
Abstract**The Turn of Theoretical Sociology on Halbwachs' Collective Memory:
From the Subject of Memory to the "Spatialization of Time"****YOKOYAMA Suzeri**

Maurice Halbwachs defined the collective memory as a group memory that reconstructs the past through the memories contributed by all the members of that particular group. The concept of collective memory is frequently referred to in the sociology of memory, but can be criticized regarding its logical consistency and application.

This paper responds to criticism levelled by Ricœur and Schutz on perspectives raised by the subject of a collective memory: who actually remembers such a collective memory? However, their argument takes only a part of collective memory into account — they miss the point that collective memory is inherited by the following generation, and is a theoretical sociology.

Halbwachs explains that the collective memory reveals the plural "temporal frames" and the "spatial frame." We refer to two systems which G. Namer proposed in terms of these two frames to clarify Halbwachs' perspective. I am of the view that Namer did not argue strongly enough on the relation between these two frames. To solve the problem, I introduced "spatialization of time," which critically discusses Bergson, and culminates in Halbwachs' perspective.

Thus, this "spatialization of time" concept clarifies a society in which memory can be perpetuated across families, generations, and religions, which embodies the significance of this paper. In other words, it is there that we can find the inheritance of memory. Furthermore, as a result, the perspective of collective memories goes beyond the subject of memory as espoused by Ricœur and Schutz. Within the memory theories of Bergson, Ricoeur, Schutz, and Halbwachs, it becomes clear that collective memory implies theoretical sociology.