Exploring Cultural Memory, Textual Hybrids, and Figure of Trickster in Indigenous Literature

Jana Žiláková
Institute of Translation and Interpreting, Faculty of Arts, University of Prešov, Slovakia
jana.scigulinska@unipo.sk

Key words: cultural memory, a figure of trickster, indigenous literature, oral tradition, transformation

1 Theory of Cultural Memory and Literature

The concept of cultural memory and its theoretical framework work on the premise that literature, at its core, has the potential to play a significant role in preserving and disseminating cultural knowledge, thus influencing the interpretation of the past. This approach allows for revisiting and reinterpretation of prevailing historical perspectives from the viewpoint of local communities and their complex historical encounters. One of the primary objectives for several indigenous authors is deliberately disrupting conventional boundaries between history, individual memories, and reality. This deliberate blurring of boundaries creates a way for meaningful exchanges between the past and the present, both for indigenous communities and the dominant society. This phenomenon is observable in contemporary Australian Aboriginal and Native American literature, where traditional texts based on oral traditions are incorporated into new texts, enabling their re-reading and actualization. In the case of contemporary Australian Aboriginals' and Native Americans' works, combining the indigenous literary traditions characteristic for their oral traditions with the non-indigenous strategies enables their unique interpretation through literature. Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony* ([1977] 2006)), Alexis Wright's *Carpentaria* (2006), Gerald Vizenor's *The Trickster of Liberty: Tribal Heirs to a Wild Baronage* ([1988] 2005), and Marie Munkara's *Every Secret thing* (2016) can be considered as good examples, as all of them contain the traditional storytelling techniques and forms such as myths and poems, even the characters of tricksters, typical for the indigenous oral traditions through which they question the historical experience and recording of the past.

A. Erll – A. Nünning (2008), and P. Hermann (2013) analyze the role of cultural memory in literature, pointing out how diverse types of memory are depicted. Culturally specific devices shape the view of memory and its function, influencing the selective marginalization of historically and culturally significant issues. These devices have the power to affect not only the interpretation of the text but also the broader extra-textual reality. Australian Aboriginal and Native American writers often reinterpret the past by incorporating multiple voices and perspectives, contributing to the shaping of memories and understanding the present. Literature can function as a mediator of memory, transmitting memory through various devices and interconnecting literary and non-literary aspects. Narration, a significant literary device found in both indigenous and non-indigenous cultures, serves as a link between memory and historical experience. It allows the transmission of cultural knowledge and the reinterpretation of the past, shaping the readers' understanding of the world. The written form of literature offers greater efficiency in organizing and presenting information than oral traditions, which often rely on repetition and additional information to enhance memorability.

P. Hermann (2013) introduces the concept of the memory of literature, suggesting that it can possess its own memory. She argues that intertextuality is crucial in constructing literary memory, as it incorporates and repeats bits of various texts to create new ones. R. Lachmann's (2008) argument presents that intertextuality, as such, represents the memory of the text because it copes with a procedure similar to that one taking part in building the memory. Such a

phenomenon is observable, for example, in contemporary indigenous literature of Australian Aboriginals and indigenous peoples of North America; traditional texts based on oral traditions are incorporated within the new texts, and through such a procedure, they are not only repeated but also actualized as the new textual environment that creates different conditions for their rereading.

Memory is not a purely individual or objective process but is heavily influenced by cultural and social factors. Different cultures have unique ways of encoding, storing, and retrieving information, and the devices and tools they use can profoundly impact memory formation and preservation. For example, memory in literature, as analyzed by P. Hermann (2013) and referring to the research by A. Erll – A. Nünning (2008), accentuates all the aspects mentioned above, in addition to focusing on the role of the individual types of memory and the way they are depicted through literature and culturally specific devices. These devices, such as oral tradition, ceremonies, and other cultural practices, including traditional knowledge, particularly for the Australian Aboriginals and Native Americans, can improve how to shape the view of memory and its function to reorganize the view of the past. This idea implies the possibility to analyze those devices when applied to narratives to distinguish their influence on the text and context. Accordingly, culturally specific devices have an influence on the selective effect of marginalization of historically and culturally prominent issues. Such procedures can influence the notion of reality beyond the textual interpretation. Therefore, memory in literature stands for a transformative power that can influence not only the intra-textual but also the extra-textual reality through language, in both its written and oral forms. For example, Australian Aboriginal and Native American writers like Alexis Wright, Marie Munkara, Gerald Vizenor, Louis Erdrich, and Leslie Marmon Silko often compose their literary texts with the aim to reinterpret the past, according to P. Hermann (2013) it can "give the past many voices, which may not be in agreement" (p. 342). By doing so, they shape the memories and contribute to readers' understanding of the present.

The concept of literature as a mediator of memory (Hermann, 2013, p. 344) suggests that literature has the ability to transmit cultural memory. As a medium, literature can employ various devices to interconnect literary and non-literary aspects, becoming part of the oral traditions through which memories can be re-mediated. Narration, as a literary device, employs storytelling and is found in the literary-cultural traditions of both indigenous and non-indigenous societies, whether in oral or written forms. B. Clunies Ross (2008, as cited in Falck Borch et al., 2008) suggests that literature, especially its narrative forms, serves as borders and links between memory and historical experience. Myth, for example, serves as a concentrated memory of the past for many indigenous communities, functioning as a fictional product of memory while transmitting cultural knowledge. When myths are written down, they maintain the essence of oral traditions but are organized by the author. According to W. J. Ong (2003), written texts are more efficient in their organization, allowing for linear movement forward or backward. Ong argues that written forms are superior to oral presentations, often repeating or adding information to enhance memorability. However, for indigenous communities, it is often the opposite.

B. Neumann (2008) describes literature, particularly narration, as a catalyst for creating memory and identity in a world constructed through this process. B. Neumann recognizes the link between memory and literature, both responsible for shaping the identity. She points out the existence of "fictions of memory" (p. 334) and how literature, as a medium, contributes to the construction and interpretation of surrounding reality, influencing the way we "encounter the world" (Neumann, 2008, p. 334). The interpretation of memories allows for expressing what had happened in the past and cannot be influenced or undone. However, the intention to change, implemented in the text, or at least the readers' engagement, can lead to awareness and transformation.

The term "fictions of memory" (Neumann, 2008, p. 334) introduced by cultural psychologists describes the mechanism of memory related to narration. In the present context, it refers to interpreting cultural or individual stories concerning origin and meaning in relation to their self-defined cultural identity. Aboriginal Dreamtime narratives, for example, represent a traditional view of the Aboriginal past and present existence influenced by the notion of cultural identity and historical experiences such as colonialism. While their believability is questionable from a scientific standpoint, they represent the construct of memory that embodies the core features of the community and its individuals, developed over a long-term process. These narratives explain present issues through the lens of the past.

The text can become a reference for the memory space, defining specific cultural attributes. According to M. M. Bakhtin (1986, as cited in Raj, 2015, p. 77), "the text cannot be detached from socio-cultural textuality which is the backdrop in which a text is created". Similarly, oral traditions within indigenous communities contribute to constituting the cultural memory of their cultures. Incorporating their functionality into written text emphasizes their purpose. For Australian Aboriginals and Native Americans, this functionality manifests in the intentional repetition expressed through various narrative forms. However, in comparison to W. J. Ong's argumentation (ibid., 2015), the indigenous understanding of literature as a mediator of memory is based on multiple layers. These layers include traditional knowledge and perspectives on the past, present, and future, characteristic of oral traditions and cultures. Consequently, their ability to move back and forth, as well as traverse individual layers and interweave them, accentuates the information and its significance for the recipients.

Regarding the preservation of knowledge, cultural memory represents a higher and more complex level. Myths contain the principles of what should be remembered or forgotten, ultimately to be shared. Despite incorporating many fantastical and supernatural elements, its myths include survival knowledge that must be shared, usually through retelling by individuals who have survived and can validate the content, whether orally or otherwise. Various techniques are employed, such as transforming abstract notions of memory into more understandable forms. Missing information is reinterpreted through imitation, preventing it from being forgotten once again as it is revived through repetitive use. Each individual experience is encapsulated within a unique memory, influenced by the selective process that constructs a corpus.

Consequently, this process shapes self-identification by embodying knowledge and experiences shared within the community, if not nationally. In literature, textual interpretation often refers to the interpretation of the past remembered by the individuals and communities in which they co-exist. It plays a role in constructing their self-perception and understanding. Cultural memory, therefore, offers a space for re-evaluating the content of indigenous literature, which also encompasses the historical experience of Western society and its oppressive cultural domination over indigenous communities. At the same time, this theory introduces literary criticism that reflects a survival mode for indigenous communities, as they strive to resist cultural subordination leading to cultural assimilation or eradication. Regarding the oral communities, D. Molloy (2015, p. ix) asserts that they "tend to rely on communicative memory, which depends on personal interaction, shared memories, and individual biographies". Nonetheless, such writing can be interpreted as actualizing the shared memories of the past, particularly when authors question the notion of individual trauma and its influence on the concept presented through cultural memory.

The interaction between cultural memory, cultural experience, and cultural traditions is embedded in the oral culture and recorded in the written texts, establishing and supporting a dialogue. The mnemonic function of oral literature creates this connection. With regard to indigenous cultural communities like Native Americans and Australian Aboriginals, A. Erll (2008, as cited in Erll – Nünning, 2008, p. 5) comments that "societies do not remember

literally; but much of what is done to reconstruct a shared past bears some resemblance to the processes of individual memory". Oral literary traditions within indigenous cultures, such as those of Australian Aboriginals and Native Americans, draw upon the transformative power affecting those who listen to stories and create some conversation with a person, a storyteller, and therefore, they also participate in the storytelling process.

The elements of narratives have become another means to challenge and transcend previously established literary frames. D. Harvey (1991, p. 42) observes that the introduction of new literary movements opened up the possibilities for expanding "particular interest in giving way to 'other voices' and 'other worlds' that have been silenced under the oppression of the mainstream meta-narrative for too long (i.e., women; sexual minorities; ethnic minorities; colonized peoples who happen to have their own unique stories to tell)". Many techniques align closely with the nature of indigenous storytelling and oral traditions, enabling their transformation into the written form and the preservation of their stories. How is this possible? Open cooperation between the processes of writing and reading has become one of the main strategies, aligning with the indigenous oral traditions of telling and listening. In such cases, the extracts of the texts often embody original cultural aspects or allude to a particular culture within the new textual environment, thereby influencing the overall understanding of the text.

The oral tradition and its elements represent aesthetics and traditional knowledge that complement contemporary indigenous literature. A. M. Lawson (2006, p. 30) notes that in the case of Native Americans, the "resistance literature"[1] utilizes foreign or colonizing cultures to convey its message. In contrast, "resilience literature"[2] draws upon its own Native American and often tribally specific culture, often specific to particular tribes.

2 Intertextual Character of Cultural Memory

Both D. Molloy (2015) and R. Lachmann (2008) emphasize the potential of intertextuality to enrich the text by pasting together textual fragments representing other literary sources, both written and spoken. Their view alludes to J. Kristeva (1980), who introduced the term intertextuality. In one of its aspects, intertextuality understands the text as "at once literary and social, creative and cultural" (Raj, 2015, p. 77). Although the concept of intertextuality is linked to poststructuralism and postmodernism, it can be considered as more universal, as it depends on the individual texts that are not simply pasted together, carefully compiled by the author "after reading other texts" (Raj, 2015, 78), and then offered to the readers. J. Kristeva argues about the authors' originality while creating a new text, as she believes it is merely a recycling of the "already existing texts" (Kristeva, 1980, p. 36). Her argument should not be considered negative because when several texts are reused and incorporated into a new textual environment, they mutually influence each other in various ways. In the case of many indigenous literary works, intertextuality allows the confrontation of colonial texts with their counterparts, the indigenous literary tradition based on orality.

One of the reasons why intertextuality is important for cultural memory, as asserted by R. Lachmann (2008, p. 304), is that "[a]ll texts participate, repeat, and constitute acts of memory; all are products of their distancing and surpassing of precursor texts. […] As a collection of intertexts, the text itself is a memory place; as texture, it is memory architecture". Thus, intertextuality focuses on how meaning is constituted under the influence of culture and language. Regarding this, D. Molloy (2011) discusses two views on intertextuality introduced by Roland Barthes and Julia Kristeva (Molloy, 2015, pp. 3–4). D. Molloy (2015) leans more

[1] Represents a category of literature and writing characteristic for its political nature confronting the ideologies and official histories.

[2] Is a recent literary category characteristic for indigenous literature based on drawing from the traditional concepts of indigenous cultures, following them in contemporary works.

toward Kristeva's view, emphasizing the dialogue between text, history, culture, and the writer. This inclination towards Kristeva is more acceptable, as her view also presents the possibility that the incorporated texts can become the textual interpretation of society and history, even though that aspect is also presented in Bakhtin's theory of dialogism (Kristeva, 1980). The writer's role in compiling various textual sources is to initiate the dialogue or conversation based on the intentionally created meaning "beyond what is inscribed in a text" (Raj, 2015, p. 78). Traditional theories and approaches, criticized for their enclosed interpretations, must be supplemented through intertextuality to reach "historical, cultural, social and institutional realms" (Raj, 2015, p. 80), thereby emphasizing the dialogue between the text and its readers.

According to the theory of intertextuality, the text cannot be considered independent and autonomous. Its connection to other texts that contribute to its constitution allows for a broader range of perspectives and reinterpretation, encompassing cultural and historical aspects. These textual "bits" can permeate through other texts that represent the cultural environment of specific societies. These bits refer not only to the quotes or transcriptions from original texts related to pre-textual times but also to more recent references to cultural experiences preserved in the memory of traditional communities. New texts often incorporate paraphrases of the original texts or simple allusions that capture the essence of the original texts. This is where the term intertextuality comes into play. According to R. Lachmann's perspective (2008), intertextuality brings together different types of texts, regardless of whether they belong to literary or non-literary domains. In her view, a written text represents another interpretation of culture itself. In this case, each incorporated text contributes to its actualization and transformation. This textual representation of culture implies that it can represent the culture and its interpretation of cultural memory.

R. Lachmann (2008) introduces three modes of intertextuality that define the relationship between memory and culture, which serve different purposes, according to D. Molloy (2015). These models are referred to as "participation, troping, and transformation" (Lachmann, 2008, p. 304), and they involve various ways in which the textual fragments are incorporated into other texts. The dialogical aspect is performed through the mode of participation. The new texts result from a simulation or a mimic of the written texts already well-known within the cultural community. On the other hand, troping confronts the original texts being incorporated, aiming to challenge and surpass them textually. By authorially engaging with these original texts, the intention is to suppress or erase their meaning and emphasize the contribution of the newly created text. The third mode of intertextuality, transformation, also includes the dialogical aspect, but it approaches the original text from a different angle. This mode of transformation then reminds us more of playing with the texts and their functionality, as a new perspective violates and questions the position of both the original and new texts. Although each mode of intertextuality represents a distinct process of textual constitution, it is challenging to distinguish any of them as dominant within a single text. Both D. Molloy (2015) and R. Lachmann (2008) agree that texts often exhibit characteristics of all modes, and treating them separately is difficult, as they all contribute to building memory, including cultural memory, through the texts created.

All three modes of intertextuality concerning the indigenous literature of Australian Aboriginals and Native Americans have their objectives, particularly regarding the expansion of options introduced by several literary and critical theories, despite occasional contradictions to their original goals. However, one crucial fact concerning participation as an intertextual mode has deliberately been omitted, as it does not pertain to orally based texts for several reasons. During the 19th and 20th centuries, in the context of assimilation policies in Australia and North America, the only available written texts were those from the dominant Western cultural society. Therefore, it was "natural" for the early written works of indigenous people to adhere to the same principles, given the lack of alternative choices due to their separation and

isolation from their original traditional cultures (Molloy, 2015). Texts based on oral traditions emerged much later due to civil rights movements in which indigenous communities sought to reinterpret their suppressed identities. In the case of the second mode, troping, R. Lachmann (2008, p. 34) alludes to the attempt to "re-represent the past". The essence of this mode lies in the pursuit of gaining control over both the new text and the precursor texts to achieve "control over a particular narrative of the past to break the authority of one representation over another" (Molloy, 2015, p. 5). Examples of this mode can be seen in the official historical narratives provided by the governments of Australia and the United States, which, through their reinterpretation of "official" history, created a so-called official historiographic view of the past (Healy, 1997). However, troping also represents the risk of interpreting historical events that challenge the official past, which, in the case of indigenous communities, can inadvertently slip to the same level. Instead of defending and confronting the official version of history written by the dominant society, it is possible to transform it into their unified view of the interpretation of the past, albeit from the perspective of the usurped.

L. Hutcheon's (1989, p. 33) "historiographic metafiction" represents and questions "the self-consciousness of the fictionality, the lack of the familiar pretense of transparency, and the calling into question of the factual grounding of history-writing". Therefore, it suggests a shift in understanding the unique qualities of narrative representations. L. Hutcheon refers to the situations where history is intertwined with fiction, particularly in narratives, to portray the events reflecting some self-conscious nature of fiction while questioning historical writing. Consequently, the third mode of intertextuality, transformation, plays a significant role in texts representing the historiographical narratives of cultural communities like Native Americans or Australian Aboriginals. Although these texts contain specific texts alluding to historical events or experiences, often from officially recorded sources, they are transformed into textual allusions or language games that reflect cultural memory. To some extent, they preserve these events, even though the focus, as noted by D. Molloy (2015), is on the process of "remembering" (p. 6), which is crucial for cultural memory.

While the concepts of intertextuality often overlap in the textual interpretation of the novels, more is needed to achieve the desired effect in many indigenous literary works. D. Molloy (2015) emphasizes the term "syncretism" introduced by R. Lachmann (2008, p. 29), which represents one of the intertextual methods and has distinct features in relation to textual interpretation. Syncretism introduces a different perspective by blending multiple texts, leading to their transformation. It not only allows for the incorporation of "different linguistic or belief systems" and "different genres and periods" but also blending "archival material with imagination, and myth with history, transgress boundaries, combine styles, and break rules" (Molloy, 2015, p. 7). In indigenous literature, syncretism, with all its possibilities, enables the exploration of various aspects of the past. Instead of relying solely on subjective and inadequate interpretations of individual experiences presented by the dominant discourse, indigenous literature reinterprets these experiences through the utilization of the indigenous "languages, voices and rhythms" or "storytelling methods" (Molloy, 2015, p. 7). It strengthens the cultural memory that supports a "network of cultures, beliefs and voices" (ibid., p. 7) and fosters a transformative relationship between the indigenous and non-indigenous mainstream populations.

According to G. McInnis's observations (2002), language is a tool whose purpose has evolved to control and influence others as it constructs reality. However, it can also deconstruct reality to introduce alternative views, which is a primary aim of many indigenous writers. For instance, contemporary Native American literature, in many aspects, continues to embrace and expand upon the principles of storytelling and other elements of oral tradition. It establishes a novel relationship between the text and its readers, which Porter defines as "dialectic" (2005, as cited in Porter-Roemer, 2005, p. 44) and is similar to those articulated by M. M. Bakhtin

(1986) and J. Kristeva (1980). In this case, the meaning of the text is influenced by "figures causing semantic shifts and reversals of polarity" that "dissolve the meaning of the text as it existed beforehand" and by "participational figures" that "seem to preserve the pre-text" (Lachmann, 2008, p. 305). Consequently, the role of intertextuality becomes even more crucial.

The storytelling tradition has made its way into the novel through intertextuality, offering indigenous writers' new possibilities for self-expression. As a genre, the novel originated from the Western literary tradition and does not have an equivalent within the cultural and literary traditions of Australian Aboriginals or Native Americans. Even M. M. Bakhtin (1965, in Kristeva, 1980) argued that the novel as a form of textual interpretation could establish conditions for crossing the intertextual borders and negotiating the meaning through dialogue. His argument underlines the potential of the novel, for the dialogue enables to "challenge the dominant languages and voices" (Molloy, 2015, p. 16). Therefore, literature, especially that that is not dominant, confronts and challenges the "common opinion" of the dominant society by presenting "alternative voices and stories" (Molloy, 2015, p. 16). One of the explanations can be found in J. Kristeva's (1980) perspective on the novel, where intertextuality emerges from the collaboration between the authorial approach, the characters, and the language. This collaboration impacts the flexibility of meaning through historical and cultural references activated by intertextuality. Consequently, literature and its genres play a role not only in relation to indigenous literature and other marginalized groups but also in questioning and challenging official opinions by presenting alternative versions through indigenous voices. Supporting the establishment of cultural memory, including self-reflection, particularly concerning indigenous communities, is therefore crucial.

In the case of many contemporary indigenous works, sometimes, it can be challenging to entirely separate the text from its author, as this is a characteristic of the formalistic approach. To truly comprehend the text, it is necessary to consider it in context. Therefore, interdisciplinary studies, such as literary postmodern and postcolonial studies, along with studies related to other humanistic fields, should be focused on alongside the authors and their own perspectives on traditional culture and the reception of the contemporary audience. Several authors from the indigenous communities introduce the form of the "adopted" genre of the novel and some postmodern or postcolonial writing strategies. For instance, Leslie Marmon Silko, as a Native American author, draws primarily from the resilience of traditional storytelling. In addition to utilizing multiple narrators, Silko incorporates the cycle principle.

Similarly, as an Australian Aboriginal writer, Alexis Wright integrates Dreamtime mythopoetics into her stories. Another writer of Native American origin, Gerald Vizenor, creatively combines postmodern strategies with traditional tribal knowledge, resulting in what he terms the trickster discourse. According to B. Ashcroft – G. Griffith – H. Tiffin (2002) his discourse is based on language games with English, the dominant culture's language. Even Marie Munkara, an Australian Aboriginal writer, employs strategies that include humor, combining them with life-writing elements to challenge the previous colonial views while "writing back".

3 Cultural Memory, Textual Hybrids, and Figure of Trickster

Through their incorporation into a new textual environment, traditional individual texts facilitate the transformation of the environment, allowing for a different perspective on the traditional stories. Literature preserves experiences through written text and creates a space for reinterpretation. Difficulties in understanding arise when specific cultural contexts have yet to be discovered. However, according to J. Ruppert (1995, as cited in Griece et al., [1988] 2001, p. 23), non-Native readers "aware of their lack of knowledge" can now recognize patterns they were previously unaware of and understand the new literary hybrids crafted by contemporary indigenous writers.

The creation and function of hybrid texts have been discussed by numerous scholars, for example, M. M. Bakhtin (1986), J. Kristeva (1980), E. Said (1995), H. Bhabha (1984), in and others. While some scholars appreciate the contribution of such texts, critics question the radical mixing of cultural acts and textual forms, citing concerns about the loss of original authenticity and cultural structures. For instance, B. Rice (2003) argues that writing, as part of the educational system, symbolizes the power of literate societies and facilitates their control over the rest of the world through a process he terms "whitewashing". In this context, postcolonial literature and hybrid texts grapple with the historical issues arising from Anglo-Western or Euro-American societies' imposition of rules, laws, and acts in written form to maintain dominance and decision-making authority over indigenous peoples.

D. Molloy (2015, p. 18) offers a different perspective; while partly disagreeing with the idea mentioned above, she argues that writing "does not belong to a particular group" and is, in fact, a "complement to oral cultures" for indigenous communities. According to D. Molloy (ibid.), the emphasis should be on transforming oral traditions into written form without sacrificing their uniqueness and authenticity by conforming solely to Western literacy norms and traditions. Instead, the new written format should acknowledge and preserve the features of oral traditions. That requires a loosening and transformation of previously established norms and rules for writing and interpreting these texts. For Australian Aboriginals, Native Americans, and similar communities, oral traditions embody traditional knowledge and significantly contribute to their cultural identity. Consequently, when these communities write "in the language of the ex-colonizer" (Snell-Hornby, 2001, p. 208), one of their primary objectives is to create a shared meaning understood by both cultures.

The concept of textual hybridity primarily pertained to the post-colonial discourse, addressing intercultural references and the representation of diverse relationships through text. Scholars introduced this term to address the transformative cultural, linguistic, and political impacts on both the colonized and the colonizer, particularly concerning "[…] replicating assimilationist policies by masking or 'whitewashing' cultural differences" (Bhabha, 1984b, as cited in Ashcroft – Griffith – Tiffin, 2002, p. 122). Hybridity offers an opportunity to challenge and alter "the structures of domination in the colonial situation" (Bhabha, 1984b, as cited in Ashcroft – Griffith – Tiffin, 2002, p. 123). M. M. Bakhtin's original notion of an "intentional hybrid", as interpreted by Bhabha, has transformed into "an active moment of challenge and resistance against a dominant colonial power […] depriving the imposed imperialist culture, not only of the authority that it has for so long imposed politically, often through violence, but even of its own claims to authenticity" (ibid., p. 123).

On the contrary, R. Lachmann (2008) and D. Molloy (2015, p. 19) view cultural hybridity as a process. They stress the importance of the differences that represent the original contexts. Through mutual confrontation, these differences challenge the original meanings and give them a new sense. Also, A. Krupat (Griece et al., [1988] 2001) is one of those indigenous scholars who support the creation of hybrids. These new forms represent the differences between two contrasting cultures, yet, at the same time, they can serve as tools for mediating communication, knowledge, and understanding between them. D. Molloy (2015) and R. Lachmann (2008) refer to writing strategies that enable the creation of complex structures resembling the form of literary hybrids. Texts labeled as hybrids are works that differ in structure and content. However, in the case of many contemporary Australian Aboriginal and Native American works, they combine indigenous literary traditions from their oral traditions with non-indigenous strategies representing their unique interpretation through literature. According to D. Molloy (2015, p. x), "[s]yncretic and hybrid forms of literature offer new ways of representing the past to reflect a broad range of values, interests, and political needs that go beyond 'official' narratives". R. Lachmann (2008, p. 301) explains that when providing her perspective on literature, she characterizes it as both "a recording device" and "a body of commemorative

actions that include the knowledge stored by a culture". Consequently, the character of literary forms influences their cultural transmission and interpretation, aiming to "retell" the viewpoints through newly rewritten texts. This approach allows for experimentation on the linguistic and textual levels, striving to capture the specifics of the oral traditions as closely as possible.

Cultural memory can be related through intertextuality to the figure of a trickster and its discourse. This occurrence is present in indigenous and non-indigenous cultural traditions and can be regarded as a hybrid in a particular way. The phenomenon of the trickster has been extensively examined from various angles, such as an archetype, a medium of cultural resistance against the pervading alien culture, or a figure that acts foolishly to ease social tensions (Radin, 1956; Vizenor, 1989). Oral traditions of the indigenous communities represent the traditional knowledge preserved in both oral and textual forms. In the context of cultural memory, these traditions can be considered cultural archives, from which the individual stories are reactivated as they are retold or rewritten anew. Intertextuality plays a crucial role as a tool of cultural memory, particularly within the genre of the novel and indigenous literature. It allows for exploring and transcending textual, cultural, and historical boundaries between the past and the present. The figure of a trickster, along with various forms of humor, naturally finds its place within the oral traditions of Native Americans and Australian Aboriginals, serving a specific purpose. Therefore, an analysis of cultural memory also encompasses studying these aspects. In the present context, it is essential to concentrate on the role of the trickster in relation to intertextuality and its significance to cultural memory.

According to C. Jung, the figure of the trickster or "the collective shadow figure" (Radin, 1956, p. 202), enables an interpretation of negative and undesirable traits that can be observed in the individuals or entire cultural communities. Additionally, it can allude to unpleasant and traumatic events, but it presents them in a manner that is contrary to what is usual and accepted. Presumably, its purpose lies in questioning the system and structure of established communities and the global impact of popular culture, aiming to challenge the authorities and the hierarchical notions they have established. J. Singer (1972, p. 90) emphasizes that a trickster enables us to "gain a sense of proportion about ourselves" in order to make the "'human society possible'". Trickster characters transcend the boundaries of both oral and written, indigenous and non-indigenous, violating these boundaries to transform cultures, preserve traditions, and confront the adverse effects. Several scholars have extensively analyzed the character of the trickster figure, including P. Radin (1956) and G. Vizenor (1989), who approach this figure from various perspectives, ranging from a traditional view to the challenges the trickster must face in contemporary literature.

In the case of contemporary indigenous literature of Australian Aboriginals and Native Americans, there is an apparent parallel between the figure of a trickster and the intertext. Both can influence the reinterpretation of perspectives and viewpoints, challenging and undermining the dominant and traditional narratives through mutual exposure. The role of the trickster in contemporary indigenous literary works encompasses traditional attributes, such as shapeshifting, pranks, jokes, and deceit. On the other hand, the trickster figure has become more of a participant in the intertextual discourse, if not its orchestrator. The figure of the trickster is then understood more for its ability to collaborate and engage with the intertexts aiming to negotiate between "differentiated, ordered, predictable, and distinct" and "undifferentiated, unordered, spontaneous, and whole" (Hynes, 1993, as cited in Hynes – Doty, 1993, p. 210). This contradictory effect empowers trickster characters to question the boundaries and burdens between the cultures by challenging the unified and authoritative perspectives, particularly those of the dominating Anglo-Western or Euro-American viewpoints. A. J. Ryan (1999) emphasizes the transformative power of tricksters to reframe harmful and destructive historical experiences into playful and enlightened interpretations of the detrimental influence exerted by dominant societies. Therefore, the actions performed by trickster figures not only confront,

question, and transform but also create space for cultural healing within communities by reestablishing cultural memory.

Intertextuality represents a level of the textual play intended to "break down distinctions between world and story" (Gruber, 2008, p. 104). It can be understood as a "trickster method", as H. L. Gates (1988, as cited in Baxter, 2012, p. 119) describes it as a way to rewrite "the original as same but different", which can be observed in the indigenous literature of Australian Aboriginals and Native Americans. Still, the ability to create chaos and the egocentric behavior of tricksters often result in actions that are hard to foresee. Due to those features, the indigenous communities' identity can be reviewed and recreated through the textual space of cultural memory.

E. Gruber (2008, p. 21) accentuates the importance of reimagining perspectives, stating that "[k]nowing and having pride in one's own history are important factors in the cultural identity formation of a group, since the group's self-conceptualization strongly relies on the imagination of its own past". The previous cultural ignorance of the dominant society or the trickster's people is exaggerated and overturned, challenging "the reader to step into the gap rather than use the writer as an easy bridge to another culture or perspective" (Smith, 2000, p. 25). In this context, literature, and therefore, the figure of a trickster, serves two functions concerning cultural memory, as described by J. Assman (Erll – Nünning, 2008). It emphasizes the textual importance of preserving valuable literary pieces, including "historic key events" (Erll – Nünning, 2008, p. 100). Assman's argument also highlights the significance of culturally relevant works that should be remembered.

The reinterpretation of the trickster's role through textual interaction, as experienced by readers, implies a liberation from the previously established boundaries in literature and history. This liberation is particularly evident through the use of irony and satire. Indigenous works of literature, such as Native American and Australian Aboriginal literature, exemplify this process as they seek to challenge preconceived notions of reality rooted in indigenous stereotypes. The traditional trickster narratives, initially passed down through oral tradition, have been adapted. However, as N. J. Sinclair (2010, p. 21) points out, the trickster still serves an "educational, medicinal and community-building purpose". Thus, the role of tricksters not only challenges the Western literary canon but also confronts the traditional beliefs embedded in the *cultural memory* of indigenous communities and their historical experiences. Despite the potentially irreverent nature of humor, including satire and irony, these elements bridge the gaps between personal experiences, collective memories, and cultural and historical narratives within the textual realm. Consequently, the cultural memory upheld by dominant societies is confronted by the cultural memory embodied by the trickster figure.

4 Conclusion

Several scholars, including B. Neumann (2008) and R. Lachmann (2008), assert that literature plays a crucial role in preserving and remembering cultural identity. Cultural memory and its tools enable the construction and reconstruction of identity. Traditional knowledge and experiences contribute to the indigenous interpretation of historical experiences. However, the transformation from oral to written form also allows one to reevaluate prevailing views of official history. Despite the novel's origins in Western culture, it has become a valuable space for transforming cultural experiences and traditions into textual form that supports the mnemonic function of literature. Cultural memory empowers indigenous communities and non-indigenous societies to reconstruct shared perspectives on the past, transforming these texts into new sites of memory. Interpreted cultural forms may be actualized and transformed, yet they retain their traditional attributes, preserving and commemorating cultural identity formation. The trickster figure plays a significant role in cultural memory and intertextuality. It is present in indigenous and non-indigenous cultural traditions and is a hybrid element that challenges

established narratives and structures. The trickster acts as a catalyst for cultural resistance, questioning authority and hierarchical notions. In cultural memory, it is an essential and transformative force, challenging established norms and creating space for cultural healing and reestablishment.

Bibliography:

ASHCROFT, B. – GRIFFITHS, G. – TIFFIN, H. (2002): *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*, 2nd ed. London, New York: Routledge.
ASSMAN, J. (2008): Communicative and Cultural Memory. In: A. Erll – A, Nünning (eds.): *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, pp. 109–118.
BAKHTIN, M. M. (1986): *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Translation by V. W. McGhee. Austin: University of Texas Press.
BAXTER, C. J. (2012): *Indi's Humour, Tricksters, and Stereotype in Selected Works of Gerald Vizenor, Thomas King, and Sherman Alexie*. Doctoral Thesis. Arlington: University of Texas.
ERLL, A. – NÜNNING, A. (2008): *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin - New York: De Gruyter.
FALCK BORCH, M. – RASK KNUDSEN, E. – LEER, M. – CLUNIES ROSS, B. (2008): *Bodies and Voices.* Cross-Cultures. New York: Rodopi.
GRIECE, H. – HEPWORTH, C. – LAURET, M. – PAGET, M. ([1988] 2001): *Beginning Ethnic American Literatures*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
GRUBER, E. (2008): *Humor in Contemporary Native North American Literature: Reimagining Nativeness*. New York: Camden House.
HARVEY, D. (1991): *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Massachusetts: Wiley Blackwell.
HEALY, CH. (1997): *From the Ruins of Colonialism: History as Social Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
HERMANN, P. (2013): Saga Literature, Cultural Memory, and Storage. *Scandinavian Studies (Provo)*, 85/3, pp. 332–354.
HUTCHEON, L. (1989): *The Politics of Postmodernism*. London & New York: Routledge.
HYNES, W. J. – DOTY, W. G. (1993): *Mythical Trickster Figures: Contours, Contexts and Criticisms*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
KRISTEVA, J. (1980): *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Language and Art*. L. S. Roudiez (ed.): New York: Columbia University Press.
LACHMANN, R. (2008): Mnemonic and Intertextual Aspects of Literature. In: A. Erll – A. Nünning (eds.): *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, pp. 301–310.
LAWSON, A. M. (2006): *Resistance and Resilience in the Work of Four Native American Authors*. Doctoral Thesis. Tucson: The University of Arizona. [Cit. 2022-12-20.] Available on Internet: <http://arizona.openepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/193773/1/azu _etd_1802_sip1_m.pdf>
MCINNIS, G. (2002): The Struggle of Postmodernism and Postcolonialism. *Political Discourse – Theories of Colonialism and Postcolonialism*. [Cit. 2022-11-21.] Available on Internet: <http://www.postcolonialweb.org/poldiscourse/mcinnis1.html>
MOLLOY, D. (2015): *Cultural Memory and Literature: Re-Imagining Australia's Past*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill.
MUNKARA, M. (2009): *Every Secret Thing*. St. Lucia – Queensland: University of Queensland Press.
NEUMANN, B. (2008): The Literary Representation of Memory. In: A. Erll – A. Nünning (eds.): *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, pp. 333–344.
ONG, W. J. (2003): *Orality and Literacy. New Accents*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
PORTER, J. – ROEMER, K. (2005): *The Cambridge Companion to Native American Literature*. Cambridge Companions to Literature. New York: Cambridge University Press.

RADIN, P. (1956): *Trickster. A Study in American Indian Mythology*. Commentaries by Carl G. Jung and Karl Kerényi. New York: *Philosophical Library.*
RAJ, P. E. (2015): Text/Texts: Interrogating Julia Kristeva's Concept of Intertextuality. *Ars Artium: An International Pee Reviewed-cum-Refereed Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3, 2015, New Delhi: Paragon International Publishers, pp. 77–80.
RICE, B. (2003): Brian Rice. The Whitewashing of Native Studies Programs and Programming in Academic Institutions. *American Indian Quarterly*, 27/1-2, 2003, Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, pp. 381–85.
RYAN, A. J. (1999): *The Trickster Shift: Humour and Irony in Contemporary Native Art*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
SAID, E. (1995): *Orientalism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
SILKO, L. M. ([1977] 2006): *Ceremony*. New York: Penguin Books.
SINCLAIR, N. J. (2010): Trickster Reflections Part I. In: D. Reder – L. Morra (eds.): *Troubling Tricksters: Revisioning Critical Conversations*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurentian University, pp. 21–57.
SINGER, J. (1972): *Boundaries of the Soul. The Practice of Jung's Psychology*. New York: Doubleday.
SMITH, C. (2000): *Coyote Kills John Wayne: Postmodernism and Contemporary Fictions of the Transcultural Frontier*. London: University Press of New England.
SNELL-HORNBY, M. (2001): The Space 'In Between': What is a Hybrid Text? *Across Languages and Cultures*, 2/2, pp. 207–216.
VIZENOR, G. ([1988] 2005): *The Trickster of Liberty: Tribal Heirs to a Wild Baronage*. Minneapolis: Minneapolis University of Minnesota Press.
VIZENOR, G. (1989): *Narrative Chance: Postmodern Discourse on Native American Indian Literatures*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
WRIGHT, A. (2006): *Carpentaria*. Artarmon – NSW: Giramondo.

Summary

Exploring Cultural Memory, Textual Hybrids, and Figure of Trickster in Indigenous Literature

The present paper points out the role of cultural memory in contemporary indigenous literature, with a closer focus on Australian Aboriginal and Native American communities, its relationship to traditional texts, and its role in contemporary works. The paper suggests that the theory of cultural memory presents the options for transforming the oral tradition and storytelling of the indigenous cultural communities into written literature – a medium flexible enough to follow the rules characteristic of oral traditions. For adopting the cultural memory theory, it is inevitable to share memories within communities. The process of writing in relation to memory is like traditional storytelling as it follows a similar process of creation, so it can be considered a combination of memory reflection and its alternative version. It can be understood as an author's play with various external sources of text and their subsequent insertion into the author's text. Authors use techniques that often require elaborative work with intertextuality, e.g., diverse types of texts are embedded within the main text to "retell" the views through the rewritten text anew. This paper develops various aspects of the cultural memory theory; for example, it presents an option for transforming oral traditions into another flexible medium, written literature. It derives from the fact that it – as such – can reflect the experience and knowledge of the past; moreover, it can accommodate the need to redefine the cultural identity of contemporary indigenous societies existing next to the mainstream society and bring their reflection of the past. The paper explores the link between cultural memory and intertextuality and focuses on the trickster figure's role and its possible role in relation to cultural memory.