



How is Oral History Possible? On Linguistically Universal and Topically Specific Knowledge

Jakub Mlynář

To cite this article: Jakub Mlynář (2022) How is Oral History Possible? On Linguistically Universal and Topically Specific Knowledge, The Oral History Review, 49:1, 116-132, DOI: [10.1080/00940798.2022.2050412](https://doi.org/10.1080/00940798.2022.2050412)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00940798.2022.2050412>



Published online: 24 Mar 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 121



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



How is Oral History Possible? On Linguistically Universal and Topically Specific Knowledge

Jakub Mlynář

ABSTRACT

Conducting oral history interviews or using them as research and educational resources requires the (mostly tacit) background knowledge necessary for understanding an interview or its excerpts. Taking the topic of commemoration and remembrance as a case in point, and analyzing fifteen interviews in the Czech and Slovak languages from the USC Shoah Foundation's *Visual History Archive*, this article aims to consider the oral history interview as an interactional accomplishment. I argue that in producing oral histories, the interviewer and the interviewee draw on *linguistically universal* and *topically specific* knowledge, which are also the resources audiences use to grasp what the interview addresses. The article concludes with a discussion of the relationships between these notions and their connection to different temporalities of oral history interviews and levels of understanding. Finally, I outline future research directions and questions inspired by this framework. By studying the linguistic and interactional constitution of oral history interviews, we can arrive at a better understanding of the very nature of oral history that can inform the use of archived interviews in research and education.

KEYWORDS

commemoration;
conversation analysis;
ethnomethodology;
remembrance; social
interaction

In part because of increased access made possible through digital technologies, we have grown accustomed, in oral history, to *secondary analysis*—using archived interviews which were not conducted by the *end user* (a term I will use for the researcher, student, or other audience member listening to the recording or reading the transcript). With this approach, it is increasingly important to understand how people make sense of archived interviews for their own purposes, be it researching history, teaching or learning about the past, investigating human experience, or other aims. The background knowledge that a listener needs to be able to comprehend an interview or excerpt raises important questions about conducting oral histories and using them as research and educational resources, as well as the possibilities for and limitations of future reuse of archived oral history interviews in various cultural and social contexts.¹ Secondary analysis also raises the question of how much knowledge oral historians should assume end users have as we shape the comprehensibility of interviews while conducting, transcribing, or summarizing them, and producing contextualizing documentation.

The central aim of this article is to provide a conceptual scheme and exploratory analytical results for this direction of research. My main argument, principally informed by ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, springs from an understanding of the oral history interview as an *interactional accomplishment*.² Developed within sociology, ethnomethodology aims to describe and explicate the methods of practical reasoning and practical actions employed by members of society in everyday life and specialized settings.³ Ethnomethodology's distinctiveness within the broader field of social science,

and its potential value for research in oral history, lie in the detailed study of the endogenous maintenance of local situational order and the sequential organization of that order in real time. Eschewing preconceived and abstract theoretical frameworks, ethnomethodology discovers and examines the participants' (within the context of oral history, the interviewer's and the narrator's) own "procedures that for them and from their point of view are more or less taken for granted as right ways of doing things," and that the participants deem "not worth talking about" as part of their routine work.⁴ Importantly, the point is "not to arrange things conveniently but to find out how they are arranged"; the main purpose is to describe the witnessable detailed orderliness of social activities.⁵ An oral history interview is such an activity, with its own characteristic organization, accomplished through the actions of the interview participants.

The second approach informing the present article, conversation analysis, follows ethnomethodology in its aspiration to study everyday conversation (or *talk-in-interaction* more generally) as a social phenomenon that may be explored and investigated on its own terms, using the practical reasoning applied by the participants themselves while they are taking part in the production of the talk. Grounding its discoveries in meticulous analyses of audio and video recordings of a wide range of naturally occurring social settings, conversation analysis has produced a vast and consistent corpus of highly illuminating studies of the intrinsic organization of various social activities, including research interviews and witness testimonies.⁶

Applying the premises and principles of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis to oral history furnishes the fundamental insight that the life story told by the narrator inevitably comes out of her or his collaboration with the interviewer within the specific social setting of an oral history interview. The recorded interview's cogency as evidence of the past, as well as its power as a document of personal experience, "originates in the act of oral, face-to-face communication."⁷ The temporal intelligibility of the story is also maintained moment by moment as a collaborative "product" of the interaction between the narrator and interviewer (often referred to as "shared authority" by oral historians). This temporal intelligibility is accomplished gradually with regard to *narrative temporality* and *interaction temporality*; the former comprises the broader chronology of the story told (for example, "Later on we went into hiding . . ."), while the latter encompasses the local chronology of the ongoing interview (for example, "Later on I will tell you . . .").⁸ In other words, any interview recording is intelligible as a social object to an audience because it has been produced as intelligible by the participants themselves, for themselves and others, in the course of the interview as a social activity. This is not a given, although it is largely taken for granted by the interview participants as well as the end users conducting secondary analysis, such as teachers, scholars, or journalists. To grasp the meaning of an interview, an end user must be adequately competent in the tacit procedures that constitute the grounds for an interview's production. In this article, the participants' practices for producing an intelligible interview become the central subject matter. I aim to discuss the "seen but unnoticed" aspects of oral history interviews, oriented by the general question, How is oral history possible?⁹

As a case in point, I will focus on how remembrance and commemorative activities are recounted and discussed in digitally archived video recordings of oral history interviews with Holocaust survivors. The diversity of Holocaust commemoration and remembrance in global culture is a subject of vast interdisciplinary scholarship.¹⁰ For decades, historians,

anthropologists, sociologists, and others have researched cultural representations of the Holocaust in media, art, movies and literature; Holocaust commemoration at memorial sites and in ceremonies; and many other related themes.¹¹ Archived oral history interviews, as collaborative commemorative activities, reflect the broader social and cultural forms of Holocaust representation and remembering.¹² Moreover, oral histories can have immense educational value, as they convey relatable personal testimonies of direct witnesses of times past. Given that educators and scholars will soon have to rely exclusively on archived recordings of oral histories, under conditions of “digital de-contextualization”—the detachment of the interview from its original context—to access and present the narrated experiences of Holocaust survivors, it seems timely to consider what makes oral history interviews intelligible as accounts of the past.¹³

Formulating my general question through the complementary approaches of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, I aim to tackle several questions: How does the topic of commemoration and remembrance become a reasonable, ordinary part of an oral history interview? What makes this topic “expected” and “normal” for competent listeners? Just what constitutes such a listener’s “competence”? In my search for the answers, I set out to investigate how interviewers, narrators, and listeners routinely produce various forms of commemoration and remembrance, conceiving them as routine and natural interview topics within the domain of oral history. After providing illustrative examples of commemoration and remembrance, I outline the more general argument about the possibility of oral history as a social activity, underscoring the significance of my findings for the current praxis of oral history. In the concluding discussion, I suggest that some oral history practices related to commemoration and remembrance require *topically specific* knowledge in the form of historical background, while others belong to *linguistically universal* knowledge that is part of the listener’s language competence.

The Analyzed Materials

Given the aim of this paper, any oral history interview could yield answers to my questions. To establish a consistent and thematically unified case in point, I examined fifteen interviews from one of the largest collections of audio-visual oral history, the USC Shoah Foundation’s *Visual History Archive* (<http://vha.usc.edu/>, henceforth “VHA”). This database comprises nearly 55,000 video recordings of oral history interviews with genocide survivors and witnesses. The majority of the interviews were collected between 1994 and 2000, mainly in the USA and Europe, and focus on the Holocaust. The entire database is now globally available online in a limited form, and at several dozen licensed access points in its full version. Interviewers conducted all of the VHA interviews in a consistent manner, using the same methodological and technical standards. The unedited interview recordings are stored in the online database in their original language; the average length of an interview is 135 minutes. Most of the archived interviews (nearly 50 percent) are in English, but more than thirty-five other languages are also represented.

The USC Shoah Foundation conducted the interviews with the general aim of obtaining the “entire life history” of the individuals interviewed.¹⁴ Despite the life-story approach, interviewers and narrators focused primarily on the Holocaust, while “life before” and “life

after” play a somewhat supplementary role.¹⁵ The outcome is that the VHA interviews capture more than just memories of the Holocaust and World War II as strictly delimited historical periods.

The interviews therefore yield numerous insights on postwar commemoration and remembrance of the traumatic events as aspects of the survivors’ life stories. As part of a broader research project focusing on the inclusion of the Jewish population into postwar Czechoslovak and Polish societies, my article draws from analysis of thirteen Czech and two Slovak VHA interviews related to the sociohistorical situation after 1945. I selected interviews annotated with the database’s keywords “commemoration” and “commemoration events,” as well as “writing,” “survivor reunions,” and “Holocaust education.”¹⁶ The annotation and cataloging process was conducted by the USC Shoah Foundation at the turn of the twenty-first century, using a hierarchically structured thesaurus of more than 65,000 keywords. The thesaurus of keywords and its routine usefulness for researchers searching and browsing VHA’s database are examples of the taken-for-granted natural intelligibility of the oral history interviews.¹⁷ To annotate particular segments of oral history interviews with keywords, the coder has to recognize a stretch of talk as pertinent and decide ad hoc whether this stretch of talk is significant as an instance of the more general topic encapsulated in the keyword and its definition.¹⁸ Annotating or indexing the contents of archived oral histories and using keywords as tools for secondary analysis presupposes a familiarity with the recounted historical events and a methodological sense of the fundamental principles of oral history interviewing.¹⁹ The “code-ability” of the cited excerpts with terms such as *commemoration* or *survivor reunions* relates more specifically to the subject matter of this article. How is oral history possible as a situated talk that recognizably and evidently relates to “the past” and its constitutive elements?

Narrating Commemoration and Remembrance in Oral History Interviews

In the interview recordings I analyzed, commemorative and remembrance activities are reflected in a variety of ways. Narrators’ commemoration manifests at a *personal* level (writings, research, site visits), a *collective* level (reunions, meetings, associations), and a *public* level (commemorative events and sites, education, media). These interviews also reveal commemoration as a phenomenon with specific *textual* (symbolic), *material* (physical), and *communal* (social) aspects. Despite these delineations, the narrative reality of commemoration in these oral histories cannot easily be characterized as one or another level or aspect.

In the analysis that follows, I will use the term *commemorative section* to refer to particular parts of the recordings. A commemorative section is an interview segment in which the participants deal with commemoration and remembrance as a topic. These are situations in a narrator’s postwar life in which experiences related to the Holocaust were brought up (such as private conversations or educational presentations), or provided a basis for social relations (such as survivor friendships or reunions held after World War II).

An example of a commemorative section appears in extract 1, taken from the final minutes of the interview, when the narrator discusses survivor reunions. Reunions focused on development and maintenance of the collective identity of the group of people who shared an experience during World War II, such as incarceration in a particular camp. In extract 1, the narrator speaks about his experience in the Auschwitz II-Birkenau death

camp. He explains how prisoners were forced to watch an execution of a Soviet prisoner of war.

Extract 1²⁰

- 1 N So the *lagerälteste* pulled out a gun and ... even before he ...
 2 was dropped into the box he shot him so he was shot ... and ...
 3 hanged so I remember this quite well. So- And ... Otherwise
 4 we were living collectively in the camp, we got so acquainted that
 5 even after fifty years we are meeting. Thanks ... to Johnny Freund,
 6 b'cause after the war we all went our different ways, I stayed here
 7 but most of those who survived, but even today fifty of them are
 8 alive, which is a great and respectable number, although it hap-
 9 every year someone ... now ... dies by normal death, so thanks to
 10 Johnny Freund ... from Canada, who is bringing us together and
 11 does so every two years, or every year as it suits us the reunions of
 12 so-called Birkenau Boys, so there is even a book with all the
 13 photographs and where ... the people ... live also thanks to him. So
 14 even after fifty years we who lived there together ... we are getting
 15 together. Well.
- 16 I This is the end of the second tape of the interview with Mr. J.P.
 [end of tape]
 [beginning of tape]
- 17 I The third tape of the interview with Mr. J.P., Prague, Czech
 18 Republic, 1 April 1997.
- 19 N Well as I said, we are meeting even after fifty years. However, the
 20 mistake is that we did not start meeting earlier. Earlier means ten
 21 years, twenty, thirty years after the end of the second world war.
 22 And that in fact the organization was created only about five years
 23 ago. This way it happened that at the first reunion after so many
 24 years we could not even recognize each other. Of course
 25 everything was cleared up later on. But let's return to the
 26 environment of the *männerlager*. There I was friends with an
 27 inmate, well my friend, K.S., who also came back and we are in
 28 contact until now. [...]

In this extract, we can note certain recurring aspects of talking about survivor reunions as a form of Holocaust commemoration. The temporal and geographic framing allows the narrator to present the reunions as remarkable events that overcome distances in time and space: in lines 5 to 7 he explains that the survivors settled in distant parts of the world, but that they nevertheless travel for reunions. Other commemorative sections similarly recall how many survivors met for reunions (lines 7 to 8), linking the decreasing number of participants (lines 8 to 9) to the passage of time. In the narrative in extract 1 above, the narrator is speaking about the delay before the formal organization of survivor reunions. Other narrators in my collection also speak about reunions as well as informal and even random encounters with other Holocaust survivors (as we will see below).

As illustrated by the extract, commemoration and remembrance becomes a natural, ordinary component of the narration in these interviews. Listeners as well as interviewers and narrators likely understand them as expected themes within the interview.²¹ Further, end users can easily grasp the content and meaning of these passages without particular trouble, although the extracts might well provoke numerous questions. Thus, in the next section, I turn to a seemingly simple question: How so? That is, just how is the natural intelligibility of commemorative sections *as* commemorative sections—the fact that a listener easily comprehends the discussion of commemoration or remembrance—achieved by the interview participants?

Commemoration and Remembrance in Oral History Interviews: Analysis

How do interview participants achieve, both for themselves and an imagined future audience, the intelligibility of commemorative sections? Such natural and routine intelligibility of oral history makes it possible to conduct historical studies or simply to listen to an interview and understand what it is all about at a given point.²² Although the problem of intersubjective understanding is not specific to oral history *per se*—it relates to any historical materials—audiovisually recorded interviews have particular features that allow us to ask unique questions. Unlike a memoir, an oral history interview consists of the real-time interaction between interviewer and narrator. Drawing inspiration from ethnomethodology, I pose Harold Garfinkel's question: "How [do] members concert their activities to produce and exhibit the coherence, cogency, analysis, consistency, order, meaning, reason, methods—which are locally, reflexively accountable orderlinesses—in and as of their ordinary lives together in detail?"²³ The "concerting" of members' practices and activities consists of the features that distinguish oral history, such as the interviewer letting the narrator speak in very long turns, often spanning many minutes, before the next question. This turn-taking organization is specific to research interviews and not common in other speech-exchange systems such as everyday conversations.²⁴ An oral history interview is heard as comprehensible and orderly by end users because the narrator's narrative was comprehensible and orderly during the course of its production to both the interviewer and narrator. To comprehend the interview, end users draw on social competences of their own that overlap with the competences employed by the oral history interview participants.

The USC Shoah Foundation interviewers methodically conducted these oral histories as life stories following a chronological framework, with narrators recounting events in the order in which they occurred. The interviews thus progress from a beginning to an end, from early childhood and family background to the period in which the interview was recorded. Within this specific structure of an oral history interview, commemorative sections occur routinely toward the end of the interview's chronology. In addition, they occur as digressions from the chronological framework of the interview. Such digressions are typical among survivor interviews, which are, as psychologist David P. Boder notes, "nearly always laden with . . . disruptions of chronological continuity by flash-backs."²⁵ I use this dichotomy between commemorative sections as digressions and commemorative sections in the concluding parts of the interview to organize the analysis that follows.

Commemorative Sections as Digressions from an Interview's Chronological Organization

This section focuses on commemorative sections occurring during earlier sections of an interview, outside of the chronological order of events, as part of the life story component to which they commemoratively refer. In these instances, the narrator intertwines the commemoration with the events commemorated, and remembrance connects with the objects of memory, which are mutually dependent and consequential in the immediate sequentiality of the interview.

To examine this structural location of commemorative sections, let us return to extract 1 above. Which practices does the narrator use to make it clear to others that he is speaking about commemoration? The narrator transitions to the commemorative section when saying “so- and . . . otherwise” (line 3). This is a cluster of indicators of a topic shift, an “in-situ announcement” that is followed by a summary formulation—“we were living collectively in the camp” (line 4)—that in turn serves as a preface to the commemorative section focusing on survivor reunions as meetings of former inmates of said camp.²⁶ Further on, the narrator marks the passage of time, saying “after fifty years” (line 5, occurring again in lines 14 and 19). Counting years and using them as structural elements is a “members’ measurement system,” to use sociologist Harvey Sacks’s term, making it clear to competent listeners that the narrator is not speaking about the World War II period anymore, but about the time of the interview recording.²⁷ Similar work occurs with what linguists call *deictic utterances*—expressions whose meaning is dependent on the context in which they are used—such as “today” (line 7) and “about five years ago” (lines 22–23), and use of the present tense, first appearing in line 5 (“we are meeting”).²⁸ After the tape change between lines 16 and 17, the narrator reestablishes the commemorative section with the tying device “as I said,” pointing to the final moments of the preceding tape and then a summary formulation “we are meeting even after fifty years” in line 19. The narrator then brings the commemorative section to completion in line 25, restoring the life story’s previous chronology by stating a “return to the environment of the *männerlager*” (line 26).

A similar pattern appears in other cases. In extract 2, the narrator speaks about his experience of the liberation of the Gunskirchen concentration camp in Austria by US soldiers. After months of starvation, the liberated prisoners broke into a food warehouse and started to consume the supplies they found there.

Extract 2²⁹

- 1 I had quite . . . quite severe diarrhea yes, but it wasn't so tragic because
- 2 one could die from the sugar, because sugar for u- hm well we did not
- 3 know sugar, right, as such. Well and . . . when we now met after the war, by
- 4 coincidence after two- two years ago when we were in that Gunskirchen,
- 5 and we met there three boys, one came from America, an M.K., one
- 6 came from Venezuela, an O.F., and for me it was the closest.
- [several lines omitted]
- 7 And . . . this M.K., he was completely obsessed by the thought “look,
- 8 where is the warehouse, where is the storage” . . . you see . . . all the time
- 9 we were looking for the warehouse [smiles] you see so . . . today we
- 10 found that the warehouse was not at all that large, that it was- well- it

11 remained almost the same, warehouse again, it is a bit more surrounded by
 12 buildings but . . . eh . . . he remembered the moment you know when we
 13 broke in and we just started . . . to liquidate it so that he also . . . that was
 14 just his “where is the warehouse, we must find the warehouse”, heh heh
 15 . . . well and so that was in fact now I have already got to . . . the end
 16 of the war you see, and from there we- eh I got to Bratislava . . . we
 17 went there on foot . . .

As in extract 1, the narrator in extract 2 marks the temporal shift from the more distant past to the recent past in several ways. First, the particle “well” (*no* in Czech) in line 3 indicates a shift in topic.³⁰ We can also note the temporal deixis “now” in line 3, which helps shift the narrative time to the present. This is shortly followed and supported by “after the war,” also in line 3, introducing the vernacular periodization of prewar, wartime, and postwar eras, which provides the basic structure of the narrative time. Furthermore, in line 4, we can see yet another marker—“two years ago”—which signals once again that what we are about to hear next is related to a quite recent past, rather than the distant past that has been narrated up to that point. An explicit mention of the act of “remembering” in line 12 substantiates the interpretation. This commemorative section concludes in lines 14 and 15 with laughter and a long two-second pause, followed by yet another occurrence of “well” and the narrator’s statement that he had “already got to . . . the end of the war,” shifting back to the original narrative chronology and his memories of the camp’s liberation.

Although the commemorative sections describing activities such as survivor reunions are often related to the narrative present, this is not always the case. Another example, from an interview with A. B., recalls the period close to the end of the war; the narrator describes bad weather and overall conditions in a field hospital in the Slovak mountains, close to Krížna peak, surrounded by the German army at the time.

Extract 3³¹

1 There was nowhere to hide, it was raining heavily all the time, fog, there
 2 was not even a piece of wood so that we could just make only a small fire
 3 and eat something warm, eh . . . I had in that time . . . yet another episode
 4 that is worth mentioning. I had in that time more than 40 [degrees
 5 Celsius] elevated temperature. There was a military hospital and I even
 6 got one bed for myself because mostly there were two to a bed. And at
 7 night a Jewish family from Banská Bystrica came with a little girl, they
 8 had no place for her to rest. So I was sitting in the bed and they put the girl
 9 next to my legs. That was in the year 44 in eh . . . towards the end of
 10 October. In the year 1965 I visited Israel for the first time . . . and they
 11 brought me to visit a family. So well there eh parents, and there was a cute
 12 how old was she forty-four sixty-five seventeen years eighteen years?
 13 Nineteen years . . . Well. Cute girl and the girl suddenly talked to me in
 14 Slovak and asks me whether I was at Krížna at the end of October 1944. I
 15 say “yes I was”. And whether I had lain in a be- like in a military
 16 hospital. “Yes I did”. And whether I remembered that a family came there
 17 with a small girl. I say “yes I remember very well”. Well and to that she
 18 says “and the small girl, that’s me”. What a coincidence, that one has even

19 such experiences during his- during his life. Well but not to make a detour,
 20 in eh at Krížna they decided that part of our unit would be incorporated in
 21 the Žižka Brigade. [...]

In this excerpt, the narrator begins the commemorative section with a story preface in lines 3–4: “yet another episode that is worth mentioning,” which happened “in that time” (line 3).³² Furthermore, the narrator notes a specific year and month in lines 9 to 10: October 1944. This inclusion of the date appears to serve two functions here; in addition to the temporal-structural function, providing orientation to the listener, it reappears in line 14 as an aspect of personal identification during the unexpected encounter in Israel. The narrator contrasts it with another specific year, 1965, in line 10, which was when he first visited Israel and once again encountered the girl that he had briefly met more than twenty years earlier. Also here, as in extract 2, remembering is explicitly mentioned as an activity (in lines 16 and 17); yet the commemoration described here by the narrator is somewhat different because it happens only twenty years after the end of World War II. The narrator concludes the commemorative section—in this case the recollection of a “random encounter”—with a travel metaphor used to gloss the narrative structure (“not to make a detour,” line 19) and reintroduction of the location of the field hospital (“at Krížna,” line 20), which both concurrently serve as devices for returning to the narrative chronology of the final months of World War II.

Commemorative Sections in the Concluding Parts of the Interview

Given the VHA’s protocol that interviews “generally follow the chronology of the narrator’s experience,” it is no surprise that commemorative sections tend to occur most often in the concluding and reflective parts of the interviews.³³ As an example of this structural location, consider the commemorative section provided here as extract 4, which is taken from the final minutes of the interview.

Extract 4³⁴

1 ... friends are scattered who were with me in the sixth battalion are
 2 scattered all around the world, even in the Easter Islands there was one,
 3 that is Southeast Asia, from eh ... Australia further to the southeast, they
 4 were meeting in Israel, the boys who lived abroad, during totality we did
 5 not endorse that too much, as we didn’t dare. Hm, after eighty-nine we
 6 have ... four boys decided to call together the locals, first we started
 7 meeting those who live in Slovakia, then we called together in seventy- I
 8 apologize seven two ninety-two a worldwide reunion in Piešťany, where
 9 there were boys from Australia, Israel, South America, Western Europe,
 10 we met in Piešťany in hotel Váh, beautiful reunion, imagine after 51 years,
 11 after 51 years old men get together, they hug each other and cry. Isn’t it
 12 touching? “You are alive? I thought that you ... died a long time ago.”
 13 That was just a wonderful meeting. [...]

This excerpt presents a commemorative section that becomes part of the narrator's speech without the direct involvement of the interviewer. In other cases, commemorative sections toward the end of the interview occur in direct response to the interviewer's question (see extract 5), or are developed during an extended discussion of a related subject, such as Jewish identity, again initiated by the interviewer (see extract 6):

Extract 5³⁵

- 1 I Eh have you been in to- did you meet afterwards maybe even
 2 someone with whom you were eh . . . in Lípa after the war?
 3 N Yeah we used to go regularly, we had- and now there is a meeting
 4 on the eleventh of June. There are not so many of us anymore of us-
 5 still alive . . . so we will meet on the eleventh of June there . . . in
 6 hotel Olšanka. I don't know how many people are going to arrive.
 7 I And how many of you were there at the last meeting?
 8 N [leans forward] Excuse me?
 9 I How many of you were there at the last meeting?
 10 N Well it's still less and less. I even- Later I did not even go there
 11 because there is not much to talk about, those are old things that
 12 we already discussed . . . and otherwise everyone has different
 13 interests well but . . . now on the eleventh of June it will perhaps be
 14 the final meeting with those from Lípa. So I will go there and the
 15 others hopefully also.

Extract 6³⁶

- 1 The girls that we used to be friends with in the camp we were in contact,
 2 in fact about once . . . a month. We were alternating hosting, so . . . but
 3 not from the beginning, we all had the feeling we have to get rid of it, we
 4 have to forget it, later girls had g- kids, so eh eh they had a lot of work,
 5 jobs, children, so only after years we s . . . started regularly getting together like
 6 that. But eh . . . in contact we were but not like that all together. And we g-
 7 meet every- always we had a reunion around the time of, hm, the liberation.
 8 Fifteenth of April, so around then we always met once a year. Of course
 9 now there are always fewer and fewer of us, well. But it still keeps . . . functioning.

In extract 4, the speaker uses the vernacular periodization device “during totality” (line 4, referring to the years of communist regime in Czechoslovakia, 1948 to 1989), as well as the specific years “eighty-nine” (line 5) and “ninety-two” (line 8), to maintain the chronological order of his narrative. In extract 5, the interviewer guides the chronology with her specific questions and formulates points in time with the terms “afterwards” and “after the war” (lines 1–2). Extract 6 starts with a spatial term, “in the camp,” that also serves as a time marker (line 1), pointing not only to the specific place but also to incarceration as an episode in a life story; after the narrator mentions the frequency of meetings “about once a month” (lines 1–2), she adds the disclaimer, “but not right from the beginning” (lines 2–3). A temporal indicator for how a listener should understand when this “beginning” era was occurs when the narrator states it was “only after years” (line 5) that the reunions started to take place.

As in the previous form of structural-temporal location in the course of the interview, the narrator and the interviewer work together to make the talk meaningful and comprehensible not only for themselves in the moment, but also for the future audiences who encounter the interview as an archived object. Although the interviewer is not overtly present in many of these excerpts—with the exception of extract 5—it is important to realize that “working together” also involves listening quietly at a given moment. The interviewer’s invisibility and silence during the recording is her or his continuous accomplishment. The interviewer could have done otherwise—interrupt, ask a question, respond audibly, sigh—but did not. Moreover, although the interview covered the time through the “post-war period,” according to the previously established narrative chronology, interviewer and narrator subtly work together to maintain the temporal structure in order for it to remain intelligible. We see similar procedures at work in the three excerpts presented above as well. This underscores the fact that the structural distinction of “concluding parts” and “temporal digression” is only useful, perhaps, to locate the relevant utterances for analysis and organize findings. Yet the temporal structure of the narrated story is progressively sustained during the entirety of the recording, in and through each next utterance.

Linguistically Universal and Topically Specific Knowledge

While participating in an oral history interview and speaking about remembering and commemoration, both interviewers and narrators invoke a taken-for-granted “stock of knowledge” with a variety of specific practices and phrases such as those described in the previous section.³⁷ However, these practices do not all have the same impact on the intelligibility of an interview for the end user listening at some later time. I argue that some of the speech practices used to produce commemorative sections in the course of the interview are related to *topically specific* knowledge that requires a certain background in history, while others belong to *linguistically universal* knowledge that is part of the competences of any speaker of a given language. In other words, certain utterances can make the commemorative sections comprehensible to listeners without drawing from particular knowledge of historical events, their sequences and relationships.

A clear example of linguistically universal features of framing, introducing, and maintaining the commemorative sections is use of the grammatical present tense and temporal deixis (for example, “five years ago” in lines 22–23 of extract 1, or “now” in line 3 of extract 2). On the other hand, topically specific knowledge includes practices such as mentioning specific years (for example, “after eighty-nine” in line 5 of extract 4) and invoking vernacular periodization (for example, “after the war” in line 6 of extract 1, or in line 3 of extract 2) presumed to be part of the common knowledge of the past in a given culture. In addition, these forms can work in tandem: as lines 20 and 21 in extract 1 suggest, the historically specific knowledge (“ten years, twenty, thirty years after the end of the second world war”) can be invoked as an overt explanation of the linguistically universal (“earlier”). Both the interviewer and the narrator routinely employ such practices, which become the unquestioned constitutive and reflexive properties of the interview as a social activity. However, it is precisely this reflexivity of the situated practices that might not be immediately and tacitly available to contemporary audiences watching the archived interview recording, or short decontextualized excerpts from it. The oral history interview

becomes an interpretable object, while also remaining a tangible trace of a lived situation—the particular situated linguistic interaction between the interviewer and narrator. As suggested above, each archived oral history interview is simultaneously a communicative event, a material object, and part of the public commemoration. In this regard, reflecting upon the complex intertwining of linguistically universal and topically specific knowledge can provide grounds for novel developments in oral history.

Making Sense of (Digital) Oral History

The challenge posed by the need for background knowledge to understand any oral-historical material is accentuated by the recent digital turn in oral history, but it is by no means exclusive to the digital age.³⁸ Describing the process of annotating the interviews he had collected in 1946, David P. Boder aptly noted that “such procedure requires from the coder an intelligent penetration into the continuity of the interview.”³⁹ In this article, I have argued that we can unravel the ways in which people make sense of oral history through a detailed analysis of interviews informed by ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. Through this approach, one can be sensitized toward the constitutive elements of oral history interviews, such as the narrative and linguistic practices that are so commonplace and ordinary that they tend to remain hidden in plain sight. To borrow C. Wright Mills’s fitting phrase, oral history practitioners and end users can perhaps “come to feel as if suddenly awakened in a house with which they had only supposed themselves to be familiar.”⁴⁰

The very possibility of oral history as an intelligible social activity is grounded in tacit cultural knowledge, enacted and embodied in concrete interview settings. At the end of the previous section, I proposed the conceptual duality of topically specific and linguistically universal knowledge. This duality in turn establish the basis for *adequate understanding* and *vague understanding*. A vague understanding occurs when the theme, context, and interactional patterns of the interview recording are foreign to the person listening to an interview; the listener does not possess *any* knowledge necessary for its interpretation. In contrast, *adequate understanding* refers to the situation in which a listener is a fully competent member of the interview itself and knows the theme and context *exactly* as well as the interviewer and narrator. These two contrasting notions, and their interrelations with the other two conceptual distinctions (narrative temporality and interactional temporality, specific knowledge and universal knowledge), could help us further elaborate how end users practically interpret oral histories.

In order to understand what is being said in an interview recording, listeners must be able to orient themselves to the complex ordering of knowledge pertinent to the historical situation under discussion. The narrator and the interviewer interact, laying the foundation of the narrative temporality; they work together to establish the frame in which the life story is collaboratively produced. Similarly, linguistically universal skills are the basis by which we are able to see where topically specific knowledge might be missing, or indeed is not required for proper understanding. Since every oral history interview is necessarily an instance of situated interaction among interviewer, narrator, and the end user listening in, a number of implicit presuppositions are embedded and embodied in an interview’s creation. Commemoration and remembrance as topics in oral history interviews point to the significance of the remembered events given the time lag between the remembered

events and the act of remembering. They also reformulate the issue of secondary analysis of oral history through the distinct contexts of participants (narrators and interviewers) and end users (researchers, teachers, and students).

What, then, does this article tell us about oral history that could otherwise be missed? What have we learned? First, I hope to have introduced and illustrated an original and potentially fruitful way of looking at oral history interviews that enables us to pose novel questions and employ more complex analyses. The perspective offered in this article opens avenues for further research that should include inquiry into the relevance of linguistic competences of universal knowledge and the historical competences of specific knowledge. How are such competences, and the lack thereof, embodied and invoked in classroom interaction, in archival research activities, or in online oral history platforms? And how could oral history methodologies be transformed to address the duality of linguistically universal and topically specific knowledge? Furthermore, by studying the linguistic and interactional constitution of oral history interviews, we can arrive at a better understanding of the very nature of oral history that can inform and illuminate the use of digital archived interviews in research and education. Ultimately, it can also enrich our comprehension of the interactional constitution of *the past* as a culturally grounded phenomenon, pointing to humans' innate affiliation with temporality—in Marcel Proust's words, "the incalculable proportions of absence and presence of mind, of recollection and forgetfulness which go to form the human intelligence."⁴¹

Acknowledgements

This article is a result of grant no. 16-01775Y, Inclusion of the Jewish Population into Postwar Czechoslovak and Polish Societies, funded by the Czech Science Foundation. All interviews were accessed at the Malach Center for Visual History, Charles University, thanks to the LINDAT/CLARIAH-CZ project (LM2018101; formerly LM2010013, LM2015071). I would like to thank Karolína Bukovská, Jonas Bakkeli Eide, and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions on earlier versions of the text. I also appreciate Janneken Smucker's assistance in her editorial role at *Oral History Review*, which helped to improve the readability of this paper.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes

1. See Joanna Bornat, "A Second Take: Revisiting Interviews with a Different Purpose," *Oral History* 31, no. 1 (2003): 47–53; Louise Corti and Paul Thompson, "Secondary Analysis of Archived Data," in *Qualitative Research Practice*, eds. C. Seale et al. (London: Sage, 2004), 297–313; Janet Heaton, *Reworking Qualitative Data* (London: Sage, 2004); Katja Roller, "Towards the 'Oral' in Oral History: Using Historical Narratives in Linguistics," *Oral History* 43, no. 1 (2015): 73–84.
2. See Elliot G. Mishler, *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986); Lorenza Mondada, "Video Recording as the Reflexive Preservation-Configuration of Phenomenal Features for Analysis," in *Video Analysis*, eds. H. Knoblauch et al. (Bern, CH: Peter Lang, 2006), 51–68. *Ethnomethodology* is an approach to the study of human sociality that emerged in the sociology of the 1950s from the work of Harold Garfinkel;

- in the 1960s, ethnomethodology inspired the establishment of conversation(al) analysis by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. See Harold Garfinkel, *Studies in Ethnomethodology* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967); Garfinkel, *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working Out Durkheim's Aphorism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002); Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson, "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking in Conversation," *Language* 50, no. 4, 1 (1974), doi 10.2307/412243; Harvey Sacks, *Lectures on Conversation* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1992); Anne W. Rawls, "Garfinkel's Conception of Time," *Time and Society* 14, no. 2–3 (2005), doi 10.1177/0961463X05055132.
3. Although ethnomethodology and conversation analysis share historical origins and important epistemological and methodological principles, they have been developing in somewhat alternative and not always compatible ways since the 1970s. However, for the purpose of this paper and the clarity of its argument for oral history, I conceive ethnomethodology and conversation analysis as two sides of one coin, as mutually relevant and constituting a singular field of research. For thorough discussions of the historical and contemporary relationship between ethnomethodology and conversation analysis see John Heritage, *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1984); Michael Lynch, "Garfinkel, Sacks and Formal Structures: Collaborative Origins, Divergences and the History of Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis," *Human Studies* 42, no. 2 (2019): 183–198.
 4. Harold Garfinkel, *Studies*, 191; Michael Lynch, Eric Livingston and Harold Garfinkel, "Temporal Order in Laboratory Work," in *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*, eds. K. D. Knorr-Cetina and M. Mulkay (London: Sage, 1983), 208.
 5. Harvey Sacks, "Everyone Has to Lie," in *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Use*, eds. B. G. Blount and M. Sanches (New York: Academic Press, 1975), 66.
 6. See Kathryn Roulston, "Close Encounters of the 'CA' Kind: A Review of Literature Analysing Talk in Research Interviews," *Qualitative Research* 6, no. 4 (2006), 515–534. On witness testimonies, see J. Maxwell Atkinson and Paul Drew, *Order in Court: The Organisation of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings* (London: Macmillan, 1979); Michael Lynch, "Law Courts as Perspicuous Sites for Ethnomethodological Investigations," in *Orders of Ordinary Action: Respecifying Sociological Knowledge*, eds. S. Hester and D. Francis (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007), 107–119.
 7. Eva M. McMahan, *Elite Oral History Discourse: A Study of Cooperation and Coherence* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1989), 5.
 8. For a more thorough discussion of these two interview layers, see Jakub Mlynář, "I'll Tell You Later On': Proleptic and Analeptic Tying Devices in Oral History Interviews," *Narrative Inquiry* 30, no. 1 (2020): 161–184, doi 10.1075/ni.18020.mly.
 9. This investigative focus is appropriated from Garfinkel's classic exposition (*Studies*, pp. 35–38), asking "how any . . . common sense world is possible"; Garfinkel in turn was echoing Simmel's fundamental question, "How is society possible?" See Georg Simmel, "How Is Society Possible?," *American Journal of Sociology* 16, no. 3 (1910): 372–391.
 10. For example, see Judith T. Baumel, "'In Everlasting Memory': Individual and Communal Holocaust Commemoration in Israel," *Israel Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1995), doi 10.1080/13517129508719342; William F. S. Miles, "Post-Communist Holocaust Commemoration in Poland and Germany," *Journal of Holocaust Education* 9, no. 1 (2000), doi 10.1080/17504902.2000.11087098; Oren B. Stier, *Committed to Memory: Cultural Mediations of the Holocaust* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003); Oren Meyers, Eyal Zandberg, and Motti Neiger, "Prime Time Commemoration: An Analysis of Television Broadcasts on Israel's Memorial Day for the Holocaust and the Heroism," *Journal of Communication* 59, no. 3 (2009), doi 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2009.01424.x; Aleida Assmann, "The Holocaust—A Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community," in *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, eds. A. Assmann and S. Conrad (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 97–117; Debarati Sanyal, *Memory and Complicity: Migrations of Holocaust Remembrance* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015).

11. For example, see David Cesarani, ed., *After Eichmann: Collective Memory and the Holocaust since 1961* (London: Routledge, 2005); Jean-Marc Dreyfus and Marcel Stoeltzer, "Holocaust Memory in the Twenty-First Century: Between National Reshaping and Globalisation," *European Review of History/Revue européenne d'histoire* 18, no. 1 (2011), doi 10.1080/13507486.2011.543579; Oren Meyers, Eyal Zandberg, and Motti Neiger, *Communicating Awe: Media Memory and Holocaust Commemoration* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); Diana I. Popescu and Tanja Schult, eds., *Revisiting Holocaust Representation in the Post-Witness Era* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Jeffrey Shandler, *Holocaust Memory in the Digital Age: Survivors' Stories and New Media Practices* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2017).
12. Elizabeth Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Eva McMahan and Kim Lacy Rogers, eds., *Interactive Oral History Interviewing* (London: Routledge, 1994); Deborah Schiffrin, "Linguistics as History: Oral History as Discourse," in *Discourse and Beyond*, eds. D. Tannen and J. E. Alatis (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2003), 84–113; Anna Sheftel and Stacey Zembrzycki, "Professionalizing Survival: The Politics of Public Memory among Holocaust Survivor-Educators in Montreal," *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* 12, no. 2 (2013), doi 10.1080/14725886.2013.796157.
13. Cord Pagenstecher, "Testimonies in Digital Environments: Comparing and (De-)contextualising Interviews with Holocaust Survivor Anita Lasker-Wallfisch," *Oral History* 46, no. 2 (2018): 109–118.
14. USC Shoah Foundation, "Interviewer Guidelines," <https://sfi.usc.edu/content/interviewer-guidelines> (accessed December 30, 2021), 15.
15. There are many examples of scholarly work that succeeds more convincingly in achieving the aim of capturing "life stories," going into survivors' personal experience in much greater detail, often interviewing them repeatedly. See, for example, Henry Greenspan, *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors: Beyond Testimony*, 2nd ed. (St. Paul, MN: Paragon House, 2010); Mark Roseman, *A Past in Hiding: Memory and Survival in Nazi Germany* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2001); Anna Sheftel, "Talking and Not Talking about Violence: Challenges in Interviewing Survivors of Atrocity as Whole People," *Oral History Review* 45, no. 2 (2019): 288–303, doi 10.1093/ohr/ohy057. I would like to thank one of the reviewers for guiding me towards some of these studies. The VHA is distinct from some later oral history projects that have focused on the postwar era by, for example, interviewing members of the second generation and investigating the *remembrance* of the Holocaust rather than *the events themselves*. According to the VHA interview guidelines, roughly 60% of the interview was supposed to be about the World War II period, 20% about the prewar period, and 20% about the postwar period; see Noah Shenker, "Through the Lens of the Shoah: The Holocaust as a Paradigm for Documenting Genocide Testimonies," *History and Memory* 28, no. 1 (2016): 153, doi 10.2979/histmemo.28.1.141. As with any instructed action, the actual interviews diverge from this prescription in many interesting ways, but these variations are not a focal point of this paper.
16. *Commemoration* is defined in the VHA as "personal or governmental efforts to memorialize individuals or sites of persecution after liberation and/or after wartime hostilities in the context of genocides and/or crimes against humanity." *Commemoration events* are defined as "holidays and events (national, regional, private, etc.) memorializing aspects of war, genocides, and/or crimes against humanity." *Writing* is, for the VHA's purposes, conceptualized as "the act of writing and the various forms of written composition, including such literary works as memoirs, poems, musical composition, novels and plays"; *survivor reunions* are defined as "formal or informal reunions of genocide survivors (including random encounters) after liberation"; and finally, *Holocaust education* is described as "the organized component of an academic curriculum that is designed to inform students, at any given level of study, about events which occurred during the Holocaust. Topics often include the rise of Nazism, as well as events before and during the Nazi attempt to annihilate the Jewish population of Europe. Often associated with these programs are lectures by survivors of the Holocaust, documentary films,

discussions of Holocaust literature, and studies of phenomena such as bigotry and intolerance.” All definitions come from the thesaurus in the online VHA user interface (<http://vha.usc.edu>); they can be retrieved via the “index search” function, available to registered users after they log in.

17. I am grateful to one of the anonymous reviewers for bringing the problematic nature of keywords to my attention, and to another reviewer for encouraging me to explain this aspect in more detail.
18. See Garfinkel’s penetrating discussion of “following coding instructions” in his *Studies*, pp. 18–24. Suchman’s study of the practices of categorization of legal documents contributes further relevant insights and literature references: Lucy Suchman, “Making a Case: ‘Knowledge’ and ‘Routine’ Work in Document Production,” in *Workplace Studies: Recovering Work Practice and Informing Systems Design*, eds. P. Luff, J. Hindmarsh, and C. Heath (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 29–45.
19. See also Jakub Mlynář, Jiří Kocián, and Karin Hofmeisterová, “How ‘Tools’ Produce ‘Data’: Searching in a Large Digital Corpus of Audiovisual Holocaust Testimonies,” in *Jewish Studies in the Digital Age*, eds. M. Chesner et al. (forthcoming from De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2022).
20. Interview with J. P., ID 29923, conducted in Prague on April 1, 1997, by Eva Benešová, USC Shoah Foundation, *Visual History Archive*, tape 2 of 4, 27:02–28:22, and tape 3 of 4, 00:00–01:10, transcribed and translated from Czech by the author. For all extracts in this article, I provide the interview’s VHA archival number, as well as the tape number, time, and original language. Square brackets indicate the transcriber’s comments, and ellipses indicate notable pauses in speech; *N* indicates speech of the narrator, and *I* indicates speech of the interviewer. The VHA interviews were recorded on thirty-minute tapes, and this structure of the material has been maintained in the online database. It is also occasionally relevant for the participants of the interview, as we can see in lines 16–17 of extract 1, and in line 19 when the narrator refers back to the previous tape, stating “as I said.” I transcribed all of the excerpts shared here as part of the analysis. I worked with the original video recordings available in the VHA. The purpose of the transcripts presented here is to make the analytically relevant segments of the archival interview recordings available to the reader.
21. John Heritage, “Analyzing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an Overhearing Audience,” in *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol. 3, ed. Teun A. van Dijk (London: Academic Press, 1985), 95–117.
22. See also Martin Hájek, “Whose Story? Whose Memory? Multiple Readings of Oral-History Life Accounts from the Socialist Era,” in *Constructing Narratives of Continuity and Change: A Transdisciplinary Approach to Researching Lives*, eds. H. Reid and L. West (London: Routledge, 2014), 66–78.
23. Harold Garfinkel, “Respecification: Evidence for Locally Produced, Naturally Accountable Phenomena of Order, Logic, Reason, Meaning, Method, etc. in and as of the Essential Haecceity of Immortal Ordinary Society, (I)—An Announcement of Studies,” in *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*, ed. G. Button (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 17.
24. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, “A Simplest Systematics.” The main features of turn-taking “machinery” as described for English in this groundbreaking paper—particularly the tendency towards “no gap, no overlap”—seem to be valid across cultures and languages. See Tanya Stivers et al., “Universals and Cultural Variation in Turn-Taking in Conversation,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106, no. 26 (2009): 10587–10592.
25. David P. Boder, “The Impact of Catastrophe: I. Assessment and Evaluation,” *The Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied* 38, no. 1 (1954): 3–50, doi 10.1080/00223980.1954.9712913, here p. 9. I would like to thank one of the reviewers for reminding me of the profound relevance of Boder’s research for the purpose of this essay.

26. On “in-situ announcements” see Peter Campion and Mark Langdon, “Achieving Multiple Topic Shifts in Primary Care Medical Consultations: A Conversation Analysis Study in UK General Practice,” *Sociology of Health and Illness* 26, no. 1 (2004), doi 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2004.00379.x.
27. Harvey Sacks, “On Members’ Measurement Systems,” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 22, no. 1–4 (1988), doi 10.1080/08351818809389297.
28. *Deixis* is a term in linguistics that refers to words and phrases that cannot be fully understood without appropriate contextual information. Examples of deictic terms include *here*, *that*, *tomorrow*, and *you*. See Stephen Anderson and Edward Keenan, “Deixis,” in *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon* vol. 3, ed. T. Shopen (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 259–308.
29. Interview with P. W., ID 19446, conducted in Prague on August 30, 1996, by Miriam Ledererová, tape 3 of 4, 8:20–10:33, USC Shoah Foundation, *Visual History Archive*, transcribed and translated from Czech by the author.
30. John Heritage, “Well-Prefaced Turns in English Conversation: A Conversation Analytic Perspective,” *Journal of Pragmatics* 88 (2015), doi 10.1016/j.pragma.2015.08.008.
31. Interview with A. B., ID 14754; conducted in Bratislava on May 23, 1996, by Karin Binderová, tape 4 of 5, 9:11–11:55, USC Shoah Foundation, *Visual History Archive*, transcribed and translated from Slovak by the author.
32. Harvey Sacks, “An Analysis of the Course of a Joke’s Telling in Conversation,” in *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, eds. R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 337–53.
33. USC Shoah Foundation, “Interviewer Guidelines,” 8.
34. Interview with B. K.-S., ID 17272, conducted in Bratislava on July 9, 1996, by Milan Nemeč, tape 4 of 5, 27:09–28:26, USC Shoah Foundation, *Visual History Archive*, transcribed and translated from Slovak by the author.
35. Interview with R. B., ID 15797; conducted in Prague on May 29, 1996, by Miriam Ledererová, tape 2 of 3, 26:19–27:12,, USC Shoah Foundation, *Visual History Archive*, transcribed and translated from Czech by the author.
36. Interview with A. M., ID 19498, conducted in Prague on September 3, 1996, by Miriam Ledererová, tape 3 of 4, 17:29–18:18, USC Shoah Foundation, *Visual History Archive*, transcribed and translated from Czech by the author.
37. On “stock of knowledge” see Alfred Schütz and Thomas Luckmann, *The Structures of the Life-World* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973).
38. On the digital turn see Alistair Thomson, “Four Paradigm Transformations in Oral History,” *Oral History Review* 34, no. 1 (2007): 49–70.
39. Boder, “The Impact,” 9.
40. Charles Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*, 14th anniversary ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 8.
41. Marcel Proust, *In Search of Lost Time II: Within a Budding Grove*, <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/63532> (accessed December 4, 2021).

Jakub Mlynář is a sociologist working at Charles University (Czech Republic) and at the University of Applied Sciences of Western Switzerland (HES-SO Valais/Wallis, Switzerland). For his PhD thesis, he conducted research on Holocaust oral history interviews addressing issues of narrative, identity, and memory. At the Malach Center for Visual History at Charles University, he has worked on how to introduce these interviews in educational contexts. In his postdoctoral research at the Department of Social Sciences of the University of Fribourg, he has studied classroom interactions involving digital technologies, in Swiss and Czech schools, in the framework of a one-year project funded by the Swiss Government Excellence Scholarships. He is also interested in technology-mediated interaction and social dimensions of artificial intelligence.