



# «Memory studies» in the socio-humanitarian knowledge: genesis of a new paradigm

## Estudios de la memoria en el conocimiento socio-humanista: la génesis del nuevo paradigma

PUSHKAREVA T.V. [1](#); NIKOLAEVA U.G. [2](#) & AGALTSOVA D.V. [3](#)

Received: 05/05/2019 • Approved: 09/10/2019 • Published 14/10/2019

### Contents

[1. Introduction](#)

[2. Methodology](#)

[3. Results](#)

[4. Conclusions](#)

[Acknowledgments](#)

[Bibliographic references](#)

#### ABSTRACT:

The article deals with the genesis of "memory studies" – a relatively new interdisciplinary area of research. The authors emphasize two main consequent stages in the formation of modern memory studies. The article is focused on the analysis of the first stage of the conceptual formation of memory studies, since the end of XIX and up to the 1980s, based on psychology, sociology, and history research. The authors demonstrate the trajectory of evolution of the scholarly understanding of "memory" – from purely psychological interpretation

#### RESUMEN:

El artículo analiza la génesis de los "memory studies", un campo de estudio nuevo. Los autores distinguen dos etapas principales consecutivas en la formación sobre los estudios de la memoria. El artículo está dedicado al análisis particular de la primera etapa de la formación conceptual de los "estudios de la memoria", desde finales del siglo XIX hasta la década de 1980, basado en investigaciones en el campo de la psicología, la sociología y la historia. Los autores demuestran la trayectoria de la evolución en la comprensión científica de

of the phenomenon to socio-psychological concept ('group memory') - and, finally, to a broad sociological theory (social-cultural-historical memory). The second part is after the 1980s till the present time, its main content is the memory research introduction into actual social practice is planned to be reviewed in the future. The present article underlines a rich heuristic potential of the concept of "social memory" for the development of modern social sciences and humanities.

**Keywords:** Memory studies, historical memory, collective memory, social memory, culture

la "memoria", desde una interpretación puramente psicológica del fenómeno hasta un concepto socio-psicológico ("memoria de grupo") y, finalmente, una amplia teoría sociológica (memoria sociocultural-histórica). La segunda etapa es después de la década de 1980 hasta la actualidad, su contenido principal es la introducción de la investigación de la memoria en la práctica social real. Ella está prevista para ser considerada en el futuro. Los autores del artículo enfatizan el rico potencial heurístico del concepto de "memoria social" para el desarrollo de las ciencias sociales y humanas modernas.

**Palabras clave:** Estudios de la memoria, memoria histórica, memoria colectiva, memoria social, cultura

## 1. Introduction

"Memory studies" is an interdisciplinary area of modern humanities, which began to arise at the end of XIX-th and early XX-th century, and reached its climax in the 1980s – 1990s. Memory studies are at the intersection of diverse humanities disciplines – general and social psychology, social philosophy, history, cultural anthropology, political science, semiotics, historical psychology, historical sociology, sociology of time. Memory studies are focused on the study of historical, cultural, social, group memory in modern societies and in the past. In general, it would be possible to underline the trajectory of evolution of the scholarly understanding of memory. It began as a purely psychological concept, i.e. memory as an individual psychological phenomenon [Bergson, 1992]. Later, it made a transformation to socio-psychological concept, i.e. 'group memory' [Janet, 1928], and, finally, to sociological concept, that is, 'social memory.' [Giddens, 1984] New concepts of memory emerged: 'historical' (memory of the past in the public opinion of common people as well as among professional historians), 'cultural understanding' (history in the experience of large social groups and masses) [Halbwachs, 2007] and, in some cases, a socio-political understanding of memory or 'collective memory' (as an object of political manipulation) [Ferro, 1992].

Conventionally, the path of memory studies can be divided into two stages: the formation of the memorial paradigm (from the end of the XIX century to the 80-ies of XX century) and the "memory boom" (from the 80-s of XX century till the present time).

The purpose of this article is to study the origin of the basic concepts of "memory research" in the context of the conceptual apparatus of the memory research formation at the first stage, to identify key points along this way and to highlight the concepts and theories that today remain heuristic for the modern society study.

This article was written in the framework of the interdisciplinary research

project "Forward to the past: archaism and archaization trends in contemporary Russian society (interdisciplinary analysis)" (2019-2021), the project includes the study of reversible processes in the economic, social, and cultural life of modern Russian society and the construction of a single explanatory model. This article is devoted to the conceptual analysis of memory studies – a key theoretical direction for the analysis of archaization processes in social and cultural aspects. At the same time, the article highlights the most heuristic directions of the first stage of "memory studies" for the subsequent deployment of sociological empirical research.

---

## 2. Methodology

True humanitarian knowledge always strives for the ideal (objective, absolute knowledge of the cultural and historical reality "as it was in reality"), but the progress towards this ideal is always hampered by the presence of a number of scientific and general cultural laws. One of the most significant regularities is related to the mechanisms of functioning of historical and cultural memory, a phenomenon that includes both the results of scientific humanitarian knowledge and all the elements of "ordinary" knowledge, people's ideas about their history and culture, events and personalities. At the same time, it turns out that the assessments that are given to events at certain historical stages are due to the specific conditions of the existence of this society, the historical situation, the characteristics of the assessing subject, everyday life and the state of science, and depending on these factors, they change, allowing us to conclude that «history is not a science, and it does not produce knowledge in the true sense of the word» [Ankersmit, 2003, p.186] and «the past is only our idea of the past» [Ankersmit, 2003, p.308].

In this regard, there is an increasing negation of classical subject-object relations in humanitarian cognition, and the subject and object in the humanitarian consciousness appear as a cultural text with an infinite number of interpretations in a closed hermeneutic circle. The historical knowledge thus interpreted is fraught with the danger of depriving history of its scientific status [Pushkareva, 2008, p.149 ].

If we approach the problem of memory from a philosophical, that is, methodological side, it turns out that social memory appears primarily as a cultural determinant of social development, and the scientific interpretation of historical time then depends on our understanding of culture as a whole. Considering culture in the traditions of 'experiential' theory – where the culture is understood as a socially significant experience of human activity transmitted from generation to generation [Muravyov, 1995] – it is possible to consider the temporality captured in the nodes of historical memory as the quintessence of the secondary determination of society. [Pushkareva, 2001]

Historical memory is formed and created on two levels, at the theoretical level, in historical science, on the one hand, and at the level of ordinary

historical consciousness, on the other. At the same time, it is easy to notice that it is in the collision of both that the historical time is formed in the proper sense of the word. At the same time, it turns out that the main factor that affects this process is human collective memory. As the past can be actualized for an individual only through his own memory, so the history of society exists only through social memory. [Pushkareva, 2001]

Since the 20s of XX century, the concept of social memory has been established in the arsenal of social sciences, although it cannot be said that it is well developed. As a result, scientists use different synonyms of this concept, referring to approximately one of its meaning, the supra-personal storage mechanism of socially significant information ("memory of the world", "external memory", "supraindividual storage system", "extracorporeal system of social inheritance", etc.) [Stolovich, Ülikool and Rebane, 1984; Rebane, 1982; Kolevatov, 1984].

Thus, memory is a condition for the existence of culture, if we consider culture as a socially significant experience of human activity. Culture is transmitted through language, demonstration, example, and this translation is impossible without the existence of mechanisms of social memory.

It is well known what memory is selective. It is less obvious that this seemingly purely psychological law also applies at the level of society. However, and, perhaps, precisely because of the nature of this selectivity, the selection mechanisms still remained largely mysterious. It is not always clear on what principle some events are recorded by memory for years, decades, centuries, and others are "erased", disappeared from memory, and therefore sometimes from history. These manifestations of memory often look like unpredictable whims, but this does not mean that it is impossible to understand the laws of its functioning. [Pushkareva, 2001]

It is known that historical memory is conditioned both by ideological manipulations and other attempts of violent formation of the historical consciousness of the masses, officially prescribed by the authorities. In this kind, memory can be seen a specific form of oppression. But here is not always clear the technique of social memory, that is, how certain events, characters, images are removed from the historical consciousness or, conversely, imposed on him. Some regularities in the functioning of collective historical memory can be explained by direct, though cautious extrapolation to the area of historical knowledge of psychological laws. On the other hand, some of the relevant mechanisms of such memory are not so spontaneous and easily identifiable. Memory of this kind is causally and functionally dependent on factors that are much easier to verbally identify than to reveal in their real manifestation [Pushkareva, 2008] Of course, the memory mechanisms included the forgetting mechanisms, as well as other mechanisms - contamination, re-emphasis, silence, approval [Pushkareva, 2008].

Its use in the social process in certain interests, but since interest, as shown in classical Marxism, is not always realized by his followers, the mechanisms of memory often act unconsciously or their action leads to unexpected, or rather, not anticipated results. And here, as we can see, we are not in the field of psychological, but actually socio-historical laws. For example, in periods of dynamic social change and transformations, the collective memory of the past becomes of increasing importance. The memory of the past, in the form of traditional sociocultural patterns, as well as archaic economic and social models, is updated and reanimated. [Pushkareva, 2008] It helps society as a whole (or certain social groups) to adapt to dramatic changes and fill the emerging cultural and value "vacuum" for some time [Nikolaeva, 2005]. The mechanisms of historical memory can be divided into two groups. One group concerns memory formed consciously, ideologically, and the second group of memory mechanisms is unconscious.

At the stage of origin of memory studies it is possible to fix counter attempts of psychologists, sociologists and historians to prove the need of new concepts – "collective memory", "group memory", "historical memory", emphasizing social and cultural sense of memory and social time. The development of this terminology can be considered successfully, although it is still criticized, which points to the anthropomorphization of the society which occurs when transferring individual psychological mechanisms to the social level.

---

## **3.Results**

Hence we distinguish three branches of the memory studies genesis, each of which contains the ideas, concepts and theories that are heuristic for the modern society study.

### **3.1. Epistemological prerequisite and intellectual consequences of social memory studies in the early 20s of XX century. The concept of "group memory"**

Throughout the history of philosophy, the concepts of time and memory were somehow thematized by philosophers of different directions, review of the basic concepts was made by M. S. Rogovin (1921-1993) [Rogovin, 1966]). But only in the 20-30s of the XX century there appears the study of memory from a fundamentally new point of view – the social one. Based on the analysis of historical documents, data of ethnography, socio-psychological experiments by representatives of socio-humanitarian sciences, it is concluded that human memory has a social character. Then, the concept of social memory itself is formed and introduced into scientific use. Let's see how it happens.

A great contribution to the formation of a new view of human memory was made within the framework of social psychology and sociology. A

gnoseological stimulus and a kind of provocation to begin forming a new view of the problems of human memory were the ideas of the French philosopher-intuitionist, representative of the "philosophy of life" Henri Bergson (1859-1941). Bergson attached great importance to memory, calling it a point of contact between the spirit and matter. In his works, he defended the idea that the "duration", interpreted as filled with subjective experiences image of a certain substance underlying all phenomena, and there is a memory inherent in all current things, thus possible memory of a single person [Bergson [1914], 1992].

The French psychologist Pierre Jean (1859-1947) criticized Bergson's thesis, stressing, that an isolated individual does not have memory, because he does not need it. Considering first of all examples of pathological development of separate persons memory, Jean is not limited to it and expands the concept to scales of social psychology, considers evolution of memory in anthropogenesis. He considers memory primarily as verbal, as a specific answer to a question, to a word. Jean's works were written a little less than a century ago, but his ideas are important for understanding the social, historical, cultural time and memory, in which the narrative, the story (narrative) really takes a very important place. Also for the further development of the study of social memory there was an important conclusion of Jean that memorization and reproduction are not reproductive, and constructive. An important thing for modern "memory studies" is described by Jean and traumatic cases of amnesia, which he explains a kind of fear – "fear of remembering". [Janet, 1928]

The cultural and historical concept of Russian psychologists L. S. Vygotsky (1896-1934) and A. R. Luria (1902-1977), in which the ideas of P. Jean developed, outlined the broadest and most general scheme of the memory development as a mental phenomenon, covering the entire written history of mankind. The decisive moment in the evolution of memory is the creation of an artificial sign as a tool, a means of remembering. Only through the mediated nature of mental processes, a person can change the surrounding reality and make behavior reasonable. L. Vygotsky was proposed the term "collective psychology", allowing shifting on group individual scheme memories developed the ideas of J.-G. de Tard, who studied the "psychology of masses" were developed in a close direction.

L. Vygotsky wrote in the 20s of XX century: "Everything in us is social, but this does not mean that all the properties of the individual psyche are inherent in all other members of this group. Only some part of personal psychology can be considered as belonging to this collective, and this part of the personal psyche in the conditions of its collective manifestation is studied every time by collective psychology, examining the psychology of the army, the Church, etc. "[Vygotsky, 1997, p. 22]

At the same time, within the framework of sociology, the theory of social time was developed, which made a kind of counter steps to psychological theories in its interpretations of time and memory. Emil Durkheim (1858-

1917) managed to justify the fundamental difference between astronomical and social time, to show the independence of social time not only from individual consciousness, but also from natural rhythms, to prove its socio-cultural value and variability [Durkheim, 2001]. Durkheim even in 1898 spoke about the need to create a branch of sociology that studies the "laws of the collective existence of ideas" [Durkheim, 1995, p.341], which in our opinion is closely related to the mechanisms of memory and oblivion, and this is still a task that is not yet accomplished.

Russian and American sociologists P. Sorokin (1889-1968) and R. Merton (1910-2003) successfully continued this tradition [Sorokin and Merton, 1990; Sorokin, 1964]. They emphasized the qualitative character of social time as immanent to cultural rhythms. They believed that social time expressed the change or movement of social phenomena in terms of other social phenomena taken as reference points. In addition, these reference points express much more than the nominal equivalent of astronomical or calendar value. Timing systems always reflect the social actions of a group. Some beginning, arbitrary or not, must be established to introduce any system of calculating time, which must be continuous. For this purpose, it is inevitable to refer to the date of some selected historical event. In all cases, the point of reference is social or associated with deep social meanings; it is always a case that is regarded as a specific social meaning. Sorokin and Merton write: "In all cases the point of departure as social or imbued with profound social implications; it is always an event which is regarded as one of peculiar social significance. Thus, there have been introduced such social frames of reference as the death of Alexander or the Battle of Geza among the Babylonians, the Olympiads among the Greeks, the founding of Rome (anno urbis conditae) and the Battle of Actium among the Romans, the persecution of Diocletian and the birth of Christ among the Christians, the mythological founding of the Japanese Empire by Jimmu Tenno and the discovery of copper (Wado era), in Japan, the Hegira among the Mohammedans, the event of the white pheasant having been presented to the Japanese emperor (Hakuchi era), never had any idea of dating the annals except by the years of rule of the reigning Pharaoh. The Armenians likewise reckoned by the number of years of the kings or of the patriarchs. From these few examples culled from an almost inexhaustible store we see some justification of the proposition that nations form their eras in terms of some remarkable event which has social implications)" (Sorokin, P. and Merton, R., 1937, pp.623-634). Thus, nations form their history based on a remarkable event that has social significance. We see here that it is memory that gives the qualitative character of social time, although Sorokin and Merton use the expression "social reference framework", thus avoiding the concept of "memory".

Today, the modern sociology of time, represented, for example, by the works of Anthony Giddens, considers social memory as the most important mechanism of the natural time organization [Giddens, 1984]. This discovery of sociologists in the temporal organization of society and

cultural memory remains significant for modern analysis of society. Thus, many processes of radical transformation of modern society reveal themselves in the reformatting in the socio-cultural time organization, implying the choice of a new "reference point" of socio-cultural, historical time, a kind of "re-election" of the historical beginning. This is, of course, not a change in the system of chronology, but a metaphorical reference to significant events of the past as the start of a certain time stream. This reference looks like a memory of the "Golden age" or an indication of a catastrophe – events that have had a decisive impact on the present. This mechanism is equally characteristic of both the modernization processes and the society archaization processes, and most clearly represents the change in value horizons of social development.

### **3.2. The ideas of Maurice Halbwachs: heuristic possibilities and limitations. "Collective memory" and "social memory" concepts**

The idea of the existence of collective (or social) structures of consciousness in the XIX – early XX century was developed not only in social psychology, but in almost all humanities. At the same time, rather diverse set of concepts was proposed: "social consciousness" in political economy and philosophy (K. Marx), "collective ideas" (E. Durkheim), "social stereotype" (W. Lippman) in sociology, "social ideas" (B. Malinovsky) and "mentality" (Lucien Lévy-Bruhl) in cultural anthropology. This line is complemented by neo-marxists Louis Pierre Althusser, who argued that the actions of individuals in modern society are mainly programmed by the ideological apparatus of the state. [Althusser, 2011].

The famous work of Maurice Halbwachs "Social frameworks of memory" (1925) begins with "legalization" and the active dissemination of the concept of "group memory" and the subsequent terminological variations on this theme. The breadth of intellectual interests and the interdisciplinary nature of the classical scientist work made it possible to create a work that has become one of the most important for modern memory studies, its importance is great for both sociology and history, theory of culture. The basic idea of M. Halbwachs is that the memory of individuals and groups socially determined: «But if we examine a little more closely how we recollect things, we will surely realize that the greatest number of memories come back to us when our parents, our friends, or other persons recall them to us... It is in this sense that there exists a collective memory and social frameworks for memory; it is to the degree that our individual thought places itself in these frameworks and participates in this memory that it is capable of the act of recollection». [Halbwachs, 2007, pp. 37-38].

Following the social psychologists Halbwachs insists on the fact that memories are reconstructed, rather than copying events: "...our minds just cannot pay attention to the past, not deforming it; rising to the surface, our memory is like transforming, changing shape, spoiled by



intellectual light"[Halbwachs, 2007, p. 56]. This thesis became a key one for the generation of historical memory researchers in the 80s of XXth century. Maurice Halbwachs examines both the individual memory and the memory of groups – family, religious groups, social class- revealing the relationship of memory and tradition.

The work "Social framework of memory", being a classic work for memory studies, still causes an ambiguous assessment of the scientific community [Gensburger, 2016]. For example, the famous German Egyptologist and cultural theorist Jan Assman complains that Halbwachs is not limited to the analysis of the "social framework" of memory, and "went even further, declaring the collective subject of memory and memories, creating the concept of "group memory" and "memory of the nation", in which the concept of memory turns into a metaphor" [J.Assmann, 2004, p. 37], The famous American historian Allan Megill echoes him: "collective memory is more likely to occur when a lot of people involved in the same historical events. Then we can say that these people have a "collective" memory of these events, but not in the sense of a certain supra-individual memory-because there is no" memory" outside of individuals, but in the sense that each person has (within the boundaries of his own consciousness) an image, experience or Gestalt, which other people have also experienced. In addition, these images or gestalts largely coincide, otherwise the memory would not be "collective" [Megill, 2007, p. 113].

Another claim to Halbwachs is that the verbal form for modern social memory (the priority of which he says in his work) with the proliferation of visual media is not so important. [Staf, 2008]

Despite the fact that Halbwachs himself distinguished between history and memory, believing that history begins where memory ends, the ideas of the French thinker strongly influenced on historical science and the spread of the new concept of "historical memory" in scientific and public discourse, primarily through the school of "Annals".

For us it is particularly interesting to analyze the mechanisms of "family memory" [Halbwachs, p. 185-218]. Halbwachs shows, how the "framework" family memory as a group memory becomes a synthesis of personal memories and social attitudes. Halbwachs shows the universality of the family as a social group, the "social complex". It also follows from Halbwax's analysis, which is based mainly on primitive and ancient examples, that the family has hermeticity (associated with the tradition of domestic cults) and the desire for social adaptation through interaction and correlation with other families. After Halbwachs we tend to consider the family memory as a meaningful and at the same time available for transformation analysis of socio-cultural memory and values, and social horizons in modern society.

### **3.3. School of “Annals” and “historical memory” concept**

The concept of social memory in addition to Maurice Halbwachs was also developed by other representatives of "Annals" school. As you know, the task of the new school of "Annals" (1929) was to synthesize all social and humanitarian knowledge within the framework of history, overcoming disciplinary barriers. Attempts to synthesize socio-humanitarian knowledge within the framework of the school of annals were carried out, we can say, outside the philosophical reflection, and historians themselves emphasized their focus on empirical knowledge, a close connection with historical fact.

Attempts to create a "total history", which were made by four generations of students of the annals school founders, fade to the 1980s, when the methodological turn to the so-called "new cultural history" occurred. It is based from the fact that the only and real object to study is culture. If annals tried to implement synthesis on the basis of socio-economic history, adding the study of culture and mentality, the new cultural history focuses on the study of culture, mentalities [Megill, 2007, p. 342-343].

The problem of historical memory from this moment is considered mostly by these historians, especially by the "third generation" of the school. These are J. Le Goff (born 1924) and his work "History and memory" (1986), E. Le Roy Ladurie (born 1929) and his "Montayu: Occitan village" (1973), "Territory of history" (1978), Marc ferro (born 1925) and his work "How to tell a story to children in different countries of the world" (1983), Pierre Nora (born 1931) and his seven-volume "Places of memory" (1986).

The work of one of the brightest representatives of this school – Mark Ferro – "How to tell the history to children in different countries of the world" (1983), where the problem of historical memory and the use of memory for political purposes begins to be actively discussed, has become a classic one for our theme. Mark Ferro distinguishes "three centers of history": "history of winners", "history of losers", and "collective memory of the society". Collective memory, according to Ferro, is spontaneously layered on the institutional history of the winners [Ferro, 1992, p. 306-308].

The surge of attention to the problems of historical memory is mostly associated with the activities and work of Pierre Nora (born in 1931), who is the head of the "new historical school" (this is the modern name of "Annals" school) nowadays. In 1984, in connection with the anniversary celebration of The French revolution at the initiative and under the general editorship of Pierre Nora there began a publication of "Places of memory" seven volumes, which were catalogued monuments, ideas, symbols, texts, holidays, which were associated with the identity of the French nation. The "places of memory" concept, which today gave the name to the whole historical school, was borrowed by Pierre Nora from Frances Yates, who in her work "Art of memory" [Yates, 1996], introduced this concept to describe the technique of mnemonics of speakers and speakers in the Middle ages: to associate each thesis of his

speech with a certain object (furniture, lamp, etc.) or area of space (atrium, window, etc.) in the audience.

According to the authors of the work (and in the compilation of "Places of memory", published in "Gallimard" publ. house under the editorship P. Nora, there attended 45 famous French historians), history exists not in the form of wholes, but in the form of individual places, because historical memory has not preserved us a common continuous picture of history, and its individual places – all we have: the national archive, monuments to people or events, libraries, museums, cemeteries and architectural works, commemorations, anniversaries, textbooks, etc., generation, region. Pierre Nora distinguishes between "history-memory" and "history-criticism", "studying" history destroys "storing" history. But the "storing" history still has an impact on the "studying", puts its results in doubt. [Nora, 1999].

From the works by "the third generation" of Annals school historians, the problems of studying memory acquire an acute social character, which until now has been consistently amplified. To sum up, the attention to the problems of social, group, historical, cultural memory, which arose in the 20s of the XX century, since the 80's of the XX century becomes really global (Anderson, 2006; Nora, J. Assmann, 2001; Assmann, 2004; Megill, 2007). At the present time when memory research has become not only an intellectual fashion, but also a fact of social and political life in Europe, America and Russia. This is the content in the second stage of development of the "memory studies" conceptual apparatus, the consideration of which is beyond the scope of this article and will be considered in the future.

In our opinion, the approaches of the "places of memory" school and in general the study of historical memory have undoubted heuristic value. A comprehensive analysis of the "places of memory" of local communities, including the analysis of everyday mass representations, expert discourse (for example, the scientific literature of local lore) in our case will allow us to trace the trends of archaization in memorial practices of different levels.

---

## 4. Conclusions

At the first stage of the "memory studies", the formation of the conceptual apparatus was developed with the dominant influence of psychological concepts, as well as the sociologists and historians participation; and also the opportunity to talk about the "collective" on the basis of the "individual" generalization was proved. This became the basis for the further development of memory studies, when national research schools about memory studies are formed, each of which tries to solve topical issues, not only scientific, but also related to the actual social development.

The highlighted achievements at the first stage of the memory studies formation allow us to formulate ideas and concepts that, from our point

of view, have a high heuristic value for the modern society analysis. This idea of the socio-cultural value of "reference point" of historical time, which is formed by a group, the idea of the family as a model available for the analysis of the socio-cultural memory functioning, the idea about managing the cultural and historical memory as a special ideological tool, and the ability of "places of memory" complex analysis for the local communities in a comparative chronological perspective. These ideas will form the basis of the methodology of the empirical part of the study "Forward to the past: archaism and archaization trends in contemporary Russian society (interdisciplinary analysis)".

## Acknowledgments

The article is a part of the Society of Professional Sociologists' research programs, supported by the Russian Fund for Basic Research. Research project RFBR № 19-011-00943 "Forward to the past: archaism and archaization trends in contemporary Russian society (interdisciplinary analysis)" (2019-2021).

---

## Bibliographic references

- Althusser, L. (2011). Ideology and ideological apparatus of the state. *Journal room*, 2011, №3. Retrieved August 23, 2019 from <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2011/3/al3.html>
- Anderson, B. (2016). *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism*. Moscow: Kuchkovo pole.
- Ankersmit, F. (2003). *History and Tropology: The Rise and Fall of Metaphora*. Moscow: Canon Tradition.
- Assmann, Y. (2004). *Cultural memory: Writing. Memory of the past and political identity in the high cultures of antiquity*. Moscow: YAzyki slavyanskoj kul'tury.
- Assmann, A. (2006). *Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit: Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik*. München: C.H. Beck Verlag.
- Bergson, H. (1992) *Matter and memory*. Moscow: Moscow club.
- Durkheim, E. (2018). *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Moscow: Delo.
- Durkheim, E. (1995). Individual representations and collective representations. *Sociology. Her subject, method, mission*. Moscow: Canon, pp. 208–243.
- Ferro, M. (1992). *How to tell history to children in different countries of the world*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Gensburger, S. (2016). Halbwachs' studies in collective memory: A founding text for contemporary «memory studies»? *Journal of classical sociology*, 2016, Vol. 16, N 4, pp. 396–413.

- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Yates F. (1997). *The Art of Memory*. St. Petersburg: Foundation for the Support of Science and Education "University Book".
- Halbvachs, M. (2007). *Social framework of memory*. M.: Novoye izdatelstvo.
- Janet, P. (1928). L'évolution de la mémoire et de la notion du temps. *Compte rendu intégral des conférences faites en 1928 au Collège de France d'après les notes sténographiques. Collège de France, Chaire de psychologie expérimentale et comparée*. Tome III: L'organisation du temps. Paris, Éditions Chahine, pp. 419 à 624. Retrieved August 23, 2019 from [https://www.psychanalyse.com/pdf/janet\\_memoire\\_temps.pdf](https://www.psychanalyse.com/pdf/janet_memoire_temps.pdf)
- Kolevatov, V.A. (1984). *Social memory and cognition*. M.: Mysl.
- Megill, A. (2007). *Historical epistemology*. M.: Canon+.
- Misztal, B.A. (2010). Collective Memory in a Global Age. Learning How and What to Remember. *Current Sociology*. Volume 58, Number 1, January, pp. 24-43.
- Muravyov, Yu. A. (1995). *Truth. Culture. Ideal*. M.: Prometheus.
- Nikolaeva, U. (2005). *Economic Archaic and Modernity*. M.: Dashkov and K.
- Nora, P., and Ozuf, M., et al. (1999). *France - Memory*. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of St. Petersburg University.
- Pushkareva, T.V. (2008). The flickering field of history: the question of the dialectic of collective memory and oblivion. *Sociology and social policy*, 2008, №2, pp. 149-157.
- Pushkareva, T.V. (2001). *Memory, culture, history: to the problem of historical time*. (Doctoral Thesis). Moscow State Pedagogical University. Moscow.
- Rebane, Ya.K. (1982). Information and social memory: on the problem of social determination of cognition. *Questions of philosophy*. 1982, No. 8, pp.44-54.
- Rogovin, M. S. (1966). *Philosophical problems of memory theory*. M.: Vysshaya shkola.
- Staf, I. (2008). Another memory? *Fatherlands notes*, № 43. Retrieved August 23, 2019 from <http://www.strana-oz.ru/2008/4/chuzhaya-pamyat>
- Sorokin, P., and Merton, R. (1937). Social Time: A Methodological and Functional Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 42, No. 5 (Mar., 1937), pp. 615-629. Retrieved August 25, 2019 from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2767758>
- Stolovich, L.N., Üuloolool, T.R., and Rebane, Ya.K. (1984). The Principle of social memory. Scientific notes of Tartu University. Vol. 695. Tartu.
- Vygotsky, L. (1997). *Psychology of art*. Moscow: Labyrinth.
-

1. Candidate of Philosophy, Associated Professor of Culture, Sociology and Philosophy Department, Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia. [ap-bib@yandex.ru](mailto:ap-bib@yandex.ru)

2. Doctor of Economics, Associated Professor, Department of Economics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia. [ylnikolaeva@gmail.ru](mailto:ylnikolaeva@gmail.ru)

3. Candidate of Pedagogy, Associate Professor of Language Training Department, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia.  
[darya\\_agaltsova@mail.ru](mailto:darya_agaltsova@mail.ru)

---

Revista ESPACIOS. ISSN 0798 1015  
Vol. 40 (Nº 35) Year 2019

[\[Index\]](#)

[In case you find any errors on this site, please send e-mail to [webmaster](#)]