

STVDIVM

Revista de Humanidades

PRENSAS DE LA UNIVERSIDAD DE ZARAGOZA
FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES Y HUMANAS
UNIVERSIDAD DE ZARAGOZA

Stvdivm 20 (2014)~Zaragoza 2014
ISSN: 1137-8417

REDACCIÓN, CORRESPONDENCIA E INTERCAMBIOS:

Studium. Revista de Humanidades
Facultad de Ciencias Sociales y Humanas
Ciudad Escolar, Carretera de Alcañiz, s/n
44003 TERUEL
Tel.: 978 61 81 00. Fax: 978 61 81 03
studium@unizar.es

SUSCRIPCIÓN Y PEDIDOS:

Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza. Edificio de Geológicas
Calle Pedro Cerbuna, 12
50009 ZARAGOZA
Tfno. 976 55 54 93 y 976 35 41 00. Fax: 976 55 54 93

PÁGINA WEB DE LA REVISTA:

<http://studium.unizar.es>

Studium. Revista de Humanidades agradece el envío de originales (artículos o reseñas), así como de libros (estudios o ediciones) para la elaboración de recensiones. La revista no mantendrá correspondencia con los autores de los artículos no aceptados para su publicación, no se verá obligada a dar explicaciones sobre las circunstancias de su rechazo ni dará a conocer los informes sobre los mismos. De no ser aceptados para su publicación, sólo serán devueltos los trabajos remitidos a petición expresa de sus autores, para lo cual deberán remitir previamente el franqueo necesario.

© De los autores

© De la presente edición, Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza

Edita: Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza y Facultad de Ciencias Sociales y Humanas, Universidad de Zaragoza, con la ayuda económica del Vicerrectorado de Investigación de la Universidad de Zaragoza. Periodicidad anual.

PRECIO DE CADA NÚMERO: 12 Euros

Ilustración de la cubierta: Mirambel, celosías (Foto: Peña Verón)

Coordinación, diagramación y corrección de estilo: María Luz Rodrigo Estevan

ISSN: 1137-8417

Depósito Legal: Z-2751-90

Impresión: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Zaragoza

DIRECCIÓN

Pedro Luis Hernando Sebastián (UZ)

SECRETARÍA

María Luz Rodrigo Estevan (UZ)

CONSEJO DE REDACCIÓN

Pedro Luis Hernando Sebastián (UZ)

María Luz Rodrigo Estevan (UZ)

José Manuel Latorre Ciria (UZ)

Ana M. Rivera (UNED, Madrid)

Frédéric Duhart (MU, Donostia)

Juan A. Tarancón (UZ)

Xavier Medina (UOC, Barcelona)

CONSEJO CIENTÍFICO

Ricardo J. Ávila Palafox (Estudios del Hombre, U. Guadalajara, Jalisco, México)

Carlos Barros Guimerans (Historia Medieval, U. Santiago de Compostela)

Elvira Burgos Díaz (Filosofía, U. Zaragoza)

Marcela Cubillos Poblete (Historia, U. La Serena, Chile)

Francisco Javier Díez de Revenga (Literatura Española, U. Murcia)

Elbia H. Difabio (Griego, U.N. Cuyo, Argentina)

Javier Esparcia Pérez (Geografía, U. Valencia)

Claudio García Turza (Lengua Española, U. La Rioja)

Xavier Gil Pujol (Historia Moderna, U. Barcelona)

Alfredo Jimeno Martínez (Prehistoria, U. Complutense)

Isabel González Turmo (Antropología Social, U. Sevilla)

Emma Liaño Martínez (Historia del Arte, U. Rovira i Virgili)

M.ª Mercedes López Suárez (Artes, U.N. Cuyo, Argentina)

Javier Martín Arista (Filología Inglesa, U. La Rioja)

Javier Pons Díez (Psicología Social, U. Valencia)

Inés Praga Terente (Filología Inglesa, U. Burgos)

Alberto Sabio Alcutén (H. Contemporánea, U. Zaragoza)

Norma Vasallo (C. de la Mujer, U. La Habana, Cuba)

Alicia Yllera Fernández (Filología Francesa, UNED)

STVDIVM 20 (2014)

Stvdivm. Revista de Humanidades

Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza
Universidad de Zaragoza. ISSN: 1137-8417

ÍNDICE

Estudios

Nosce te ipsum. <i>Ensayo de un tema en las letras universales</i> José PALOMARES EXPÓSITO.....	13-28
<i>Las obras de las crónicas de Alfonso III: Crónica de Alfonso II sobre el final de los reyes godos, Leyenda de Covadonga, Crónica de Sebastián de Salamanca y Crónica de Ordoño I</i> Iván PÉREZ MARINAS.....	29-54
«Esta señora de España siempre le pondrá cuernos con este enamorado de comunidades.» <i>Un análisis histórico-conceptual del discurso político en el movimiento comunero</i> Antonio SUÁREZ VARELA.....	55-96
<i>El Sol de Occidente, San Benito (1697), una comedia desconocida de José de Cañizares</i> Elisa DOMÍNGUEZ DE PAZ.....	97-116
<i>Algunos apuntes sobre el legado de Quintiliano en España durante los siglos XVII, XVIII y XIX</i> Guillermo SORIANO SANCHA.....	117-134
<i>Aspectos históricos de Teruel a partir de un problema aritmético del siglo XVIII. Una propuesta multidisciplinar</i> Vicente MEAVILLA SEGUÍ & Antonio M. OLLER MARCÉN.....	135-150
<i>Acerca del discurso occidental en los relatos mesoamericanos</i> Rodolfo FERNÁNDEZ & Diana CARRANO.....	151-166
<i>La cultura lúdica en los rituales funerarios de Iberoamérica: los juegos de velorio</i> Jaume BANTULÀ JANOT & Andrés PAYÀ RICO.....	167-188

<i>Los kakemonos del conde Giuseppe Primoli (1851-1927)</i>	
María Pilar ARAGUÁS BIESCAS	189-202
<i>El «otro» ainu en el cine documental japonés: del redescubrimiento de las minorías en la posguerra al recuerdo como reivindicación en Tadayoshi Himeda</i>	
Marcos CENTENO MARTÍN	203-230
<i>Cocina, transformaciones sociales y nuevos conceptos para nuevas prácticas alimentarias: el caso de la «cuina compromesa» (Burg, Pirineo de Lleida)</i>	
Neus MONLLOR, Jaume GUILLAMÓN, Carles GUIRADO, F. Xavier MEDINA & Ignacio L. MORENO.....	213-256
<i>De las lentejas con chorizo a la pizza congelada: prácticas alimentarias del hombre tardomoderno en la era de Internet</i>	
José Ignacio ARÉVALO SEVIL	257-282
<i>Postmodernism and / or Post-History. Philosophical and Political Proceedings</i>	
Viorella MANOLACHE.....	283-296
Notas y reseñas	
Historia de la ciudad de Teruel, coords. M. Martínez & J. M. Latorre	
Alejandro RÍOS CONEJERO.....	299-304
<i>¿Iría Ulises al médico si fuera inmigrante en España?</i>	
Jorge SOLER GONZÁLEZ	305-313
Sumarios	315-330
Normas para la publicación de originales	331-336
Boletines de suscripción e intercambio	337-339

STVDIVM 20 (2014)

Stvdivm. Revista de Humanidades

Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza
Universidad de Zaragoza. ISSN: 1137-8417

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Articles

Nosce te Ipsum: <i>Essay on a Topic from the Universal Arts</i> José PALOMARES EXPÓSITO	13-28
<i>Works from the Chronicles of Alfonso III: Crónica de Alfonso II sobre el final de los reyes godos, Leyenda de Covadonga, Crónica de Sebastián de Salamanca and Crónica de Ordoño I</i> Iván PÉREZ MARINAS	29-54
<i>“Esta señora de España siempre le pondrá cuernos con este enamorado de comunidades.” A Historical and Conceptual Analysis of the Political Discourse of the Comunero Movement</i> Antonio SUÁREZ VARELA	55-96
<i>The Sun of the West, San Benito (1697): An Unknown Comedy by José de Cañizares</i> Elisa DOMÍNGUEZ DE PAZ	97-116
<i>Some Notes on the Influence of Quintilian in Spain in the 17th, 18th and 19th Centuries</i> Guillermo SORIANO SANCHA	117-134
<i>Historical Aspects of Teruel Arising from an 18th Century Arithmetical problem: A Multidisciplinary Proposal</i> Vicente MEAVILLA SEGUÍ & Antonio M. OLLER MARCÉN	135-150
<i>On the Western Discourse of Mesoamerican Texts</i> Rodolfo FERNÁNDEZ & Diana CARRANO	151-166
<i>The Leisure Culture in the Funeral Rituals of Latin America: Funeral Wake Games</i> Jaume BANTULÀ JANOT & Andrés PAYÀ RICO	167-188

<i>The Kakemonos of Count Giuseppe Primoli (1851-1927)</i>	
María Pilar ARAGUÁS BIESCAS	189-202
<i>The «Other» Ainu in Japanese Documentary Cinema: From the Rediscovery of Minorities to Memory as Struggle in Tadayoshi Himeda's Films</i>	
Marcos CENTENO MARTÍN	203-230
<i>Cuisine, Social Transformations and New Concepts for New Food Practices: The Case of «Cuina compromesa» (Burg, Lleida Pyrenees)</i>	
Neus MONLLOR, Jaume GUILLAMÓN, Carles GUIRADO, F. Xavier MEDINA & Ignacio L. MORENO.....	231-256
<i>From Lentils with Chorizo to Frozen Pizza: Eating Habits of Late Modern Man in the Internet Era</i>	
José Ignacio ARÉVALO SEVIL	257-282
<i>Postmodernism and/or Post-History. Philosophical and Political Proceedings</i>	
Viorella MANOLACHE.....	283-296
Notes & Reviews	
Historia de la ciudad de Teruel, coords. M. Martínez & J. M. Latorre	
Alejandro RÍOS CONEJERO.....	299-304
<i>Would Ulysses Go to the Doctor if He were and Immigrant in Spain?</i>	
Jorge SOLER GONZÁLEZ	305-313
Abstracts	315-330
Guidelines for Contributors	331-336
Subscription and Exchange Policy	337-339

POSTMODERNISM AND/OR POST-HISTORY. PHILOSOPHICAL AND POLITICAL PROCEEDINGS

*Postmodernismo y/o Post-historia.
Filosofía y actuaciones políticas*

Viorella MANOLACHE*
Bucharest University

Resumen

The present study approaches that post-history is only a particular expression of mood, but not entirely *postmodern*, establishing that, *post-historical* Humanity, ever more un-differentiated in conduct, views, interests and value judgements, became *consensual* in relation to a “ubiquitous normality” of the real, where the specific element, the particular element, and the difference get transformed into “pure fallacy, submissive in front of the exclusion.” There where *postmodernism* searches diversity and fragmentation, *post-history* sees but unity and undifferentiating. There where the Lyotardian stare looks for positive “providers” of reality, the sceptical eye of Arnold Gehlen hooks on the “lament” of contemporary world. Nevertheless, if we would consider a virtual point of convergence of the two notions, it would be rigorously situated, precisely along the continuation of a Habermasian treatment of the century. *Post-history* would be thus, in this specific case, a possible slippage, “the potential accident, determined by the mediated (re)correlation of the fragments of the real.”

Palabras clave: post-history, postmodernism, *Homo Posthistoricus*, trans-modernity, recuperated history

Abstract

Este ensayo pretende demostrar que la post-historia es sólo una expresión particular del estado de ánimo, sin definirla como totalmente posmoderna. Podemos establecer que la humanidad post-histórica, cada vez más *in-diferente* en su conducta, sus puntos de vista, sus intereses y sus juicios de valor, estableció

* PhD, Scientific Researcher III at the Romanian Academy, Institute of the Political Science and International Relations, at the Department of Political Philosophy. Correo electrónico: vio_s13@yahoo.com. Fecha de recepción del artículo: 16 de septiembre de 2013. Fecha de aceptación y versión final: 13 de enero de 2014.

consensuadamente una relación de “normalidad ubicua” con la realidad. Una relación donde el elemento específico, el elemento particular, y la diferencia se transforman en “un error puro, dócil a la exclusión.” Ahí donde *el posmodernismo* busca la diversidad y la fragmentación, la *post-historia* identifica la unidad y la indiferencia. Allá donde la mirada de Lyotard busca positivos “proveedores” de la realidad, la mirada escéptica de Arnold Gehlen conecta con el “lamento” del mundo contemporáneo. Sin embargo, si tratamos de situar el punto de convergencia entre las dos nociones, en rigor ese punto se localiza precisamente en la continuación del tratamiento habermasiano del siglo. En este caso la *post-historia* sería, por tanto, un posible deslizamiento, “el accidente potencial, determinado por la media entre la (re) correlación de los fragmentos de la realidad.”

Key words: post-historia, postmodernismo, *Homo Posthistoricus*, trans-modernidad, historia recuperada

1. WARNING: A POSSIBLE SITUATION IN POST-HISTORY

On the luring foundation of an apparent apocalyptic and theoretical depletion, nourishing the feeling of mechanical hanging and / or the dogmatic pressure, the foundation of a speech or of (another, whichever) option vindicates itself from *exhausted models* and would stand in its very own *paradigm: postmodernism* and / or *post-history*.

Responding to the survey (*Istoria literaturii române postbelice intră premise și realizări*) launched by the “Convorbiri literare” magazine (number 3, March 2009) we have established that the changes of paradigm, from the last quarter of the century, illustrate the drama of light and easily avoidable hesitations: from the social history to the history of mentality, from the structural history to that of everyday life, from macro-history to narrative micro-histories (stimulated by cultural anthropology), triggering the “nostalgia of meaning”, the need for order, at any span of the temporal interval. To avoid any form of reductionism, these particularities ought to be considered as such, *along with all the consequences flowing from here and assumed as providing reality*. Compliance would not hide the tendency to surrender to the irrational.

“We have paid enough for the nostalgia for the past and of the One, for the reconciliation of the concept and of the sensitive, of the transparent and communicable experience,” said J. Fr. Lyotard, in response to general demand for relaxation and quietude (but from which blows “taste” and “price of terror” or even “the desire to fulfil the fantasy of the smothering of reality.”)

This explains also the fact that post-history is only a particular expression of mood, but not entirely *postmodern*.

Post-historical Humanity, ever more un-differentiated in conduct, views, interests and value judgements, became *consensual* in relation to a “ubiquitous normality” of the real, where the specific element, the particular element, and the difference get transformed into “pure fallacy, submissive in front of the exclusion.”

There where *postmodernism* searches diversity and fragmentation, *post-history* sees but unity and undifferentiating. There where the Lyotardian stare looks for *positive* “providers” of reality, the sceptical eye of Arnold Gehlen hooks on the “lament” of contemporary world. Nevertheless, if we would consider a virtual point of convergence of the two notions, it would be rigorously situated, precisely *along the continuation of a Habermasian treatment of the century*.

Post-history would be thus, in this specific case, a possible slippage, “the potential accident, determined by the mediated (re)correlation of the fragments of the real.”

In parallel with the “dethronement of history” as a “strong science,” there is an impressive number of “witnesses” called, each and every one of them with “its phantasm accounts,” or more realistic accounts, on certain “facts”, not long enough watched, accompanied by “explications” searched for only afterwards.

In the light of such a “concept of subjectivity”, the act of perception would appear not as a true mirroring of the things, but as a transformation of the things, produced according to an “inner model,” which is one generating crises, an *incomplete model!*

Politically, we are tempted to ask ourselves whether there is any point for this effort of situation of the things, events, processes, etc. within the horizon of modernity or in postmodernity, and, especially, within which horizon we understand to define our place in history.

The answer of philosophy to this political problem¹ belongs to the appeal to the proximal heritages and the denial of what is accepted as stable structures of the beings as necessary patterns for the “founding” of the

1. Viorella Manolache, 2004, *Postmodernitatea românească între experiență ontologică și necesitate politică (Romanian Postmodernity-Between Ontological Experience and Political Necessity)*. Sibiu, Lucian Blaga University.

(not) precarious certitudes. The process of dissolving the stability of being is partial in the “grand systems of the metaphysical historicism of the 20th century”. There, as in the affirmations of Vattimo, the being does not just *stay*, but it *becomes*, according to certain necessary and recognisable rhythms that maintain a specific ideal stability, thought by Nietzsche or Heidegger as a *happening*. Ontology is then nothing else than the interpretation of this *situation (condition)*, on the consideration of the fact that, outside this happening, our being becomes historicised.

Politically, here a naturalist and cyclical vision on the phenomena prevail, interpreting phenomenon that are typical for modernity as a pattern for development and growth within the purely mundane and secular parameters (the Hebraic and Christian heritage maintains the idea of history as the history-of-salvation, articulated between creation-sin-awaits for the final judgement)

As such, from the perspective of our situation within the *course* of the political event, in its flux, any discourse on postmodernity remains contradictory: to affirm that we are now in a moment that is *ulterior* to modernity, to confer to this obvious observation a signification that would be to a certain extent decisive means to accept the a point of view of modernity (“the idea of history with its corollaries, the notion of progress and that of overcoming” – Vattimo) Things change when we recognise that postmodernism is characterised not as much as a novelty in relation to modernism, but, especially, as a dissolution of the category of new, as experience of “end of history” and not as a *stage* of history.

Even though the politicians speculate this specific experience of the end of history, of the “twilight of the West”, of menace of the atomic catastrophe (apocalypse), the postmodern experience indicates, and it does this in the terminology of nowadays, *post-historical*, culture, the condition in which progress becomes *routine*.

The Ontology of Social Existence by Georg Lukacs, translated into Romanian language around 1982, represents, in fact, a huge polemic against any linear interpretation, as well as against any univocal, forcefully logical and rationalised interpretation of the historical and social processes. The constant aspirations of Georg Lukacs are those that attempt to render relative the concept of historical necessity, to statute the principal heterogeneity of the rapport among different social complexes, in order to set in place, as a consequence, the (in) equality and the (un)predictability as constitutive traits for the historical development.

According to David Harvey,² the aesthetical, cultural, and political practices, are, especially, influenced by the ever changing experience of the space and time. They presuppose the construction of representations within the complex flux of human experience. From this perspective, postmodernism can be understood as a distinct historical and geographical condition.

If, by tuning into the hermeneutic trend, there are interventions placing their bets on the surviving in a parallel temporal line, within a symmetry that confirms history placing us, fearfully (still!), as well within it, infirming *post-history*, or, on the contrary, declaring that this is just a term overlapped over postmodernity (and that postmodernism is the one that supplies its contents) *this study aims at confirming the overcoming of history –as a moment spent or emptied– establishing that the philosophical and political narrative and action that follows are nothing else but moments of the act of historical establishment (be it more or less comfortable) within posthistory.*³

2. A HESITANT PROFILE:

THE LAST MAN AND/OR HOMO POSTHISTORICUS

Starting from the consideration that liberal democracy could be the final point of the ideological evolution of humanity, the final form of human government, mark placed as a constitutive element of the end of history, Francis Fukuyama⁴ (following Alexandre Kojève) considers that history ended with the definitive solution (fully satisfied by the modern world) of the matter of *recognition*, replacing the master-slave rapport with the universal and equal recognition.

2. David Harvey, 2002, *Condiția postmodernității (The Condition of Postmodernity)*. Timișoara, Amarcord.

3. The hypostasis of a “end of time” is to be, anyhow, approximated also in the Romanian space, by the study of Simion Mehedinți, *Creștinismul românesc*, in English, *Romanian Christianity* (1941), a pretext for (over)posing the end of the Western model to the Romanian one, appealing to the work of Jacob Burckhardt, *Die Zeit Constantins des Großen* (1853), initiative that confirm the fact that the end is as well a sort of continuous phenomenon, diluted, marked by pluralities: hell is to follow hell... (postapocalyptic romanesc.blogspot.com/.../trei-ipostaze-postapocaliptice.html). If the perspective of *endism* renounces to keep and (re)establish the modern existential values, the *posthistorical* hesitations concentrates on the deconstructivist-postmodern (re)activation of the residues of modernity, by the appeal to social / linguistic / political variables.

4. Francis Fukuyama, 1992, *Sfârșitul istoriei și ultimul om (The End of History and the Last Man)* Bucharest, Paideia Publishing House.

If Hegel and Marx decisively affirmed that the evolution of human society was not endless, the hallmark of the “endism” representing that form of human society that would satisfy the fundamental aspirations of the background of the *directional histories*, Fukuyama places the *end of history* between the landmarks of the liberal (Hegel) or communist (Marx) state.

The first man (translating the accent from the end towards the beginning) becomes disputed, as well, from a Hobbesian, Lockian or Hegelian perspective, either by their placement into the *natural state* (“solitary, poor, miserable and short”) as a latent-general state manifested when civil society collapses, or by the *bloody battle* defined by Hegel (“each man against each”), the instinct of self-preservation being the strongest of the natural passions, a Hobbesian mark of the inclination toward peaceful and quiet living. For Locke, *the first man* fights for recognition, in the natural state, because he is obliged by education to subordinate his will for recognition to the will for preservation of his existence and to his will to obtain his comfort, not only to protect his material belongings of his material state, but also to accumulate even more.

Within the Hegelian vision, *the first man* (detached from his material things) searches the recognition of his liberty and humanity by the others, immune to the things of this world, as a moral agent parted from his physical or natural determinations.

This sort of relapse from a first profile (confirmed as well by the Bible by the definitively opposed and irreconcilable versions of Cain and Abel), reconfirms the fact that the abrupt jump toward the last man, by the appeal to a whole set of potential defects of the first one, is marked by the parallel historical processes (the logic of will and the fight for the recognition), the end of history, by obtaining the recognition and the material, making impossible the existence of man who ceased to fight and work.

According to A. Kojève, “the disappearance of man by the end of history is not a cosmic catastrophe; the natural world continues to be what it has always been. As well, for this reason, it is not a biological catastrophe either: Man continues to exist as animal in harmony with Nature or with a given Being. What disappears is the very Man—that is, the Actions that denies what is given and the Error, or, in general, the Subject opposed to the Object.”⁵

5. Alexandre Kojève, 1947, *Introduction à la lecture de Hegel*. Paris, Gallimard.

The empirical component proposed by Fukuyama, demonstrates with insistence the rapidity with which the great majority of world governments tend to adopt the formula of liberal democracy. Philosophically, we would be in the presence of the non-utility of the nature of the conflict, the recognition and the accumulation of moral prestige —a hallmark of the legitimacy of democracy to suppress inside its mode of existence the functioning of this less founded binary equation “master-slave.”

Placing itself into a *local causality*, within a continuous chain of causes and effects,⁶ proposing, as an alternative model, *the club with two heads*, Basarab Nicolescu⁷ established that the *logic of the excluded third* is a privileged one, especially by the fact that it permits the coherent traversing of the different domains, inducing an open structure, or more precisely, inducing a Gödelian structure,⁸ to the assembly of the levels of the Reality. The conciliation of the *pro* and *contra* cannot be produced elsewhere than on a different level of Reality, where they become the contradictory poles of a larger unit, according to the logic of “to be together”. A concept such as *Homo sui transcendentalis* (re)invents the central character of the alternative currents (namely Epimetheus, Prometheus’ brother), as the one who bears the stamp of *trans-* (*trans-figuration, trans-vision, trans-port, trans-formation*) and who becomes, by definition, *the one who thinks afterwards*.⁹

(Re)placing the profile of *homo posthistoricus* inside the prefix *trans-*, *transmodernity* might mark the return, copying and survival of the *weak*

6. See also, Viorella Manolache, 2010, *Curentele alternative ale prefixului post- evaluări filozofico-politice (Alternative Currents of the Prefix „Post-” – Philosophical and Political Evaluations)* Sibiu, TechnoMedia Publishing House.

7. Basarab Nicolescu, 2007, *Transdisciplinaritatea. Manifest (Transdisciplinarity. Manifesto)* Iassy, Junimea.

8. The Gödelian structure of the assembly of the levels of Reality associated to the *logic of the included third*, implies the impossibility to build a complete theory to describe, on the one hand, the movement from one level to the other and which is to describe, on the other hand, the assembly of the levels of Reality. (Nicolescu 2007: 63)

9. According to Basarab Nicolescu (“Pe drumul terțului inclus – Following the Included Third”, *Convorbiri literare*, year CXLIII, December 2009, nr.12-168), following Jean-François Malherbe, the new stage of Logosului is characterised by the dispute Heraclitus (“the inventor of becoming”) —Parmenides (“the inventor of the being”). For Jean-François Malherbe, the confrontation between Heraclitus— Parmenides becomes the dispute *excluded third – included third: excluded third* (in) filtrates the exclusion of the consciousness, the only true one being that of the One. Paradoxically, One gives way to a multitude of worlds that are incompatibles with one another; the vision of Parmenides remains one of the *sleep*, while Heraclitus becomes the unique guide of the *awakening*.

attribute of modernity in its *light* form (by fiction, or by eclecticism, or by the replacement of models), a travestied of postmodernity, the latter deprived (in its attempt to avoid the end in the barbarian cybernetics or in the mass-media) of its innocent rupture. It undertakes and (re)makes the avant-garde, eliminating the distances among the elites, their culture and the mass, representing the image, the baroque run, the self-reference, the catastrophe, the turn, the fractal reiteration, the obese entropy, the grouse inflation of data, and the aesthetic of what is full and of what has disappeared, in entropy and fractal quality. The key of access to such an alternative model stays in *trans-justification* and in the possibility to overcome the paradigms. *Trans-modernity* exists as a random complex of imposed strategic situations, by the abandonment of the representation and by the suzerainty of real simulation.

Situating the argument in a gnosiological deadlock, apparently, *trans-modernity* is organised as a dialectic type of synthesis of the modern and / or postmodern theses. Ironic towards the Hegelian theses, it renounces to represent an increase of the Absolute and becomes genuine virtuality, by the abandonment of the pyramidal and arborescent structure of the system by the undertaking of a process of self-multiplication of the interconnected models. Under the imprint of *trans-*, neither the Spirit, nor the Absolute Truth are global, this attribute being the descriptive of the successful synthesis between the moment of modern positivism and the postmodern nakedness by an (em)placement into the prolific *crystallography*.

Beyond the divergences and the difficulties of modernity, *trans-modernism* becomes the final phase of its disintegration.¹⁰ This fills without ambiguities the self-transcendental notion “as something that is arriving”, incorporating the truths of modernisms with an expansive and integral consciousness of historicity.

Homo posthistoricus becomes an apparent community, whose institutionalisation remains sufficiently fluid and un-hierarchical to stop blocking its inner life in rites and conventions, collecting the energy of the implicit forces that compose the subjectivity of the global society.

10. Paul H. Ray, *Transmodernismul nu este postmodernism (Transmodernism is not Post-modernism)*, http://aisberg.8k.ro/index_rev.html

3. THE REGISTRATION OF THE EVENT AND THE SKIN SHEDDING OF HISTORY

Into this mutual contamination of the registration of the *event* and of the renewal of *history* as in a process of skin shed, what is admitted within the category of *singular cocoon* emits pretensions to a *special historical narration*, to a *Geschichte selber*. This would be an assault of the *event* on *history* encompassing, mainly, the dimming of the harmony between *individual memory* and the plurality of *collective memories* exfoliated out of the “weak experience” where *history* becomes its very own project. Or, in agreement with the nostalgic light of the first letter from the miniatures, we might be the witnesses of an *exuviating of the memory* and of the *inscription of its minute narratives on thin onion peels*.

(Re) gained within the perimeter of the *chrono-sophies*, where *memory*¹¹ still vindicates its right to “infect” the “ultimate dialectics”, the balance *forgetting by delete vs. forgetting by reserve* —as formula (e) of the *memory of will, ars obliviones and ars memoriae*— becoming forms of the historical extinction, subsumed to the imperative: *to (in) scribe to put out, to (de)scribe to put together archives!*

Oozing on indecisive limena between what *constitutes* past orientation and/or is *instituted* as a parallax within the beam of the angle formed between “not any more” and “past”, *personal* and/or *collective memory* (the memory lost or found) now (sub)summates under the urgency to attribute, in a legitimate manner, a certain freedom of manoeuvre between the *pathos* of the anamnesis and the *praxis* of the exploration, in/from an ego-logical perspective, the perspective of the inner look, or, within the limits of the phrase of Charles Taylor,¹² within the limits of the *inwardness*.

In agreement with Paul Ricoeur,¹³ the excesses generated by the *ars memoriae* are equivalent to these between the threads of fabric, weaved into the transparent fabric of a veil, of an *artificial memory*, exploring, methodically, as well the esplanade of the anamnesis, as the maze of the abused memory (*jammed and manipulated*), highlighting the vulnerability

11. Paul Ricoeur, 2001, *Memoria, istoria, uitarea (Memory, History, Forgetting)*. Timișoara, Amarcord.

12. Charles Taylor, 1989, *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

13. Paul Ricoeur, 2001, *Memoria, istoria, uitarea (Memory, History, Forgetting)*. Timișoara, Amarcord.

of any reminiscence generated by the rapport inaugurated with the absence of the remembered thing and with its presence within the texture of the (re)presentation.

Within a summary exercise, for an exegete such as Paul Ricoeur, found in a declared coalition with S. Freud, *archived memory* would presuppose a *terminus a quo* (something similar to the memory caught in flagrant) and a *terminus ad quem* (a sort of indubitable proof). Thus, the *dating*, as a phenomenon of inscription, becomes the referential for symmetry between/ among “later” and “while”, the assertion of the factual reality of the related event verifying, within this weak context, its presumed viability. Yet, the *self-designation* shall be inscribed into an exchange nourishing a conventional situation where fiduciary evidence of the witness claims that the event —related to this exuviations of history— to be believed to the very end. The public space, where the criticism of the avowal is situated into the praxis, establishes the rule of the game —with the possibility to suppose— configuring the design of a supplementary dimension: that of the availability of the witness to maintain his confession in time and because

memory enjoys invoking lacunae. What does remain imprinted appears without any notice, again and again with different names, in love with disguises. Also, memory offers only vague information and with a myriad of interpretations. Its drainer has now a loose network, and then a really tight one. The feeling, the crumb of thought literally gets away through it. (Günter Grass 2007: 187)

Overlapping the act of memory on the data provided by experience and various limit-situations of the reflexive thought, we are going to establish —within a loose agreement with Karl Jaspers— that the notion of *political culpability* engages the members of the political community, independently from their individual acts or from their degree of adhesion to the politics of the state, since “political ethics is founded upon the principle of a state life that involves the participation of all, through their consciousness, through their knowledge, through their opinions and wishes.” (Jaspers 1990: 49)

Similarly, according to Pierre François Weber,¹⁴ to (re)strain the humane to the politic attracts the risk to neglect either the aspect of the excess of humanity, or the aspect of the use of the political for aims of

14. Pierre François Weber, 1994, *La question des droits de l'homme chez Hannah Arendt*. Paris I, DEA.

destruction, forcing the invention of something beyond political realm and considerations, meant to remain definitively veiled within the private wrinkles of the self: “duty and guilt. Two words that seem so close (...), the former could be attenuated and resolved by payment (...); guilt, nevertheless—the proven one, as well as the one that went away, buried or just suspected—that remains.” (Günter Grass 2007: 37)

Within the tragic alchemy of the equation that correlates memory-guilt-the banality of the totalitarian evil, Hannah Arendt¹⁵ (operating also a parallel between Nazism and socialism) established that the totalitarian regime, although claimed presumptuously to obey both the laws of nature and the laws of history—and supposedly from history all the positive laws came—opted, though, for the totalitarian law, in its hypostasis of mere law of action. *The Law of nature*—at the Nazi was a *Law of history*—became at the Bolsheviks the expression of the action itself. Such an ideology was to be associated by Hannah Arendt to the absence of thinking. This was due to the argument that the totalitarian ideology, as the logic of only one idea, (ex)poses and it does also (sup)poses a major risk for thinking, unable to live inside what Arendt named, metaphorically, the “asylum” of someone’s interiority. Such an ideological illusion increases the intensity of the crisis of identity, as crisis of reality, and it becomes the logic of one idea, within a process of continuous change, the equivalent of a “deductive delirium”, where this illusion is adapted (or, adopted?) to the Discourse (by the discourse) which is substituted to a real that was depurated,¹⁶ peeled off as an onion by a skilled hand.

Otherwise, it is generally known that for H. Arendt, the *massification*, the infallible predictions, the totalitarian propaganda, and the desolated man are the defining marks of the totalitarianism, conditions that resulted from the *strong conventions* of modernity, with a mention: Auschwitz represents the crime which was meant to open post-modernity, post-history, les-suzerainty. Not the regicide, but people-cide (*populicidia*) is among its signs.

Here it is, thus, the design of this transparent geography, with the demarcation lines traced up by the beginning of a *new history*, of a *novum*

15. Hannah Arendt, 2006, *Originile totalitarismului (The Origins of Totalitarianism)*. Bucharest, Humanitas.

16. Évelyne Pisier, coord., 2000, *Istoria ideilor politice (History of the Political Thought)*. Timișoara, Amarcord.

discourse! Here the imperative is the (re)ordination: of the events—in function of the Christian story of salvation, related to the Adam’s mistake of an emancipation out of ignorance and servitude, by the intention of knowledge and equalitarianism— given the speculative narratives of the universal Idea —by the new dialectics of the concrete— of the Marxist grand narrative of emancipation —by the socialisation of the work— or, by the invisible capitalist hand freeing people of poverty —by development/ progress/ technical and industrial recovery.

As we notice: here we have an object of litigation and dispute! As such, *civil disobedience*¹⁷ becomes a concept meant to provoke democracy and totalitarianism beyond what Arendt saw in /through the interpretations of the phrase “human plurality”. Power, vigour, force, authority, violence are employed inside the signs of the means of domination,¹⁸ of a “loaded” history, prematurely exuviated.

For Katherine Verdery,¹⁹ *recuperated history* is overlapping the corpses, cadavers in movement, with a posthumous political life, though, in the service of the process of creating a universe with renewed meanings. Their political work consists of the institution of certain conceptions of morality, by the attribution of the responsibility and punishment, by the consecration of the space in a renewed manner, redefining the temporality of the daily life, the alignment of the people in the descending line of some alternative ancestors,²⁰ rendering us to assist “to the reburial of the corpses that wanted new tombs” (Günter Grass 2007: 316), to the (re) configuration of the communities in cocoons.

17. Hannah Arendt, 1999, *Crizele republicii (Crises of the Republic)*. Bucharest, Humanitas.

18. The notions of sovereignty, power, reason d’état are approximated by the appeal to civil disobedience, defined as a “rebalancing of the power towards the side of the citizens.” According to Dominique Colas (*Diționar de gândire politică- Dictionary of the Political Thought*, Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic Publishing House, 2003), the introduction of the civil disobedience in the political institutions is to constitute the „cure” for any disability marked by unbalance and the lack of the juridical control.

19. Katherine Verdery, 2006, *Viața politică a trupurilor moarte. Reînhumări și schimbări postsocialiste (The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change)*. Bucharest, Vremea.

20. Verdery 2006: 197-198.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we notice, thus, clearly, how history *sheds skin* and regenerates itself introducing itself to us as *(history)graphic enterprise*; as *(in)conscience* claims itself as the subject of creativity and life. The benefits of this exuviations of the history —postulated by the prophet of postmodernity, Nietzsche, from the pulpit of the disenchanted world— it represents the threading stylistic unity, between interior and exterior, the transparent profile of a *double* “there” —underneath which traces agglomerate (as in an intersection of history), the authoritarianisms of the prototypes are shaken, and the aimless, and uncertain strategies cram. Briefly, a *code of the simulacra* is instituted —with terms, notions and concepts— offered as a cure, supplement, ontological brand, and panacea.

History changes its skin... *The memory* that replaces the sign to become sign itself, self-determination and ritual that brings to the fore

the guests of the local chosen one [see the metaphor of the Cellar with Onions at Günter Grass], as well the stoned ones, as the ones thirsty for life were moved to tears by the wooden vegetable cleaver and the knives: minced onions, a special laxative, was just about right to deem the “incapacity to mourn” imputed later on to the post war society to become more permeable (...). Be it so that, leaf after leaf, it [the onion] helps memory to leap trough time, or be it softening the dried out lachrymal channels, and forces them tear it is time and again exemplary (...) [Günter Grass 2007: 376]

Memory becomes active *in* what it takes place from a historical point of view, (re)forming itself from the inside —it is known that the mechanism of (self)construction is exercised *from the outside*. For *memory* is not a thing, but something else, found in movement/exuviating in that thing.

And, if we are to believe Gianni Vattimo that the *memories-events* are realised/confirmed in things and, as such, invested with actuality and presence —in a provisory and revisable manner, of course— then *memory* remains also a message that sets in motion the umbilical mechanism of a thinking that (re)activates the nostalgia of the returning from outside into oneself. Or, maybe it leads to the releasing of the dried out strata buried under the primacy of the “false consciousness”, to (re)discover —in a late hour of *history*— the *absolute* principle of the useless reminiscence!

5. SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ARENDT, Hannah, 1999, *Crizele republicii (Crises of the Republic)*. Bucharest, Humanitas.
- ARENDT, Hannah, 2006, *Originile totalitarismului (The Origins of Totalitarianism)*. Bucharest, Humanitas.
- COLAS, Dominique, 2003, *Dicționar de gândire politică (Dictionary of the Political Thought)*. Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic.
- FUKUYAMA, Francis, 1992, *Sfârșitul istoriei și ultimul om (The End of History and the Last Man)*. Bucharest, Paideia.
- GRASS, Günter, 2007, *Decojind ceapa, (Peeling the Onion)*. Iassy, Polirom.
- HARVEY, David, 2002, *Condiția postmodernității (The Condition of Postmodernity)*. Timișoara, Amarcord.
- JASPERS, Karl, 1990, *La culpabilité allemande*. Paris, Minuit.
- MANOLACHE, Viorella, 2004, *Postmodernitatea românească între experiență ontologică și necesitate politică (Romanian Postmodernity—Between Ontological Experience and Political Necessity)* Sibiu, Lucian Blaga University.
- MANOLACHE, Viorella, 2010, *Curențe alternative ale prefixului post-evaluări filosofico-politice (Alternative Currents of the Prefix „Post-” – Philosophical and Political Evaluations)*. Sibiu, TechnoMedia.
- PISIER, Évelyne, coord., 2000, *Istoria ideilor politice (History of the Political Thought)*. Timișoara, Amarcord.
- RICOEUR, Paul, 2001, *Memoria, istoria, uitarea (Memory, History, Forgetting)*. Timișoara, Amarcord.
- TAYLOR, Charles, 1989, *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- VERDERY, Katherine, 2006, *Viața politică a trupurilor moarte. Reînhumări și schimbări postsocialiste (The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change)*. Bucharest, Vremea.
- WEBER, Pierre-François, 1994, *La question des droits de l'homme chez Hannah Arendt*, Paris I, DEA.