Language in Society (2024), 1–24
doi:10.1017/S0047404524000927

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

ARTICLE

Sociolinguistics, memory studies, and the dynamics of interdisciplinarity

Ben Rampton and Thomas Van de Putte

King's College London, London, UK
Email: Thomas.1.van_de_putte@kcl.ac.uk

(Received 10 January 2024; revised 27 August 2024; accepted 27 August 2024)

Abstract

This article uses a dialogue between memory studies (MS) and ethnographic and interactional sociolinguistics (EIS) to explore the dynamics of interdisciplinarity. MS focuses on the social remembering of high-profile and often traumatic events, and this is relevant to EIS's growing interest in (in)securitization. MS is increasingly keen to explore everyday practices of remembering in interscalar analyses, and EIS' expertise in the study of mundane communication can provide essential support. But there are major differences in their focal concerns and analytical cultures, as well as in their approaches to interdisciplinarity. This generates asymmetries in their exchange, which we illustrate with studies from Oświęcim/Auschwitz (MS) and Cyprus (EIS). By mapping these differences and highlighting collaborative data sessions as a practical arena for building relationships, the article seeks to deepen our understanding of interdisciplinarity and facilitate its practice. (Everyday practice, cultural memory, (in)securitisation, Mode 1 and Mode 2 interdisciplinarity)

Introduction

'Sociolinguistics', say Coupland & Jaworski (2009:19), is 'a broad and vibrant interdisciplinary project'. But interdisciplinarity can be complicated and take different forms. This article draws on the dialogue between a sociolinguist (Ben Rampton) and a memory studies scholar (Thomas Van de Putte) to explore its dynamics.

Memory studies (MS) focuses on the collective and personal remembering of high-profile and often traumatic events in cultural texts and institutional practices of commemoration, and it is already a significant point of reference in critical discourse analysis (CDA).[1] For the most part, however, CDA accounts of public remembering have centred on public displays and institutional discourses. Even though there is recognition that 'everyday commemorative practices' are 'no less important' (Milani & Richardson 2023:6–7), there has been relatively little ethnographic sociolinguistic work on the links between the events, objects,

and narratives thematised in memory studies, on the one hand, and fairly low-key communicative activity, on the other (for exceptions, see e.g. Krzyżanowska 2023; Burnett, Ahmed, Matthews, Oliephant, & Walsh 2023; Pérez-Milans & Guo 2024). It is this gap that provides a starting point for the questions we address in this article: What is the scope for a sustainable interdisciplinary collaboration between MS and the ETHNOGRAPHIC and INTERACTIONAL branches of sociolinguistics (EIS) where mundane communicative practice is a central concern? What forms could the collaboration take, and what are the complications?

We begin with broad-brush sketches of major theoretical and methodological interests in MS and EIS and identify quite substantial differences in 'analytical culture'. One tradition leans towards respectful curation (MS), the other towards sceptical irreverence (EIS); while one attends hermeneutically to the afterlife of events in narratives, archives, and so on, the other captures the ongoing enactment of society across a plurality of genres in the factualities of recorded data. And while one handles material of considerable public interest (MS), often surrounded by legal and ritual discourses, the other tries hard to reveal the hitherto unrecognised consequentiality of what most people take for granted (EIS).

Nevertheless, there are potentially enduring cross-disciplinary connections in:

(a) MS's nascent interest in interscalar analysis which requires reaching into the details of ordinary talk, and in
(b) EIS' growing interest in (in)securitization, which is a system of governance that sometimes turns memories of conflict into resources for political control and mobilisation.

But the connections achieved in these two areas follow different interdisciplinary logics:

(i) MS targets EIS for its distinctive methodological capacity to unpack the micro-dynamics of practice, and it uses EIS to open up a fundamental dimension in the production of social reality that it has recognised but lacked the tools to investigate empirically.
(ii) In contrast, EIS is interested in MS for its thematic focus on the commemoration of traumatic events but can treat it as only one among a number of other-disciplinary resources that are relevant in its efforts to understand the complex multi-dimensional problem of (in)securitisation as a powerful but specific system of rule.

These two approaches can be distinguished as 'Mode 1' and 'Mode 2' interdisciplinarities, and we illustrate them in two empirical projects that examine the benefits that MS and EIS bring each other—an MS study of remembering in Auschwitz/Oświęcim in Poland and EIS research on Greek-Cypriots learning Turkish in Cyprus. After that, we propose two-hour data sessions as a productive practical arena for strengthening interdisciplinary dialogue, optimizing the differences and accepting the uncertainties, tangents, and asymmetries that interdisciplinarity necessarily involves. We conclude with some comments on the wider significance of our discussion.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Memory studies

Memory studies' main field of theorizing and empirical research is the collective and personal remembering of high-profile events of major significance in cultural texts and institutional practices of commemoration.

MS scholars are generally interested in the meanings of past events, not in the past as such—they study and interpret how the meaning attributed to events in the past changes or remains stable across time, situations, cultural, and political contexts. Focusing on the afterlife of events, discourses and narratives in monologic texts, testimonies, archives, and interviews are the most common source materials, and when these materials are not linguistic in nature—monuments, for example—they are often treated as texts that can be read and interpreted (e.g. Young 1993; Violi 2017).

In the humanities and qualitative social sciences, memory studies scholars today tend to conceive of the pedigree of their field in three partly overlapping phases and intellectual waves (Erll 2011). In the first phase, the 'classical' founding fathers wrote their texts on collective memory. Maurice Halbwachs, Aby Warburg, and Frederic Bartlett are considered to be the key authors. But in practice it is the Durkeimian tradition in which Halbwachs worked that is the most widely cited (Halbwachs 1925, 1950). Today, the general takeaway from Halbwachs for memory scholars is that our personal acts of remembering are informed by all kinds of social frameworks, which make memory inherently social and thus 'collective'.

Phase two is the theoretical consolidation of the field in 'schools' and the boom in empirical research. The memory 'boom' (Winter 2001) in the humanities and social sciences has been informed by an interest in cultural and collective trauma (Caruth 1996; La Capra 2001; Alexander 2012) in the 1980s and 1990s and the globalization of Holocaust memory in the same period (Levy & Sznaider 2005; Kansteiner 2006). Two theoretical schools in memory studies are key to phase two. First, there is the historical and nation-focussed school inspired by the work of Pierre Nora (1997), where the main project has been to theorize and study a nation's material and immaterial 'realms of memory' (*lieux de memoire*), first in France and then elsewhere. Second, there is the German, more cosmopolitan and literary orientation inspired by Jan Assmann (2008, 2011) and Aleida Assmann (1999). The Assmanns conceptualize collective memory as both communicative and cultural. Communicative memory is what has been directly experienced by members of groups and societies, and it usually lasts only a few decades after the events. Some of these events and meanings are then culturalized in a society's cultural memory. These memories, then, become durable and relatively stable, disconnected from direct experiences of the remembered events. This second phase in MS runs roughly from the 1980s until the early 2010s.

Phase three sees the Assmanns' understanding of collective memory becoming dominant in memory studies in the humanities and being mobilized to study cases around the world. This third phase is more media-oriented, transcultural, cosmopolitan, and a good deal of theoretical innovation comes from literary and cultural studies, where new concepts emerge to study the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mediation and movement of memory through time and between cultural contexts. Memory is now said to be travelling, multi-directional, transcultural, prosthetic, post-, and much more (Hirsch 1997; Landsberg 2004; Rothberg 2009; Erll 2011; Bond & Rapson 2014). Cultural and collective memories are never stable and fixed—they are the result of constant borrowing from other meanings and from resignification in ever-new contexts.

Recently, however, there have been calls for a new phase in MS. Memory studies 'phase three' is criticized for not being equipped to understand the most important issues today (climate change, most notably, Craps Crownshaw, Wenzel, Kennedy, Colebrook, & Nardizzi 2018), for focusing too exclusively on events rather than processes (Wustenberg 2023), for being too Eurocentric (Adebayo 2023; Mwambari 2023), and for having exhausted its potential for theoretical innovation (Van de Putte 2024). In the field, there is growing interest in cross-disciplinary connections as a source of inspiration for the retheorisation of memory, and this comes with a broader call for interscalar (De Cesari & Rigney 2014; Keightley, Pickering, & Bisht 2019; Van de Putte 2022, 2024) and relational approaches (Gensburger 2016; Erll 2017; Jones 2022), bringing scholars from different disciplines together to examine the same phenomena, taking each other's theories seriously.

This is where ethnographic and interactional sociolinguistics comes in. If MS wants to go multi- or interscalar, it will need to do more than interpret acts of remembering from cultural and/or institutional perspectives. In the attention that both the Halbwachsian and Assmannian traditions in MS give to official commemorative rituals and relatively stable, sacred memorial meanings in institutionalized texts, the view of the self is monolithic: people are seen as either internalizing and then reproducing one dominant narrative or resisting both processes as 'activists' (Van de Putte 2021). These theories do not recognise how dominant cultural meanings are forged through interactional practice, and how flexibly the remembering self can enact different and contradicting memory narratives in specific situations, both reproducing and resisting the dominant accounts without creating existential problems for the self.

So, at least in principle, EIS could offer MS a way of seeing how, for example, cultural meanings and political power take shape in quotidian interaction, or how the meanings of extraordinary events and processes are normalized. Investigating the micro-foundations of larger cultural memory meanings needn't require cultural memory scholars to give up on understanding the significant master narratives that assure continuity in societies (Jones & Van de Putte 2024). Rather, reaching out to EIS will allow us to better understand how (everyday) practices inform and subvert dominant and subordinate cultural memories and the social relations that they are connected to.

There is, though, always more to interdisciplinarity than just the logical next step in a programme of inquiry. Disciplines often differ in their dispositions, work habits, and senses of academic identity, and according to Sarah Gensburger, past-president of the Memory Studies Association,

> [t]oday, if researchers from various disciplines tend to call for interdisciplinary practices, it is generally to assert the primacy of their own discipline

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> for the more specific study of 'memory'.... For contemporary memory studies, discipline-specific expertise on 'memory' hides behind an 'interdisciplinary' label and becomes a [form] of academic one-upmanship. (2016:407)

So, is MS destined for second place in its encounter with ethnographic and interactional sociolinguistics and, by the same token, is EIS inclined to one-upmanship? At this point we should turn to EIS: how obvious is the connection with MS, and what are the potentials for reciprocity and/or friction?

Ethnographic and interactional sociolinguistics

Dating back at least to Gumperz & Hymes (1972), mundane communicative practice has been a central object of study in a significant number of the (very broadly) sociolinguistic schools and traditions: ethnography of communication, interactional sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, linguistic anthropology, variationist sociolinguistics, linguistic ethnography, nexus analysis, sociocultural linguistics, and so on. Many of these traditions are interested in the larger-scale social processes that concern researchers in disciplines like sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, and geography, but they approach them by looking very closely at recordings of everyday interaction among ordinary people, using ethnography to trace the interaction's links to the plurality of processes, systems, identities, and relationships that comprise its multi-layered 'context', influencing the encounter before, during, and after its occurrence (Rampton 2006:ch.10). Indeed, with practice itself standing as a central contemporary academic concern (Ortner 2006), EIS is often inclined 'to reach out to other disciplines... conceiv[ing] of language no longer as the primary object of inquiry but as an instrument for gaining access to [the] complex social processes' studied in other fields (Duranti 2003:332).

There is quite a bit of diversity in the models of society that EIS traditions work with, but Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu have been very influential reference points for a long time,[2] and this points to an abiding interest in how linguistic practice (re)produces social inequality. So investigations of the inequalities of class, race, gender, sexuality, generation, and so forth take the 'microscopic' analysis of mundane talk as their baseline, and then scale up and down through the genres in play, the physical arrangements, the institutional roles, and so on, to look at how practices on the ground reproduce or interrupt longer/wider structural processes, often also engaging with highly influential ideologies and systems of governance like standardisation and marketisation. Moving from social systems to individuals, there is also a good deal of interest in mundane practical consciousness—'communicative competence', 'habitus'—and how this shapes and takes shape in everyday conduct (even though heightened awareness also moves into focus when the everyday gets breached, resisted, and denaturalised from time to time).

The data with which sociolinguistics pursues these interests certainly do not exclude the narratives, interviews, media reports, and public discourses that feature prominently in memory studies, but they also extend far further, both in institutional siting and generic form, spanning (to name just a fraction)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

communities, schools, clinics, offices, social media, chats, jokes, lessons, lectures, consultations, committee meetings, and so on. Theories in these sociolinguistic traditions are usually developed through very close and repeated examinations of data, and although there is ongoing work refining/revising theoretical models themselves, theories are often technologised quite quickly as 'tools' and 'analytical frameworks'. As such, it is their capacity to illuminate communicative practice that matters,[3] and there is usually an overarching commitment to holding theories and analysis accountable to the hearable facticity—to the 'truth'—of audio/video-recorded data, where, crucially, the analyst's interpretations of meaning are themselves often constrained by the understandings displayed by other participants in the event being studied (see, for example, the next-turn proof procedure in CA or playback in interactional sociolinguistics).

So, it sounds as if EIS would be open to dialogue with MS, but overall, its typical interests, sites, and procedures look rather different, as can be seen in Figure 1, which sets our broad-brush characterisations next to each other.

PRINCIPAL OBJECTS OF STUDY IN	
INTERACTIONAL & ETHNOGRAPHIC SOCIOLINGUISTICS	MEMORY STUDIES
• *Sociolinguistic systems*: language and communication in the mundane (re)production of everyday life, often including inequalities, institutional regimes, and ideologies like standardisation, marketisation (Bourdieu, Foucault)	• *Collective and personal remembering* of high-profile events of major social significance, in institutional practices of commemoration, musealization, political ritual (sacralisation) (phase 1: Halbwachs/ Durkheim, Warburg, Barlett; phase 2: Nora, A. Assmann, J. Assmann); phase 3: since 2000, mediatisation)
• *Individuals in society*: mundane practical consciousness, communicative competence and habitus	• *The formation of collectivities:* heightened attention and affective unity among the participants (consecration); mediated multi-directional movements of memories
• *Data:* a plurality of genres (lessons, jokes, chats, consultations, etc.), from a lot of different institutional settings (schools, clinics, communities, offices, etc.), with a great deal of authority residing in the facticity of empirical recordings	• *Data:* the afterlife of events in narratives, monologues, testimonies, archives, interviews and, for example, monuments interpreted hermeneutically as text

Figure 1. Principal objects of study.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Indeed, there are quite striking differences in how we have presented each of these fields. The description of MS narrates a line of development and a pedigree, while the account of EIS AMALGAMATES different traditions to claim wider relevance to social science (in Coupland's (1998:116) words, 'restructuring how we represent the discipline to ourselves and others' to 'advance social theory'). These differences in self-presentation point to more general differences in epistemic demeanour, to which we now turn.

Different analytic dispositions?

As an undergraduate in the discipline, one of the first things you learn is that sociolinguistics does 'myth-busting', debunking prejudice about the inferiority of non-standard language; ethnographies of communication produce findings that confound mainstream assumptions about practices that look strange to outsiders; and conversation analysis is resolute in focusing on what initially looks trivial and mundane. These traditions all position themselves as social science, ambushing irrationality, deluded commonsense or indeed high-falutin' theory through the application of systematic frameworks to empirical texts and recordings.

That said, ethnographic and interactional sociolinguists have a good deal of freedom to pick and choose what they want to study. Alongside the other-disciplinary reference points mentioned above, there is also often a lot of non-academic, professional, bureaucratic, educational, or journalistic discourse around the everyday practices that EIS researchers decide to focus on, and these non-academic discourses can also be important points of departure and reference throughout. The big challenge is to say something that is different but still relevant to the other discipline(s) you have been reading and/or to the commonsense prevailing in the particular institution(s) in focus. And with unspectacular practice at the centre of EIS analysis, you quite often find yourself asking: "Am I really just making a mountain out of a molehill?", "Is this actually all just trivial pedantry?", "So what? Why bother?".

For memory studies, the picture looks different. Scholarly accounts on memory enter high-profile arenas that are already very well populated with narratives and discourse from sociopolitical actors as well as other disciplines, and a lot of different constituencies care about the representations that memory scholars study and produce. Indeed, scholars in MS are often heavily involved in co-shaping and enterpreneuring the cultural meanings and narratives they study: influential memory scholars are part of, for example, parliamentary commissions about the colonial past (e.g. Valerie Rosoux in Belgium), and advise the government on resignification of fascist heritage (e.g. Francisco Ferrandiz in Spain). The normative position in MS usually varies, depending on who the actors are that are doing the remembering: Nationalist interpretations of the Holocaust, or imperial nostalgia, are likely to be debunked (e.g. Craps 2013; Grabowski 2016), while liberal interpretations of the Holocaust, or the memories of marginalized communities, tend to be treated less sceptically and the researcher contributes to the sacralization of memory. So as a memory scholar, it is not the triviality of what you are studying that worries

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

you—what you try to avoid is either transgressive desecration or public endorsement, depending on what you are examining.

Thus, as well as differing in their thematic focus, it looks as though EIS and MS foster different analytical dispositions (Figure 2). On what grounds, then, is there any realistic hope of sustainable dialogue of lasting mutual benefit? A shared interest in high profile public texts and artefacts can account for the conversation between memory studies and CDA in particular projects, but what are the prospects for an enduring conversation that puts mundane everyday practice at its centre? This is a point where we need to recognise that a two-way interaction can accommodate DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO INTERDISCIPLINARITY, sustaining the exchange despite the asymmetries that this involves. To summarise the differences that we illustrate in the next two sections.

- EIS can offer MS a set of frameworks and procedures to open up a fundamental dimension of social reality that MS has started to recognise ontologically but has hitherto failed to theorise because it has lacked the analytical tools;

SELF-POSITIONING IN THE PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THEIR OBJECTS OF STUDY	
ETHNOGRAPHIC & INTERACTIONAL SOCIOLINGUISTICS (investigating the contemporary reproduction of social systems through mundane practices)	MEMORY STUDIES (investigating personal remembering and the collective commemoration of major events in the past)
• *Social scientists* denaturalising taken-for-granted ideas and beliefs by applying rigorous procedures and systematic frameworks to empirical datasets (sociolinguists as critical sceptics)	• *Humanists (and qualitative social scientists):* The originating facts are now unknowable => hermeneutics, with many other disciplines and sectors also interested in the remembered events in focus (MS scholars as co-curators, entrepreneurs).
• *Accountability:* A good deal of freedom selecting what to focus on, though sociolinguistic findings are often quite easy to ignore, drowned out by the bureaucratic, professional, and journalistic discourses surrounding sociolinguistic objects of study.	• *Accountability:* Many non-academics and non-specialists care about the remembered event, which may be embedded within ritual, legal/juridical, historiographic, and popular discourse.

Figure 2. Self-positioning in knowledge production.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- in the other direction, MS can contribute to EIS's understanding of a particular form of everyday governance—(in)securitisation—that has become increasingly salient in the contemporary world. To make sense of power dynamics that EIS has hitherto overlooked, MS becomes one among a number of strands in an already eclectic set of other-disciplinary resources that EIS draws on in this endeavour.

We use two case studies to demonstrate such an interdisciplinary crossfertilization, the first drawing on Thomas Van de Putte's work in MS and the second on Constadina Charalambous's work with Ben Rampton and Panayiota Charalambous in EIS.

Mode 1: Memory studies and the problem of interactional complexity

Memory studies' trouble in making sense of the complexity of self-presentation in interaction was a problem for Van de Putte's analysis of data from his participant observation fieldwork among a group of friends living in the contemporary Polish town of Oświęcim/Auschwitz in Poland (Van de Putte 2021). But by drawing on concepts from Goffman-inspired sociology and interactional discourse analysis—positioning (Davies & Harré 1990; Bamberg 2003; Georgakopoulou 2007), narrative pre-construction (Labov 2006), vicarious experience and the construction of epistemic authority (Sacks 1984; Norrick 2013, 2020)—he was able to write about his participants as skilled communicators able to switch between a 'catalogue' of different narratives.

Oświęcim's 40,000 inhabitants live so close to the Auschwitz-Birkenau former concentration camp that they are constantly navigating different sacred and profane meanings in their everyday lives. To illustrate the complex interactional practices that this involves, it is worth looking at a short strip of interaction that Van de Putte felt unable to make sense of before reaching out to EIS. The interaction comes about an hour into a two-hour twelve-minute interview in a living room belonging to Adam, a self-employed window repairer who is also a passionate collector of historical objects connected to Auschwitz/Oświęcim. He finds these objects during his work in old houses and exhibits them in his basement, turning the basement into a small private museum (Van de Putte 2021). Adam and Van de Putte have been discussing how he writes about the town's past on Facebook, looking at some printed screenshots that Van de Putte has brought to the interview. Van de Putte asks about the meaning of one of his Facebook posts and this requires Adam to locate his social media activity in a context that includes the dominant narrative about the Nazi German occupation of the town in various contexts.[4]

(1)

1	Adam:	no to każdy sobie już wyobraża no:: *'well then everyone already is imagining yes::'*
2		Niemcy obóz (yy) zajęli miasto wyrzucili Polaków czy tak dalej *'Germans, camp (yy) they took over the city threw out Poles or and so forth'*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3		czyli w rzeczywistości my wszystko już wiemy (.) natomiast *'so in fact we already know everything (.) however'*
4	Thomas:	myślisz ze wszystkie wiedzą *'do you think all know'*
5	Adam:	ja mysle ze tak no bo jeżeli tutaj mieszkają to to to to *'I think that yes well because if they live here well that that that'*
6	Thomas:	Okay
7	Adam:	myślę ze ze większość wie no po prostu (.) no większość (.) *'I think that that the majority knows well simply (.) well the majority (.)'*
8		znaczy to jest tak większość ludzi wie ze to było żydowskie miasteczko można powiedzieć *'that means that is yes the majority of people know that it was a Jewish small town as one could say'*
9		no bo jednak procentowo zawsze te pięćdziesiąt parę procent było większość Żydów (.) *'because however percentually always these fifty and a bit percent was a* *majority of Jews (.)'*
10		Niemcy przyszli wyrzucili wszystkich w sumie Żydów (.) *'the Germans came threw out all the total of Jews (.)'*
11		Polacy część została prawda↗ *'Poles a part stayed right↗'*
12		wiadomo że nie w kamienicach ale gdzieś tam na obrzeżach (.) *'it is known that not in the tenement houses but somewhere there on the outskirts'*
13		no ale (.) Żydów wysiedlono (.) do obozów (.) na Zagładę i tak dalej *'yes but (.) Jews resettled (.) to the camps (.) for the Holocaust and so forth'*

The cultural memory narrative Adam tells at first is a peculiarly short one (line 2): "Germans, camp, they took over the city threw out Poles or and so forth." The main actors in this story are "the Germans", who took over the city and threw out the Poles, and the "Poles", who were passive and were thrown out. Adam's mention of "the camp", without explaining what that may mean, seems to be connected to the other two actions "the Germans" took (taking over the city, throwing out the Poles). Adam ends his story with "and so forth". He does not elaborate, and Van de Putte also doesn't ask him to.

What is crucial here is that Adam does not explicitly mention Jews or other victim groups in the story. The role of Jews might have been assumed in the mentioning of "the camp" or in the "and so forth","but Adam does not thematise them explicitly. He only stresses the active role of the Germans and the passive role of the Poles. These choices largely reflect a dominant cultural narrative that is promoted by Catholic, Polish nationalist actors in the Polish public sphere (Zubrzycki 2013, 2016).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

At the end of this part of the exchange in line 3, Adam wants to continue his story, but Van de Putte interrupts him (line 4), asking whether Adam really thinks that is what everyone knows. Adam had known Van de Putte as a friendly acquaintance during his period of ethnographic fieldwork and he is not used to Van de Putte in the role of interviewer, questioning his views. Because the critical question came so unexpectedly, Adam has to reposition both himself and Van de Putte, Van de Putte's expectations, and the norms governing their interaction. From a friendly in-group member during his ethnography, Van de Putte becomes repositioned as a critical interviewer. After the interruption, Adam realizes that a different cultural memory narrative than the one he has just performed is required. But it takes time for Adam to formulate that narrative.

To Van de Putte's question, he initially replies confidently, "I think that yes well because if they live here . . ." (line 5). However, then the conversational data suggest that Adam starts doubting his answer and is struggling to make up his mind. From lines 5 to 8, he takes about ten seconds to start a new story. During these ten seconds, the pace of his speech is slowing down, and at least three times Adam halts his own stream of thoughts. Adam seems to be struggling here to reestablish the epistemic authority and confidence that he performed before Van de Putte's critical interruption.

The second narrative (lines 8–13) is completely different from the first one. Now, it is not the Germans and Poles who are the central actors, but it is the Jewish past of the town that everybody is supposedly remembering. Adam explains that "the majority of people know that it was a Jewish small town as one could say" (line 8). He goes on to explain that about fifty percent of the inhabitants before the war were Jews. After having set the scene of Auschwitz/Oświęcim as a Jewish small town, he narrates the Second World War and the Holocaust. The Germans invaded, removed all of the Jews. Some of the Poles stayed on the outskirts of the town, but the Jews were forcefully removed "to the camps for the Holocaust and so forth" (line 13). Notice that not only Jews are new to the story. In this part of the story, some of the (Catholic) Poles also stayed in the town, while in the first narrative, they were "thrown out". Now it is the Jews who occupy a passive role, not the Catholic Poles.

To sum up, Adam mobilizes different parts of his cultural toolkit (Swidler 1986) in this interaction. Initially, he offers the Polish nationalist narrative appropriate to an in-group member but then switches to the more liberal and international narrative required for a critical interviewer. For MS as such, the episode looks messy and confusing because it does not show a person who has internalized just one memory narrative, consistently either reproducing or resisting the hegemonic version. But EIS recognises the negotiations, stance nuancing and dissonance emerging in a plethora of encounters, and this helps to make the interaction intelligible, allowing us to see the discursive effort with which Adam manages the shift without disrupting the event.[5]

Stepping back to consider the cross-disciplinary moves involved, we can say that this is a case of 'Mode 1 interdisciplinarity' (Economic & Social Research Council nd; Gibbons, Limoges, Nowotny, Schwartzman, Scott, & Trow 1994; Rampton, Maybin, & Roberts 2014:6; Strathern 2000:285–86). In Mode 1

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interdisciplinarity, focal problems are identified within a particular (sub)discipline, and there is cross-reference to another paradigm/line of research in order to get past a bottleneck that researchers have reached using only the concepts and methods available within their own disciplinary heartland. The rationale for cross-referencing other approaches and the parameters of what to include are set fairly clearly, and there is quite a well-defined sense of exactly what kinds of methodological borrowings and combinations are now in order.

This differs from interdisciplinarity in 'Mode 2'. In Mode 2, it is the multidimensional complexity of 'real-world' issues of social, technical, or political significance that calls for collaboration between a multiplicity of disciplines and stakeholders, and it is important not to commit too quickly to a specification of the key methods and dimensions of analysis.

Mode 2 interdisciplinarity: EIS, MS (and other disciplines) at the nexus of (in)securitisation

Although they are absolutely not new in many parts of the world, over the last two decades discourses of security have become much more insistent in wealthy countries like the UK, western Europe, and the US, where ethnographic and interactional sociolinguistics first developed and now thrives. This entails a form of governance that has been called 'securitisation' in the study of international relations (IR), and in IR, securitisation has been described as the 'practice of making "enemy" and "fear" the integrative, energetic principle of politics displacing the democratic principles of freedom and justice' (Huysmans 2014:3). It is a way of managing populations in which the normal laws and rules guiding citizens in contemporary liberal democracies no longer apply, and instead, people act as if there is a state of exception (or a state of siege) where there are existential threats and the strong possibility of violence and/or death.

IR has been a vital external reference point for sociolinguists seeking to engage with securitisation as a 'real-world' process, and the relevance to EIS[6] has increased with growing critical IR interest in 'details, local events, or precise and complex life stories' (Bigo 2014:190–91), looking at how 'vernacular constructions, experiences and stories of (in)security have the POTENTIAL TO DISRUPT "official" accounts' (Vaughan-Williams & Stevens 2015:42). The bracketed prefix (*in-*) is now often added to *security* to capture the fact that securitisation usually works in two or more directions— security to one person can be insecurity to another, and this can change with the situation, sometimes quite quickly—and this more interactive approach has been accompanied by increased interest in ethnography. EIS has tuned into these developments, and the ensuing exchange has also included some collaborative IR/EIS publications, projects, and training (e.g. Mc Cluskey & Charalambous 2022; Charalambous, Charalambous, & Rampton 2017; Rampton & Charalambous 2020; www.kcl.ac.uk/liep). But where and how does memory studies come in?

Collective memories and narratives of trauma or a glorious mythical past can feature very prominently as warrants for the political action needed to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

manage the existential threats conjured in discourses of securitisation (Jones & Van de Putte 2024). This is one very good reason for EIS to stay in touch with memory studies, and in order to illustrate a distinctively MS contribution to EIS in action, we should now turn to the research on Greek-Cypriot secondary school students in Cyprus learning Turkish, the language of the (former) enemy.

In 1974, Cyprus was de facto divided following violent conflict between Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots, and after that, communication between the two parts was impossible for almost thirty years. But when the (mainly Greek-speaking) Republic of Cyprus signed the EU accession treaty in 2003, restrictions of movement across the buffer zone in Nicosia were partially lifted, and among other things, the Turkish language was introduced as an option in Greek-Cypriot secondary education for the first time, framed within a rhetoric of reconciliation. In 2006, there were 1,138 secondary students studying it for ninety minutes a week for two years, and in 2012, there were 873. But the task of teaching Turkish was very far from straightforward, because for a long time, Greek-Cypriot education has been a major site for collective remembering of the conflict and for the construction of Turkish otherness, emphasizing Greek-Cypriot victimhood and promoting a militant spirit of 'I don't forget and I struggle' (see Zembylas, Charalambous, & Charalambous 2016).

Plainly, the memory of conflict loomed large in Cyprus (and still does), and to sharpen her sense of the complex and contested symbolic significance of language framed within a legacy like this, Charalambous (2019) turned to a branch of memory studies, critical heritage studies (CHS; Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996; Graham 2002). She used this to consolidate her examination of shifts in the approach to teaching and learning Turkish over time, spotlighting variation and change across policy documents, curriculum texts, and interviews with students and ministry officials, also summarising earlier work on different styles of teaching Turkish (Charalambous et al. 2017). This scrutiny revealed an uneasy movement away from the government's initial goals of collective healing and reconciliation to a much more instrumental view of the language's potential professional and economic value to individuals. Concepts in CHS like 'commodification' and 'erasure' reinforced the account (see below), and parallels also emerged between these broad shifts in language ideology and the management of material heritage, including 'the reconstruction of Ottoman hamams, mosques, tekkes, etc' over the same period (2019:880; Constantinou & Hatay 2010:1614). Linking into a subfield of memory studies in this way, Charalambous' (2019) article was able to enrich the theorisation of 'heritage language' in language education, 'shift[ing] the focus from what is heritage to how heritage is managed and practiced, and to how it functions socially and politically… reveal[ing its] role in reconfiguring or sustaining a conflict-troubled past' (2019:886); to 'add… language to the CHS agenda (where it has not featured prominently)' (2019:886); and to position Turkish more clearly within 'post-conflict struggles… to create particular historical narratives or memories of the past as well as political visions for the future' (2019:884).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But in the context of the current discussion, this sketch of an explicit connection drawn between memory studies and EIS research on learning Turkish isn't quite sufficient, because it leaves out the detailed analyses of interaction on which this 2019 paper was building. Prior to the paper's invocation of concepts in CHS and its references to different pedagogic styles, there had been a good deal of interactional analysis attending to ways in which the memory of conflict was actually negotiated in routine classroom activity, situating relatively mundane acts and sequences within a multi-layered plurality of larger, longer processes. It is worth illustrating a little of this, pointing to what a process like 'erasure' can actually look like in the ongoing conduct of classroom life.

In 2006–2007, Charalambous sat in on some of these secondary school Turkish classes, and in the thirty-two hours of Mr. Andreou's lessons that she observed, Mr. Andreou used the terms 'Turks' or 'Turkish-Cypriots' only four times. Instead of talking about Turkish-speaking people, he focused his lessons on the teaching of grammar and vocabulary, treating language as only a formal code, erasing its cultural settings and social connotations. Given a range of contextual data—the historical background, reports of being called 'traitors' by other students, interview accounts in which students spoke of a potentially conflicting motives for learning Turkish (military security, reconcilation, end of year grades)—it is tempting to interpret Mr. Andreou's non-reference to Turkish speakers, culture, and society as a deliberate attempt to hold off the 'taught memories' dominating the rest of the curriculum (Zembylas et al. 2016). There are, though, plenty of precedents for this kind of exclusively form-focused language pedagogy, and without further evidence, it might just be that Mr Andreou was rather old-fashioned in his style of teaching. There was, however, one lesson described in Charalambous (2013) with sixteen- and seventeen -year-old beginners where Mr. Andreou was teaching personal pronouns, and this included the 'politeness plural'. Here he explained that in Turkish, people always use the politeness plural when addressing someone older, and he went on to say that Turkish was a very polite language, with some phrases sounding even more polite than Greek. According to Charalambous' fieldnotes,

(2) [t]he moment Mr A said that the Turkish language might sound better than Greek, the students, who until then had been quietly listening to his talk, started shouting. This was unusual for this class which was always well-behaved. Students started talking all together despite Mr A's repetition of 'please'. Although it was not clear what they were saying, since they talked simultaneously, I could hear a student saying 'but they are Turks' and some others saying about Turkish players of 'Survivor' being impolite during the reality show. (Extract from fieldnotes, 07/11/06. Translated from Greek)

The lesson was also audio-recorded, and the detailed analysis in Charalambous 2013 (also Rampton & Charalambous 2016) shows that Mr. Andreou lost control of the turn-taking; his calls for order were ignored; he was interrupted; his

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

epistemic authority was challenged ('how do you know'); and he was addressed in the non-polite singular. In his own speech, there were a lot of cut-off words, abandoned phrases, stretched vowels, hesitations and repairs, and, as well as the audible loss of fluency, he used more Greek-Cypriot dialect than usual. And then the interlude drew to a close and the class returned to business-as-usual, focusing on LANGUAGE, with the following sequence.

(3)

87	Mr. A:	[((*sighs*))
88	F:	[Yeah!
89	Mr. A:	Don't go to extremes... "they did an invasion"
90		Yes! They did an invasion
91		Was it done...?
92		I- we are talking in general about a language

(Translated from Greek)

"They did an invasion" sounds as if Mr. Andreou is quoting a student's words, but Charalambous couldn't hear it, either in situ or on the recording. But either way, this is good evidence that yes, collective memory of the conflict was indeed an 'absent presence' shaping the way in which Turkish classes were conducted. The practical enactment of these classes (and this government policy more generally) required the routinisation of a culturally neutered pedagogy that held this memory at bay, but this was still precarious, and in interactional echoes of far larger scale processes of political reordering, classroom order and the teacher's composure were disrupted when students thought that the hegemonic narrative was being transgressed.

So, although the documents, artefacts, and interviews that memory studies attend to can provide an invaluable view of the broader environment in which activity unfolds, they can't tell us about the practical experience of everyday life in the situations they illuminate. For this, it is important to turn to the close-up interactional analysis focused on 'the facticity of empirical recordings' of the kind that EIS specialises in.

Returning to the dialogue between EIS and memory studies more generally, what can the particularities of this case tell us about the PRACTICAL DYNAMICS of interdisciplinarity itself? When borrowing happened the other way round and MS looked to EIS, the movement across disciplines looked elegantly targeted—MS drew on EIS to open up everyday practices of remembering and to extend multiscalar analysis into 'lower level' memory processes. Indeed, much the same happens when critical IR draws on EIS, and our accounts of interaction in Turkish lessons have proved especially resonant in work on 'everyday peace-building' in the IR subfield of peace and conflict studies (Mac Ginty 2014; Charalambous, Charalambous, & Rampton 2021; see also https://www.everydaypeaceindicators.org/).[7] All this suggests that EIS is indeed a go-to resource for anyone getting interested in the empirical micro-dynamics of practice theory and social reality construction. In contrast, the cross-disciplinarity initiated in the Cyprus study looks much more unstreamlined, serendipitous, and eclectic: Critical IR's ethnographic interest in (in)securitisation

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

strengthens the argument that Turkish classes are a potentially significant field site for an EIS concerned with systems of governance; notions of 'everyday peace' in peace and conflict studies chime with its interpretation of everyday classroom practice; and, then, via critical heritage studies, MS comes in to help illuminate shifts in the discourses about curriculum Turkish. This all looks rather untidy, but it is exactly how Mode 2 interdisciplinarity operates. Complex real-world issues call for collaboration with a multiplicity of disciplines/stakeholders that can't be pre-specificied and that only emerges over time.

So, if this discussion of the Oświęcim/Auschwitz and Cyprus projects is anything to go by, MS and EIS have things to learn from each other, but there are substantial differences in their movement through interdisciplinary space (and the 'dispositional' differences sketched in the section DIFFERENT ANALYTIC DISPOSITIONS introduce additional complexity). None of this need deter further engagement, but it is worth considering whether there are practical arenas to support the dialogue, allowing for flexible exploration of its possibilities. In the next section, questions about processes of interdisciplinary research and theorizing take precedence over the more substantial and empirical arguments that we have made in the last two sections. We argue that, yes, there is support to be found in DATA SESSIONS FOCUSED ON SHORT STRIPS OF INTERACTION, distilling the kinds of analytic and interdisciplinary dynamics that we have described into manageable two-hour encounters between scholars with different backgrounds.

Incubating interdisciplinarities in data sessions

In the data sessions we organise, one person—the 'data-bringer'—shares a short excerpt of verbal data from the research project that they are working on with a small group of about fifteen people, and they spend two hours analysing it together. The data is usually a transcript and audio or video recordings of around three minutes of face-to-face or online interaction taken from naturally occurring talk, from interviews or focus groups. First, the data-bringer takes a few minutes to introduce the data and give a little context to the interaction it records. After listening/watching the recording together two or three times, individual data session participants take fifteen to twenty minutes to study the transcript on their own. After that, there's sixty to ninety minutes of group discussion of the data. Generally, the discussion starts off with provisional answers to questions such as 'What is happening here?', or 'What is striking, interesting in this fragment?', and rather than dictating the direction that the discussion takes, these questions allow for a range of observations and interpretations to emerge. Key to this part of the data session is that the data-bringer remains silent and does not intervene with the analytical ideas they themselves have formulated. It is only in the last ten to fifteen minutes that they are given the floor again to reflect on the group's discussion and to say whether it fits or contradicts their own analysis and/or generates new ideas.

The format of these data sessions is inspired by similar sessions conducted in conversation analysis (Ten Have 2007:142). They are very much EIS 'home turf', and a prime site for training people from other disciplines who come to EIS with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mode 1 motives (Rampton et al. 2014:§3). But although the 'facticity of recorded data' is something to check back to throughout a session, interpretations usually go far beyond the structures and processes of interaction itself, and the openness to different interpretative logics allows scholars of interaction, memory, and other traditions to learn from each other. So, in our sessions, Van de Putte tends to start with a macro-cultural lens, bringing processes beyond the situation into his interpretation, grouping pieces of interaction together in master-narratives, while Rampton often urges him to ground theoretical 'speculation' in the data, and 'point to the lines'. But this does not inhibit the discussion. There is often methodological reflection on, for example, the kinds of ethnographic evidence and context needed to consolidate what looks like a very speculative inference, and more generally, this process of data-cued discussion forces participants to explain the potential relevance of theoretical perspectives they are bringing to the table. These then get discussed by everyone else—scrutinized, tested on the data, and weighed up against other interpretations and theories—and this can mean that, without spending a lot of time in high-flown theoretical and methodological discussion, in only two hours you can work on many more theories than you could gather in a month of reading by yourself. In fact, data sessions also enact Mode 2 interdisciplinarity in miniature, drawing a plurality of inferences from the complex 'real world' problem-space constituted in a small piece of recorded data, assessing together the manner and extent to which the material provides evidence for the interpretive claims generated by a range of perspectives, theories and disciplines.

How then is new theory produced from such practical encounters in data sessions? Data sessions are fertile ground for *abductive* reasoning, theorizing, and imagining (Figure 3). Abduction 'refers to a creative inferential process aimed at producing new hypotheses and theories based on surprising research evidence' (Tavory & Timmermans 2014:5), and it leads the research 'away from old to new theoretical insights' (Timmermans & Tavory 2012:169). It is not a deductive logic—it does not seek to verify a theory in data—and it also is not inductive: it does not try to formulate a new theory ground-up from a comprehensive analysis of the dataset (such as in some forms of grounded theory).[8]

- **Abduction starts with consequences and then constructs reasons.** The surprising fact C is observed. But if A were true, C would be a matter of course. Hence, there is a reason to suspect that A is true. (Peirce 1934:117)
- **Deductive** reasoning begins with a rule and proceeds through a case to arrive at an observed result, which either demonstrates the rule or falsifies it
- **Induction** starts with a collection of given cases and proceeds by examining their implied results to develop an inference that some universal rule is operative: All observed A are C. Thus all A are C.

Figure 3. Abduction, deduction, and induction compared.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Instead, an abductive analysis starts from the proposition that (i) empirical reality is complex and surprising, and that (ii) pre-established theories allow us certain creative insights and perspectives on data. The abductive 'trick' is to go constantly back and forth between empirical analysis and theorizing, adjusting, and innovating both analysis and theory whenever they do not match. To optimise abductive creativity, the epistemology also needs to be collaborative, constantly moving back and forth not only between observation and conjecture but also, as in data sessions, between EACH OTHER'S observations and conjectures.

Data sessions can also work very well with non-academic professionals and stakeholders (Rampton et al. 2014:§4; Rampton & Charalambous 2016:14–17; Heltai & Tarsoly 2023:80–81) and, whoever the participants, they almost always lead to surprising insights (Van de Putte 2022). They are also rather a good way of getting past the kinds of suspicion pinpointed by Gensburger above, because affectively, it is often rather exhilarating as you experience the names, the words, and the small slices of life transcribed on paper starting to dance with purposes, projects, and problems interpellated in different lines of analysis. It is quite humbling as you come to understand how it is all much more complicated than you thought at first, but at the same time, there is almost a feeling of 'communion' in the collaborative experience of intensive sense-making focused on the piece of data you've all shared.

Data sessions, in sum, offer an experience of collaborative participation that optimises the differences it brings out, and in our own work, they have been indispensable as a site for continuing the dialogue between MS and EIS, turning the uncertainties, tangents, and asymmetries that this entails to good effect.[9]

Conclusions

The dialogue between MS and EIS can run much further than the two empirical studies that we have described. Securitisation orients to the future in its efforts to control the present with fear and uncertainty while commemoration keeps the past active and influential in the present, and this all thickens the terrain that sociolinguistic analyses of (in)securitisation seek to understand, setting reverence next to suspicion, commemoration of the past alongside anxiety about the future. In memory studies, the dialogue with EIS opens up the theoretical and empirical opportunity for an action-oriented memory studies, adding an extra dimension to the analysis of interscalar processes in which people are seen as DOING things with cultural and collective memory. Without the exposure to interactional sociolinguistics, Van de Putte would be spending his time describing the meanings of the past, whereas now he looks at how people ATTRIBUTE meaning to it, exploring when, where, how, why, by whom, and with what specific discursive devices past events get sacralized or profaned.[10] Of course, as remembering moves away from the elaborately stylised sites and occasions where events are ritually commemorated, it becomes harder to predict either the semiotic practices that evoke the images, beliefs, values, and expectations tied to major events in the past, or the strategies used to manage them. But as the Cyprus study shows, this does not mean that the memory of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

these events loses its power to influence everyday practice, and there is a lot of scope for further collaboration of MS/EIS in the multiscalar investigation of (in)securitisation.

But what of the ways in which MS and EIS have been presented to each other? In our interaction, memory studies has been figured as a field with a defining topic that lacks the methods needed to pursue its topic into the details of practice. EIS has been positioned as a methodology rather than a set of internally debated language topics (Coupland 1998; Duranti 2003:332), recruiting MS to a multi-disciplinary collection of resources that can help it to grasp one of the complex empirical processes in which it has recently developed an interest. How far, though, does our characterisation of MS 'targetting' EIS (Mode 1 interdisciplinarity) and EIS 'collecting' MS (Mode 2) carry beyond the particular cases we have discussed?

Of course, sociolinguistics does actually have topics of its own—language diversity, language ideology, situated language practice, and so on—and borrowing from other disciplines sometimes advances the analysis of heartland sociolinguistic topics like language policy and heritage languages. There are also tradition-specific topics, priorities, and arguments INSIDE linguistic anthropology, INSIDE conversation analysis, narrative analysis, and so forth. Even so, beyond these field-internal concerns, EIS has methodological expertise in the analysis of a 'practice', a fundamental dimension of the social process that many disciplines now feel they need to address, and this makes it a popular target of their Mode 1 intentions. 'Ethnographic and interactional sociolinguistics' is itself an aggregation strategically pitched at a level of generality that makes it more accessible to outsiders (Rampton et al. 2014:14); approaches from outside are openly welcomed in an undertaking like linguistic ethnography (Rampton 2023); and there are similarities here to CDA's experience as an important resource for disciplines interested in 'discourse'. At the same time, that is not to say that EIS is (or will remain) a unique target of the Mode 1 designs of others. Indeed, even in memory studies, it is not just the interactional 'bottleneck' that is a problem—there are other issues calling for Mode 1 excursions into other fields. For example, MS theories assume that individuals 'internalize' cultural memory narratives during socialization, but there is no clear empirical evidence on how this 'internalization' works, and in the coming years, MS might reach out to research on cognition to address this (see e.g. Lizardo 2021).

As Figure 4 illustrates, the interdisciplinary dialogue between ethnographic and interactional sociolinguistics and memory studies is complicated and inelegant, and of course there are a lot of other contingencies affecting the productivity of encounters like this. Nevertheless, there are cross-cutting paths and practical meeting points across the empirical terrain that—in different ways and to different degrees—we are engaged with. MS and EIS have a good deal to offer each other, but they are different in a range of ways—humanities/social science, meaning/structure-and-action, anxieties, public profiles, Mode 1/Mode 2. In this article, we have tried to map these differences to make it easier to locate the crucial complementarities, perhaps also providing some useful orientation for others looking, like us, towards 'a new social science

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Interdisciplinary dynamics in the dialogue between EIS and MS	
Ethnographic & interactional sociolinguistics	Memory studies
• *EIS's presentation of itself in interdisciplinary space:* EIS extricates itself from internal arguments within and across subfields of language study, and configures itself as an accessible methodology, open to a plurality of visitors approaching it with Mode 1 intentions (critical IR, PCS, MS, and others). EIS welcomes their interest as an affirmation of the non-triviality of its investment in mundane practice.	• *MS's presentation of itself in interdisciplinary space:* MS configures itself as a field, recognises its methodological limitations, and looks outside for resources to increase its empirical rigour. It also sees other bottlenecks in its theorisation of cultural memory (e.g. 'internalisation'), readying itself for further Mode 1 excursions.
• *How EIS itself approaches MS:* EIS makes Mode 2 movements across interdisciplinary space, and sees MS as another valuable resource in its efforts to understand the complex real-world processes of (in)securitisation, adding to its collection of illuminating themes and concepts assembled from a range of different disciplines.	• *How MS approaches EIS:* MS makes a Mode 1 move and targets EIS as the holder of an empirical tool-kit that MS needs in order to open up interactional practice (practice itself being a substantial bottleneck in its efforts to develop interscalar accounts of memory).
Data-sessions: a practical and enriching space in which to work through these interests, uncertainties, and differences	

Figure 4. Interdisciplinary dynamics in the EIS/MS dialogue.

understanding' (Wetherell 2012) of big concepts like 'memory', 'practice', 'language', and 'security'.

Notes

[1] These connections started with the Vienna school of CDA (e.g. Wodak & Heer 2008; Reisigl 2009), which mostly focused on Austria's and Germany's struggles over the collective memory of the Nazi era. More recently, this scope has broadened, incorporating cases from across the globe, engaging more with Rothberg's (2009) idea of 'multi-directional memory' (see e.g. Milani & Richardson 2023).
[2] To give just one example, they are the most frequently cited non-sociolinguists in Nik Coupland's 2016 edited collection *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates*.
[3] See Duranti's comments on linguistic anthropologists and their 'ability to project an image of themselves as empirically oriented fieldworkers who have more important things to do than

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

argue with one another (or with those in other subfields)', and who 'have had no difficulty moving back and forth from one paradigm or another without confronting (or being confronted by others regarding) their own epistemological, ontological, and methodological wavering' (2003:334).

[4] For a more detailed analysis of this fragment see Van de Putte (2022, 2023).

[5] Maybe it is an indication of the innovative status of this analysis that the book carrying it was a runner-up in the 2021–22 Memory Studies Association First Book Award.

[6] Within sociolinguistics, securitisation has been significant topic in critical discourse analysis for some time (e.g. Hodges 2013; Macdonald & Hunter 2013), and as well as explicitly citing IR, CDA has been picked up by researchers in international relations and security studies (Stritzel 2007).

[7] Consistent both with work on everyday peace and Mode 2 interdisciplinarity more generally, the Cyprus study also fed back to stakeholders in policy and professional practice through Charalambous' teacher training and education committee work.

[8] Though see e.g. Reichertz 2010.

[9] We have been meeting each other regularly in data sessions in London, Trento, and online for over eight years.

[10] EIS frameworks can obviously also be applied to the enactment of non-routine, sacral events. See e.g. Hanks 2000, which includes 'memorial' time.

References

Adebayo, Sakiru (2023). *Continuous pasts. Frictions of memory in postcolonial Africa*. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. (2012). *Trauma: A social theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Assmann, Aleida (1999). *Errinerungsraume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedachtnisses*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Assmann, Jan (2008). Communicative and cultural memory. In Astrid Erll, & Ansgar Nunning (eds.), *Cultural memory studies: An international and interdisciplinary handbook*, 109–18. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Assmann, Jan (2011). *Cultural memory and early civilization: Writing, remembrance, and political imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bamberg, Michael (2003). Positioning with Davie Hogan: Stories, tellings, and identities. In Colette Daiute & Cynthia Lightfoot (eds.), *Narrative analysis: Studying the development of individuals in society*, 136–57. London: SAGE.

Bigo, Didier (2014). Afterword. In Mark Maguire, Catarina Frois, & Nils Zurawski (eds.), *The anthropology of security*, 189–205. London: Pluto Press.

Bond, Lucy, & Jessica Rapson (2014). *The transcultural turn: Interrogating memory between and beyond borders*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Burnett, Scott; Nettly Ahmed; Than-dee Matthews; Junaid Oliephant; & Aylwyn M. Walsh (2023). A politics of reminding: Khoisan resurgence and environmental justice in South Africa's Sarah Baartman district. *Critical Discourse Studies* 20(5):524–39.

Caruth, Cathy (1996). *Experience: Trauma, narrative, and history*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Charalambous, Constadina (2013). The burden of emotions in language teaching: Renegotiating a troubled past in the language classroom. *Language and Intercultural Communication Journal* 13(3):310–20. doi: 10.1080/14708477.2013.804535.

Charalambous, Constadina (2019). Language education and 'conflicted heritage': Implications for teaching and learning. *Modern Language Journal* 103(4):874–91. doi: 10.1111/modl.12593.

Charalambous, Constadina; Panayiota Charalambous; & Ben Rampton (2021) International relations, sociolinguistics and the 'everyday': A linguistic ethnography of peace-building through language education. *Peacebuilding* 21(4):387–408. Online: https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2021.1895604.

Charalambous, Panayiota; Constadina Charalambous; & Ben Rampton (2017). De-securitizing Turkish: Teaching the language of a former enemy, and intercultural language education. *Applied Linguistics* 38(6):800–823. doi: 10.1093/applin/amv063.

Constantinou, Costas; & Mete Hatay (2010). Cyprus, ethnic conflict and conflicted heritage. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 33:1600–1619.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Coupland, Nikolas (1998). What is sociolinguistic theory? *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2(1):110–17.
Coupland, Nikolas (ed.) (2016). *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical debates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Coupland, Nikolas, & Adam Jaworski (eds.) (2009). Social worlds through language. In Nikolas Coupland & Adam Jaworski (eds.), *The new sociolinguistics reader*, 1–21. Basingstoke.: Palgrave Macmillan.
Craps, Stef (2013). *Postcolonial witnessing: Trauma out of bounds*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Craps, Stef; Rick Crownshaw; Jennifer Wenzel; Rosanne Kennedy; Claire Colebrook; & Vin Nardizzi (2018). Memory studies and the anthropocene: A roundtable. *Memory Studies* 11(4):498–515.
Davies, Brownyn, & Rom Harré (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20(1):43–63.
De Cesari, Chiara, & Ann Rigney (2014). *Transnational memory: Circulation, articulation, scales*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Duranti, Alessandro (2003). Language as culture in US anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 44:323–47.
Economic & Social Research Council (n.d.). *ESRC Funded Interdisciplinary Research: Advice for Applicants*. Basingstoke: Economic & Social Research Council.
Erll, Astrid (2011). Travelling memory. *Parallax* 17(4):4–18.
Erll, Astrid (2017). Travelling memory in European film: Towards a morphology of mnemonic relationality. *Image & Text* 18(1):5–19.
Gensburger, Sarah (2016). Halbwachs' studies in collective memory: A founding text for contemporary 'memory studies'? *Journal of Classical Sociology* 16(4):396–413.
Georgakopoulou, Alexandra (2007). Positioning in style: Men in women's jointly produced stories. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Style and social identities: Alternative approaches to linguistic heterogeneity*, 393–481. Berlin: De Gruyter/Mouton.
Gibbons, Michael; Camile Limoges; Helga Nowotny; Simon Schwartzman; Peter Scott; & Martin Trow (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: SAGE.
Grabowski, Jan (2016). The Holocaust and Poland's 'history policy'. *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs* 10(3):481–86.
Graham, Brian (2002). Heritage as knowledge: Capital or culture? *Urban Studies* 39:1003–1017.
Gumperz, John, & Dell Hymes (eds.) (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Halbwachs, Maurice (1925). *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. Paris: Albin Michel.
Halbwachs, Maurice (1950). *La Mémoire collective*. Paris: Albin Michel.
Hanks, William (2000). *Intertexts: Writings on language, utterance and context*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
Heltai, János, & Eszter Tarsoly (eds.) (2023). *Translanguaging for equal opportunities*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Hirsch, Mariane (1997). *Family frames: Photography, narrative, and postmemory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Hodges, Adam (2013). *Discourses of war and peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Huysmans, Jef (2014). *Security unbound: Enacting democratic limits*. London: Routledge.
Jones, Sara (2022). *Towards a collaborative memory: German memory work in a transnational context*. Oxford: Berghan Books.
Jones, Sara, & Thomas Van de Putte (2024). Following the well-trodden paths of the past: memory, continuity and slowness. *International Journal of Heritage, Memory and Conflict*. Online: https://doi.org/10.5117/HMC2024.JONE.
Kansteiner, Wulf (2006). *In pursuit of German memory: History, television, and politics after Auschwitz*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
Keightley, Emily; Michael Pickering; & Pawas Bisht (2019). Interscalarity and the memory spectrum. In Nicole Maurantonio & David Park (eds.), *Communicating memory & history*, 17–38. New York: Peter Lang.
Krzyżanowska, Natalia (2023). Politics of memory, urban space and the discourse of counterhegemonic commemoration: A discourse-ethnographic analysis of 'Living Memorial' in Budapest's 'Liberty Square'. *Critical Discourse Studies* 20(5):540–60.

Labov, William (2006). Narrative pre-construction. *Narrative Inquiry* 16(1):37–45.
La Capra, Dominic (2001). *Writing history, writing trauma*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
Landsberg, Alison (2004). *Prosthetic memory: The transformation of American remembrance in the age of mass culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Levy, Daniel, & Nathan Sznaider (2005). *The Holocaust and memory in the Global Age*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
Lizardo, Omar (2021). Culture, cognition and internalization. *Sociological Forum* 36(1):1177–1206.
MacDonald, Malcolm, & Duncan Hunter (2013). Security, population and governmentality: UK counter-terrorism discourse (2007–2011). *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* 6(2):123–40. Online: http://cadaad.net/journal.
Mac Ginty, Roger (2014). Everyday peace: Bottom-up and local agency in conflict-affected societies. *Security Dialogue* 45(6): 548–64.
Mc Cluskey, Emma, & Constadina Charalambous (eds.) (2022). *Security, ethnography and discourse*. London: Routledge.
Milani, Tommaso, & John Richardson (2023). Discourses of collective remembering: Contestation, politics, affect. *Critical Discourse Studies* 20(5):459–76.
Mwambari, David (2023). *Navigating cultural memory: Commemoration and narrative in postgenocide Rwanda*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Nora, Pierre (1997). *The realms of memory: Rethinking the French past*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Norrick, Neil (2013). Narratives of vicarious experience in conversation. *Language in Society* 42:385–406.
Norrick, Neil (2020). The epistemics of narrative performance in conversation. *Narrative Inquiry* 30(2):211–35.
Ortner, Sherry (2006). *Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power and the acting subject*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Peirce, Charles (1934). *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, vol. 5: Pragmatism and pragmaticism*, ed. by Charles Hartshorne & Paul Weiss. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Pérez-Milans, Miguel, & Xiaoyan Guo (2024). *Religion, social memory and future re-imagination: Utopian narratives through ethnographic lens*. London: University College London, MS.
Rampton, Ben (2006). *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rampton, Ben (2023). Advanced linguistic ethnography? *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* 310. Online: www.wpull.org.
Rampton, Ben; Janet Maybin; & Celia Roberts (2014). Methodological foundations in linguistic ethnography. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* 125. Online: www.wpull.org.
Rampton, Ben, & Constadina Charalambous (2016). Breaking classroom silences: A view from linguistic ethnography. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 16(1):4–21. Online: Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies 116 at www.wpull.org.
Rampton, Ben, & Constadina Charalambous (2020). Sociolinguistics and everyday (in)securitization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 24(1):75–88. Online: *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies 264* at www.wpull.org.
Reichertz, Jo (2010). Abduction: The logic of discovery of grounded theory. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 11(1). Online: https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-11.1.1412.
Reisigl, Martin (2009). Spoken silence – bridging breaks: The discursive construction of historical continuities and turning points in Austrian commemorative speeches by employing rhetorical tropes. In Ruth Wodak & Getraud Auer Borea (eds.), *Justice and memory: Confronting traumatic pasts: An international comparison*, 213–40. Vienna: Passagen.
Rothberg, Michael (2009). *Multidirectional memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the age of decolonization*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
Sacks, Harvey (1984). On doing 'being ordinary'. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 413–29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Strathern, Marilyn (2000). *Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics and the academy*. London: Routledge.
Stritzel, Holger (2007). Towards a theory of securitization: Copenhagen and beyond. *European Journal of International Relations* 13(3):357–83.
Swidler, Ann (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review* 51(2):273–86.
Tavory, Iddo, & Stefan Timmermans (2014). *Abductive analysis: Theorizing qualitative research*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Ten Have, Paul (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: SAGE.
Timmermans, Stefan, & Iddo Tavory (2012). Theory construction in qualitative research from grounded theory to abductive analysis. *Sociological Theory* 30(3):167–86.
Tunbridge, J. E., & G. J. Ashworth (1996). *Dissonant heritage: The management of the past as a resource in conflict*. Chichester: Wiley.
Van de Putte, Thomas (2021). *Contemporary Auschwitz/Oświęcim. A synchronic, interactional approach to memory*. London: Routledge.
Van de Putte, Thomas (2022). "Let me tell you what we already know": Collective memory between culture and interaction. *Memory Studies* 15(4):751–66.
Van de Putte, Thomas (2023). Cultural memories and their re-actualizations: A narrative perspective. *Narrative Inquiry* 33(2):342–62.
Van de Putte, Thomas (2024). *Outsourcing the European past: An interscalary study of memory and morality*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
Vaughan-Williams, Nick, & Daniel Stevens (2015). Vernacular theories of everyday (in)security: The disruptive potential of non-elite knowledge. *Security Dialogue* 47(1):40–58.
Violi, Patrizia (2017). *Landscapes of memory: Trauma, space and history*. New York: Peter Lang.
Wetherell, Margaret (2012). *Affect and emotion: A new social science understanding*. London: SAGE.
Winter, Jay (2001). The generation of memory: Reflections on the 'memory boom' in contemporary historical studies. *Canadian Military History* 10(3):57–66.
Wodak, Ruth, & Hannes Heer (2008). *The discursive construction of history: Remembering the Wehrmacht's War of Annihilation*. London: Palgrave.
Wustenberg, Jenny (2023). lTowards a slow memory studies. In Brett Ashley Kaplan (ed.), *Critical memory studies: New approaches*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
Young, James (1993). *The texture of memory. Holocaust memorials and meaning*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Zembylas, Michalinos; Constadina Charalambous; & Panayiota Charalambous (2016). *Peace education in a conflict- affected society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Zubrzycki, Genevieve (2013). Narrative shock and (re)making Polish memory in the twenty-first century. In Florence Vatan & Marc Silberman (eds.), *Memory and postwar memorials: Confronting the Violence of the Past*, 95–115. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Zubrzycki, Genevieve (2016). The politics of Jewish absence in contemporary Poland. *Journal of Contemporary History* 52(2):250–77.

Cite this article: Rampton B, Van de Putte T (2024). Sociolinguistics, memory studies, and the dynamics of interdisciplinarity. *Language in Society* 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404524000927