

Heteroglossia, "common sense," and social memory

ABSTRACT

In this article I analyze internally contradictory narratives articulated by former settlers of Algeria. By adopting a discourse-centered approach to these stories of colonial assimilation, I show that what are often described as "commonsense" forms in popular memory can be viewed as examples of Bakhtinian heteroglossia. Passages from taped conversations illustrate multiple voices in dynamic interaction. Research in cognitive anthropology and psychology suggests that it is not unusual for individuals to retain multiple and conflicting viewpoints simultaneously. Narratives about the past may be especially multivocal, for reasons I discuss here. I reflect on implications of these insights for anthropological models of social memory. [*social memory, common sense, hegemony, French Algeria, settlers, multivocality, heteroglossia*]

1. Everyone intermarried. There were no more Maltese. After my father, everyone married people of different backgrounds. In Algiers, people intermarried, and there wasn't a Maltese "colony."

2. [Later in the same interview] In Algiers, people didn't like the Maltese at all, to such an extent that, I had a friend, of French origins, his name was Frémont ... everyday I went to fetch him, we went to school together, and (one day) his mother said, "Are you Maltese, you?" and I said, "Why do you ask me that?" And she said, "Because if you are Maltese, I don't want you to play with Georges anymore." So I said, "No, I'm not Maltese"—I lied—"I'm Corsican," I said. And he was my best friend! The Maltese had a reputation, I don't know why ... but I know there was a bad stereotype of the Maltese in Algeria.

—Mr. Azzopardi¹

In this article I address a confounding problem in the ways that elderly former settlers of Algeria (*pieds-noirs*) of non-French European origins discuss the past: Their narratives about assimilation in the colony are internally contradictory.² They claim that non-French European settlers, such as the Italian, Spanish, or Maltese migrants, "melted together," becoming French easily and without discrimination. At the same time, sometimes in the same interview, the former settlers indicate otherwise. The presence of internally contradictory narratives about the past is not a new finding; oral historians and scholars of social memory often report on the ambivalent statements of their interviewees (Cole 2001:270; Portelli 1991; Roche and Taranger 1995:179; Swedenburg 1995:77). In fact, some scholars, especially those highlighting the pasts of subaltern peoples, have argued that popular memory is especially composite, partial, and internally contradictory by nature because of its basis in "common sense" (Gramsci 1971:419).³ Why this should be the case and how researchers might best understand such composite collective memory are questions requiring further consideration. In the following pages, I argue that these composite and contradictory narratives should be viewed as examples of heteroglossia (Bakhtin 1981, 1986), the juxtaposition of competing voices, each presenting a distinct point of view on the world. By

employing a fine-grained, language-centered approach, I am able to delineate within the apparent confusion distinct perspectives on the past, as I illustrate here with excerpts from my taped conversations with elderly settlers. Because of the imbrication of memories of different origins that occur in any speech community, I argue that this multivocality is not restricted to *popular* memory but may be apparent in narratives of the past by people of any subject position.

Popular memory and Gramsci's commonsense forms

The memories of the subaltern classes were tangled up in the thick and intricate web of what Gramsci calls "common sense." Unlike the relatively coherent and systematic discourses that issue from official sources, common sense, according to Gramsci, is "ambiguous, contradictory . . . , multiform" and "strangely composite."

—Swedenburg, 1995

Representations of the past are social constructions central to the symbolic constitution of social groups (Alonso 1988; Brow 1990; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983). Because societies are composed of multiple overlapping subgroups, each with its own collective memory, a plurality of social memories exists in each social setting, and the past often becomes a site of struggle. Scholars of social memory have long been attuned to this problem and the ways that power shapes the field of "public representations of history" (Popular Memory Group 1982:207). Insightful works have explored the encounters between dominant, official, hegemonic or national memories or histories and subaltern, private, popular, or subordinate memories (Alonso 1988; Boyarin 1994; Fabri 1995; Popular Memory Group 1982; Swedenburg 1995). Many works, as indicated by the Swedenburg passage above, describe popular or subaltern memory as especially composite and ambivalent. As in other "commonsense" cultural forms, this characteristic is explained as having developed in a constant struggle with hegemonic representations:

Private memories cannot, in concrete studies, be readily unscrambled from the effects of dominant historical discourses. It is often these that supply the very terms by which a private history is thought through. Memories of the past are, *like all commonsense forms*, strangely composite constructions, resembling a kind of geology, the selective sedimentation of past traces. [Popular Memory Group 1982:211, emphasis added]

Popular memory's incoherence is often contrasted with what is presented as more "coherent" and "systematic"

dominant memory (Swedenburg 1995:27). For instance, concerning the use of history among the Cumbales of southern Columbia, Joanne Rappaport writes:

The nature of *popular* historical memory is, as I hope to show, very different from historians' tales. It is not made up of carefully woven narratives but of a series of brief and incomplete images, which are never developed in any detail. Instead, these images are lodged in the minutiae of everyday life. [1994:6, emphasis added]

Because scholars so often associate popular memory with Gramscian "common sense," it is worthwhile to return to the source of these ideas. "Common sense" for Gramsci was an unreflected and largely unconscious conception of the world shared by the "mass of people" (1971:325). Subaltern thought, he felt, was "not critical and coherent but disjointed and episodic," the result of the uncritical accretion of any number of "principles" and "prejudices" from previous and current eras (Gramsci 1971:324):

This conception of the world is not elaborated and systematic because, by definition, the people . . . cannot possess conceptions which are elaborated, systematic and politically organized and centralized in their albeit contradictory development. It is, rather, many-sided—not only because it includes different and juxtaposed elements, but also because it is stratified, from the more crude to the less crude—if indeed, one should not speak of a confused agglomerate of fragments of all the conceptions of the world and of life that have succeeded one another in history. [Gramsci 1985:188–190]

In many of his writings, Gramsci described in vivid language the composite character of subaltern thought. I should emphasize here that his ultimate concern was not the analysis of cultural forms, however, but the liberation of the subaltern classes through their successful challenging of the existing hegemony. An effective counter-hegemonic assault, he felt, would require not only considerable political organization and the development of a new power bloc but also the articulation of a counter-hegemonic narrative.⁴ In his view, a prerequisite for such a narrative is coherence, a quality he believed was impossible to develop from within the subaltern classes except with great difficulty and only, ultimately, through a direct confrontation with that class's common sense.⁵ Thus, common sense itself, for Gramsci, was a threat. As Kate Crehan writes, "In the case of the broad masses of the population, who live immersed in the 'fragmentary, incoherent and inconsistent' . . . world of common sense, it is precisely this world of common sense that has to be overcome" (2002:113).⁶

Clearly, some aspects of Gramsci's model of popular common sense are more useful to anthropologists than are others. Although scholars are still greatly interested in better understanding the absorption of dominant perspectives, ideologies, or schemas into those of subaltern groups, a topic explored by many popular memory scholars and one that I tackle further here, the characterization of popular thought as incoherent or unprogressive by definition, due to its basis in common sense, is problematic. Such a stance could be misinterpreted as suggesting a real primitivism in popular thought processes, not unlike the works on working-class consciousness critiqued by Claudia Strauss (1990:312–313). Gramsci's claim that coherency of thought is a prerequisite for the development of counter-hegemonic narratives is also vulnerable to challenge, as data presented here indicate. Finally, a model of popular memory as *necessarily* confused is also problematic because such a characterization easily serves to foreclose further research. Although the literature contains vivid and quite apt depictions of the swarm of perspectives on the past elicited by researchers, it points to no clear understanding of whether popular memory is more incoherent than that of other social groups, and, if so, why this would be the case. It is as if Gramsci's writings serve as the final word instead of providing a point of departure for further research.

In the following analysis I show that the social memory of a population in an ambiguous social position, that of "subaltern colonists," is not unlike the popular memory described above. Like popular memory scholars, I, too, am interested in the incorporation of dominant views and concepts into the collective memory of this intermediate, nondominant group. I explore this question, however, by adopting a discourse-centered approach (Brenneis 1987; Hill 1985; Sherzer 1987; Urban 1991), one that uses everyday speech as data. Such an approach allows me to further explore the composite character of memory, and it illustrates how memory can be best understood as heteroglossic. I also suggest that, rather than retarding political development, as Gramsci might argue, this composite quality may in fact be fertile ground for dynamic change.

Locating social memory in speech: Multivocality in colonist narratives

Studies of social or collective memory, like the historical representations described by Ana Alonso (1988), often hide the hermeneutics of their production. Although such works may clearly describe social memory, the reader is less certain of the body of data the researcher uses to develop these ideas. Was it talk, history textbooks, media productions, or some other material? Where should one locate social memory? Contemporary anthropologists highlight an array of data and methods. Maurice Bloch

(1998:7) promotes the further study of nonlinguistic forms of knowledge and of memory and argues against equating narrative with memory.⁷ Many anthropologists highlight such nonnarrative forms as embodied memory, social practices such as rituals, and elements of material culture (Battaglia 1992; Cole 2001; Connerton 1989; Rappaport 1994:74; Stoller 1995).⁸ There is, of course, another effective source for understanding social memory creation, reproduction, and analysis—speech. As Iwona Irwin-Zarecka (1994:54–55) writes, if social memory is a socially articulated and maintained "reality of the past," it makes sense to look at the most basic and accessible means for memory articulation and maintenance, that is, talk. Many scholars of memory either explicitly or implicitly use speech as a primary resource.⁹ Some have identified distinct genres in social memory, highlighting those associated with skilled oral performances (Tonkin 1992). My work illustrates the significance of applying the tools of linguistic anthropology to everyday talk about the past, as well. In fact, it may be in that context that one will find a more fluid mixing of orientations on the past, as discourses are released from generic convention. I argue that such an approach to social memory not only is effective, but it is also the approach that best enables researchers to elucidate the mental processes that can yield common-sense forms in popular memory.

Some scholars have noted that the study of oral testimony is dialogical in nature, in that such research emerges out of a conversation between interviewee and interviewer (Portelli 1997:3; Roche and Taranger 1995:24–25). One can move beyond the wider interview setting to consider how Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of dialogism also applies to the very essence of these conversations. Bakhtin (1986:91) argued that because each individual utterance responds to preceding utterances, speech becomes polyphonic. No matter how monological at first glance, each utterance in some ways is a response to what has already been stated, and thus any utterance is filled with other voices or discourses, with the "half-concealed . . . words of others" (Bakhtin 1986:92–93). He also highlighted the tension that occurs between centrifugal and centripetal forces of language. Centripetal forces (such as state institutions or fixing language in print) work at unifying and centralizing "the verbal-ideological world" (Bakhtin 1981:270–271). At the same time, however, centrifugal forces counter this tendency and encourage linguistic heterogeneity, stratifying language into multiple linguistic codes, each representing distinct socioideological points of view (Bakhtin 1981:271–272). At any given historical moment, each generation at each social level has its own language, as does each age group, profession, and so forth. These languages provide specific "points of view on the world" (Bakhtin 1981:291) that interact dialogically. These different voices or points of view should be represented in

subtly different languages that are identifiable in terms of the close relationship between content, ideological orientation, style, compositional structure, and even speech setting (Bakhtin 1986:60). People can communicate with each other because we are able to identify and understand these multiple perspectives, or “voices,” that are necessarily present in any speech event and, according to Bakhtin, in the speech of any one individual.

It follows from these insights that everyday discourse about the past, like discourse on other subjects, should also contain multiple perspectives and voices. In fact, narratives about the past may be especially dialogic. Not only do subgroups of each society share a multitude of stories and perspectives on the past, but in looking back individuals are also necessarily addressing previous themes and prior points of view. Hence, other voices (or Bakhtin’s “words of others”) may be even more prevalent in reminiscences than in other kinds of discourse.

Settler narratives on the French Algerian past present a fascinating example of such multivocality. In such narratives I identify two main voices. The first voice represents the dominant viewpoint or perspective, which asserts that colonist assimilation in French Algeria was thorough and complete and argues that all European migrants of various origins ultimately “melted” together. This perspective is illustrated in part 1 of Azzopardi’s statement in the epigraph that opens this article. The melting pot metaphor often serves as a convenient shorthand for this noncontroversial narrative of the formation of a new colonist culture. Because this perspective is the most widespread “explanation” for the colonist experience and because it is the viewpoint most often promoted by state officials and included in state-sponsored texts, I refer to this voice as the “official” or “melting pot” narrative. I found this voice to be especially prominent during large public gatherings involving *pieds-noirs* of different ethnic origins and among people meeting for the first time. This voice also presents a more distant vantage point on the past. This distance is illustrated by the speakers’ use of third-person pronouns when discussing their own past (“they all melted together”). In addition, this voice involves an absence of descriptive detail and actors’ agency. Together, these features suggest that this voice may not necessarily reflect the individuals’ own life experiences but, instead, may repeat a generic model of history that speakers learned in school or other such venues and that then spread widely through various media and subsequent conversations.

The “contrasting” voice offers a different perspective on the same past (see Table 1). Assimilation emerges in these discussions as a difficult experience. Narratives presented in this voice are typically presented in greater detail than in melting pot narratives, often involving anecdotes of specific events or persons, and include reported speech,

Table 1
Characteristics of Official and Contrasting Voices

	OFFICIAL VOICE	CONTRASTING VOICE
FORM		
pronoun	third-person	first-person
compositional structure	simple	detailed, convoluted
other features	melting pot metaphor verbs: <i>fondre</i> , <i>mêler</i> , <i>mélanger</i> , nouns: <i>brassage</i> , <i>creuset</i>	
social categories	standard usage: Français d’origine néo-Français, naturalisé	nonstandard usage: Maltais, Italiens, Espagnols, Français de France, de souche, pur Français
CONTENT		
topics covered	melting pot, intermarriage, military service	discrimination, hatred by French, changing names, intermarriage, poverty, immigrant perspective
agency ideological orientation	passive assimilation was easy, distinctions did not exist, we were one, harmony	active assimilation was difficult, distinctions were pervasive and mattered, class/ethnicity hierarchy

as seen in part 2 of the opening epigraph. In addition, stories tend to be told with first-person pronouns. Individuals are depicted as having to make choices, sometimes difficult ones, and thus as possessing agency. This voice is also saturated with ethnic- and class-based terminology used to identify different segments of the colonist population. Furthermore, stories of class bias are key themes. When analyzed in this way, contradictory statements such as those made by Azzopardi no longer appear merely confused but reflect the accommodation of two very different and distinct ways of interpreting a complex and, as I elaborate below, undeniably ambivalent colonial past.

Settler assimilation in the colony

The narratives that I discuss here were generated in unstructured taped interviews with elderly former colonists of Algeria, also known as “*pieds-noirs*,” who have been living “in exile” in France since 1962. I met with former colonists over a 20-month period (1995–2001), recording the ways the past emerged in everyday talk.¹⁰ The *pieds-noirs* I met are a loosely knit group of people of a variety of class backgrounds and ethnic origins—French, Spanish, Italian, and Maltese—living in high-rise apartments or small houses in an urbanized area of southeastern France.

During my time spent at their meetings, parties, and individual homes, I found that the colonial past was a source of great interest to these elderly refugees from a prior world order, yet a topic that they rarely discussed except with each other. They were thus eager for an audience to whom they could direct their life stories and whom they could try to convince of those stories' meaningful shape, purpose, and morality. My status as a comparatively young person from a U.S. university, and, thus, as an obvious outsider, greatly facilitated this research, as the former colonists assumed me to be a blank slate, someone with few fixed prior biases. The data for this article are derived from participant-observation of multiple social occasions during which the past was discussed, my informal interviews with 69 individuals of multiple colonist ethnicities, and transcripts of over 50 hours of audio recordings of informal conversations with 37 individuals.¹¹

Although our discussions were generally characterized by a great diversity of topics, points of view, detail, and ideological orientation, it was in narratives by the "foreign"-origin settlers, particularly those of Maltese ancestry, about their assimilation to French culture in the colony that I encountered the most internally contradictory discourses. Those narratives are the primary focus herein. Two distinct and even mutually exclusive perspectives were presented, sometimes by the same person in the same speech event: (1) French Algeria was a melting pot that blended colonists of different origins into a new colonist culture, and (2) ethnicity and class were prominent social categories that divided the colonists into distinct, identifiable, and even ranked subgroups. Sometimes while articulating a melting pot viewpoint, speakers employed terms that suggested that the different colonist factions had not melted together thoroughly at all. For example, speakers referred to individuals of various ethnic origins not by their nationality, as is the standard usage in French, but by their ethnicity (e.g., referring to the French of Italian heritage as *les Italiens*). The very social categories used in telling a melting pot version of the past called the metaphor into question. Were the speakers simply muddled, perhaps by age? After further analysis of this particularly rich set of data, I came to see that this material is composite and contradictory in clearly patterned ways.

These narratives concern colonial assimilation, which here refers not to the cultural or political integration of the indigenous Algerian populations, a vital issue in Algeria, as in other colonial settings (Ageron 1968a, 1968b), but to the integration of immigrants of other European origins into the French settler bloc. An astounding majority of the "French" colonists of Algeria were not originally French. People from across the European continent migrated to Algeria immediately after initial French military operations

there in 1830 and continued to do so throughout the 19th century, leading to the creation of a complex multiethnic and multilingual settler population. The majority of the earliest migrants were impoverished sharecroppers or day laborers from peripheral locations across the Mediterranean, such as Sardinia, Sicily, Malta, the Balearic Islands, and Pantelleria. Unemployed urban laborers and miners from Spain and northern Italy followed later in the century. Throughout the history of the colony, the fact that the non-French colonists dominated numerically within the settler population was a topic of tremendous public concern in both France and Algeria, as the literature on colonial categories would predict (Cooper and Stoler 1989; Stoler 1989, 1992). Tourists and French writers reported on the bewildering array of dress, customs, and languages, and politicians and social scientists nervously compared population figures, noting, for instance that Spanish was the primary language in whole regions of the colony (Jordi 1986:272–273; see also Leroy-Beaulieu 1887; Ricoux 1880). In response to widespread fears of losing this treasured possession, either literally or symbolically, to foreign cultural norms, the French state developed incentives to encourage more French citizens to migrate. These official colonization schemes were notoriously unsuccessful, however.¹² When it was clear that the state management of demography was a project of limited success, state officials found the naturalization of the non-French and their transformation into Frenchmen and women to be the only remaining alternative.¹³ But even this tack floundered, as foreigners apparently wished to retain their nationalities (Jordi 1986:129). Finally, by the close of the 19th century, the state removed the element of choice, seemingly in desperation, and established laws in 1889 and 1893 that forcibly naturalized most of the non-French European population *en masse*.¹⁴

What was the result of this mass naturalization of foreign settlers? Did the non-French colonists quickly lose their languages and other symbols of cultural distinctiveness? These are questions I aimed to explore in the larger project of which this article is a part. The standard official narrative about Algeria's colonists, one that can be found in French histories of the colony, is that they melted together in the Algerian melting pot (*creuset*) very early on, several generations before their return to France in the 1960s. This process, initiated by the mass naturalizations, was completed, many argue, by other French assimilating institutions, in particular, the schools, military, and political and legal systems. Indeed, one can find this official historical narrative today in newspaper articles and even contemporary historiography.¹⁵ This pervasive narrative, however, is directly challenged by my discovery of the existence in France of several social clubs developed by, and for, former settlers of Maltese ancestry. The fact that individuals had formed such clubs indicated to me that

assimilation, at least for the Maltese migrants, had not been as complete as officially stated.

Whereas the official narrative downplays the assimilation process of the non-French or presents it as a nonissue, I found substantial archival evidence to the contrary.¹⁶ French and non-French settlers were incorporated differently into the colony's economy and social and political life, leading to the formation of a hierarchy of colonist ethnicities. French settlers were the elite, socially superior to the *petits-blancs*, as the non-French were sometimes labeled by the French. The *petits-blancs* included the largely working-class colonists of Spanish and Italian origins, who were often employed as laborers or foremen on French-owned farms and factories. At the bottom of the hierarchy were people of Maltese origins and naturalized Jews, who were described by their contemporaries as semi-European and were awkward intermediaries interstitially located between the "true" colonists and the much larger indigenous Muslim population that the non-Muslims collectively dominated.¹⁷

The Maltese were an especially liminal population throughout much of the colony's history. They were in many ways situated at the colonized-colonist boundary, and many of their contemporaries found them a people difficult to categorize. They were among the poorest of the Europeans to migrate across the Mediterranean, some arriving with no possessions whatsoever, not even shoes (hence, their occasional appellation *pièds-nus*, "bare feet"). They were also a colonized people; the British had ruled Malta since the beginning of the 19th century. Ironically, even their strong adherence to their Catholic faith marked the Maltese as not fully "European" to many of the French elite.¹⁸ Perhaps most questionable was their language, which linguists now describe as a Semitic language closely related to ninth-century Maghrebine Arabic, which had come to Malta with conquerors of that era along with Islam.¹⁹ Their language allowed the Maltese migrants in North Africa to communicate easily with the colonized populations, and many started life in the colony as intermediary traders, buying goods from Algerians and selling them to the French. Anti-Maltese discrimination began early in French Algeria: A local official of Philippeville wrote only a few years after the town's establishment that the townsfolk "shower the Maltese with disdain" (Lapaine 1842). This discrimination and liminal status help explain why the Maltese have been the only colonists to date to organize multiple distinct, ethnically based social clubs (Smith 2003).

Intracolonist cultural difference and discrimination did not end with the late-19th-century naturalizations. In his landmark work *Making Algeria French* (1990), David Prochaska documents the persistence of marked social and economic distinctions between French and non-French colonists well into the 20th century, even

between "original" and naturalized French. The naturalization laws, it seems, did not instantly transform all settlers into Frenchmen and women. After 1911, however, census data no longer distinguished French colonists by their ethnic origins, and little archival evidence is presently available, making research into the problem of intracolonist ethnic-class distinctions difficult at best.²⁰ It is to the representation of this past by those who lived through it, the elderly Maltese-origin *pied-noirs*, that I now turn.

Assimilation in social memory

Le creuset algérien: The Algerian melting pot

En Algérie ... il y a eu un, un brassage des différentes ethnies européennes.

[In Algeria, there was a, a mixing together of the different European ethnicities.]

—Mrs. S.

Un creuset miraculeux, au fond duquel se sont lentement fondues ... toutes les races de la Méditerranée.

[A miraculous melting pot into which were slowly melted ... all of the peoples of the Mediterranean.]

—Gignoux and Simiot, 1961

Elderly settlers often glossed their history in the colony through the use of a metaphor—the remarkably widespread "melting pot" image. After talking with me about the different European immigrant populations and their concentrations in particular occupational niches in Algeria, or simply to summarize their monologues, individuals sometimes turned to me and said, "Well, you know, it was a melting pot, like your country." The first few times I heard this, I thought that the speakers were resorting to the famous metaphor for U.S. immigration history primarily in response to my presence: In trying to illustrate their ancestors' pasts in a way that I could understand, they were taking advantage of a widely shared perception of the history of my part of the world. But this image emerged in so many different social settings that it soon became clear that the melting pot was *their* way of depicting the history of French Algeria to each other, as well. They explained that over the decades, the boundaries between the various European populations slowly began to dissolve, the cultures began to merge together, and a new culture arose, that of the *Algérien*, or of the *pied-noir*.²¹ People I interviewed sometimes used the melting pot metaphor directly by talking about assimilation in the Algerian melting pot (*le creuset algérien*) or indirectly by using such verbs as *fondre*, "to melt," as in "we all melted together." Colonial Algeria was described as a *mélange des races* (a mixture of races-peoples), a *fusion* (fusion, blending). Sometimes a "stock

pot" variant was used, and people discussed how they were all "mixed together" (*mêlés*) as if in a large cauldron.

Social context mattered.²² The melting pot iteration of the colonial past was particularly prominent during conversations at large and relatively formal gatherings of pied-noirs and during the earlier stages of long taped interviews. At the annual meeting of one organization, I found myself seated at a table at the local Maison des Rapatriés (Repatriates' House) with people of various ethnic origins who were meeting me and each other for the first time. Mr. Frendo, a man in his early seventies, was telling me about his efforts to trace his family back to Malta. A younger woman, who had traveled to the meeting by motorcycle with her non-pied-noir husband, joined in. I asked Frendo about Algeria. Were there any ethnic neighborhoods or Maltese communities there? "Well," he answered, "Bône was a wonderful small city. The people came from all over. Such a range of religions and races. But, we were all mixed (*mélangés*), we were French first and Maltese second. We went to French schools, of course, and that is how we were mixed, how we melted together" (*nous nous sommes fondus*). The biker couple began to take part in the discussion, and the young woman concurred. "Yes, we were all mixed (*mélangés*), that was the beauty of Algeria."

The essence of metaphor is to understand and experience one thing in terms of another, a process that has been described as the mapping from a "source" to a "target" domain (Lakoff and Johnson 1980).²³ Target domains are usually abstract, whereas source domains are familiar, often part of the physical world, and "easy to think with" (Quinn 1991:57). The melting pot metaphor is a classic metaphor in this sense because the target domain, the assimilation process, is abstract and complex, whereas the source domain is that of a tangible physical process. Metaphors are "good to think with" because they draw our attention toward certain aspects of the target domain while silencing others. Through metaphors, the complex process of assimilation in colonial Algeria is simplified. The ambivalent aspects of that experience, such as the fact of French cultural hegemony and power, as well as the existence of millions of Algerians who were excluded from power altogether, are silenced. The subjects of this experience are reduced to passive ingredients, blended as if by an invisible hand, and the whole question of just how assimilation was experienced by those involved, and to what extent they were active participants, is evaded.

Former settlers of all ages, ethnic origins, and class backgrounds used the melting pot metaphor as a shorthand for colonial Algerian history in both private and public settings—at dinners, dance parties, on bus tours in southern France, and in relatively casual meetings with friends in their homes. Their statements correspond

closely with the official account of the process of assimilation found in French journalism, historiography, and school texts, and they even employ the same key terms, such as *creuset*, *fondre*, and *fusion*, that one sees in the passages introducing this section. One conclusion to draw from the close parallels found in these spoken and written accounts is that these representations reflect the primary "truth," with the official and subaltern colonist versions corresponding nicely. The elderly pieds-noirs with whom I spoke were all French citizens at birth, as were their parents and most of their grandparents, and one could easily imagine that assimilation had never been a difficult issue for them. In recounting their stories, however, speakers sometimes presented clues, such as the use of ethnicity as a primary social category, that suggest otherwise. These clues within the standard official narratives alert listeners to the existence of another, quite contrasting, representation of the same past.

Clues to a contrasting memory

In the very stories meant to illustrate how thoroughly everyone "melted" together to form a *new* French culture, one in which former distinctions between settlers were no longer relevant, people used terms indicating that they understood colonial Algerian society as organized by ethnicity and class. The marking of the social universe by individuals' ethnic origins was even a feature of stories meant to illustrate how little such distinctions mattered, as in the following taped conversation with Mr. Mifsud. Mifsud was a sprightly 75-year-old man of mixed French-Maltese heritage who lived with his wife in the suburbs of Marseilles. I had started the conversation by asking how it had felt to grow up in Algiers as a Maltese man, thus eliciting a long monologue in which Mifsud first made it quite clear to me that, although he was of Maltese origins, he was and always had been a French citizen. Furthermore, he added, nobody cared about ethnic origins in Algeria; there one's origins were completely irrelevant:

1. Voyez ? Entre Italiens, Français, Maltais, Grecs, euh ... j'ai jamais entendu. ... Y'avait

You see? Between Italians, French, Maltese, Greeks, uh, I never heard. ... There was

2. une certaine cohésion. Et quand y'a eu la guerre, en 42, en 40, enfin 42, on a tous été

a real cohesion. And during the war, in '42, in '40, well '42, we were all

3. mobilisés, on a tous fait la guerre ... Italiens, Français ... enfin, Français, bien sûr, mais

mobilized, we all served in the war ... Italians, French, well, French, of course, but

4. d'origine française, italienne, espagnole, sans problèmes. Nous nous sommes battus ...

of French, Italian and Spanish origins, without difficulties. We served ...

5. sans même sav ... sans même *penser* qu'on était d'origine étrangère.

without even know—without even *thinking* that we were of foreign origins.

This passage is especially revealing because Mifsud twice backtracks to revise his story. In the first line he uses national origins, for example, *Italiens, Français* (Italians, French), like I had, as a shorthand to refer to individuals of these ethnic heritages. Technically, this usage is incorrect, for the people to whom he refers, settlers who enlisted in the French army, were undoubtedly French citizens. This is not an insignificant error. In France there has long been a quasi-official moratorium on distinguishing religious, ethnic, or racial subgroups of nationals.²⁴ Even today, plural or ethnic identities are rare and are viewed with suspicion, unlike in the United States (Gross et al. 1996:128; see also Blum 2002; Hargreaves 1995:27; Silverman 1992:2). Officially, French society is composed of citizens and foreigners, and the latter are further distinguished by their nationalities, if at all. Thus, Mifsud is employing nonstandard usage when he identifies French citizens as "Italians." Perhaps recognizing this problem or the tension it creates in his narrative, he corrects himself to more closely match standard usage, referring to his fellow soldiers as people of French or Italian *origins* (line 4). But he then corrects himself a second time. After beginning to tell me that he and his fellow colonists did not even *know* that they were of foreign origins, he alters his statement to indicate instead that they did not even *think* about these origins (line 5). To further illustrate this point, he exclaims later on in the same interview, "There were Spanish who did not even speak Spanish anymore!"

Mifsud's statements are contradictory. If ethnic distinctions had been thoroughly erased, Mifsud presumably would not have known the origins of the people in his stories. If the individuals who he says did not speak Spanish anymore were so thoroughly "blended in," for instance, how could Mifsud possibly know that they were Spanish in origin? Did he recognize this on an unconscious level, and only after thinking about their names was he able to consciously acknowledge their origins? I soon found this regular "ethnic marking" of

the colonial social world to be widespread. Former colonists I interviewed of all backgrounds—elite, middle and lower socioeconomic class status, "French origin" and "foreign origin"—identified each other in this way. In fact, this ethnic marking of the social universe is so widespread, I contend, that it is an important element of a pied-noir linguistic repertoire and an indication of their membership, at least at one time, in a common speech community. The prevalence of this practice also indicates that at some important level settlers recognized ethnic difference in Algeria long after they had become French citizens. Cultural differences had not completely melted and blended together, and even the naturalized French, such as the military recruits in Mifsud's story, remained identifiable as members of distinct European ethnicities. In fact, after living in France for over 30 years, members of this community still referred to their friends, acquaintances, and themselves—people who were all second- to fifth-generation French citizens—in terms of this ethnically marked language in casual conversation.

In this contrasting vision of the colonial past, class emerges as another important distinction within the settler bloc, and class and ethnicity are often linked. For instance, former colonists sometimes referred to the non-French settlers as *le petit peuple* (the lower classes or humble classes) or as *Français du deuxième zone* (second-class French). This conflation of class and ethnicity was never more pronounced than in discussions by the "non-French" about "the real French." The elderly Franco-Maltese regularly noted when individuals in their stories were *not* "naturalized" or "non-French" but, rather, were of French origins. These "real" French were regularly identified as the "pure" French (*pur Français*), the "real French" (*vrai Français*), those of "French stock" (*Français de souche*), or "French French" (*Français de France, Français d'origine*). In another conversation, Mifsud explained that at school, the goal among his non-French peers was to try to reach the same level as the *Français de souche*, "*les vrais Français*," he emphasized. In such discussions, people sometimes used ethnicity to index class. Marie, a woman in her late sixties, explained to me that her mother and grandmother were quite poor and worked as house cleaners for a lawyer's family, "*des gens riches et tout*" (rich people and all), she explained. "*Des Français de France*," she added reverently, as if her specification of the family's ethnic background would communicate to me without question their elite social standing.

Stories of intermarriage

So far I have considered ways in which the melting pot metaphor glosses a positive and officially sanctioned version of colonial Algeria at the same time that it is

undermined by language that, I argue, represents interruptions by a contrasting point of view. I further argue that these versions of the past represent two distinct "voices" in the Bakhtinian conception of multivocality. The following two passages illustrate quite clearly these voices in interaction and provide further evidence that they represent distinct representations of the past. Each passage derives from interviews with a married couple who, in outlining the standard melting pot narrative, turn to examples of intermarriage between colonists of different European ethnic origins to illustrate their points.²⁵ These examples are particularly interesting because intermarriage regularly appears in historical texts promoting a melting pot interpretation, serving both as proof that colonist distinctions were no longer significant socially and as one of the many processes that facilitated the further blurring of ethnic boundaries.²⁶ Like these texts, many elderly informants also claimed that "everyone" intermarried, citing as examples marriages in their own families. Intermarriage was a pervasive theme in my interviews with colonists of all backgrounds, who often contrasted this marriage pattern with the nearly complete absence of intermarriage across religious lines (i.e., between the European Catholic or Christian colonists and either Algerian or French Jews or Muslims). But although intermarriage between naturalized French of different origins was often cited in such stories, I met only two couples out of over 30 who represented a union between French-origin and Maltese-origin families, the ethnic groups at the two poles of the European colonist ethnic-class hierarchy. Excerpts from these couples' interviews are found below. In the following selections each couple first asserts the dominant view that intermarriage was common and of no consequence. Over the course of these taped conversations, however, the spouses of Maltese origin (in one case, the husband; in the other, the wife) eventually speak up and contradict this assessment, presenting a different argument in the "contrasting" voice, using as illustration accounts of their very own marriages.

In the first example, Suzanne Xuereb is of French origins and her husband Pierre had four Maltese grandparents. I stayed with the couple in their tiny apartment in northern France one cold winter weekend. In the tape excerpt below, they first present to me the optimistic official melting pot viewpoint in a fast-paced, co-constructed narrative (lines 1–5); however, when prompted by one of my questions (line 7), the narrative shifts as Pierre begins to talk about the discrimination and hatred he felt from the French:

1. **Pierre:** Mais, en Algérie ... c'étaient ... euh, un mélange de races ... le brassage ...

But in Algeria, it was a mixture of races ... a mixing/brewing ...

2. **Suzanne:** Ah oui, ça c'est fait très vite.
Yes, it happened very fast.

3. **P:** ... le brassage de tous les Français d'origine éter ... étrangère ...
... the mixing together of all the French of for ... foreign origins ...

4. **S:** ... d'ailleurs ils sont tous allés à la même école ...
... and, they all went to the same school ...

5. **P:** se sont mariés ... à la même école, ... se sont mélangés, et ont parlé français. Puisque je vous married each other, mixed together, and spoke French. Because, like I was telling

6. disais tout à l'heure que mon grand-père, qui est né en 1870, n'a jamais parlé le maltais.
you before, my grandfather, who was born in 1870, never spoke Maltese.

7. **Author:** Est-ce que vous vous rendiez compte, à cette époque-là, que vous étiez d'origine maltaise?
Did you realize, back then, that you were of Maltese origin?

8. **P:** Oui, oui, oui.
Yes, yes, yes.

9. **A:** Mais c'était pas très important?
But it wasn't very important?

10. **P:** Ce n'était pas important ... (hesitating)
It wasn't important ...

11. **S:** Quand même c'était ...
But, it was ...

12. **P:** Mais pour moi ça m'a *toujours* marqué parce que les Français de la métropole ... les
But for me, I was *always* affected because the French of the metropole, the

13. Français d'origine, a toujours été en Algérie une classe supérieure. Et méprisante.
"French French," were always a superior class in Algeria. And contemptuous.

14. Et méprisante. *Méprisante*, hein!?
And contemptuous. *Contemptuous*, hein!?

15. **A:** Oui.
Yes.

16. **S:** Oui. Donc c'était un peu méprisant qu'on se mariait avec un Italien ... ou qu'on se mariait avec un Maltais, ...

Yes. So it was a bit shameful to marry an Italian, or to marry a Maltese ...

17. **P:** Je vois le mépris de ta mère pour un Maltais. ...
Ma belle-mère avait *un mépris* pour le Maltais.

I remember your mother's contempt for the
Maltese. My mother-in-law *hated* the Maltese.

18. **S:** Oui.
Yes.

The speakers here initiate their joint narrative in the official voice and outline the process of assimilation, including intermarriage, in positive terms. Note, too, that both Paul and Suzanne first use impersonal third-person pronouns as would a French history text, even when referring to their own past ("they went to the same school, married each other," lines 1–5). But when I ask Paul directly about his own experiences (line 7), his narrative begins to shift. He first discusses the contempt he felt from the French, which he states has always affected him ("ça m'a toujours marqué"); these memories have left their mark. He then illustrates this point with the example of his own experiences with his mother-in-law's anti-Maltese sentiment. Although at some level he may still believe in a vision of French Algeria as a melting pot, he cannot ignore his own personal memories of the discrimination he had felt from "the French" (lines 12–14).

In the second example, Robert Vella is part Maltese and part French, whereas his wife Marie is of "pure" Maltese ancestry. Robert first claims that where he grew up in eastern Algeria, there were many Maltese–French marriages, but as the conversation continues, he touches on family stories that contradict his initial assessment:

1. **Robert:** Et les familles de condition plus modeste, eh ben ... ils se mariaient entre eux. Mais

And families of more modest means, well ... they married each other. But in our

2. chez nous, y'avait beaucoup de ... de, d'unions entre Français et Maltais, hein? Entre

region, there were many ... marriages between French and Maltese, hein? Between

3. Français et Maltaises et Maltaises et ... et Français ... oui.

French men and Maltese women and Maltese women and ... and French men [*sic*] ... yes.

4. **Author:** Et ce n'était pas mal considéré ?
And this wasn't badly viewed?

5. **R:** Non, non, non, non. Chez nous, non.
No, no, no, no. Where we lived, no.

6. **A:** Um-um. Pas à Constantine.
Oh. Not at Constantine.

7. **R:** Les Maltais ... (pause)
The Maltese ...

8. **A:** Et à Bône est-ce que ça a été ...
And at Bône, was it ...

9. **R:** A Bône, oui.
At Bône, yes.

10. **A:** ... plus de ségrégation peut-être ?
... more segregated perhaps?

11. **R:** Oui, oui, oui. A Bône ... Mais, enfin, on peut pas dire que ... classer ça ...

Yes, yes, yes. In Bône ... But, well, we can't really say that ... classify that ...

12. Particulièrement les Français considéraient les autres comme ... des deuxièmes zones,

The French in particular considered the others like ... second class (people),

13. des Français de deuxième zone, de seconde qualité. Mais même entre Italiens et

second-class French, second rate. But even between Italians and

14. Maltais, comment elle s'appelle? ... Anne-Marie. La mère elle a pas voulu

Maltese, what's her name? ... Anne-Marie. Her mother didn't want (her to marry him)

15. parce que c'était un Maltais. Hein ? Elle aimait un garçon et tout et sa mère ...

because he was Maltese. Huh? She liked a guy and her mother ...

16. **Marie:** (interrupting) Mais même *Robert*, quand il a dit à sa mère : 'J'connais une fille,' elle a dit:

But even *Robert*, when he said to his mother, 'I know a girl,' she said,

17. 'Qu'est-ce qu'elle est ?' Elle t'a demandé quelle natio ... quelle origine quoi. Il a dit:

'What is she?' She asked you what nation ... what background, whatever. He said:

18. 'Maltaise.' Ça lui plaisait pas. Pourquoi ? Parce que je n'étais pas ... euh ... Bon. Nous

'Maltaise.' She wasn't happy about it. Why? Because I wasn't ... um. Well. We

19. étions français oui, mais d'origine ... euh ... um.
were French, yes, but of origin. ...uh... um...

20. **R:** Mais pas d'ori ... française d'origine quoi.
But not of origin ... French origins.

21. **M:** *Française d'origine.* J'étais d'origine maltaise, quoi, et ma belle-mère, elle était pas

French origins. I was of Maltese origins, huh, and my mother-in-law, she was not

22. contente.
pleased.

Robert first asserts that in his town, mixed Maltese–French marriages were common. His parents, in fact, represent one such early mixed marriage: His father, a first-generation Maltese born in Algeria, married the Algerian-born daughter of a French family after having served four years in World War I. Apparently his decoration for war service after being gassed in Europe convinced the woman's father to permit his daughter to marry the man despite his stigmatized ethnicity. Although Robert's mother was ultimately quite happy with her husband, she was displeased when her son decided to follow her example and marry a Maltese-origin woman. Robert has somehow "forgotten" this part of his own history when making positive generalizations about the prevalence of French–Maltese marriages. He then thinks of a case in which intermarriage was frowned on (lines 14–15). At that point his wife can listen no more; she finally interrupts (line 16) to discuss with emotion the ill will her mother-in-law had harbored against her because of her Maltese heritage.

Note the persistence in this narrative of the "improper" use of nationality to identify colonists of different origins (see lines 2, 3, 7, 13–15, 18). As in the previous quotes, the individuals discussed in this example were all French citizens. When discussing her own experiences, however, Marie finds it difficult to describe herself in any way other than as "Maltese" (lines 18–19) and has to rely on her husband's assistance to come up with the more correct usage, "*d'origine maltaise*" (lines 20–21). Finally, note the shift from a distant, third-person narrative in the official voice in lines 1–3 ("they married each other") to the recounting of firsthand experience that directly contradicts the official voice, framed in a first-person voice and embellished with reported speech in lines 16–19 and 21.

In these two examples, one can observe the collision and intersection, midnarrative, of two ways of viewing the past. In the second example, in particular, after discussing intermarriage in generally positive terms, the speakers sought examples to illustrate their points. Perhaps lacking better options, they turned to their own marriages, only to find in the process of talking about them that their experiences presented a story that awkwardly contradicted, and further called into question, the larger narrative the speakers had been trying to construct. These excerpts nicely illustrate heteroglossia and the close correspondence between form and content, and one can see how ideological orientation and pronoun use each index a distinct voice and a particular point of view on the past.

An advantage of exploring social memory with such a detailed, discourse-centered approach is that researchers can refer to the rich literature in linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics on heteroglossic speech communities to better understand which factors might motivate speakers to choose from among an array of socially meaningful

voices (Duranti 1992; Eckert and Rickford 2001; Gal 1987; Gumperz 1982; Hill 1985; Pujolar 2001; Schieffelin et al. 1998; Woolard 1985, 1989). Shifting voices thus becomes a meaningful act. Research on code switching, as others interested in multivocality have shown (Hill 1985, 1986), can yield particularly fruitful insights. Social context and speech event, as I noted above, may influence which voice a speaker uses. I found that the official voice was most widely used in large gatherings of relative strangers, whereas the contrasting voice was especially apparent in more intimate settings with only a few people present, and never in mixed French–non-French company. One might argue then that audience plays the most prominent role and that the official voice should be viewed as the "public transcript," that which is presented in the open interaction between subordinates and dominant groups, whereas the contrasting voice represents a "hidden transcript," that which takes place "off-stage," away from direct observation of those in power (Scott 1990:2, 4). That choice of voice is more complex than indicated by such an interpretation becomes clear when one pays closer attention to situational code switching. John Gumperz writes that when a speech style is regularly associated with a certain class of activities, "it comes to signify or connote them, so that its very use can signal the enactment of the activities even in the absence of other clear contextual clues" (1982:98). The shifts made by Mifsud in his discussion of his fellow military recruits may be an example of this type of "code" switching. He commenced in the contrasting voice by referring to his comrades as "Spanish" and so forth, but he then corrected himself. He may have been influenced by the thematic content of his story during its telling: When discussing military service, an experience undoubtedly permeated with associations with official discourse, Mifsud caught himself and replaced the alternate voice with the official voice in midsentence. When one explores such narratives as examples of multivocality, the shifts in language use, ideological orientation, and, ultimately, the ways the past is represented become meaningful.

Authoritative utterances and selective traditions

The question remains why the official melting pot representation of the colonial past is so widespread, especially if it does not represent individuals' life experiences or those of their friends and family members. One factor to consider is the influence of wider contemporary concerns on the ways the settlers think and talk about the past. Since the pied-noir settlement in France in 1962, there has been growing interest in that country in immigration and in its impacts on French society. Debates among social scientists, politicians, and the public alike have centered on whether France is, or should be, multicultural and on the processes by which assimilation or integration has

occurred in the past.²⁷ These debates are often polarized, with immigration viewed either as the embodiment of France's capacity for assimilation or as proof of a breakdown in that process (Silverman 1992:15). In these debates, the melting pot metaphor sometimes appears as shorthand for a society of immigrants. It has been used to argue that France is *not* a melting pot as well as to argue that France is homogeneous today because of the power of assimilation in the past. In the 1980s, the metaphor was also introduced to describe a society rooted in "tribalism," one composed of distinct tribes separated into ghettos (i.e., a negative portrayal of the United States; see Green 1991). The term has even appeared in titles of works on French immigration history (Noiriel 1988), and the metaphor has become so widely used that the phrase now appears in French publications in English without quotation marks (Green 1991:78).

The degree to which the elderly colonists have followed or have absorbed the terms of these debates is difficult to determine. I should note that although these discussions concern contemporary France and, sometimes, the United States, they have not addressed settler assimilation in colonial Algeria. The former settlers did, at times, however, discuss contemporary French immigration politics with me. Departing from common French parlance, in which *immigré* (immigrant) and *étranger* (foreigner) are often conflated and used as code words or euphemisms for "Arab" or "North African" (Silverman 1992:3), the *pieds-noirs* spoke more directly by specifying the ethnicity of the specific immigrant group being discussed (*les Maghrebins* or *les Italiens*), a speech practice consonant with colonial usage. They sometimes drew connections between immigration debates and their own past, as well. More than once in the middle of a discussion of their family migration history, individuals turned to me and exclaimed, "C'est nous, les immigrés!" ("We are the immigrants!"). In fact, because of their double migration, many *pieds-noirs* saw themselves as more "immigrant" than any other group in French society today.

Absent another likely source for the melting pot metaphor, one might claim that its use to describe colonial Algeria derived solely from the contemporary context. Quite similar debates, however, also wracked Algeria in the 19th century and earlier. As I have noted, the same metaphor was employed there historically in quite similar ways to *pied-noir* parlance today, to gloss an optimistic stance on a complex and ambivalent social process.²⁸ Thus, the official narrative and, perhaps, even aspects of the contemporary French debate have colonial roots. To understand how this particular representation of the past became so widespread in colonial times, Bakhtin's writings are again illuminating. He emphasized a distinction between "primary" and "secondary" speech genres. The former, he argued, are based in "unmediated speech

communion," whereas the latter are more complex forms that are primarily written. Bakhtin (1986:62) focused in particular on the incorporation of primary genres into secondary ones, as in the incorporation of oral sources into written texts such as novels. Although fragmentary on this point, his work suggests that the reverse occurs as well:

In each epoch, in each social circle, in each small world of family, friends, acquaintances, and comrades in which a human being grows and lives, there are always authoritative utterances that set the tone—artistic, scientific, and journalistic works on which one relies, to which one refers, which are cited, imitated and followed. [Bakhtin 1986:88]

The melting pot narrative can be viewed as one such "authoritative utterance," a state-promoted, dominant perspective on colonist assimilation that gained wide circulation in colonial Algeria at the time of the 19th-century naturalization laws. Because it presents a model for the past, it can also be viewed as a "selective tradition," an intentionally selective version of the past that offers a historical ratification of a contemporary order (Williams 1977:115–116). This representation of the past served the cultural, political, and economic interests of the dominant French faction of colonial society by glossing the socioeconomic realities of the decidedly subordinate "second-class" colonists. It further aided the cause of the hegemonic bloc by uniting, at least symbolically, all colonist factions, a critical step in their ongoing effort to consolidate the greatly outnumbered settler population in the face of near constant resistance by the colonized. This representation has continued to play a similar role since decolonization by encouraging the French public to welcome the arriving one million *pieds-noirs*, with their great diversity of backgrounds, as thoroughly "melted," as all truly French, and thus as their own.²⁹ Like Bakhtin's "authoritative utterances," the French state, via school texts and other materials, was not the only source of the melting pot ideal, for novelists and essayists promoted in their late-19th-century and early-20th-century writings the idea that a "new white race" was being forged in the "crucible" of Africa.³⁰

Selective traditions are vulnerable, however, for, as Raymond Williams writes, "the real record is effectively recoverable" (1977:116). It is recoverable in this case from people's individual and collective memories. The official vision of the past does not represent colonial Algeria as all colonists experienced it, and, thus, it exists alongside contrasting views, rooted in people's life experiences. Because the narrative of the past that the elderly settlers have learned from others does not correspond with what they have learned in their own lives, a kind of conversational cognitive dissonance develops.

This dissonance is not necessarily retrogressive, however, as Gramsci might have argued. One can observe in tape excerpts how the contrasting voice, when placed alongside the official hegemonic voice, begins to evolve into a forcefully articulated oppositional stance in the course of a single conversation.

The ways that social memory's very multivocality may encourage change is suggested by a longer narrative of Mifsud. Mifsud was troubled by his ambivalent Franco-Maltese identity and raised this topic without my prompting each time we spoke. In the following passage from the second of two interviews, he again uses the melting pot metaphor when referring to the fate of the different immigrant groups in Algeria.³¹ In this case, however, he appropriates this key metaphor to construct a different vision of the same past. I distinguish the different voices here in the following manner: Italics signify the official voice, standard font highlights a transitional variation on that voice, and boldface indicates the contrasting voice.

*In Algeria, people . . . melted together, really, uh . . . like I was telling you, people who were . . . the children of immigrants, didn't want to call too much attention to the fact that they were immigrants' kids. To be French, to receive all of the advantages, and then, and then. . . Well, no, especially because immigrants in general are people of a lower social class. It's not the rich who, who leave their country. It wasn't the rich Italians, Spanish, or Maltese who left their countries, it was those who were really from a pretty lower class who left because they didn't have any work, anything to eat. And they didn't want people to be able to know that they were from that class of society . . . that wasn't, well, rich, who came there because otherwise they would starve. Thus, it was a bit to save face, if you will, to retain their dignity, out of pride, not wanting to be recognized as one of those people. So, they tried to melt in, to melt together, to blend in, and me, during my entire youth, there was never a question of my being Maltese! And furthermore, I had a lot of education! I had civil and military training . . . and it was never a question of being Maltese. I was Mifsud, French, Mifsud, French! I never would have said, "I'm of Maltese origins." Now, though, I say it. . . But in my youth, I never would have said it, never. I was French.*³²

At first, Mifsud outlines the melting together of the diverse colonists, beginning in the official voice (note, for instance, the impersonal, third-person statement "people melted together"). Moving into the transitional passages, his narrative remains for a time impersonal, told using third-person pronouns, but the content shifts. He reminds me of a previous conversation we have had and tries to explain why it was so important for people to hide their

immigrant origins in Algeria. The story he tells shifts to one about the difficulties experienced by the lower classes, a topic that is unthinkable within the constraints posed by the official melting pot point of view. In the third section, he resurrects the melting pot metaphor, extracting it from the fabric of the official narrative, and uses it to tell another story altogether, one in which those who assimilated were not passively shaped by an invisible hand in a positive story with a happy ending for all. Instead, they were active participants. Mifsud describes a conscious effort to erase all vestiges of cultural difference as people willingly threw themselves headlong into the smelter. By the end of this passage, he finally reveals that he is speaking from personal experience and begins to express his own memories in a detailed and passionate conclusion, employing first-person pronouns ("I was Mifsud, French, Mifsud French!"). It appears from this excerpt that through talking with me and noting the contrasts between the official version of colonial Algeria and his own quite distinct memories, his interpretation of that past is changing.

This last example shows how social memory is not static but involves an ongoing and actively constructed set of views on the past, each view engaged by, and reflected back on, the other. As Bakhtin wrote, all languages of heteroglossia "may be juxtaposed to one another, mutually supplement one another, contradict one another and be interrelated dialogically. As such they encounter one another and co-exist in the consciousness of real people" (1981:292). One can see such an encounter and its results in Mifsud's monologue. The ways that such a process can lead to a direct challenging of selective traditions and can facilitate the development of oppositional visions of the past are suggested here.

Schemas and propositional memory

In her writings on working-class beliefs and ideologies, Strauss argues for a connectionist approach to cognition, one in which beliefs are viewed as "patterns of learned associations distributed over an extensive neural network" (1990:314).³³ Depending on how and when one learns them, she argues, quite distinct and even contradictory ideologies may be held by the same individual in different schemas in varying relationship to each other, such as "closely related" or "widely separate."³⁴ Strauss argues that these forms of internalization can be identified when one reviews naturally occurring speech.

One can apply a similar approach to representations of the past. Multiple representations of the past circulate in the same community, even within the same family, because individuals learn and process memories differently and independently and because societies are heterogeneous. One can assume that with careful attention to narrative style, content, and form, distinct memory

sources or schemata and their degree of integration will be identifiable. The narratives of intermarriage presented here, for instance, suggest the presence of two ways of viewing the same topic that have remained relatively distinct and unconnected to each other, for the speakers try to find ways to knit the contradictory statements they make into some sort of meaningful whole while maintaining conversational conventions.

The relationship between these distinct voices can be further elucidated by considering concepts from the psychological literature on individual memory. Some psychologists distinguish different forms of individual remembering that they propose are the result of fundamentally different mental processes. In Endel Tulving's (1983) taxonomy, "procedural" memory, the remembering of skills and tasks, is distinguished from "propositional" memory. The latter comprises "episodic" and "semantic" memory. Tulving (1983:9) suggests that episodic and semantic memories are two systems that differ in the type of information processed and in their application in everyday life. Episodic memory is the memory of events (or episodes) that an individual has experienced firsthand. This form of memory is rooted in lived experience and is immediate. Semantic memory, by contrast, is independent of a person's past and involves anything that may be referred to as knowledge of the world, such as facts, ideas, rules, schemata, or some combination thereof (Tulving 1983:38). Semantic memory may be more tightly organized, as when it involves learning through some rote, repetitive process, for example, at school, whereas episodic memory may be more loosely organized and more closely linked to affect. Finally, episodic memory may be more vulnerable and may even change with retrieval, whereas semantic memory seems to be less altered in this way.

The two voices found in colonist narratives of the assimilation process map rather nicely to the episodic-semantic distinction. The contrasting voice often involves stories of remembered life experiences, like Tulving's episodic memory, whereas the official voice narrates a more general representation of the past, which, like semantic memory, may have been learned at school, in conversations, or from history textbooks. In addition, I found the contrasting voice to be more closely linked to affect than the official voice, which remained rather invariable over repeated telling, qualities Tulving associates with episodic and semantic memory, respectively. Thus, like Strauss's multiple ideologies, these versions of the past appear to have been learned in different ways and emerge in everyday conversation from distinct mental schemas.

The settlers' narratives prompt a rethinking of some assumptions made about forms of cognition and their expression in speech. Strauss (1990:314-315) proposes

that ideas internalized as theories will be expressed at length and with relative ease and will be context invariant, whereas less theorized ideas will be sketchier and exhibit greater context variability. Her findings are only partially applicable here. In the settler narratives, the official melting pot perspective was widely and readily cited. This viewpoint, however, did not generate richly detailed or lengthy narratives. In fact, melting pot narratives were rather dull, emotionally void, and unimaginative, as might be expected of the recitation of knowledge memorized at school. Instead, it was the "less theorized" material based on people's memories of their own lived experiences, their "episodic" memories, that elicited the more detailed discussions energized by strong emotion.

The data presented here differ from some researchers' characterizations of popular memory, as well. Rappaport, for instance, writes that, unlike dominant memory, popular memory contains "brief and incomplete images, which are never developed in any detail" (1994:6), and the Popular Memory Group (1982:210) describes the "common sense of the past" as lacking consistency and explanatory force. I have found that lived experiences can generate immediate and vivid narratives rich in detail. Moreover, these narratives can be articulated with explanatory force in clear contradistinction to widely disseminated official representations, with what could be viewed as emotionally charged interruptions that challenge existing "selective tradition." The material presented above also suggests that it may indeed be possible for people to develop counter-hegemonies from multivocal, "composite," "commonsense" views of the world, as Mifsud appears to be developing in his long monologue above. Such development may be due not to some underlying coherence, however, as Gramsci might argue, but to social memory's incoherence, its composite nature: Social memory can evolve and people can become more critical of dominant views through the confrontation of voices that such "incoherence" may allow or even encourage.

Conclusion

While the collective memory endures and draws strength from its base in a coherent body of people, it is individuals as group members who remember. While these remembrances are mutually supportive of each other and common to all, individual members still vary in the intensity with which they experience them. ... Some may say how strange it is that our most personal remembrances, offering such a striking character of absolute unity, actually derive from a fusion of diverse and separate elements.

—Halbwachs, 1980

In this article I have analyzed internally contradictory narratives of the past articulated by elderly *pieds-noirs*. Building their arguments on Antonio Gramsci's concept of "common sense," previous scholars encountering similar ambivalence have suggested that the social memory of subaltern peoples can be characterized as especially composite and contradictory by nature. I have outlined limitations of this concept for anthropologists, especially if we take seriously Gramsci's characterization of subaltern thought as necessarily composite and incoherent and, thus, as an obstacle to progress. Advances in cognitive anthropology and psychological studies of individual memory formation suggest no reason to assume that individuals connect the various approaches to, and discourses about, the past into some coherent whole. Instead, different schemas may be stored differently in different parts of the brain, and one can expect that people may simultaneously maintain multiple distinct, even irreconcilable, notions about past events and their meanings. These insights also suggest that incoherence may be a more generalized phenomenon and not limited to one subgroup or class of society.

I have shown the value in adopting a discourse-centered approach to this ambivalent, everyday talk about the past. Such an approach, influenced by Bakhtin's ideas on heteroglossia, reveals the existence in these narratives of distinct voices, each distinguishable by content and form. In this case, pronoun use, agency, ideological orientation, social categories, and the melting pot metaphor index a distinct orientation and interpretation of the past. In studying such narrative, researchers can begin to understand the interweaving of different voices as resulting from processes similar to those that shape heteroglossia in other contexts. Continued research bridging studies of social memory with the linguistics of heteroglossic speech communities should prove interesting indeed.

The particular example of settler narratives discussed here indicates the power of "authoritative utterances" and "selective traditions" (Bakhtin 1986; Williams 1977), as models of the past taught in schools and other colonial venues can emerge in speech some thirty to fifty years after they were inculcated. This finding should be of special interest to scholars concerned with lasting hegemonic cultural forms and to oral and contemporary historians more generally. The fact that speakers sometimes became aware of the contradictions they made in their statements, and from this awareness began to challenge the dominant melting pot model, suggests that incoherence itself may be a recipe for change, a finding that should interest Gramscian scholars in particular.

Bakhtin's ideas on heteroglossia are particularly well suited for the analysis of social memory. Multiple representations of the past exist and confront each other in

any given society as each of its constituent subgroups—communities, localities, classes, ethnic groups, and families—promotes its own interpretations of past events. Even in one community, members may present widely varying accounts of the past, depending on audience and other contextual factors.³⁵ Narratives on past events may be especially heteroglossic because of the influence of the content—stories about people and their actions in the past—on their telling. Such narratives may be likely to contain instances of reported speech and other types of "reaccentuation" (Bakhtin 1986:89), leading to rich multivocal monologues that become even more complex when co-constructed in conversations involving more than one person. The resulting discourse may appear contradictory, confused, or ambivalent, but careful analysis allows one to find meaning in the chaos.

Finally, multivocality should not be limited to the social memories of subaltern peoples alone, as this example concerning former settlers from an exceedingly polarized colonial society suggests. Because all social groups generate multiple views on the past, if only because they are composed of individuals with their own life experiences, episodic and semantic memories, and ways of interpreting shared memories, as Halbwachs noted long ago, dominant memory, like popular memory, should be multivocal and composite, as well. Conversely, it may be the *absence* of multivocality, reflecting considerable centripetal forces, that one should find particularly noteworthy. Discourse about the past of people of all social positions should provide richly composite examples of patterned and meaningful multivocality.

Notes

Acknowledgments. This article is based on ethnographic research conducted during January 1995 through June 1996, September 1998, and June 2001 in southeastern France, Malta, and Tunisia. Fieldwork was made possible with the generous support of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, the Social Science Research Council, the American Institute for Maghrebi Studies, and Lafayette College. A dissertation fellowship from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation and a dean's fellowship from the University of Arizona provided crucial writing support. I am grateful to Lafayette College, especially to members of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, for the research leave that allowed me to complete this piece. Many friends and colleagues have provided comments on various iterations of this work. I thank especially Jane Hill, Deborah House, Susan Niles, Pat Janssen, Helen Robbins, and Susan Carol Rogers for their time and many helpful suggestions. Virginia Dominguez and several anonymous reviewers of the journal provided extremely insightful readings of an earlier version of this piece, and I thank them for taking such time with my work. Finally, much of the research on which this article is based took place before or after sumptuous meals generously prepared for me by the many *pieds-noirs* who invited me into their homes; their remarkable hospitality, commitment to my research, and openness to outsiders cannot be overstated.

1. These quotes were recorded as follows: 1. "On s'est mariée tous. Y'a plus de Maltais. ... A partir de mon père, on s'est mariés avec des gens différents ... A Alger, les gens se mariaient ... et y'avait pas la colonie maltaise" (several pages of transcript are omitted here). 2. "A Alger, on n'aimait pas du tout les Maltais—à, à tel point qu'j'avais, un p'tit ... copain, d'origine française, il s'appelait Frémont ... j'allais tous les jours le chercher, on allait à l'école ensemble, et (un jour) sa mère me dit: 'Tu es Maltais, toi?', je dis: 'Pourquoi vous m'demandez ça?' Elle dit: 'Parce que si tu es Maltais, je n'veux plus qu'tu joues avec Georges.' Alors j'ai dit: 'Non, j'suis pas Maltais', j'ai menti, j'ai dit: 'Non, j'suis pas Maltais, j'suis Corse'—c'est mon meilleur ami! ... Les Maltais avaient une réputation, ... je n'sais, sais pas pourquoi, p't'être par'qu'ils réussissaient ou qu'ils étaient mauvais garçons, ou je sais pas ... mais j'sais qu'y avait une très mauvaise réputation des Maltais, en Algérie." I have edited this passage, and the others presented here, to eliminate repetitions such as "hein ... hein ... hein" or "les—les, les Maltais" to enhance readability. Italics denote speaker emphasis. All speaker and place names in this text are pseudonyms.

2. *Pied-noir* (black foot) is an appellation for the French settlers of Algeria. It has unknown origins. It may have been used in the early 20th century (Lorcin 1995:287 n. 31), but it became widespread only later, during the French–Algerian war. It has been claimed since by many individuals from Algeria, including the majority of the people I interviewed, and thus I use it here interchangeably with "former settlers of Algeria."

3. See, for instance, Popular Memory Group 1982, Rappaport 1994, and Swedenburg 1995.

4. For a thorough review of Gramsci's ideas on this point, see Crehan 2002:110–115.

5. To oppose this incoherent common sense and to assist the subaltern in articulating an effective counter-hegemonic narrative, Gramsci outlined the pivotal role played by the "organic intellectual." See Gramsci 1971 for more on organic versus traditional intellectuals.

6. Crehan 2002: chapter 6 provides a clear and intelligent review of Gramsci's ideas on this topic.

7. Although Maurice Bloch calls our attention to nonlinguistic forms in his recent work, he also analyzes narrative. He discusses an undifferentiated type of verbal narrative about the past found in everyday accounts, which he says has been ignored by most anthropologists to date (Bloch 1998:109). It is precisely this form of narrative that I focus on here.

8. Cole 2001, Oakdale 2001, and Rappaport 1994 are fascinating works that consider both narrative and nonnarrative data to elucidate social memory processes.

9. See Cole 2001, Dakhli 1990, Middleton and Edwards 1990, Price 1983, Shryock 1997, and Swedenburg 1995. There is still great variation in the degree to which the actual spoken word appears in the published texts, however.

10. I conducted ethnographic research primarily in southeastern France, with trips to Malta and Tunisia (January 1995–June 1996, September 1998, and June 2001).

11. The 69 people with whom I carried out formal and informal interviews were of the following ethnicities: Maltese, 54 percent; mixed origins, including Maltese, German, Italian, Spanish, and French, 19 percent; French origins, 22 percent. The 37 individuals taped are distributed similarly and include Maltese, 57 percent; mixed and non-French origins, 19 percent; and French-origin settlers, 24 percent. I should note that these rough estimates are based largely on individuals' self-ascription: One "Maltese" man had three Maltese and one Sicilian grandparent, for instance, and one "French" man had one Swiss and

one Alsatian grandparent. Most others of mixed origins described themselves accordingly, including a woman of Corsican (i.e., French) and Sicilian ancestry.

12. For a critical review of official colonization programs, see Peyerimhoff 1906.

13. Naturalization procedures were greatly simplified by the Sénatus-Consulte of 1865, with a goal of increasing the numbers of French in relation to non-French Europeans in the colony.

14. Naturalization laws of June 26, 1889, and July 22, 1893. See Smith 1996 for further discussion of the politics of naturalization in 19th-century French Algeria.

15. Historical sources include Ageron 1991b:62; see also Crespo and Jordi 1991:9, Jordi 1986:275–288. Memoirs and other journalistic accounts that utilize melting pot language include Ageron 1991a, Baroli 1967, Espitalier 1987, Gignoux and Simiot 1961, and Méfret 1987.

16. The official viewpoint can be seen in the very few pages devoted to the origins, migration histories, and experiences of the non-French in the classic works in colonial Algerian historiography, Julien 1964 and Ageron 1979.

17. On the relationship between Maltese settlers and Algerian Jews, see Smith 2003:338–339.

18. Narcisse Faucon wrote, for instance, "Regarding their faith, they are as intolerant as Arabs. Furthermore this is not the only similarity that they have with the latter. ... Their bone structure, features, language, temperament, customs, all reveal their Arab blood" (1893:301).

19. Although the origin of the language is still an emotionally charged subject in some circles (see Smith 2003:347–349), most linguists now describe Maltese as the result of the convergence of North African Semitic (Maghrebin Arabic) and southern European Romance languages (Brincat 1991).

20. The lack of archival evidence is due to French law requiring 30, 60, 100, 120, and sometimes even 150 years to elapse before the release of documents regarding colonial Algeria, compounded by a time lag in classifying otherwise available materials.

21. In a remarkable example of symbolic violence, by the end of the 19th century, settlers claimed not only the territory but even the label *Algérien*, which had been used previously to refer to residents of Algiers (Lorcin 1995:13). They, of course, had to abandon this appellation at Algerian independence.

22. The notion of context in linguistic anthropology is complex and includes such dimensions as setting, behavioral environment, language, genres, and extrasituational features. See Goodwin and Duranti 1992.

23. Key sources on metaphor in language and thought include Fernandez 1991, Lakoff 1987, Lakoff and Johnson 1980, and Quinn and Holland 1987. The degree to which metaphors shape thought or, instead, reflect deeper shared schemas, is a matter of debate. See Strauss and Quinn 1997: chapter 6.

24. Some date the strict demarcation between foreigner and citizen to the French Revolution, but Silverman (1992:27–33) notes that this demarcation was not institutionalized until the latter half of the 19th century.

25. By contrast, French–Algerian marriages were exceedingly rare in this colonial setting.

26. Many historical texts claim that at least after World War I, members of the different European ethnicities stopped their formerly endogamous marriage practices, thus accelerating the inevitable cultural fusion. See Ageron 1991a and Baroli 1967.

27. It is impossible to list all relevant sources here. Notable key texts include Blum 2002, Brubaker 1992, Hargreaves 1995, Noiriel 1988, Schnapper 1998, Silverman 1992, Weber 1976, Weil 1991, and Wihtol de Wenden 1987.

28. In his discussion of the European populations in Algeria, for instance, Paul Leroy-Beaulieu (1887) discussed ways to maintain Algeria's French quality through naturalization, mixed marriages, education, and religion. A primary goal for the future of Algeria, he believed, was "la fusion des elements européens divers" [the fusion (or melting) of the diverse European groups] (Leroy-Beaulieu 1887:55).

29. This goal seems to underlie the September 1961 special issue of *Les Documents de la Revue des Deux Mondes*, wherein articles repeatedly confront negative metropolitan stereotypes about pieds-noirs and underscore the former colonists' loyalty to France and Frenchness (Gignoux and Simiot 1961:3).

30. Notable examples include novels by Robert Randau (1911) and Louis Bertrand (1899). For an excellent review of these works as well as the Algérieniste movement, see Lorcin 1995: chapter 9.

31. The first interview was taped on December 26, 1995, the second on February 11, 1996.

32. This French passage is as follows:

Mais, en Algérie, les gens se sont, se sont fondus, vraiment ... je vous le disais, les ... les gens qui étaient donc ... fils d'émigrés voulaient pas trop faire état de leur situation le fils d'émigrés. Pour être français, pour bénéficier de tous les avantages, et puis ... et puis. ... Non, surtout parce que les émigrés en général sont des gens de classe sociale basse. Ce sont pas les gens riches ... qui, qui quittent leur pays. C'est pas les Italiens, Espagnols ou Maltais aisés qui quittaient leur pays. C'était les gens vraiment qui, qui étaient d'une société, d'un niveau assez bas, qui quittaient leur pays parce que dans leur pays ils avaient plus de quoi travailler, de quoi manger. Donc, ils, ils voulaient pas qu'on puisse penser que ils étaient issus, issus de ces, de cette classe de société qui était, qui était pas riche quoi, qui venait là parce qu'ailleurs euh ... y'avait pas de quoi manger. Donc y'avait un p'tit peu ... sauver l'honneur, si vous voulez, par amour-propre, par amour-propre ne pas reconnaître qu'ils étaient de ces gens-là. Alors ils essayaient de se fondre, et moi, dans toute ma jeunesse, ... il n'a jamais été question de maltais hein! *Jamais*. Pourtant j'ai fait des tas d'études hein! Des études aussi bien civiles que militaires hein! J'ai fait les écoles civiles d'ingénieur, j'ai fait l'Ecole d'officier. ... Il a jamais été question de Malte ... j'étais Mifsud, français, Mifsud, français. Jamais été question. ... Puis j'aurais jamais dit: "Je suis d'origine maltaise." Maintenant je le dis. Maintenant je le dis. Et j'en suis pas déshonoré, au contraire.

33. For further discussion of connectionist approaches to cognition, see Strauss and Quinn 1997.

34. For a review of the literature on schemas in cognitive anthropology, see Casson 1983; see also Quinn and Holland 1987, Strauss and Quinn 1997.

35. Jeffrey Olick (1999) shows that dialogism necessarily exists between successive public commemorations, focusing on May 8, 1945, commemorative practices in Germany.

References cited

- Ageron, Charles-Robert
1968a *Les Algériens musulmans et la France* (1871–1919), vol. 1. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- 1968b *Les Algériens musulmans et la France* (1871–1919), vol. 2. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- 1979 *Histoire de l'Algérie contemporaine*, vol. 2: De l'insurrection de 1871 au déclenchement de la guerre de libération (1954). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- 1991a Français, Juifs et Musulmans: L'union impossible. *L'Histoire* 140:52–58.
- 1991b *Modern Algeria: A History from 1830 to the Present*. Michael Brett, ed. and trans. London: Hurst.
- Alonso, Ana
1988 The Effects of Truth: Re-Presentations of the Past and the Imagining of Community. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1(1):33–57.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M.
1981 *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- 1986 *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, eds. Vern McGee, trans. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Baroli, Marc
1967 *La vie quotidienne des Français en Algérie. 1830–1914*. Paris: Hachette.
- Battaglia, Debora
1992 The Body in the Gift: Memory and Forgetting in Sabarl Mortuary Exchange. *American Ethnologist* 19(1):3–18.
- Bertrand, Louis
1899 *Le sang des races*. Paris: Ollendorff.
- Bloch, Maurice
1998 *How We Think They Think: Anthropological Approaches to Cognition, Memory, and Literacy*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Blum, Alain
2002 Resistance to Identity Categorization in France. In *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses*. David Kertzer and Dominique Arel, eds. Pp. 121–147. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyarin, Jonathan
1994 *Remapping Memory: The Politics of TimeSpace*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Brenneis, Donald
1987 Talk and Transformation. *Man* 22(4):499–510.
- Brincat, Joseph
1991 Language and Demography in Malta: The Social Foundations of the Symbiosis between Semitic and Romance in Standard Maltese. In *Malta: A Case Study in International Cross-Currents*. Stanley Fiorini and Victor Mallia-Milanes, eds. Pp. 91–110. Msida: Malta University Publications.
- Brow, James
1990 Notes on Community, Hegemony, and the Uses of the Past. *Anthropological Quarterly* 63(1):1–6.
- Brubaker, Rogers
1992 *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Casson, Ronald
1983 Schemata in Cognitive Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 12:429–462.
- Connerton, Paul
1989 *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooper, Frederick, and Ann Stoler
1989 Introduction. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Control and Visions of Rule*. *American Ethnologist* 16(4):609–621.
- Crehan, Kate
2002 *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Crespo, Gérard, and Jean-Jacques Jordi
1991 L'immigration espagnole dans l'Algérois de 1830 à 1914. Versailles: Editions de l'Atlanthrope.
- Dakhli, Jocelyne
1990 L'oubli de la cite. La mémoire collective à l'épreuve du lignage dans le jérid tunisien. Paris: Editions la Découverte.
- Duranti, Alessandro
1992 Heteroglossia in Samoan Oratory. *Pacific Studies* 15(4): 155–175.
- Eckert, Penelope, and John Rickford, eds.
2001 Style and Sociolinguistic Variation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Espitallier, Jean-Michel
1987 Un habitant de Descartes se souvient. Special issue, "Algérie. Histoire et Nostalgie, 1830–1987." *Historia* 486: 116–119.
- Fabri, Antonella
1995 Memories of Violence, Monuments of History. In *The Labyrinth of Memory: Ethnographic Journeys*. Jacob Climo and Marea Teski, eds. Pp. 141–158. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Faucon, Narcisse
1893 La Tunisie avant et depuis l'occupation française, vol. 2: Colonisation. Paris: Augustin Challamel.
- Fernandez, James, ed.
1991 Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gal, Susan
1987 Codeswitching and Consciousness in the European Periphery. *American Ethnologist* 14(4):637–653.
- Gignoux, Claude-Joseph, and Bernard Simiot, eds.
1961 Les pieds noirs. La question du jour. Special issue, *Les Documents de la Revue des Deux Mondes*, 18.
- Goodwin, Charles, and Alessandro Duranti
1992 Rethinking Context: An Introduction. In *Rethinking Context. Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, eds. Pp. 1–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio
1971 Selections from the Prison Notebooks. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Smith, eds. and trans. New York: International.
1985 Selections from Cultural Writings. David Forgacs and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, eds. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Green, Nancy
1991 L'immigration en France et aux États-Unis: Historiographie comparée. *Vingtième Siècle* 29:67–82.
- Gross, Joan, David McMurray, and Ted Swedenburg
1996 Arab Noise and Ramadan Nights: Rai, Rap, and Franco-Maghrebi Identities. In *Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity*. Smadar Lavie and Ted Swedenburg, eds. Pp. 119–155. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Gumperz, John
1982 Discourse Strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halbwachs, Maurice
1980[1950] The Collective Memory. Francis Ditter and Vida Ditter, trans. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
- Hargreaves, Alec
1995 Immigration, "Race," and Ethnicity in Contemporary France. London: Routledge.
- Hill, Jane
1985 The Grammar of Consciousness and the Consciousness of Grammar. *American Ethnologist* 12(4):725–737.
1986 The Refiguration of the Anthropology of Language. *Cultural Anthropology* 1(1):89–102.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds.
1983 The Invention of Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Irwin-Zarecka, Iwona
1994 Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Jordi, Jean-Jacques
1986 Les Espagnols en Oranie 1830–1914. Histoire d'une migration. Montpellier: Collection Africa Nostra.
- Julien, Charles-André
1964 Histoire de l'Algérie contemporaine, vol. 1: La conquête et les débuts de la colonisation (1827–1871). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Lakoff, George
1987 Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson
1980 Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lapaine, Commissaire Civil
1842 Tableau de la situation de Philippeville pendant l'année 1841 et le 2ème trimestre de l'année 1842. October 12, 1842. Manuscript 1L8. Archives d'Outre Mer, Aix-en-Provence, France.
- Leroy-Beaulieu, Paul
1887 L'Algérie et la Tunisie. Paris: Librairie Guillaumin.
- Lorcin, Patricia
1995 Imperial Identities: Stereotyping, Prejudice and Race in Colonial Algeria. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Méfret, Jean-Max
1987 Spécial pieds-poirs. L'irrésistible ascension des pieds-noirs. *Le Figaro*, June 27(13319): 81–91.
- Middleton, David, and Derek Edwards
1990 Conversational Remembering: A Social Psychological Approach. In *Collective Remembering*. David Middleton and Derek Edwards, eds. Pp. 23–45. London: Sage.
- Noiriel, Gérard
1988 Le creuset français: Histoire de l'immigration xixe–xxe siècles. Paris: Seuil.
- Oakdale, Suzanne
2001 History and Forgetting in an Indigenous Amazonian Community. *Ethnohistory* 48(3):381–401.
- Olick, Jeffrey
1999 Genre Memories and Memory Genres: A Dialogical Analysis of May 8, 1945 Commemorations in the Federal Republic of Germany. *American Sociological Review* 64: 381–402.
- Peyerimhoff, M. de
1906 Enquête sur les résultats de la colonisation officielle de 1871 à 1895. Gouvernement Général de l'Algérie. Direction de l'Agriculture, du Commerce, et de l'Industrie. Algiers: Imprimerie J. Torrent.
- Popular Memory Group
1982 Popular Memory: Theory, Politics, Method. In *Making Histories. Studies in History Writing and Politics*. Richard Johnson, Gregor McLennan, Bill Schwarz, and David Sutton, eds. Pp. 205–252. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Portelli, Alessandro
1991 The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History. Albany: State University of New York Press.
1997 The Battle of Valle Giulia: Oral History and the Art of Dialogue. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Price, Richard
1983 First-Time: The Historical Vision of an Afro-American People. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Prochaska, David
1990 *Making Algeria French. Colonialism in Bône, 1870–1920.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pujolar, Joan
2001 *Gender, Heteroglossia and Power. A Sociolinguistic Study of Youth Culture.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Quinn, Naomi
1991 *The Cultural Basis of Metaphor. In Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology.* James Fernandez, ed. Pp. 56–93. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Quinn, Naomi, and Dorothy Holland
1987 *Culture and Cognition. In Cultural Models in Language and Thought.* Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinn, eds. Pp. 3–40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Randau, Robert
1911 *Les Algériennes.* Paris: Sansot.
- Rappaport, Joanne
1994 *Cumbe Reborn: An Andean Ethnography of History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoux, René
1880 *La démographie figurée de l'Algérie. Etude statistique des populations européennes qui habitent l'Algérie.* Paris: G. Masson.
- Roche, Anne, and Marie-Claude Taranger
1995 *Celles qui n'ont pas écrit. Récits de femmes dans la région marseillaise 1914–1945.* Aix-en-Provence: Edisud.
- Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity, eds.
1998 *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schnapper, Dominique
1998 *Community of Citizens.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Scott, James
1990 *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sherzer, Joel
1987 *A Discourse-Centered Approach to the Study of Language and Culture.* *American Anthropologist* 89(2):295–309.
- Shryock, Andrew
1997 *Nationalism and the Genealogical Imagination: Oral History and Textual Authority in Tribal Jordan.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Silverman, Maxim
1992 *Deconstructing the Nation: Immigration, Racism, and Citizenship in Modern France.* London: Routledge.
- Smith, Andrea
1996 *Citizenship in the Colony: Naturalization Law and Legal Assimilation in 19th Century Algeria.* *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 19(1):33–49.
2003 *Place, Replaced: Colonial Nostalgia and Pied-Noir Pilgrimages to Malta.* *Cultural Anthropology* 13(3):329–364.
- Stoler, Ann Laura
1989 *Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule.* *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31(1):134–161.
1992 *Sexual Affronts and Racial Frontiers: European Identities and the Cultural Politics of Exclusion in Colonial Southeast Asia.* *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34(3):514–551.
- Stoller, Paul
1995 *Embodying Colonial Memories: Spirit Possession, Power, and the Hauka in West Africa.* New York: Routledge.
- Strauss, Claudia
1990 *Who Gets Ahead? Cognitive Responses to Heteroglossia in American Political Culture.* *American Ethnologist* 17(2):312–328.
- Strauss, Claudia, and Naomi Quinn
1997 *A Cognitive Theory of Cultural Meaning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swedenburg, Ted
1995 *Memories of Revolt: The 1936–39 Rebellion and the Palestinian National Past.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tonkin, Elizabeth
1992 *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tulving, Endel
1983 *Elements of Episodic Memory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Urban, Greg
1991 *A Discourse-Centered Approach to Culture: Native South American Myths and Rituals.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Weber, Eugen
1976 *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870–1914.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Weil, Patrick
1991 *La France et ses étrangers: L'aventure d'une politique de l'immigration, 1938–1991.* Paris: Calmann-Lévy.
- Wihtol de Wenden, Catherine
1987 *Citoyenneté, nationalité et immigration.* Paris: Arcantère.
- Williams, Raymond
1977 *Marxism and Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn
1985 *Language Variation and Cultural Hegemony: Towards an Integration of Sociolinguistic and Social Theory.* *American Ethnologist* 12(4):738–748.
1989 *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

accepted July 11, 2003

final version submitted September 5, 2003

Andrea L. Smith
Department of Anthropology and Sociology
34 Marquis Hall
Lafayette College
Easton, PA 18042
smithal@lafayette.edu

