitration and engineering in the context of cultural politics. She demonstrates that the contemporary heritage regimes are situated in the framework of curative concerns (heritage "care") and cultural engineering. In other words, as contemporary critics argue, the concept of cultural heritage is used to sanction, give status and materialise the intangibilities of culture and human experience.

The recent research draws attention to the process of heritagisation by making visible how choices involving inclusion and exclusion of relevant history cause disagreement in a number of heritage cases. **Grete Swensen**, in this volume, is making use of the concepts 'difficult heritage' (Logan & Reeves 2009; Macdonald 2008) and 'contested heritage' (Flynn 2011) in analysing how prison history is described and mediated in two former prison buildings in Norway. She demonstrates that the motivations behind the present use of the buildings range from the intention to stimulate new local cultural arenas, to increasing insight into local cultural history, to serving solely commercial ends. Through this approach, Swensen supports the standpoint that views heritage as a mode of cultural production, which actively uses the past to produce something new (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 2012: 199 in Swensen).

Pauliina Latvala takes this idea even further and discusses narration on political practices and emotions as "heritage from below" (Robertson 2012). Following Laurajane Smith (2006), she approaches the transmission of oral histories as acts of heritage management. Focusing on one case of archived documentary heritage making, in this particular case an archive collection campaign, Latvala demonstrates how tangible collections saved for future generations pass down multi-dimensioned historical and political knowledge through intangible, experienced history, and may thus serve as a counter-history. Therefore, heritage from below makes up a part of the process of changing past images and challenges the significance of the master narrative.

The triangle of concepts 'traditionalisation' – 'heritagisation' – 'memorialisation' illustrates a close connection between the concepts under scrutiny. They all signify the 'making of', whereas traditionalisation applies more to local contexts and actors, and heritagisation to a global context. Memorialisation, in its own turn, may include both traditionalisation and heritagisation. For Rodney Harrison, heritagisation is a way and form of memoralisation in society (Harrison 2012: 168). While Harrison views heritage as a mnemonic process, Scandinavian historians and cultural researchers Peter Aronsson and Linda

Gradén (2013: 19) stress heritage's "capacity to form a historical consciousness, an understanding of why we are at this position in history and where we ought to direct our actions". Recently 'heritage' has become increasingly related to 'cultural memory' and here the same pattern is evident as it was in the case of 'history culture' and 'memory': diverse concepts meet in the framework of some concrete research field.[11] **Anne Heimo**'s article in this issue is a good example of this. Heimo investigates the different ways that the 1918 Finnish Civil War is commemorated and represented on the Internet, on both private and institutional websites as well as in social media. She takes the perspective of participatory history culture (Rosenzweig & Thelen 1998) and vernacular authority (Howard 2013) and approaches the online history-making in relation to memory and heritage politics. It is a relevant lack of focus on historical representation and commemoration in folklore studies on the Internet that makes her to rely, to a large extent, on the work done by scholars of other fields, mainly oral history, memory studies, media studies and cultural heritage. By stressing the performative nature of online documenting, she makes use of the increasing tendency in memory studies to focus on the active processes of remembering and commemoration instead of memories as static products. She maintains that digital memories are open to continuous remediation, reformulation, recycling and remixing to the extent that boundaries between private and public, personal and collective memories become blurred or even disappear. This, in its own turn, has consequences to the understanding of heritage. Heimo's approach focuses on digitally born "new heritage", which comes to being "through shared and repeated interactions with the tangible remains and lived traces of a common past" (Giaccardi 2012: 1–2 in Heimo). As Heimo demonstrates, this new way of heritagisation also implicates new culture of commemoration.

CONCLUSION

As this article demonstrates, the key concepts related to studying the use of the past have started to overlap quite a lot in their ways of conceiving themes and approaching objects. The understanding of tradition "as a rhetorical and political resource for promoting certain values and motives [---], as a point of intersection between ideology and agency, and as a constituent of common sense and practical judgement" (Gencarella 2013: 50) bears a strong resemblance to the concept of 'collective memory' in Anglo-American social memory studies (Olick & Vinitzky-Seroussi & Levy 2011: 36–39), albeit it may be more disciplinary focused. In its most general sense, the term 'heritage' refers to something in the past that has influenced what is now present; it also func-

tions as "a meta-cultural activity – a culture about culture which takes the view that both tangible and intangible heritage is selected, named and framed in the present but has recourse to the past" (Aronsson & Gradén 2013: 19; see also Kirchenblatt-Gimblett 2004). In this sense it barely differs from the broad definition of cultural memory as "the interplay of present and past in socio-cultural contexts" (Erll 2008: 2). Naturally, the difference lies in how the criticism of these concepts has acted as compared to the internal development of the concepts: for example, the criticism of tradition and heritage has driven these concepts to expansive development (Smith 2006), while at the same time the criticism of memory studies still appeals "to clarify the conceptual fuzziness surrounding the label 'memory'" (Berliner 2013). Aronsson, having worked out the concept *historiebruk* (the use of history), which could be regarded as the Scandinavian equivalent for history culture, conceived it as functioning in the institutional, official, commercial and private sphere in all its forms (aesthetic, cognitive, affective or normative) (Aronsson 2004: 278). Following his train of thought, all the observed concepts could in the current situation be dealt with not only as fields of research, but as perspectives relevant for all areas of cultural research (ibid.: 275).

Whether and to what extent researches on history culture, memory, tradition and heritage are entangled, is dependent on problem settings and objects of research, to which the respective research directions were originally related, but also connected with disciplinary contexts and national borders. For example, 'memory turn' usually cites as its catalysts the Jewish Holocaust memory industry and 20th-century wars, as well as the end of communism in Eastern Europe, so that it is often associated with 'trauma'. In Germany, where, as a result of the Second World War, attitude to the past has been namely a political issue, the studies of history culture and remembering (*Erinnerungskultur*, oral history) also have a strong political and social dimension. Besides, focus on studying the pivotal events of the 20th century has brought closer to one another the research of the grassroots-level remembering and the construction of national memories, as well as cross-country and cross-disciplinary study of memory politics (Heimo & Peltonen 2003; Kõresaar 2007). At the same time, the relationships between, e.g., the research of individual and private remembering and the research of national memory policies are far from being tension-free. If for Rüsen in the German context both approaches have common roots and aims ("… *die Rettung von Zeitzeugenschaft im Modus der historischen Erinnerung…*") (Rüsen 2006: 68), Paula Hamilton and Linda Shopes (2008b) see fundamental differences here. In their point of view, memory studies are differentiated from oral history by their more abstracted approach, which asks how broader cultural memory is created, circulated, mediated, and received,

while oral history concentrates on how individuals produce meaning from their memoirs (Hamilton & Shopes 2008a: x). It is interesting to observe in Finnish and Estonian contexts how oral historians' contacts to earlier memory studies differ according to their academic background. Whereas folklorists relied on already established disciplinary concepts and got embedded to the international (mainly Anglo-American and Italian) tradition of oral history, ethnologists found inspiration from Halbwachs's and Assmanns' theories of collective/cultural memory as well as from *Erfahrungsgeschichte* (a German eqvivalent for oral history) (Kõresaar 2001; Heimo 2010: 40–41).[12]

Concentration on different cultural levels and raising of different research questions has also kept memory studies and research of heritage culture in a relatively disengaged state until recently. While the focus of memory studies was on experiencing traumatic events and its articulation, in the research of heritage the legal discourse was predominant for a long time, focusing on particular kinds of objects, buildings, towns and landscapes. Additionally, until quite recently, memory studies were confined within national borders, while heritage studies have global "roots". Due to the recent criticism of heritage research, which maintains that even if places are not officially recognised as heritage, the way that they are set apart and used in the production of collective memory serves to define them as heritage, the object levels of both research trends have approached one another.[13] By specifying intangible heritage, also contacts with oral history and tradition studies have emerged, as referred to in the articles by Coppélie Cocq and Pauliina Latvala in this volume.

In addition to impulses arising from inside research directions, the reason for the greater engagement of these directions could be the rise of interdisciplinary fields, which are not anchored to any specific concepts. It was already referred to in museum studies, in which – especially when they focus on the heritagisation of pivotal historical events – the concepts 'heritage' and 'memory' may become interchangeable. The same line in this issue is represented by Tuomas Hovi's study of tourism.

A situation in which cultural research concepts with solid trajectories become replaceable occurs also in the case of transdisciplinary 'turns'. Naturally, a large number of different starting points, objectives and concepts are circulating in the sphere of influence of each 'turn'. Furthermore, the 'turns' are interconnected (Bachmann-Medick 2006: 381–383). Anne Heimo's article in this volume demonstrates how different concepts meet and start to overlap in the interaction of various cultural turns, e.g., performative turn, and medial turn in the research of a specific field – here online remembering.

This leads to the last point. The research perspectives behind different concepts are best engaged within a specific field of research, which in turn has

made way to the emergence of new concepts that bridge the established ones. In the context of this thematic volume, it is meaningful to refer to the increased cross-disciplinary interest in how the representation of the past in a variety of public spheres takes place. In this respect, concepts have been taken into use referring to the 'public' at different levels: from official, state-sanctioned, institutions to less formal, often locally based settings, to particular, individualised contexts. In English-language literature, we can encounter concepts like public folklore (Baron & Spitzer 2008), public history (Kean & Martin 2013), and public memories (Hamilton & Shopes 2008b) in this context. 'Public', if we use the reasoning of Paula Hamilton and Linda Shopes (2008a: xiv-xv), denotes here both how the making of memory/history/folklore affects and is effected by various publics, and why and how some memories or re-presentations of the past become public, emerge in particular ways in attempts to fix their meaning. This thematic volume takes a position in the interconnected settings of the public and proposes a complementary perspective of how the concepts and views of neighbouring disciplines relate to each other.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NOTES

[1] Having said that, it should be noted, however, that the way I choose to highlight the relevant concepts also derives from my own background in ethnology, memory studies and oral history in a sense of *Erfahrungsgeschichte*, which is closely related with the study of history culture.

[2] In the same programmatic article, Rüsen refers to earlier uses of concepts (Rüsen 1994a: footnote 1).

[3] See, e.g., Ruusmann 2003 on the use of the concept 'image of history' in the same sense as oral history research in Estonian.

[4] More thoroughly on the context, predecessors and outcomes of Halbwachs's works see Olick & Vinitzky-Seroussi & Levy 2011: 6–25.

[5] Cf. the criticism by Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi and Levy (2011: 23) that Nora's *les lieux de mémoire* have been unreasonably understood as a narrow spatial concept. See also international reception of Nora's *les lieux de mémoire* in similar projects in Erll 2005: 25–26.

[6] Nora's monumental work has started to embody the history-memory debate in historiography. The debate is rooted, however, in a still earlier discussion on the rhetoric nature of historical interpretation. By the 1990s, the problems of history and memory shifted to the focus of history writing. See Le Goff 1992 [1988]; Maier 1988; Burke 1989; Kammen 1991; Zerubavel 1995.

[7] See about Assmanns' contribution to the founding of cultural memory studies in Erll 2005: 27–33; Erll 2011a.

[8] See more closely about the development of concepts in the German-language area in Gudehus & Eichenberg & Welzer 2010: 75–125.

[9] In folklore scholarship, however, rather than 'invention', the term 'appropriation' became favoured: power takes over the symbolic forms of the subaltern, while individuals borrow from the larger culture and make it their own.

[10] Cf. concepts of 'tradition' in historians' approach (Kammen 1991), which can also be regarded as 'heritage'.

[11] It depends on the background of the researchers and the disciplinary trajectories of research fields, how the different concepts start to relate to each other. For example, in cultural landscape studies (Moore & Whelan 2012), (collective) memory is a heuristic category to explore the landscape–identity relationship, whereas heritage is a functional category that means curating, managing landscape for identity-building purposes. In museum studies, however, the relationship between diverse terms associated with cultural memory, heritage and history culture seems to be more relaxed (Arnold-de Simine 2013).

[12] Cf. Heimo's detailed treatment of interdisciplinary web of influences in Finnish oral history (*muistitietotutkimus*) (Heimo 2010: 37–52) as well as Jaago & Kõresaar & Rahi-Tamm (2006) on diverse (inter)disciplinary trajectories of Estonian life story research. The point that both overviews make is that oral history and life story research are not linear processes and instead of trying to reduce them to coherent "origins", one should focus on significant "meeting points" of diverse academic traditions and interests.

[13] See, for instance, a recent study of Sharon Macdonald (2013), in which she treats memory-heritage-identity relationship as a tightly intervowen complex.

REFERENCES

Arnold-de Simine, Silke 2013. *Mediating Memory in the Museum: Trauma, Empathy, Nostalgia*. Houndsmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian.

Aronsson, Peter 2004. *Historiebruk – att använda det förflutna.* [The Use of History – to Practice the Past.] Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Aronsson, Peter & Gradén, Lizette 2013. Introduction: Performing Nordic Heritage – Institutional Preservation and Popular Practices. In: L. Gradén & P. Aronsson (eds.) *Performing Nordic Heritage: Everyday Practices and Institutional Culture*. Farnham & Burlington: Ashgate, pp. 1–26.

Assmann, Aleida 1999. *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. München: Beck.

Assmann, Aleida 2002. Gedächtnis als Leitbegriff der Kulturwissenschaften. In: L. Musner & G. Wunberg (eds.) *Kulturiwissenschaften: Forschung – Praxis – Positionen*. Wien: WUV Universitätsverlag, pp. 27–45.

Assmann, Aleida 2004. Four Formats of Memory: From Individual to Collective Constructions of the Past. In: C. Emden & D. Midgley (eds.) *Cultural Memory and Historical Consciousness in the German-Speaking World since 1500*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 19–37.

Assmann, Aleida 2010. Re-framing Memory: Between Individual and Collective Forms of Constructing the Past. In: K. Tilmans & F. Van Vree & J.M. Winter (eds.) *Performing the Past: Memory, History, and Identity in Modern Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 35–50.

Assmann, Jan 1988. Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität. In: J. Assmann & T. Hölscher (eds.) *Kultur und Gedächtnis*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 9–19. Available at http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/propylaeumdok/1895/1/Assmann_Kollektives_Gedaechtnis_1988.pdf, last accessed on March 21, 2014.

Assmann, Jan 1992. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. München: Beck.

Assmann, Aleida & Assmann, Jan 1994. Das Gestern im Heute. Medien und soziales Gedächtnis. In: K. Merten & S.J. Schmidt & S. Weischenberg (eds.) *Die Wirklichkeit der Medien. Eine Einführung in die Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 114–140.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris 2006. *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Hamburg: Rowohlts.

Baron, Robert & Spitzer, Nick (eds.) 2008. *Public Folklore*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Berliner, David C. 2005. The Abuses of Memory: Reflections on the Memory Boom in Anthropology. *Anthropological Quarterly*, Vol. 78, No. 1, pp. 197–211. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/anq.2005.0001.

Berliner, David C. 2013. Integration: Memory and Transformative Durability. Fieldsights – Field Notes. *Cultural Anthropology Online*, September 25, 2013. Available at http://culanth.org/fieldsights/383-integration-memory-and-transformative-durability, last accessed on March 21, 2014.

Bjerg, Helle & Lenz, Claudia & Thorstensen, Eric 2011. Introduction. In: H. Bjerg & C. Lenz & E. Thorstensen (eds.) *Historicizing the Uses of the Past. Scandinavian Perspectives on History Culture, Historical Consciousness and Didactics of History Related to World War II*. Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 7–23. Available at http://www.transcript-verlag.de/ts1325/ts1325_1.pdf, last accessed on March 25, 2014.

Borries, Bodo von 2001. Geschichtsbewusstsein als System von Gleichgewichten und Transformationen. In: J. Rüsen (ed.) *Geschichtsbewusstsein: psychologische Grundlagen, Entwicklungskonzepte, empirische Befunde*. Köln: Böhlau, pp. 239–280.

Boyer, Pascal 1990. *Tradition as Truth and Communication: A Cognitive Description of Traditional Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, Peter 1989. History as Social Memory. In: T. Butler (ed.) *Memory: History, Culture and the Mind*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 97–113.

Climo, Jacob J. & Cattell, Maria G. (eds.) 2002. *Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*. Lanham: AltaMira.

Eriksen, Anne 1997. Collective Tradition and the Individual. *ARV. Nordic Yearbook of Folklore*, Vol. 53, pp. 71–85.

Eriksen, Anne 2009. Foreword. In: A. Eriksen & J.V. Sigurðsson (eds.) *Negotiating Pasts in the Nordic Countries: Interdisciplinary Studies in History and Memory*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, pp. 7–12.

Erll, Astrid 2005. *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen*. Stuttgart & Weimar: J.B. Metzler.

Erll, Astrid 2008. Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction. In: A. Erll & A. Nünning (eds.) *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 1–15. Available at http://michaeljgoodnight.com/_Memes%20Books/Netzach-Hod/Media-and-Cultural-Memory.pdf, last accessed on March 18, 2014.

Erll, Astrid 2011a. *Memory in Culture*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Erll, Astrid 2011b. Travelling Memory. *Parallax*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 4–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13534645.2011.605570.

Erll, Astrid & Nünning, Ansgar (eds.) 2008. *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Fentress, James J. & Wickham, Chris 1992. *Social Memory: New Perspectives on the Past*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Flynn, Kate M. 2011. Decision-Making and Contested Heritage in Northern Ireland: The Former Maze Prison / Long Kesh. *Irish Political Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 383–401. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07907184.2011.593741.

Gencarella, Stephen O. 2013. Critical Folklore Studies and the Revaluation of Tradition. In: T.J. Blank & R.G. Howard (eds.) *Tradition in the Twenty-First Century: Locating the Role of the Past in the Present*. Colorado: Utah State University Press, pp. 49–71.

Giaccardi, Elisa 2012. Introduction: Reframing Heritage in a Participatory Culture. In: E. Giaccardi (ed.) *Heritage and Social Media: Understanding Heritage in a Participatory Culture*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 1–10.

Gudehus, Christian & Eichenberg, Ariane & Welzer, Harald (eds.) 2010. *Gedächtnis und Erinnerung: Ein interdiziplinäres Handbuch*. Stuttgart & Weimar: J.B. Metzler.

Halbwachs, Maurice 1950. *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Halbwachs, Maurice 1952 [1925]. Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France [originally published in *Les Travaux de L'Année Sociologique*, Paris: F. Alcan, 1925].

Hamilton, Paula & Shopes, Linda 2008a. Introduction: Building Partnership between Oral History and Memory Studies. In: P. Hamilton & L. Shopes (eds.) *Oral History and Public Memories*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. vii–xvii.

Hamilton, Paula & Shopes, Linda (eds.) 2008b. *Oral History and Public Memories*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Harrison, Rodney 2012. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London & New York: Routledge.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 1970 [1832–1845]. *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Heimo, Anne 2010. *Kapina Sammatissa. Vuoden 1918 paikalliset tulkinnat osana historian yhteiskunnallisen rakentamisen prosessia*. [Rebellion in Sammatti: Local Interpretations of the 1918 Finnish Civil War as Part of the Social Process of History Making.] Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Heimo, Anne & Peltonen, Ulla-Maija 2003. Memories and Histories, Public and Private: After the Finnish Civil War. In: K. Hodgkin & S. Radstone (eds.) *Contested Pasts: The Politics of Memory*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 42–56.

Heins, Frank 1993. Über Geschichtsbilder in Erinnerungserzählungen. *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde,* Vol. 89, No. 1, pp. 63–77.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1983. Introduction: Inventing Traditions. In: E.J. Hobsbawm & T.O. Ranger (eds.) *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–14.

Hockerts, Hans Günter 2001. Zugänge zur Zeitgeschichte: Primärerfahrung, Erinnerungskultur, Geschichtswissenschaft. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte,* Vol. 28, pp. 15–30. Available at http://www.bpb.de/apuz/26154/zugaenge-zur-zeitgeschichte-primaererfahrung-erinnerungskultur-geschichtswissenschaft, last accessed on March 21, 2014.

Howard, Robert Glenn 2013. Vernacular Authority: Critically Engaging "Tradition". In: T.J. Blank & R.G. Howard (eds.) *Tradition in the Twenty-First Century: Locating the Role of the Past in the Present.* Logan: Utah State University Press, pp. 72–99. Available at http://rghoward.com/research/Howard,VernacAuth.13.pdf, last accessed on March 21, 2014.

Howard, Robert G. & Blank, Trevor J. 2013. Introduction: Living Traditions in a Modern World. In: T.J. Blank & R.G. Howard (eds.) *Tradition in the Twenty-First Century: Locating the Role of the Past in the Present*. Logan: Utah State University Press, pp. 1–21.

Huyssen, Andreas 2000. Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia. *Public Culture*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 21–38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/08992363-12-1-21.

Jaago, Tiiu & Kõresaar, Ene & Rahi-Tamm, Aigi 2006. Oral History and Life Stories as Research Area in Estonian History, Folkloristics and Ethnology. *Elore*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 1–15. Available at http://www.elore.fi/arkisto/1_06/jkr1_06.pdf, last accessed on March 21, 2014.

Jeismann, Karl-Ernst 1980. Geschichtsbewusstsein. Überlegungen zur zentralen Kategorie eines neuen Ansatzes der Geschichtsdidaktik. In: H. Süssmuth (ed.) *Geschichtsdidaktische Positionen. Bestandsaufnahme und Neuorientierung*. Paderborn: Schöningh, pp. 179–222.

Kammen, Michael 1991. *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kean, Hilda & Martin, Paul (eds.) 2013. *The Public History Reader*. London & New York: Routledge.

Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara 2004. Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production. *Museum International*, Vol. 56, No. 1–2, pp. 52–65. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-0775.2004.00458.x.

Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara 2012. From Ethnology to Heritage: The Role of the Museum. In: B.M. Carbonell (ed.) *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts*. Second edition. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 199–205.

Kuutma, Kristin 2012. Between Arbitration and Engineering: Concepts and Contingencies in the Shaping of Heritage Regimes. In: R.F. Bendix & A. Eggert & A. Peselmann (eds.) *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property, Vol. 6. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, pp. 21–36. Available at http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/univerlag/2012/GSCP6_Bendix.pdf, last accessed on March 21, 2014.

Kõresaar, Ene 2001. Kollektiivne mälu ja eluloouurimine. [Collective Memory and Biographical Research.] In: T. Anepaio & E. Kõresaar (eds.) *Kultuur ja mälu.* [Culture and Memory.] Studia Ethnologica Tartuensia 4. Tartu: Tartu University Press, pp. 42–56.

Kõresaar, Ene 2007. The Culture of Remembrance of the Second World War in Estonia as Presented in Post-Soviet Life Stories: On the Logic of Comparison between the Soviet and the Nazi Occupations. In: A. Mihkelev & B. Kalnacs (eds.) *We Have Something in Common: the Baltic Memory*. Tallinn: Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus, pp. 35–60.

Le Goff, Jacques 1992. *History and Memory*. Transl. by S. Rendall & E. Claman. New York: Columbia University Press (orig. *Histoire et mémoire*, Gallimard, 1988).

Logan, William & Reeves, Keir (eds.) 2009. *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with "Difficult Heritage"*. London & New York: Routledge.

Lowenthal, David 1998. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macdonald, Sharon 2008. *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond*. London & New York: Routledge.

Macdonald, Sharon 2013. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. London & New York: Routledge.

McNeill, Lynne S. 2013. *And the Greatest of These is Tradition: The Folklorist's Toolbox in the Twenty-First Century*. In: T.J. Blank & R.G. Howard (eds.) *Tradition in the Twenty-First Century: Locating the Role of the Past in the Present*. Logan: Utah State University Press, pp. 174–185.

Maier, Charles S. 1988. *The Unmasterable Past: Holocaust and German National Identity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Misztal, Barbara A. 2003. *Theories of Social Remembering*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Moore, Niamh & Whelan, Yvonne 2012. *Heritage, Memory and the Politics of Identity: New Perspectives on the Cultural Landscape*. Aldershot & Burlington: Ashgate.

Nora, Pierre (ed.) 1984–1992. *Les Lieux de mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard.

Nora, Pierre (ed.) 2009. *Rethinking France: Les Lieux de mémoire. Volume 3: Legacies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nora, Pierre & Kritzman, Lawrence D. (eds.) 1997. *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past. Vol. 2. Traditions*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Noyes, Dorothy 2009. Tradition: Three Traditions. *Journal of Folklore Research*, Vol. 46, No. 3, pp. 233–268. http://dx.doi.org/10.2979/JFR.2009.46.3.233.

Olick, Jeffrey K. & Robbins, Joyce 1998. Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 24, pp. 105–140.

Olick, Jeffrey K. & Vinitzky-Seroussi, Vered & Levy, Daniel 2011. Introduction. In: J.K. Olick & V. Vinitzky-Seroussi & D. Levy (eds.) *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–62.

Oring, Elliott 2013. Thinking through Tradition. In: T.J. Blank & R.G. Howard (eds.) *Tradition in the Twenty-First Century: Locating the Role of the Past in the Present*. Logan: Utah State University Press, pp. 22–48.

Pandel, Hans-Jürgen 1987. Dimensionen des Geschichtsbewußtseins. Ein Versuch, seine Struktur für Empirie und Pragmatik diskutierbar zu machen. *Geschichtsdidaktik. Probleme, Projekte, Perspektiven,* Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 130–142.

Radstone, Susannah & Hodgkin, Katharine (eds.) 2005. *Memory Cultures: Memory, Subjectivity, and Recognition*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Robertson, Iain J.M. (ed.) 2012. *Heritage from Below*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Rosenzweig, Roy & Thelen, David 1998. *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life*. New York & Chichester: Columbia University Press.

Ruusmann, Reet 2003. The Establishment of Collective Farms and Their Early Years as an Image of History in the Estonians' Life Stories. *Pro Ethnologia*, Vol. 16, pp. 21–38. Available at http://www.erm.ee/pdf/pro16/ruusmann.pdf, last accessed on March 21, 2014.

Rüsen, Jörn 1994a. Geschichtskultur als Forschungsproblem. In: J. Rüsen. *Historische Orientierung. Über die Arbeit des Geschichtsbewusstseins, sich in der Zeit zurechtzufinden.* Köln & Weimar & Wien: Böhlau, pp. 235–245.

Rüsen, Jörn 1994b. Was ist Geschichtskultur? Überlegungen zu einer neuen Art, über Geschichte nachzudenken. In: K. Füßmann & H.T. Grütter & J. Rüsen (eds.) *Historische Faszination. Geschichtskultur heute.* Köln & Weimar & Wien: Böhlau, pp. 3–26.

Rüsen, Jörn (ed.) 2001. *Geschichtsbewusstsein: psychologische Grundlagen, Entwicklungskonzepte, empirische Befunde*. Köln & Weimar & Wien: Böhlau.

Rüsen, Jörn 2006. *Kultur macht Sinn: Orientierung zwischen Gestern und Morgen*. Köln & Weimar & Wien: Böhlau.

Salmi, Hannu 2001. Menneisyyskokemuksesta hyödykkeisiin – historiakulttuurin muodot. [The Experience of the Past Put into Use: Modes of History Culture.] In: J. Kalela & I. Lindroos (eds.) *Jokapäiväinen historia*. Helsinki: SKS, pp. 134–149.

Smith, Laurajane 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London & New York: Routledge.

Zerubavel, Yael 1995. *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Welzer, Harald 2001. Das soziale Gedächtnis. In: H. Welzer (ed.) *Das soziale Gedächtnis: Geschichte, Erinnerung, Tradierung*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, pp. 9–21. Available at http://www.diana-wagner.com/KuWi/Dokumente/Welzer,%20Harald-Das%20soziale%20Ged%C3%A4chtnis.pdf, last accessed on March 21, 2014.

Welzer, Harald 2005. *Das kommunikative Gedächtnis. Eine Theorie der Erinnerung*. München: Beck.