ABSTRACT: Currently, the conceptualisation of the relations between literature and memory is very diverse. It can be studied on the background of intertextuality, topics, canon, metaphor, and/or from the perspective of the question how to construct the memories as a narrative. A link between literature and time plays an important role, especially in autobiographic memory. A systemic theory, cognitive psychology, gender studies and media studies belong to the latest theoretical approaches concerned with literature and memory. Contemporary interdisciplinary memory research deals with the following question: to what extent can the examined phenomena be classified? Because of this, my paper has a systemic nature. It evaluates the link between literature and memory on the background of three concepts: memory of literature, memory in literature and literature as a medium of memory.

Keywords: history, literature, individual and collective memory, reminiscence

The phenomenon of memory and reminiscences has been in the focus of intensive research for over thirty years. It has been an area of interest of cultural sciences, natural sciences, political and public discussions as well as everyday talks. It would be insufficient to study memory only by the methods of neurosciences because during the lifetime memory is also formed in accordance with concrete social experiences. Therefore, psychology of remembering, the development of autobiographical memory or psychoanalysis of remembering are also studied. The second area of memory research is represented by individual sorts of memory: autobiographical memory, collective memory, cultural memory, communicative memory, social memory, etc. Recently, a very important role has been played by the media that are considered to be the instances of remembrance, for example the writing system, rituals, architecture, libraries, museums, radio, print media, internet, human body, etc. The aforesaid research areas cross each other in the field of individual disciplines. Therefore, they are further assessed from the perspective of historical sciences, philosophy, sociology, literary science, gender studies, etc.

The conceptualization of relationships between literature and memory in which we are now interested is also very diverse today. They can be studied, for instance, on the background of the issue of intertextuality or topics, canon, metaphorics, or a question can be posed: how can reminiscences be narratively stage-managed? Very important is also the interconnection between literature and time, for instance in autobiographical memory, and also between novel and identity, memory and history. The latest theoretical incentives studying literature and memory include a systemic theory, cognitive psychology, gender studies or the media sciences. Thus,
the current interdisciplinary-oriented memory research, inter alia, insistently raises the question: to what extent can the examined phenomena be systemized? The present paper has a character of a summarizing study, i.e. it does not bring new research results or new approaches. Its main objective is to inform readers about the individual literary-scientific concepts of memory. It poses the question: how can be the issue of memory approached by means of literary science (and in a broader sense by means of cultural sciences)? The paper is primarily grounded in the German-language secondary literature, as the German academic environment has recently largely dealt with this issue and produced a number of relevant publications on this topic.¹

A kind of a stepping stone for the classification of the literary-scientific dealing with memory can be the statement of three fundamental orientations suggested by two German literary theorists and Anglicists: Ansgar Nünning and Astrid Erll. Specifically, it is a case of the following concepts:

1. Memory of literature (Gedächtnis der Literatur);
2. Memory in literature (Gedächtnis in der Literatur);
3. Literature as a medium of memory (Literatur als Medium des Gedächtnises).²

1. Memory of literature

The author of this concept is the German literary theorist and Slavicist Renate Lachmann. She understands the concept “memory of literature” as intertextuality or intertextual relationships in the broadest sense as acts of recalling (Erinnerungssakte). In her book entitled Memory and Literature. Intertextuality in Russian Modernism (1990) she stated: “Memory of literature is its intertextuality.”³ Through its relationships to the previous texts, genres, forms, structures and symbols literature “recalls” itself. This view opens the way for the diachronic dimension of the “literature system” that studies the relationships between artworks and the memory-related procedures of repetition and updating of aesthetic forms. In this context, a very important role was played by the German art historian and cultural historian Aby Warburg (1866–1929) in the first third of the 20th century. Up to the present, the Warburg Library of Cultural Studies has been well-known. Until 1933 it had been located in Hamburg. It was saved from the Nazis and since 1944 the Warburg Institute has been a part of the University of London. Warburg was a passionate book collector and shortly before his death the library had about 60,000 titles. Inter alia, Warburg was interested in the phenomena of the repetition of art forms. For instance, he recognized a motif of garment depicted in motion in ancient frescos, in Renaissance paintings, e.g. in Botticelli’s picture Adoration of the Magi (around

¹ This, of course, does not mean that the bibliography is complete. The research area could be also extended by Anglo-American literature, for instance by VERVLIE, Raymond - ESTOR, Annemarie (eds.). Methods for the Study of Literature as Cultural Memory Studies. Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA, 2000 or ERLL, Astrid - NÜNNING, Ansgar (eds.). A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies. Berlin : Walter de Gruyter Verlag, 2008.
1475), and even in the postage stamps in Germany in the 1920’s. Warburg perceived these art forms as cultural symbols that had the potential to release a memory and were a cultural “can of energy”, while culture rested on the memory of symbols. Importance of memory is also emphasized by the last Warburg’s project, the pictorial atlas entitled according to the Greek patron of memory – Mnemosyna (1924–1929). By means of pictures, the atlas was aimed to present various forms of the continuation of antiquity in European culture. Warburg used wooden frames and pieces of cloth on which he pinned photographs related to one theme. He did not just concentrate on classic objects but also used postage stamps, newspaper clippings or photographs of current political scene. There were over forty cartons and about 1,500-2,000 photos. After Warburg’s death, the boards, however, did not survive. They were reconstructed later on the basis of the preserved photographs of the boards. Although in Warburg’s research the focus is on visual culture, the latter is medially and interdisciplinary interconnected, for instance, even with everyday culture, with various holidays and celebrations and, last but not least, with literary works as well. It was precisely Warburg’s statement of repeating motifs and structures in artworks that created conditions for viewing intertextuality as memory of literature. In her lexicon titled Themes of World Literature (Stoffe der Weltliteratur) Elisabeth Frenzel presented several examples of literary themes from which literature has been drawing since its beginnings up to now. They include various mythological, biblical or historical figures, e.g. Faust, Cassandra, Prometheus, Tristan and Isolde, Jacob, John the Baptist, Columbus or Napoleon. By participating in the cultural pretext with a particular theme, literature recalls itself, historically updates itself and becomes a reservoir of literary memory (e.g. the figure of Christopher Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus can be intertextually interconnected with Goethe’s Faust or, later in the 20th century, with Klaus Mann’s novel Mephisto. Novel of a Career (1936) or Thomas Mann’s Doctor Faustus (1947).

In Warburg’s footsteps followed the Romance scholar Robert Curtius (1886–1958). Shortly after World War II he published his great publication European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (1948) in which he laid the foundations of the scientific research of topoi. Curtius’s objective was to find certain schemes of thought and expression that connect the literature of the Latin Middle Ages with Late Antiquity and to discover the fundament of western culture or the constants of European cultural heritage. The author uncovers various shapes of literary forms by means of topics. In its original meaning topos (in Greek, a “place” or “site”) belongs to the area of inventio (the first stage of production in rhetoric); to the science of the search of arguments and evidence that creates a connection between rhetoric and dialectics or logic. Within the meaning of Aristotle’s Topics, the rhetorical topos is a “deposit” of evidence or arguments. By means of this concept, which he understands as a cliché or as a thought and expression scheme, Curtius created the fundament of historical comparatistics. He elaborated on the rhetorical topoi in the narrower sense (e.g. the topos of modesty and ineffability), further as topic metaphors (meta-
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phor of life as a voyage) or the world as theatre (*theatrum mundi*), landscape topoi (*locus amoenus*), etc. The fact that the topoi had survived in the course of history, that they had become “recurrent motifs” or “literary constants”, Curtius considered an evidence of the unity of the heritage of European culture. Thus, for instance, the author finds the continuity of the literary topos *locus amoenus* (a pleasant, lovely place in the idealized nature) as the main theme of all descriptions of nature (its minimal setting consisted of a tree, meadow, spring or creek) in ancient literature from Theocritus’s bucolics through Vergilius’s eclogues, up to the 16th century. It can be found in the medieval epic, in the *Song of Roland* (the trees and hills in the death scene), chivalric novels or later in the pastoral baroque literature (*Schäferdichtung*).

In this context, an important role is played by the relationship between *inventio* and *memoria*, because artistic activities are always also an act of recalling, return to the past, return to tradition. While in Warburg the collective pictorial memory is formed by cultural symbols, in Curtius the literary memory is materialized by means of topoi.

The concept of memory of literature can be understood in two senses:

a) Literature “has” its memory. Intertextuality, topics and individual literary genres are a result of memory of literature as a symbolic system. For instance, in the heroic epics, in the *Song of the Nibelungs* or the *Song of Roland*, a nation is talked about and recalled.

b) Literature “is” remembered. This process takes place in the institutionalized way: by means of the creation of a canon and writing a history of literature. Since about 1980 the matter of the rate of constructiveness of the history of literature has been brought to the front burner in the literary science, while the issue is not the depiction of content, of what was written, in what way and for whom, but an active creation of versions of the literary past (as a constructive act of recalling). A cultural-historical dimension of the canon – the functions of the formation of identity, the mediation of values and political legitimation were highlighted by Aleida and Jan Assmann in their publication *Canon and Censorship* (1987). As the title reveals an important role is here played by an interference of censorship in the creation of the canon and writing histories of national literatures. In our cultural environment, the influence of censorship on the creation of the history of national Slovak literature may be demonstrated on the period prior to 1989. As a result of ideological interference in the cultural production, literature was remembered by a constant repetition and interpretation of certain themes, authors and works that were shaping the collective literary memory in a decisive way. On the other hand, some authors were neglected, they were removed from the collective memory and they would find their place in the history of literature or in the literary canon only after 1989.

2. Memory in literature

The second approach of the literary-scientific relationship between literature and memory is focused on the depiction or representation of remembrance and memory in literary works.

The fundamental question is: by what procedures are the contents and functions of memory thematized and stage-managed? We can distinguish between a) literary
depiction of individual remembrance and b) representation of collective memory or cultures that are remembered.

While the concept of memory of literature emphasizes a diachronic level of literary system and the relationships among a number of texts, memory in literature is largely focused on the forms and structures of individual works. The synchronic interconnection between the text and context, the issue of its production or reception, is also often reflected. For instance, within narratology various techniques creating an impression of retrospectiveness of literary texts are studied in this context, whether they are flashbacks of narrator (by means of which they flash back to the past) or metanarrative commentaries, iterative narration (detective novel), relationships between memory and space (e.g. labyrinth) or the issue of unreliability of narration or an unreliable narrator. In the studying of the forms and functions of the literary stage-managing of remembrance and identity, an important role is played by the knowledge of cognitive-psychological incentives. Based on the analysis of narration, mechanisms for revealing identity (narrative theories of identity) are uncovered in narrative psychology. We talk here about specifics of personal remembrance, not a kind of “revival” of past experience by means of remembrance but their reconstruction. Identity, as Jörn Rüsen says, “has been formed, constructed through remembrance”.6

In addition, a number of literary texts thematize and problematize the relationship between individual identity and reminiscences. An individual reminiscence, through which an individual reflects the aspects of his/her own past from the current situation, intersects with individual identity, i.e. with the deeds or acting through which an individual identifies himself/herself. The process of the formation of identity or the concept of individual identity is, however, assessed as a complex phenomenon in which an important role is played by social psychology. Thus, the concept of identity becomes a broader term that gets connected to the research of the social-psychological theories of identity and memory research.

The process of formation of identity does not take place only introspectively. The social environment also participates in its formation; according to the social-psychologically oriented theories of identity, this process primarily takes place through acting. So, identity is not a sort of list of the constant characteristics of the subject but permanent acting through which the subjects “work” on their identities. In addition to the fact that identity is formed by both subjective self-knowledge (internal perspective) and the influence of participants on the identifying subject (external perspective) we can also recognize another level of identity, namely its synchronic and diachronic dimension.7 The synchronic dimension of identity includes the self-
knowledge of an individual in various life contexts, e.g. at work, in his/her family, among his/her friends. Contrarily, the diachronic dimension primarily shows in the dependence of current identity on its previous (self-)knowledge. When we, therefore, try to mark individual stages of our lives, we try to understand them, we “arrange” individual events of life stages in time (past, present, future) and from certain perspective (e.g. in relation to our body, profession, family line, etc.). From the perspective of cognitive psychology, memory constitutes identity in an immediate way. The loss of memory is, therefore, often connected with the loss of identity.

The importance of remembering in the formation of identity is problematized in various literary texts as well. It can be thematized marginally or, contrarily, a reminiscence and identity become central objects of narration. Besides a qualitative level, an important role is also played by narrative procedures. Specifically, it is possible to take into account such aspects as the relationship between the character that is remembered and the superordinate narrative instance that is currently remembering, further the thematization of identity and reminiscence in the language of characters; and the temporal and spatial tension between the present and the individual levels of the past. Very often homodiegetic narration is used, in which the narrator is a part of the world that he/she talks about. The current remembering “I” is in the dialectic relationship to the past “I”, it is a “remembering narration”. The narrating current “I” can in its memories flash back even to the distant past in an effort to retrospectively take hold of the remote past. In this process a construct of the identity of a character is outlined for readers and with it identically the figure of narrator as well. As an example could serve the novel by the German prose writer Christa Wolf, entitled *Die Kindheitsmuster* (1976). The very title of the novel, also referred to as autobiographical, explicitly indicates the issue of remembering, the matter of the level of exactness and reliability of memories of childhood or “more childhoods”. This then, of course, also involves the process of forgetting and narration reliability. In an effort to keep her distance from the past, the author uses different personal pronouns for individual periods of her life. The current “I” recalls its childhood in the era of National Socialism. However, it does not use the phrase “I was” but it uses the third person of singular, the pronoun “she” or the name Nelly. When talking about “its” adulthood, it uses the second person “you”. It is apparent, therefore, that the issue of remembering, together with the effort to get to know oneself, are narratively stage-managed by the functional use of personal pronouns with the aim of their merging, with a view to join individual disparate parts into as compact identity as possible. That it is not an easy process is also documented by the fact that the author had created over thirty different novel beginnings while she came to the last childhood pattern.

Since 1980 the cultural sciences have not dominantly dealt with individual memory; the research emphasis has shifted to the concepts of collective remembering. The relationships between identity and reminiscence are expressed by various terms: social memory, communicative memory, cultural memory, collective memory or cultural memory. Today, a term *collective memory* is most often used as a collective concept for myths, tradition, historical consciousness, archive, canon, monuments, rituals, commemorations, and communications in families.
Despite the fact that the number of disciplines and miscellaneous theories concentrated in this research are is quite high, there are at least two common features: a) all the disciplines emphasize the perspectivity and constructivity of collective memories and b) close interconnection between collective remembering and identity.

A practice of collective remembering – such is a fundamental premise of the culturological theories of memory – creates the conditions for the formation of transpersonal collective identity. The theories of collective memory thus become the theories of collective identity as well.

In the 20th century several publications played an important role in this research area. The issue of collective memory was significantly influenced by the work of the French sociologist and philosopher Maurice Halbwachs (1877–1945), especially by his publication *The Collective Memory* (1950, written in 1920´s and 1930´ s). Unlike Warburg, who emphasizes visual culture, Halbwachs claims that culture is determined socially. This means that memory is formed in certain reference frameworks and constitutes a sum of individual reminiscences of a number of members of one and the same group. A prerequisite for individual remembering is, therefore, a reverse linkage to social frameworks. Although Halbwachs strictly separates individual memory from collective memory, it is possible to talk about individual memory only on condition that it participates in collective memory. So, what is important is that not a reminiscence itself but a combination of the contents of remembering in groups is what shapes individuality, it is, as Halbwachs says, what is really individual:

“Our memories remain collective […] even though only we were participants in the events or saw the things concerned. In reality, we are never alone. Other men need not be physically present, since we always carry with us and in us a number of distinct persons.”

Halbwachs then mentions, as an example, his first visit to London: “Many impressions during my first visit to London - St. Paul’s [...] - reminded me of Dickens’ novels read in childhood, so I took my walk with Dickens.” We could say that according to Halbwachs Robinson Crusoe may have had memories because even on the desert island he could flash back to the social frameworks in his country. A more complicated case is, however, Caspar Hauser, a youth who was found in Nuremberg in 1828. Since he had been shut in a darkened cell for all his life and he had had no opportunity to enter in contact with any group, his memories cannot be classified as collective. In addition, the studies of the French historian Pierre Nora accentuate that it is not a sort of collective soul or objective spirit what is behind the memory of a group, but a society with its signs and symbols. An individual participates in the collective memory and collective identity through common sym-
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bols. Nora thus does not have in mind a particular group in time and space but an abstract group defined timelessly and beyond space.

In his book *The Social Frameworks of Memory* (1952) Halbwachs deals, inter alia, with the relationships between memory and language, memory and dream and, in the conclusion, he also concerns himself with the forms of social memory: collective family memory or collective memory of religious groups. For instance, family memory is a typical generation memory. All members of the family take part in it, even the youngest ones – even though they had not experienced some of the events, through the stories told by older family members they can participate in the collective family memory.

One of the most debated publications on the cultural scientific theory of memory is the book by the Egyptologist Jan Assmann *Cultural Memory* (1992). In his book Assmann deals with the themes of remembrance, collective formation of identity and exercise of power and he also searches for common and different signs in oral and script cultures. With regard to memory he distinguishes its four external dimensions:

- **Mimetic memory.** This dimension is related to our acting based on imitation.
- **Material memory.** Objects around us, either a bed, clothes or houses, or cities and streets, reflect us the image of ourselves, they remind us of ourselves, our past, ancestors, etc.
- **Communicative memory.** It contains memories living in the present. A typical example is generation memory.
- **Cultural memory.** This constitutes a space which can be entered by all three previous types of memory. If, for instance, a mimetic routine acquires the status of a ritual, it will point not only to the purpose but also to the meaning, it will go beyond the sphere of mimetic memory. This also applies to objects when they do not point only to the purpose, but also to the meaning: symbols, icons, memorial plaques, temples, etc. The relationship between cultural memory and communicative memory creates conditions for the study of the role of language and communication. In this context, with regard to the formation of cultural coherence, both fundamental media of cultural memory seem to be important: spoken language and script. Assmann thus approaches the third literary-scientific orientation of memory research – literature as a medium of memory.

Another important distinction of concepts was carried out by the Anglicist and Egyptologist Aleida Assman in her publication *Spaces of Remembrance: Forms and Transformations of Cultural Memory* (Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnises, 1999). She sees the spaces of remembrance in, for instance, mythical countries, sacred sites, cities like Jerusalem and Thebes, graves, gravestones, places associated with trauma, e.g. Auschwitz, etc. In the fifth chapter
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11 The chapter Memory as Ars and Vis was also published in Czech translation by Jiří Soukup in the journal entitled Česká literatura. Inter alia, there is an interview with Aleida Assmann. Cf. Česká literatura 61, 2013/1.
of the first part of her book, the author gives her opinion on, inter alia, one of the most debated issues associated with memory – its relationship to history. Generally, there are two approaches: one group of authors polarizes the two concepts, e.g. Maurice Halbwachs or the French medievalist Jacques Le Goff in his book *History and Memory* (1988). Contrarily, Dan Diner, a historian at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, tries to put both concepts on the same level. Third time, Aleida Assmann tries to find a compromise in the sense that she defines history and memory as “two modes of remembering”.\(^\text{12}\) On one hand, she suggests so-called “functional memory” (*Funktionsgedächtnis*) that is “inhabited” or “occupied” (bewohnt). This kind of memory is connected with a bearer that can be a group, institution or an individual. Another feature of functional memory is selection, i.e. memory selects only some of the great number of reminiscences, the rest of them remain unprocessed or forgotten. In addition, functional memory mediates values that shape an individual or collective identity. For instance, a life story connects memories and experience into a structure, it configures the sense. So-called “storage memory” (*Speichergedächtnis*) or “uninhabited memory” is, on the other hand, “amorphous mass”, a reservoir of unused memories, data, information, and documents that surrounds functional memory. It is not its opposite but its background. Storage memory can verify, support or correct functional memory (for instance by means of historical evidence). Functional memory, on the other hand, can direct and motivate storage memory. Aleida Assmann’s conception of functional and storage memories shows certain affinity to the conception of H. White according to whom a historian selects concrete data from the amorphous mass of historical events (in this case from storage memory) and by their configuration he/she forms a particular story at the level of functional memory – romance, tragedy, etc. Thus, we can see that Assmann reserves the concept of memory for history as well – specifically the concept of storage memory to which she complementary relates the concept of functional memory (which can be also individual). From this perspective, a remembrance is not memory, but it is a part of either amorphous memory or it is concretized by means of functional memory (e.g. the remembrance of Auschwitz, whether at individual or collective level).

3. Literature as a medium of memory

In comparison to the two previous orientations, the last concept “literature as a medium of memory” is the youngest one. From this perspective, literature is constituted as a medium that does not lie only in memory processes (memory of literature) or in the depiction of memory (memory in literature), but also *gets memory over* in the culture of remembering. In this context, the cultural-historical significance of literature as a medium of memory is studied, for instance in the study *Jewish Memory and Literature*\(^\text{13}\) by Bettina Bannasch and Almuth Hammer. The au-
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Thors point to the importance of the Bible, autobiographic texts or literary fictional texts as the media of Jewish self-understanding prior to the period of Shoah and after it. Inter alia, the question arises: what can Jewish literature bring after 1945? What new perspective does the Bible (Torah and the Book of Deuteronomy) offer after 1945 in connection with the Promised Land and the establishment of the State of Israel? The processes of remembering, forgetting, removing and traumatization are on the front burner.

From the position of gender studies a particular body can be understood as a medium of memory, while literature can be perceived as a media procedure of fixation and archiving of body knowledge. In her book *Images of Cultural Memory* (Bilder des kulturellen Gedächtnisses, 1994), Sigrid Weigel pays attention to the issue of body as memory and body language on the background of the prosaic works by the German author Christa Wolf (facial expressions, gestures, physical symptoms, illness and depression are the result of various traumatic situations where the body becomes a kind of memory mirror that appears to reflect the body).

Another group of authors focuses on the issue of intermediality and memory. For instance, the following questions are discussed: Do we remember through words or images? Which of the following factors does have a greater impact on the shaping of collective memory: literature or visual arts? What media do dominate in what contexts? What role is played by intermedia relationships (e.g. the relationship between a literary text and film) or the change of media (literature-based films) or the combination of media (opera, film) and what impact does it have on collective memory?

In the German literary-scientific terminology, a term “the novel of commemoration” (Gedächtnisroman) has been introduced which refers to the English and German novels on World War I written in the late 1920’s. These constitute so-called collective texts, e.g. Remarque’s novel *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1929), that, as the media of communication memory (in the spirit of Assmann’s approach), co-form the memories of the recent past. These works become an important medium through which an identity of a certain generation is formed.

In the current Canadian literature, there is a number of novels in which individuals and groups are portrayed in the processes of remembering, forgetting and imaginations of miscellaneous versions of the past. This type of novel is known as *fictions of memory*, e.g. Margaret Atwood: *Cat’s Eye* (1988), Terence M. Green: *A Witness to Life* (1999) or Matt Cohen: *Nadine* (1986).

**Conclusion**

Within the cognitive-psychological research of organic human memory, the term “memory” is defined a reservoir of information. On the other hand, the term “reminiscence” is perceived as a process of activation of the parts of this reservoir, i.e. the process of recollecting. Thus, the basic relationship here seems to be an interconnection between individual and collective memory, because the information which
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is not received and explained through individual consciousness cannot produce any activity. The collective acts of recalling without individual updates vanish in emptiness.

In addition, cognitive psychology distinguishes several systems of memory. The conscious reminiscences are updated either through “semantic” or “episodic” memory. Semantic memory involves learned, symbolic knowledge (e.g. the Earth is round). Episodic memory is linked to a specific time and context (e.g. the memories of the first day at school). Obviously, this does not rule out the temporal-contextual linkage of semantic memory as well. Besides explicit memory, there is also “implicit” memory in cognitive psychology. The latter involves the reminiscences that can be recalled unconsciously. These include procedural memory which allows us to perform certain activities automatically, such as riding a bike or playing the piano. Through the senses, the human body can also implicitly “recall” past events. For instance, the smell can bring back memories of childhood, either pleasant or traumatic. There are no strict boundaries among semantic, episodic and procedural memory and they are applicable within both individual and collective memory.

If we, in connection with the process of intertextuality, used to talk about the mutual cultural interconnection of literary texts, today it is probably more adequate to talk about the process of intermediality, since “the intertextuality as memory” is now strongly influenced by media sciences. Literary texts are thus not dominantly assessed in relation to and compared with each other, but they can be found in different intermedia situations, e.g. they have been made into a film or theatrical performance or comic). In connection with such production or performance, another research area opens up: remembrance performativity. In what manner can be, for instance, a remembrance performatively presented in the narrative text, e.g. in the novel?

Today, therefore, it is inconceivable to talk about the literary-scientific concepts of memory without taking into consideration interdisciplinary and intermedia links. In such a way, a literary text becomes one of the forms of the implementation of the act of recalling which, after taking into account certain specifics, becomes an equal part of the complex of collective memory.

**SUMMARY**

**Literary-Scientific Concepts of Memory**

Within the cognitive-psychological research of organic human memory, the term “memory” is defined a reservoir of information. On the other hand, the term “reminiscence” is perceived as a process of activation of the parts of this reservoir, i.e. the process of recollecting. Thus, the basic relationship here seems to be an interconnection between individual and collective memory, because the information which is not received and explained through individual consciousness cannot produce
any activity. The collective acts of recalling without individual updates vanish in emptiness.

In addition, cognitive psychology distinguishes several systems of memory. The conscious reminiscences are updated either through “semantic” or “episodic” memory. Semantic memory involves learned, symbolic knowledge (e.g. the Earth is round). Episodic memory is linked to a specific time and context (e.g. the memories of the first day at school). Obviously, this does not rule out the temporal-contextual linkage of semantic memory as well. Besides explicit memory, there is also “implicit” memory in cognitive psychology. The latter involves the reminiscences that can be recalled unconsciously. These include procedural memory which allows us to perform certain activities automatically, such as riding a bike or playing the piano. Through the senses, the human body can also implicitly “recall” past events. For instance, the smell can bring back memories of childhood, either pleasant or traumatic. There are no strict boundaries among semantic, episodic and procedural memory and they are applicable within both individual and collective memory.
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