DIFFERENTIAL IDENTITIES AND THE DIALOGUE WITH THE PAST IN THE GLOBALIZATION ERA

Adriana-Claudia Cîteia, Assist. Prof., PhD, "Ovidius" University of Constanța

Abstract: Differential identities are bearing archetypal nucleuses and also some borrowed structures, whose role is that of ensure the autonomy and originality of the individual. The role of the archetypal structure is that of delimiting the horizon of significations of a human group, "surrounding world", comfortable or constraining. The differential identities convert the present time in past time, and the past in present, in the autodiegetic effort. The grammatical game with the memory time offers clues relating to the modalities of expressing the polycronic identity, yet it can also signal fictionalization of memory as a subterfuge meant to mask the oblivion. Thus, the image of the past cannot keep its full substance in present, so that the anamnetical effort is accompanied by the theatralization of the past.The individual identity thus becomes part of an identitary system of reference constituted based on the similarities between individuals. In the context of the multiple identity the identitary hypostases are characterized by the interaction, juxtaposition or omission of certain identitary sequences or even by the definition of a identity of "collage" type conjoining autobiographical sequences and sequences borrowed from other biographies.The retreat in the "inner citadel" signaled by the Post Renaissance philosophy, the definition of a metakosmia – possible world localized in the self and organized according to a personal system of values impose the reconsideration of the concept of world, from within the reference system of the individualism of perfection, yet also from the perspective of the danger of identitary alteralization. The limits of the interior world can be radically marked, static, case in which the isolation becomes hermetical seclusion in the self, or can be dynamical, permeable, conditioned by the preservation of the relation with the exterior, and with the "others".

Keywords: differential identities, individual identity, archetypal structure, metakosmia, anamnetical effort.

Differential identities are bearing archetypal nucleuses and also some borrowed structures, whose role is that of ensure the autonomy and originality of the individual. The role of the archetypal structure is that of delimiting the horizon of significations of a human group, "surrounding world", comfortable or constraining[1].

The retreat in the "inner citadel" signaled by the Post Renaissance philosophy, the definition of a metakosmia – possible world localized in the self and organized according to a personal system of values impose the reconsideration of the concept of world, from within the reference system of the individualism of perfection, yet also from the perspective of the danger of identitary alteralization. The limits of the interior world can be radically marked, static, case in which the isolation becomes hermetical seclusion in the self, or can be dynamical, permeable, conditioned by the preservation of the relation with the exterior, and with the "others".

The impossibility of communicating directly, "face to face", determines the metamorphosis of the world in "my world" and of the history in "my history", the personalization of the world being accompanied by fictionalization. The fictionalization of the memory, the constitution of a memory of the present is done by hybriding real information with the individual wishes, illusions and echoes of information in the past[2].

[1] K. Wilkes, "How Many Selves Make Me?" in D. Cockburn ed., *Human Beings*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
[2] *Ibidem.*

BDD-V59 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:56:06 UTC)

An example to this effect may be the conversion of the present time, and the past in present, in the autodiegetic effort. The grammatical game with the memory time offers clues relating to the modalities of expressing the polycronic identity, yet it can also signal fictionalization of memory as a subterfuge meant to mask the oblivion. Thus, the image of the past cannot keep its full substance in present, so that the anamnetical effort is accompanied by the theatralization of the past[3].

Between the limits of the subjective space the rules of sentence operators of adverbial type ("before", "after", "now") are subjective. The adverbial inflections are only clues on the individual temporal sequences, on what persists, on what is relevant throughout the identitary itinerary[4].

The modern compatibilist theories referring to the relation between determinism and free will may be useful in understanding the individual autonomy (of "encapsulation") and the modality in which is expressed the dependence or independence of a given horizon of significations[5].

The classic compatibilism of Hobbes consists in asserting the individual's freedom to do what he/she wants or is leaning to do[6]. The freedom to decide without constraints may be yet limited by events of the past which confer to identity an anamnetic character and which cannot be controlled any more[7].

From Robert Kane's point of view[8] the individual autonomy which asks for indeterminism is incoherent. Robert Kane subscribes to the analysis line opened by Charles Taylor concerning the dependence between individualism, authenticity and a given "horizon of signification"[9].

In case determinism means that "a certain past implies a certain future", the denial of the determinism should mean that "a certain past implies different perspectives on the future"[10]. In this context, the question is to what extent the fictionalization of the past may modify the identitary trajectory so that to ensure multiple perspectives of future based on the theatralization of the identity or on the development of a hyperproteic identity.

Another question is to what extent the polycronic identity cancels the determinist perspective on the past-future relation. In case the polycronic identity contradicts the classical order of the temporal enstasis, producing a "memory of the present", the determinism is defined in terms of the relation present-future[11].

The neocompatibilists are defining the profound self, which identifies what we really are and which produces personal values, in direct relation with the archetypal identity[12], drawing attention on the danger of fictionalizing the identity as a result of decompatibilizing the temporal enstasis and of the installation of a "pathology of the self"[13].

---

[3] *Ibidem*, p. 73-75

[4] Certain theories in psychopathology are significant from a philosophical point of view. The identitary discontinuities followed by the dramatic metamorphoses are the result of therapeutic "erasing" some fragments from the individual identitary trajectory. Jennifer Radden, "Identity, Personal Identity, Characterization Identity and Mental Disorder", *The Philosophy of Psychiatry*, 2004, p. 134. Eadem, *Divided Minds and Successive Selves*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1996, *passim*.

[5] Robert Kane, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005, *passim*.

[6] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1958, p. 108.

[7] R. M. Chisholm, *Human Freedom and the Self*, Oxford University Press, 2003, p. 24-35.

[8] Robert Kane, *op. cit*., p. 16.

[9] Charles Taylor, *Etica autenticității*, Editura Idea Design and Print, Cluj Napoca, 2006, p. 53-59.

[10] Robert Kane, loc. cit.

[11] Saul Smilansky, *Free Will and Illusion*, Oxford University Press, 2000.

[12] Susan Wolf, *Sanity and the Methaphysics of Responsability*, in Gary Watson, *Free Will*, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1990, p. 153-154.

[13] *Ibidem*.

BDD-V59 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:56:06 UTC)

The archetypal identity implies, according to the Aristotle's definition[14], placing all the sources and causes in the individual[15] and not in his exterior (in the others and not in the relation with the divine). Two possible directions of the identitary metamorphosis are thus delineated:

a. the identity metamorphosis takes place voluntarily, and the multiple identity appears on a proteic or Manichaeist archetypal base. The resulted identities are of dualist, contradictory or multiple nature;
b. the metamorphosis is accidentally produced[16], without intention, unplanned. Identities of this type may not be included in the typology of multiple identities.

Thus, a typology of the identity could include:

a. the **differential identity** created with the help of some attributes of the archetypal identity which reflects in the facets of the multiple identity,

b. the **parepidemical transmundane identity** which supposes the existence of possible spaces of identity expression, the individual being attached to each topic floor by means of imagination,

c. the **multiple identity** in which identitary facets manifest in the same chronotopic system of reference, maintaining their dependency on an archetypal identitary base.

The "interior otherness" is a component inherent to the differential identity and it stimulates imagination to create original individual objects impregnated by the subjectivity of the author[17]. Yet the creativity is deliberately tempered, in order not to lead to non-distinction (confusion) between creator and his creation, the consequence being the identitary subordinationism. The projections of the interior otherness in the exterior systems of reference to which the individual relates, as forms of expression of the stages of returning to the self, may be creative (Pygmalion archetype) or destructive (Narcissist archetype).

The Pygmalionic identity is substantiated on heteroidentification, "the other" being the fruit of the individual's own creation. Thus, the discovery of the self calls for *poiesis*, and the work becomes a form of mediation between the identity from inside and the others, a form of communication of the interior citadel with the exterior space.

The imaginative creative individualism may produce own axiological systems and a value based relativism. The moral ideal behind the creator individualism is represented by the consistency to the self[18]; in exchange, the Narcissism suggests the lack of moral ideal or its use as a shield for the self-tolerance. Narcissism may also be understood as a way of self-perfecting opposite from the exigencies of the society, as inner exile, as auto-contradictory seclusion of self, and lacking a moral ideal. The understanding of the self-perfection in strictly personal terms has as consequence the instrumentalization of the community, the exit from the role, the moving in to the self and, implicitly, the malformation of the identity that becomes unrecognizable to the others.

Thus, the return to the self as form of *peregrinatio in stabilitate* may take different shapes:

a. ***enantiodromic,*** through the delimitation from an existent horizon of significations, the assertion of the autonomy, the creative expression of the self recovery itinerary; (Aeneas archetype).

b. ***palindromic***, through the assertion of an existent horizon of significations which is inherited and becomes the main source of identity building through historical homology. Yet

[14] *apud* William Hasker, *The Emergent Self*, New York, Cornell University Press, 1999.
[15] *Ibidem*.
[16] Robert Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
[17] Constantin Vâlcu, in Corin Braga, *Concepte şi metode în cercetarea imaginarului*, Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 2009, p. 131, n. 1.
[18] Charles Taylor, *Etica autenticităţii*, ed. cit., p. 18.

BDD-V59 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:56:06 UTC)

the practice of homology has as consequence the fictionalization of the identity; the assumed and reinterpreted past becomes a source of fictions which are useful in defining the individual as history and subject[19], and the history as *mystory* and *ifstory*[20]. The identity is built, in this case, by transferring data from the historic past in the personal history and by heroization of the one's own life (Odysseus archetype).

c. ***tautodromic,*** through the repetition of some existential scenarios, in the different stages of life (Sisyphus archetype).

The otherness is a form of expressing a metairetic type of identity[21]: the individual is in a continuous metamorphosis due to the "need-wish"[22] of self-perfection which projects him in the plan of fiction. The integration in a time interval of transgression from real to fictive (archetypally expressed by the identity of Icarian type) leads to otherness as form of self denial[23], of self alienation, and of overcoming one's own limits.

While in Antiquity the modalities of expressing the radical otherness were the Dyonisius' thyrsus and the cortege of satyrs[24], the medieval world has translated the feeling of loosing the self through the metaphor of the ship of fools and of the dance with the death[25]. The otherness is the consequence of an axiological collapse which does not destroy, yet it transforms the identity. The hybrid being of the satyr is at the border between the ludic and the tragic fictionalization of identity, being the expression of a noisy identitary Manicheism, in a space found between the self as creator subject and the self as possibility of cognitive concentration of the individual on himself.

In both cases the show of the otherness troubles the emotional balance (echitimia)[26], the status of balance between the interior citadel and the exterior space. The oscillation between enthusiasm and solitude, between the glorification of the person and the closure between one's own limits as axiological poles of otherness motivates the need to define a new individual space according to both the Achilles hypostasis of the glorious hero and to the Icarian one of the tragic hero. The Dyonisius' thyrsus, similarly to the ship of fools, projects this interior space in an exterior dimension the identitary coordinates of which are difficult to set. The parepidemic identitary space is redefined independently by the Christian classical system of reference of the întâlnirii meeting with the Divine. The parepidemic otherness may be defined as exit of the self (ek-stasis), self-search (heautomeros)[27], self-loosing.

The two hypostases of otherness, ludic and tragic (the noisy cortege of the Silenos and the quiet ship of the fools) are, from archetypological point of view, the most explicit modalities of depicting the multiple identity, yet also the dissociated identity, the

[19] Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of Moddern Age,* trad. Robert Wallacce, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1983, p. 52.
[20] *Ibidem*.
[21] The verb *metairein* (Matthew 13, 53) indicates the transition from a *topos* to another one, and the uncertain and unstable character of the limit (*peras, horos*). The verb suggests the metamorphoses of an imagined symbolically trimmed space, relating to identitary geographies. In this context, the limit has the role to ensure the junction between past and present.
Unlike the verb *metairein*, the verb *metabainein* (Matthew 8, 28) indicates the drastic transfer from a topos to another, from one ontological status to another. *Metabainein* means *to pass from*, *metairein* înseamnă *to pass towards*.
[22] Edouard Le Roy, *Le Probleme de Dieu,* Aristan du Livre, Paris, 1929.
[23] Constantin Enăchescu, *Homo Demens*, Polirom Publishing House, Iasi, 2008, p. 155.
[24] Adelina Piatkowsky, *Jocurile cu satiri în antichitatea Greco-romană*, Polirom Publishing House, Iasi, 1998, *passim*.
[25] Johan Huizinga, *Amurgul Evului Mediu*, Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002, p. 194-213.
[26] Constantin Enăchescu, loc. cit.
[27] *Ibidem.*

BDD-V59 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:56:06 UTC)

hallucinating "double monstrous"[28]. The inter-changeable character of the double creates equivocal terms, the metamorphosis being explained through the Dyonisian expression "you have begun to see what you should see"[29], yet also through the metaphor of the narcissist echo[30]. In the fictionalization of narcissist type of the identity, the mirror signifies the loss of the self through mimicry. The auto-mimetic mirror replaces the absence of the creative interiority and suggests the idea of rivalry with the self, and of otherness.

Axes of identitary metamorphosis

a. Axis self-Divinity:

a. *parepidemic identity* (built through reference to the divine benchmark); the individual, foreigner and traveler on the Earth is considered in relation with a future of eschatological dimensions.

b. *metairetic identity* (built through the search of the self and the conversion to the self).

b. Axis self-community:

a. *anaclitical* : *proteic* (built as a need of adaptation)

mimetic (built through reference to an exterior model)

c. *criptomnesical* (built on the nucleus of some memories).

c. Centered exclusively on the self:

a. *narcissist*: *gemelar* - of Ianus type (reconstituted by regression, through reference to the past which decisively conditions the future)

- of Cain-Abel type (identitary dissociation in pairs of contrairs)

b. pygmalionic (built through transfer, projection of the self in the exterior space).

The Mitoclastic character of the modern epoch that has appeared in the context of the "disenchantment" of the world[31] and of the decentering of the axial identity having as poles the self and the divinity, has had as consequence the "lonely search of the interior identity"[32]. The Mitoclastic trend that accompanies the individualism of self-perfection has replaced the common mythological fond with a subjective mythical basin built through the mitomorphous fictionalization of the self and of the own autobiographical narration. The individual relates to the dynamic archetypal models and to euhemerized structures, modified by his own psychological structure[33]. The divine is placed in relation with the human nature; it is reduced to the human possibilities of understanding. The euhemerized structures are built starting from the humane traits of any character anchored by the collective imaginary in the mythical space of antiquity or in the Christian divine space. The fictionalization of the identity by reference to the euhemerized mythical systems of reference simplify the assimilation of such in the autodiegetic speech and the creation of a subjective archetypal field, as a need to offer heroic dimensions to one's own life.

Joseph Campbell has reduced the subjective archetypal field to the mono-myth of the "universal godly-man, immanent and active in all of us"[34], possessor of hyperproteic qualities which motivate the apparition of multiple identitary hypostases. Yet according to

[28] René Girard, *Violenţa şi sacrul*, Editura Nemira, Bucureşti, 1995, p. 172-173.
[29] Euripide, *Bacantele*, p. 212; René Girard, *op. cit.*, p. 174-175.
[30] *Ibidem*.
[31] Arthur O. Lovejoy, *Marele lanţ al fiinţei*, Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 1997, p. 59-85.
[32] Jerome S. Bruner, „Mith and Identity" , *Mith and Mythmaking*, ed. Henry A. Murray, New York, 1960, p. 285.
[33] Erich Neumann, *Art and the creative Unconscious*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1974, p. 82.
[34] Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a thousand faces*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1973, p. 389.

BDD-V59 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:56:06 UTC)

the vision of the mentioned author the hero cannot be a rescuer of the humane community except in the context of "the silence of his individual despair"[35].

The ritual of the return to the self includes at least three stages:

a. the confession as a pronounced correlative of the introspective approach[36];
b. the apparition of the differential identity and the identification of the autobiographical narrative thread from the perspective of a mythical narration and with a consistent contribution from imagination[37];
c. the euhemerization and humanization of the hero, his inclusion into a genealogy (real or fictive)[38].

The antique and medieval man did not develop an isolationist granular identity, unless in close connection with the sphere of religiosity, in the context of a solidarity with the universe. The identities were built through reference to a myth assumed and lived. The multiplied identity "in the series of its presences in universe"[39] has prevented the adhesion to the self, the expression of individuality being posterior to the existence of humanity. The personal autonomy on which the occidental thinking has built the edifice of moral values was defined together with the need of solitude, of retreat in a personal space in which the dialogue with the self may take place coherently and undisturbed by the noise of the world.

The mimetic interferences, the impulse of *imitatio proximi*, and the proteic instinct have produced desorganizations and reorganizations at levels of complexity more and more profound, accelerating the process of formation the multiple identity. The mimetic partners were not always contemporaneous, and the mimetic interface with heroes from the past or with fictive characters has had as consequence the capacity of considering the other as an *alter ego*, the consequence being the Dioscuri halving.

The constant danger of the model transformed in *alter ego* and metamorphosed subsequently in rival has produced interior otherness, the interruption of connections between identity hypostases and the installation of the internal conflict. The rivalry with the mimetic partner has thus become the fight with the self, the status of *double-bind*[40], of interior contradiction between the need of authenticity and the need to imitate and be imitated.

The theory of the *double-bind* developed by Gregory Bateson[41] refers to a contradictory message, to a conflict in the interior space which can determine the retreat in the self, the "breach of reciprocity"[42], the isolation, (in the vocabulary of Bateson "symmetric schismogenesis" understood as opposition of the identitary hypostases).

The identitary dynamics may be analyzed relatively easily from the perspective of the archetypal interior structure; the interior conflict is archetypized in the ambivalence of contradictory feelings, of an interior division emerged as a consequence of a double choice (archetype of antagonist brothers Cain and Abel, Balin and Balan from the Arthurian

---

[35] *Ibidem*.
[36] Montaigne confesses in his preface preceding the *Essays*, "Thus, dear reader, I myself am the *dough* for my book"; *Essays,* I, translation by Mariela Seulescu, Editura Ştiinţifică Publishing House, 1966.
[37] Michel de Montaigne, *op. cit*., p. 89: "I am among those which feel very strongly the call of imagination. It shakes everybody but breaks down some of them. Its strength overtakes me. My skill consists in dodging it, for I have no power to stand against it"
[38] *Ibidem*, "To the reader": "I did not have in view (with this book) to serve you or my fame. My powers are not worth of such plan. I meant it especially for the relief of my relatives and friends..."
[39] Georges Gusdorf, *Mit şi metafizică*, Amarcord Publishing House, Timişoara, 1996, p. 78-80.
[40] René Girard, *Despre cele ascunse de la întemeierea lumii*, Nemira Publishing House, Bucharest, 1999, p. 322-324.
[41] Gregory Bateson, „Toward a Theory of Schizophrenia", *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, 1969, p. 244-270.
[42] *Ibidem*.

BDD-V59 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:56:06 UTC)

narration) instituted together with the idea of free will. Yet there is also the possibility of interior self-confinement as form of expressing a saturated identity, in which case the relation with the exterior and with any form of alterity is irrelevant.

A catalogue of mythology archetypes could offer an existential typology, the adventures of archetypal heroes[43] being summed up to the stages of the self-knowledge[44].

The archetype of the happy island[45] was interpreted with the meaning of the adventure of the self-knowledge, ending with the definition of the interior paradise. The stand-alone self-definition may have a double signification:

- reference to an individual horizon of significations which places the adventure of self-discovery in a well-defined system of reference, as in the Ulysses adventure in which the hero wanders in a hostile space, yet the purpose of the purpose of the journey is well defined: the return in familiar Ithaca

- or, on the contrary, the distancing from the individual horizon of significations which had become limiting, and the research for a new system of reference which would warranty the individual happiness.

The differential identity could thus be defined as hypostasis of the axial identity which makes it possible to communicate with the others, and to integrate in a type of community which does not belong to a common geographical and historical territory, yet which supposes an exchange of cultural values, adaptations, and syntheses. The identitary differentiation is a modality exercising of one's individual capacity of metamorphosis, through reference to two fundamental axes: the archetypal axis provided by the historical matrix and by a well-defined horizon of cultural significations, and the mimetic axis needed to adapt to new historical and cultural contexts, different from one's own contexts and provided by the stromatic perspective of globalization. The differential identity prevents the identitary confusion.

Bibliography:

Blumenberg, Hans, *The Legitimacy of Moddern Age*, trad. Robert Wallacce, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1983

Braga, Corin, Concepte şi metode în cercetarea imaginarului, Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 2009.

Bruner, Jerome, S., „Mith and Identity" , *Mith and Mythmaking*, ed. Henry A. Murray, New York, 1960.

Campbell, Joseph, *The Hero with a thousand faces*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1973.

Chisholm, R. M., *Human Freedom and the Self*, Oxford University Press, 2003

Enăchescu, Constantin, *Homo Demens*, Polirom Publishing House, Iasi, 2008.

Girard, René *Despre cele ascunse de la întemeierea lumii*, Nemira Publishing House, Bucharest, 1999

Girard, René, *Violenţa şi sacrul*, Editura Nemira, Bucureşti, 1995.

Gusdorf, Georges, *Mit şi metafizică*, Amarcord Publishing House, Timişoara, 1996.

Hasker, William, *The Emergent Self*, New York, Cornell University Press, 1999

Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan*, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1958.

Huizinga, Johan, *Amurgul Evului Mediu*, Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002.

Kane, Robert, *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*, Oxford University Press, 2005.

[43] Icar, Sisyphus, Oedipus, Achilles, Aeneas, Odysseus, etc.

[44] Georges Gusdorf, *op. cit*., p. 226-227.

[45] The island of Alcinous in the *Odyssey*, or the island of Robinson Crusoe.

BDD-V59 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:56:06 UTC)

Lovejoy, Arthur, O., *Marele lanţ al fiinţei*, Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 1997.

Le Roy, Edouard, *Le Probleme de Dieu*, Aristan du Livre, Paris, 1929.

Montaigne, Michel, *Essays*, I, translation by Mariela Seulescu, Editura Ştiinţifică Publishing House, 1966.

Neumann, Erich, *Art and the creative Unconscious*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1974.

Piatkowsky, Adelina, *Jocurile cu satiri în antichitatea Greco-romană*, Polirom Publishing House, Iasi, 1998.

Radden, Jennifer, "Identity, Personal Identity, Characterization Identity and Mental Disorder", *The Philosophy of Psychiatry*, 2004.

Radden, Jennifer, *Divided Minds and Successive Selves*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1996.

Smilansky, Saul, *Free Will and Illusion*, Oxford University Press, 2000

Taylor, Charles, *Etica autenticităţii*, Editura Idea Design and Print, Cluj Napoca, 2006.

Wilkes, K., "How Many Selves Make Me?" in D. Cockburn ed., *Human Beings*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Wolf, Susan, *Sanity and the Methaphysics of Responsability*, in Gary Watson, *Free Will*, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1990.

BDD-V59 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:56:06 UTC)