

Linguistic Memory*

JURAJ DOLNÍK

ABSTRACT: The thesis of the author is that the past of the language and of the linguistic community is projected into the linguistic memory as a component of the cultural memory. If we raise the question what referential entities of the past are meant within the metaphorical usage of the term memory with regard to the language, this evokes the idea of the coexistence of external and internal memory. The explanations of the author are conducive to the hypothesis that internal linguistic memory is constituted on the basis of the functioning of the mechanism which guarantees the continual identity of the language. This mechanism is based on the constantly repeated cross-generational communication within the framework of which the linguistic memes are passed onto the following generations on the basis of the analogical linguistic behaviour of the receiving generations. External linguistic memory is constituted by the institutionalization of interpretations from the data from the past of the language, and of the manners of reactions to it with regard to the particular needs and interests of the whole speech community or to some particular intentions and goals. It is inherently connected with creating collective self-image based on the need of self-identification which is carried out within various historical-social conditions which, however, influence the interpretation.

Key words: cultural memory, linguistic memory, internal and external linguistic memory, collective self-image, naturalness of the language usage.

1. The Past of the Language Within Its Present

When viewing a certain language and a particular linguistic community from the perspective of their identity the initial observation is that on the basis of some features this language and this community are in an opposite relationship to other languages and communities, and that they are products of linguistic-historical and social-historical processes. While from the opposition point of view the description of their identity requires synchronical cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparison, their explanation from the historical aspect presupposes the application of the research method by which it becomes manifested how the past of a language is reflected in its present, and how the past of the linguistic community is demonstrated in its present situation. When focusing our attention on the historical aspect, there arises the question how a certain nation, by means of its past, can preserve or cultivate the image of its own identity. In the search for the answer to this question,

* This text is a part of grant project VEGA 1/0332/11 Discourse Analysis: understanding.

one of the possible supportive ideas can be the notion of cultural memory as one of the existential forms of collective memory. A preliminary general answer to this question is that a certain nation is cultivating the image of its identity by means of its past with the help of cultural memory. However, this is only a primary initial answer which merely indicates the methodology of investigating the phenomenon studied.

With regard to the above, also in the relationship to language and to the linguistic community there arises the thesis that their past is reflected in the cultural memory. As the language and the linguistic community constitute a special component of culture, we shall start by stating that the cultural memory also entails the linguistic memory. This thesis is consequently modified in such a way that the past of the language and of the linguistic community is projected into linguistic memory as a component of cultural memory. At this point we have to realize the following two phenomena:

(1) Cultural memory has the character of functional memory. This statement is based on the differentiation of functional memory from the accumulation memory which was suggested by A. Assmann (1999) in connection with the notion of cultural memory. While the accumulation memory functions as the archives of the given culture, i.e. collected in it are the veracious, non-modified data from the past, the functional memory “stylizes” the past, i.e. it selects data from the accumulation memory archives and structures them on the basis of the needs, interests, etc. of the given linguistic community.

The past marked by the selection and structuration on this basis acquires the quality of the actualized past, i.e. of the past assimilated with regard to the contemporary needs and interests of the given community. Hence, cultural memory is a stylizing, i.e. assimilative memory existentially motivated by the needs and interests of the community. This means that cultural memory is an instrument for preferential processing of the phenomena from the past, i.e. for a targeted interpretation of the past. As it stems from the selective, preferential and interpretational function of the cultural memory, cultural remembrance is connected with cultural forgetting. Meanwhile, it is obvious that the forgetting is not a result of lack of cultural memory, but an indispensable accompanying feature of its function.

The above formulated initial answer to the question how a certain nation preserves its past can now be further developed in such a way that the nation stores it into its collective accumulative memory, but it also reflects it into the collective functional memory which is denoted as cultural memory. The accumulative memory forms the potential interpretation basis of the cultural memory. By means of cultural

memory the phenomena from the past acquire a certain sense. Their fundamental sense concerns the identity of the community.

(2) The differentiation between the accumulative memory and the functional (i.e. cultural) memory also concerns the linguistic memory. While the accumulative memory functions as the linguistic archives of the given linguistic community, the cultural linguistic memory, i.e. the linguistic memory as a component of the cultural memory is constituted by the “stylization” of what the linguistic world of the past has to offer. The accumulative linguistic memory entails all the preserved linguistic signs (in the broadest sense of the word) and the institutionalized ways of handling them which can potentially be related to the needs and the interests of the contemporary linguistic community. The tool for the selective realization of this potentiality is cultural linguistic memory. In it there are preserved the preferential and interpretational reactions of the linguistic community to what the linguistic archives offer, hence this memory functions as a regulator of the linguistic community with regard to the collective linguistic memory and forgetting. Nevertheless, it has to be added that the cultural linguistic memory is not in each moment connected with the accumulative linguistic memory. If the particular place of explanation does not require any higher degree of explicitness, the expression linguistic memory is replaced by the tree-member expression cultural linguistic memory.

If we raise the question what referential entities of the past are meant within the metaphorical usage of the term memory with regard to the language, this evokes the idea of the coexistence of external and internal memory (analogically to external and internal language history). Also with regard to it we have to take into consideration the accumulating quality and functionality of memory, and thus distinguish between the external and the internal accumulative linguistic memory and between the external and internal functional (cultural) linguistic memory. While the internal accumulative linguistic memory entails a set of products of the history of the internal development of the language, the contents of the external accumulative linguistic memory are constituted by the sum of the data about the external conditions of the history of the language.

External functional memory is formed by the images concerning the events, stories, attitudes, decisions and similar circumstances of earlier linguistic life with regard to constituting the collective self-image, while the internal functional linguistic memory is related to the internal identity of the language.

2. Internal Linguistic Memory

The memory metaphor had already earlier been applied to text: there started to occur references to the memory of the text as well as to intertext memory. F. Miko (1989:50) describes the particular aspect of the communication process as a sum of the linear formation of sentences in the memory of the text. In the light of the processual aspect the text is manifested in such a way that *“in the present-related focus of the occurring processes all the particular sentences of the text gradually take turns. After their being carried out – on the part of the speaker after their being uttered or written, and on the part of the recipient after their being listened to or read – each of them actually disappears. Its thematic counterpart – the fact – gets amalgamated in the “memory of the text” into the accumulated structure of the so-far occurring facts. However, by this it also disappears, but it disappears in the superstratum which is being formed in the “memory of the text”...”*

Here the memory of the text is actually the textual memory of the abstract communicator. With regard to the above presented context, of relevance is the explanation concerning the disappearance of the sentences as well as of their thematic correlates (facts), namely to the effect that the processual past of the text is preserved in the memory as an imaginary trace “imprinted” into the contents of the text. Corresponding to this “as if real trace” is the “remembrance-related knowledge” of the communicator that the given text arose from certain (i.e. not just any) sentences and facts which the communicator does not have to be able to recall exactly, but he/she knows that in the contents of the text their existence has been preserved. In spite of the fact that by the amalgamating elimination operations the linear text was transformed into the content-related memory, on the basis of the imaginary trace of the processual past its identity has been preserved.

In the explanations of the notion of intertextual memory from our point of view of interest are those moments which concern the objectivity of a certain text returning to the previous texts. With regard to literary texts it is said that intertextuality constitutes a “remembrance effect” of the text which is independent of the author, i.e. it does not have to be a direct, intended allusion. The author can be “remembering” other texts, but into his text, without the author being aware of it and spontaneously, there can penetrate motifs, metaphors, sentences, etc. from other texts, solely on the basis of the fact that he had perceived them earlier and they remained in his/her accumulation memory (cf. Lachmann, 1990). In the intertextual memory allusions are stored regardless of the will of the author: Objectively they exist in the memory of the text. Directing the attention to the intertextuality connected with the inactivity of the author leads to the fact that in the intertextual memory there are observed also

the traces of the forgotten contents eliminated from the tradition (Haverkamp, 1993). On the basis of the polycontextuality of each sign the trace of its past is preserved. Let us remind here, too, that this is an imaginary trace.

Within the investigated theme the central question now sounds as follows: How is the past of the language preserved in its memory? By the term internal linguistic memory we indicate that it is the internal aspect of the past of the language which was being overcome within the development of the language as a result of the natural communicative handling of it, hence by using it without any external regulation, without any intervention from the position of power. This past of the language is being preserved in its memory as an imaginary trace linked to its units. By means of this trace the identity of the language becomes fixed, which is expressed by its unchanging name: Slovak, Czech, etc. in the past as well as at present.

It could seem that the notion imaginary trace is only a mental construct which does not have any correlate in reality. However, its being real is supported by the natural command of the users of the language. With regard to the memory of the text, pointed out was the natural knowledge of the fact that its contents arose from certain linearly ordered sentences and facts stemming from them, and with regard to intertextual memory it was pointed out that each linguistic sign can occur in various contexts. In the case of the memory of the language it is natural knowledge that the signs forming the basis of the contemporary language arose from intergenerational communication, and that they could be used in various contexts. This natural knowledge is acquired by the users in such a way that within the process of socialization they participate in intergenerational communication in which they experience their language, or recognize it as being the same one which in spoken/written form is used by the older generations, although they also identify some differences.

The fact to which such knowledge is related is objective to the effect of intersubjective validity as well as independence of the will of the individuals. It has the character of collective spirituality, i.e. of the source of shared knowledge of the linguistic community which, however, gets variously individually manifested (the individual language users have their own experience with regard to intergenerational communication). By recalling one's own experience related to intergenerational communication there is constituted the generation-related (or communication-related memory; cf. with the differentiation of the communication-related and cultural memory by J. Assmann, 1992). Stored in this memory are also the signs of the language of the older generations which is still within the reach of remembrance, and thus the developmental shifts in the language are actually perceived. The signs of the

language of the current generation bear the real traces of their usage by the older generations (cf. with the explanation of intertextuality by J. Kristeva who, e.g., says that each word is marked by the traces of its previous ways of usage, and in this sense it is polycoded and polyvalent; Kristeva, 1972).

Bearing in mind that in the communication memory of each current generation the signs are stored with these traces, the users with regard to the particular time so to speak generalize their knowledge based on experience, i.e. they extend their time-related validity beyond the confines of their own remembrance. The signs of the current language then no longer bear not only the real traces of the near past, but also the imaginary traces of the more distant times. These traces then do not characterize the signs in the communication-related memory, but in the internal linguistic memory. The imaginary trace does not provide information about what is the real form of the timewise distant correlate of the given sign in the memory of the language, but only about the fact that such correlate in some form had existed. The trace of the imaginary time-related correlate constitutes the basis of experiencing the identity of one's own language.

When we state that the past of the language exists in its memory in such a way that its units are marked by the imaginary trace of the past, we make a statement about the manner of the existence of the past of the language in its present, referring to the experience-based knowledge of the users of the language which are related to cross-generational communication, as well as to an imaginary time-related extension of this communication. As this concerns objective collective knowledge, it is coded in the signs stored in the memory of the language. This means that the constant accompanying feature of using a sign from this memory is that it is a current correlate of the previous states of this sign, and that it is a sign of the same language. The impicator of this correlation is that the sign was passing from the memory of the language of one generation into the memory of other generations.

From the psychological point of view this constitutes the acquisition of language in the process of socialization – the individual speakers acquire the language of the previous generation – but from the perspective of the language this is its heritage: language is inherited. If we accept this view concerning the inter-generational continuity of language and accept also the nativist theory from N. Chomsky's generative grammar, we arrive at the statement that the universal grammar on the basis of which an individual speaker acquires a particular language is transposed genetically, and in a similar way a given language is passed from one generation to another one. It is obvious that this simulacrum view leads to the socio-biological theory of the evolution of culture. Let us remind ourselves of the

analogical perception of the biological and cultural evolution by the influential biologist who to the expression gene added the analogical expression meme with the idea that memes are spreading from one brain to another one by means of imitation (Dawkins, 1978:227).

The approach to internal linguistic memory from the position of evolution directs our attention towards the mechanism which guarantees the continual identity of the language, i.e. the identity based on not perceiving the consequences of the spontaneous changes in the language used (spontaneous linguistic changes occur unnoticed, hence the users all the time experience the usage of the same language). The basis of this mechanism is imitation as a medium for transferring the memes into the communication memory of the new generation, but it has to be added that the imitation is based on interpretation stemming from which is possible linguistic change. Imitation is at first the experience of “inheriting” the language at the time of acquiring it, and then it as a rule functions as an unconscious reaction to the linguistic behaviour of others.

Imitation is an analogical behaviour, i.e. behaviour in that sense (in that spirit) as the behaviour of a “testator”, hence minor shifts (in pronunciation, in semantics) as a result of the fact that imitation is not true copying, are not perceived as a change of behaviour, but they can constitute the beginning of such perception (cf. with the explanations of spontaneous linguistic changes in Dausen, 1991). Hence, interpretation has a double role here: the user interprets his/her behaviour as being “the same”, although it is only analogical, but the occasionally registered shifts (in pronunciation, in collocations) can mark the beginning of their interpretation as being relevant, i.e. their reinterpretation (reevaluation). As reinterpretation is a gradual process, the change is not perceived as an interference into the state of the language. By experiencing this process the user acquires intuitive knowledge of the spontaneous dynamics of the language. These dynamics are marked as evolutionary due to the fact that a certain shift from the set of individual or group shifts in linguistic behaviour (e.g. in pronouncing a particular sound) turned out to be socially “the most vital” one, and so it gained ground.

Let us stress: Communication among the memories of language is carried out by means of imitation based on interpretation, i.e. by analogical behaviour. Linguistic memes – analogically to genes – function as non-physical replicators. They are spreading, while there also occurs their “mutation” stemming from the mutation based on interpretation. The meme “mutants” are manifestations of the evolution of the language: from among the potential changes (“mutants”) those cases of potential changes are carried out which prove to be socially “vital”, i.e. they have a higher

potential within usage (biologists speak about biological appropriateness – “fitness”, which can be understood as “*a statistic value of the probability of the multiplication of an individual of a certain type in relationship to the given ecological environment*”; Keller, 2003:196-197). Intuitive knowledge of the spontaneous dynamics of language entails also evolutionary intuition. This intuition constitutes a component of knowledge concerning the continual identity.

A feature of memory is also forgetting. Forgetting has two opposite sides. On the one side it is a memory deficit, i.e. its negative aspect, because something from the past which we would like to evoke gets lost; but on the other side it is its positive aspect, it is its attribute which corresponds to our will or needs. In our approach we focus on this latter aspect. It was well utilized by the sociologist N. Luhmann within his analyses of the social system which would have rigidified without this feature of memory. From this point of view he adduces that “*the principal function of memory, hence, lies in forgetting, in preventing the self-blocking of the system by a rigidification of the results of previous observations*” (Luhmann, 1997:579).

From this point of view memory of language is constituted within the process of forgetting the linguistic structures the usage potential of which was weakened, and so their social “vitality” got lost. Intergenerational analogical usage of linguistic structures (the current generation linguistically behaves in the same spirit, in the same sense as the previous generations, hence it does not mechanically reproduce their behaviour) is followed by forgetting which supports the advancement of linguistic innovations. Linguistic evolution is conditioned by forgetting. However, what does not undergo forgetting is the experience-based knowledge arising from cross-generational communication by which the continual identity of the language is preserved. Certainly not forgotten is what the users of the language experience, what they perceive as ascertaining its identity.

The previous explanations are conducive to the hypothesis that the internal linguistic memory is constituted on the basis of the functioning of the mechanism which guarantees the continual identity of the language. This mechanism is based on the constantly repeated cross-generational communication within the framework of which the linguistic memes are passed onto the following generations on the basis of the analogical linguistic behaviour of the receiving generations. The time-related generalized knowledge which the receiving generation acquires from its experience with the functioning of this mechanism is stored in the internal linguistic memory in which the past of the language is preserved, with regard to its continual identity. This is a continual identity strongly marked by the destructive and at the same time

pragmatic quality of memory – by forgetting. Preservation of the continual identity of the language means non-mechanical reproduction of its substantial identity.

The substantial identity is non-mechanically reproduced by cross-generational analogical linguistic behaviour, i.e. by the behaviour “in that spirit” (“in that sense”) as in the case of the previous generation, by which “the spirit” – the substance – of the language is preserved. Due to the fact that the new generation linguistically behaves in the spirit of the behaviour of the previous generation, it behaves in the spirit of its own language. Within this knowledge the manner of the communicative handling of the linguistic past is maintained. Preserved in it is the substantial identity of the language in its past states. The substance is not any given constant, but it is the dynamic identification basis of the language (cf. Orgoňová, 1998).

Internal linguistic memory is not activated by acts of remembrance from which the images from the previous states of the language are recalled, but by the very usage of linguistic means, this being so because it is directed by this memory. The intuitive knowledge of what corresponds to the spirit of the language is coded in the usage of its means. The manner of linguistic behaviour determined by the evolution of the language corresponds to the natural collective interest in preserving one’s own identity.

In harmony with this interest by means of the internal linguistic memory, from the internal past of the language brought to the present is the fact that all its means and processes which were being carried out within it corresponded to its substance, hence that they stemmed from its spirit. This image of the past of the language is latently, automatically construed by the natural usage of the language, i.e. by the manner of using it which is determined by the evolution of the language. The attribute natural indicates that by interfering into this manner of usage from an extra-communication position, i.e. on the basis of a logical reflection of the natural usage from the position of an abstract language, the image of this past of the language gets adapted to the linguistic construction of the identity of the language. At this point we are already arriving at the external linguistic memory.

3. External Linguistic Memory

External linguistic memory includes the consciously regulated selection of data from the past of the language and dealing with it. It exists in the form of institutionalized conservation media (books, electronic media, memorial localities, boards, etc.), i.e. within standardized forms of the preservation and the processing of data from the past, as well as the cultural practices connected with them. It functions

as recalling the remembrance images of the previous forms of language and the ways of reacting to the language, which manifests the way of the interpretation of the past of the language from the point of view of its role at present.

The historically first stimulus for considering this memory is provided by Plato's notion *anámnēsis*. Let us recall from his teaching that the universe is composed of the world of phenomena and the world of ideas; as a human being has a soul which is immortal, he/she has the possibility of entering also into the world of ideas. Before incarnation the soul of a human being belonged to this world, he/she can recall what he/she had forgotten within the process of incarnation. By recalling – by *anámnēsis* – a human being gets to know the truth (as well as beauty and goodness). The mission of this teaching is that the world that we perceive now is only a surface form of the previous world, while its true, real form has to be searched for in the past.

An expression of this message is also the notion “hot” social form – in opposition to the “cold” form – introduced in ethnology according to which there is also used the notion “hot” culture in opposition to “cold” culture (Assmann, 1992). This in fact concerns the way in which the relationship between the present state of the speech community and its past is perceived: while by “coldness” it is expressed that the present is not affected by the past, by the attribute „hot” the influence of the past upon the present is stressed. In the second case there is constantly at play “the returning to the roots” and the confrontation of the contemporary unsatisfactory state with the “better times” in the past. The breeding ground of the external linguistic memory is the “hot” culture.

The existence of this memory is motivated by the interest in preserving the reactions to the past of the language which will guarantee that the actual treatment of the language is carried out within the spirit of “anámnēsis”, i.e. with regard to preserving one's true, real language which we can find in its deep past. This interest is connected with the need of the fixing and traditional preservation of the self-image of the linguistic community with the historically acknowledged identity and the need of cultivating the national ideology in favour of the whole linguistic community or its part. There is created an idealized remembrance image of the past of the language as a measure of evaluating its contemporary state and of handling it. According to this measure there are “bright” as well as “dark” periods in the history of the language and by applying it we can determine to which period the contemporary language is linked (cf. Orgoňová, 2005).

The principal referential domain of the external linguistic memory is the Standard Language. Preserved in it is a selection of reactions to this linguistic form

which correspond to the linguistic ideology supported – consciously or non-consciously – by the philosophy of the objective spirituality of language. The application of the conception of objective spirituality which is a philosophical conception that was “started” by Plato and affected Humboldt, Herder, Hegel, etc. – leads to the idea that the basis of languages lies in their reflecting the spirit of the particular nations which exists as a certain objective substance. As languages were formed and developed with this role under the influence of variable circumstances, in their development there occur deviations from their nature, a return to the past is called for. As a typical example Štúr’s selection of the Cultural Central Slovak as the “purest” existential form of the Slovak of those times to become the basis of Standard Slovak. This reaction to the fundament of Standard Slovak is stored in the Slovak external linguistic memory and serves as a background of the interpretations of contemporary manifestations of the language from the position of the puristically oriented linguistic ideology.

In the “cold” social form (or culture) there functions only the accumulatory external linguistic memory in which the reactions to the past of the language are deposited as facts which thus do not serve for reacting in their spirit to the contemporary state of the language. Of course, the division of the cultures into “hot” and “cold” is schematic, in reality these features occur to a lesser or higher degree. This means that in the social life of the linguistic super-communities the external linguistic memory also plays either a more distinct or a less distinct role depending on the fact of how these linguistic communities are motivated to perceive the contemporary language by means of its past.

Let us stress that external linguistic memory is constituted by the institutionalization of interpretations from the data from the past of the language, and of the manners of reactions to it with regard to the particular needs and interests of the whole speech community or to some particular intentions and goals. It is inherently connected with creating a collective self-image based on the need of self-identification which is carried out within various historical-social conditions which, however, influences the interpretation. The collective self-identification, i.e. the answer to the question who we are, which implies the questions where do we come from and how have we arrived at the contemporary stage, is motivated not only heuristically, i.e. by the need to understand the identity of one’s own linguistic community, to be oriented in it, to find the sense of its existence and activities, but – and this motivation dominates – it is also motivated politically.

This motivation is accompanied by the question in favour of what political interest (expansive, defensive, etc.) the linguistic community interprets itself with

regard to its identity. For example, the self-identification of the Slovak nation has a distinct hetero-acceptation motivation: the manifestation of one's own identity is causally linked with the will to be acknowledged by other linguistic super-communities. When it became evident that language is accepted as an important attribute in the structure of identification signs, it turned into a prominent object of political interest. The interest in the hetero-acceptation of the Slovak language, and hence also of the Slovak nation, became the regulator of the interpretation of the linguistic past. Through institutionalization of this interpretation the Slovak external linguistic memory was formulated. This memory, e.g., also forms the ideological support of the Slovak Linguistic Act from the year 1995 which is based on the premise that the Slovak language is the most important feature of the uniqueness of the Slovak nation and the most precious value of its cultural heritage.

As the key relational point of self-identification and the argument in favour of hetero-acceptation is the beginning of the history of the linguistic community, the central place in the external linguistic memory is taken by the linguistic phenomena which are connected with the events of foundation importance (these are interpreted as the activities constituting the genetic basis of the linguistic community). The revelation of the existential base of the linguistic community in the distant past serves as a testimony of its firm historical roots among the linguistic communities, and as an argument supporting the defence of the rights for its own existence. The events which are ascribed as having a founding importance become fixed in the cultural memory, and the linguistic community is referring to them as to its own fundamental tradition.

The Constitution of the Slovak Republic can serve as a good example and starts as follows: *“We, the Slovak nation, remembering the political and cultural heritage of our predecessors and the centuries of experience with struggling for national existence and our own statehood, in the sense of the spiritual legacy connected with Cyril and Methodius, as well as of the historic heritage of the Great Moravian Empire, based on the natural right of nations for self-determination...”* (Ústava Slovenskej republiky – The Constitution of the Slovak Republic – 1992:23). The text of the Constitution embodies the component of the cultural memory of the Slovak nation which evokes the remembrance of the linguistic community of the spiritual activities of Cyril and Methodius, and of the historic events from the times of the Great Moravian Empire, while the remembrance is “impregnated” by the interpretation on the basis of the collective political interest (it is connected with the natural right of the nation for self-determination).

This component of the cultural memory also entails the texts in which it is fixed that “*the first truly standardized language of our predecessors was the Old Church Slavic language*” (Pauliny, 1983:23). Those texts represent the elements of the internal linguistic memory. In our calendar July 5th is marked as a holiday in honour of Cyril and Methodius, so that in a regular cycle this moment of cultural memory becomes reproduced. Within the standardized festivities connected with the rituals the Old Church Slavic and the glagolitic script are remembered. According to the findings of an expert “*in Slovakia the traces of Old Church Slavic written documents are very quickly disappearing*” (Pauliny, 1983:45), but in the linguistic memory they are fixed within the interests of manifesting the depth of our own linguistic history, which is an important support in developing the national consciousness and self-confidence, as well as in the effort aimed at hetero-acceptation. With regard to the fact that the historical depth of the linguistic community and its language as indicator of its vitality, and hence also its right for self-determination as a nation in the generally accepted sense won recognition, this factor has played an important role in it within constituting the cultural memory and the external linguistic memory.

4. Conclusion

Human beings as part of the animal world have been preserved as a species on the basis of the functioning of the genetic programme. Human beings as creatures shaped by a certain culture have been preserved as a “cultural species” on the basis of the functioning of the collective memory in which an important role is played by the cultural memory, which stems from the fact that one of the fundamental orientations of human beings – their orientation upon their own identity – has a considerable pragmatic potential. The cultural memory arose from the collective interest in using this potential. Human being as a “cultural species” is also a “linguistic species”, and this appurtenance to the species is maintained by linguistic memory.

The cultural linguistic memory was constituted by the actualization of the pragmatic potential of orientation upon the identity of the language. While the accumulative collective memory and its linguistic component conserve the past facts, and thus can function as a medium of the collective self-identification stimulated by the internal need for collective self-determination, by means of the cultural memory and the linguistic memory as its component the collective self-image with pragmatic motivation is cultivated. The pragmatic motivation is fully manifested within cultivating the collective self-portrait by the external linguistic memory which is constituted and functions under the influence of ideological and political interests. By the internal linguistic memory this self-image is cultivated as the experiencing of the naturalness of language usage stemming from its dynamic substance, while the

pragmatic motivation is hidden in this naturalness (“Natural is what has proved its worth, and what has proved its worth is useful”).

By the pragmatization of preserving the past of the language in the present the question of its corresponding veracity (whether the picture of the past corresponds to the reality) is pushed aside, and what becomes actualized is the pragmatic veracity (the truth is what is interpersonally valid) linked with the sense (with what the past of the language means for us). A culturologically oriented linguist aims at this truth, its circumstances and consequences. From the point of view of interference into the language of special importance is the knowledge of the internal linguistic memory connected with the question of the normal functioning of the language. Here we find the stimulus for the reflexion of the relationship between the linguistic truth which claims the status of (relative) objectivity, and the user’s truth which stems from the natural usage of the language.

Bibliography

1. ASSMANN, A. (1999): *Erinnerungsräume, Formen und Funktionen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. München: Beck.
2. ASSMANN, J. (1992): *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. München: Beck.
3. DAUSES, A. (1991): *Sprachwandel durch Analogie. Zu den Grenzen des sprachlichen Wandels*. Stuttgart: Frank Steiner Verlag.
4. DAWKINS, J. (1978): *Das egoistische Gen*. Berlin: Springer,
5. KELLER, R. (2003): *Sprachwandel. Von der unsichtbaren Hand in der Sprache*. 3. Aufl. Tübingen und Basel: A. Francke Verlag.
6. KRISTEVA, J. (1972): Bachtin, das Wort, der Dialog und der Roman. In: J. Ihwe (ed.), *Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
7. LACHMANN, R. (1991): *Gedächtnis und Literatur, Intertextualität in der russischen Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
8. LUHMANN, N. (1997): *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. MIKO, F. (1989): *Aspekty literárneho textu. Štúdie 6*. Nitra: Pedagogická fakulta v Nitre.
9. ORGOŇOVÁ, O. (1998): *Galicizmy v slovenčine*. Bratislava: Stimul.
10. ORGOŇOVÁ, O. (2005): Neologizmy z interkultúrneho aspektu. In: J. Dolník (ed.), *Jazyk a komunikácia v súvislostiach*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského.

11. PAULINY, E. (1983): *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
12. *Ústava Slovenskej Republiky* (1992): Bratislava, NVK INTERNATIONAL.

Department of Slovak Language

Gondova 2, 814 99 Bratislava 1

<juraj.dolnik@fphil.uniba.sk>