

Hermeneutics
Херменевтика

FICTION AND FACTION PERPLEXITY IN THE HISTORICAL DISCOURSE

Nysret Krasniqi

University of Prishtina (Kosovo)

Abstract. In this article the whole argument lies in discussing a close relationship between history and literature on the generic basis especially due to the long path of theoretical and philosophical coherence. From Antique to Postmodernism, the generic coherence of hybrid discursive formations dictated perplexity of defining perhaps separating the very idiosyncratic composition of them. Thus, this article deals with the philosophy of history in terms of its reflecting on literary discourse or in philosophy of literature. This ambiguity provoked many discussions hereby melted within the philosophical ideas and literary theories with the prior aim finding best possible ways toward idealized truth both in the discourse of history and literature.

Keywords: Philosophy of history; literary discourse; fiction and faction; aletheia; immanence

Intention for the truth

Aristotelian concept that distinction between poetry and history consists of the fact that the former relies on what has happened and the latter one on what may happen. Therefore, poetry is more philosophical than history and has perplexed western literary tradition until modernity. As we see in Aristotle's *Poetics*, poetry expresses universality and history dwells upon particularity,¹⁾ and they represent different *mimetic* forms of life. This generic dichotomy means that if history focuses on specific topics, narrative text should be an episodic description of given facts and conversely when poetry is based on episodic history its aim will be to gain an artistic totality and universality.

Generic dichotomy, seeing it through evolution of models, has changed through ages and due to evolution and interwoven forms of discourses.

Herodotus, as a father of history, wrote a type of *moralistic history*²⁾ based on oral narratives about greatness of actions of heroes in the Greek-Persian War as a *Homeric tradition*³⁾ of glorification. But, Thucydides in the *History of the Peloponnesian War* wrote a political history seeing the written text as an internal communication between military strategies within which he was and political system

as it was in Athenian democracy. In this conceptualization of historical narrative, Thucydides did not abandon figurative characterizations of political figures, thus prompting irony as a literary device through narrative discourse of history.⁴⁾

Discussing some models in the historical manner, we can observe that Cicero insights in terms of some philosophical concepts dwells the history as an integral part of rhetoric. Moreover, knowing that rhetoric deals with established topics within the political milieu of Rome, historical discourse was colorized with ironic narrative. This irony of discursive memory of the past was an example of establishing a corpus of events of the past with the intention to prevail a debate of the present situations in the actual political developments of roman society. Thus, for Cicero it was no problem to object the facts, because through *argumentum*, which it may be a false on the basis of *veritas*, he had the final objective to gain and to produce conviction. In his *De inventione*, Cicero established philosophical triangle *fabula*, *history* and *argumentum*⁵⁾, to go further on elaborating that *fabula* is a group of narrated events not linked to truth and *history* is a group of events narrated in our time about past happenings, thus *argumentum* defined as a narration which does not have any basis of happening as a truth or reality.

This view of the role of historian varies in the Judeo-Christian period, even if it is as a result of breaking the power of the world of *myths*, as well as the Christian concept of death. If on the ancient philosophical principles, the being was subject to the process of passing, movement in circle, but not death, it meant only the record of human events in their "logging" in the infinite time of nature. But the Latin-Christian era builds up a different concept as opposed to Greek immortality and its connection to nature. *In Christianity, neither the world nor the ever-recurring cycle of life is immortal... It is the world that will pass away; men will live forever.*⁶⁾ This is the period when the author gets the power of criticism and authority, even of political opinion, to reassess a prior period of human relationship with nature, making the essential difference in building a human philosophical and metaphysical relationship with God. However, the fall of Rome significantly affects the fading of the concepts of Christian faith, even as a tendency of earthly interpretation that the God has forgotten the Christian center, since the goal for the sacred metaphysics has damaged the nucleus of social organization of man. As a counterweight to the concepts that denied devotion, comes St. Augustine, who is considered among the greatest religious fathers, and writes the book *De civitate Dei contro paganos*. The purpose of elevating *Christian doctrine*, the integration of the allegorical discourse and the attack on paganism distinguish the *powerful author*, both as the interpreter of the Holy Scripture, as well as the selector of the abundant culture of Greek antiquity, which was conveyed as dominance in Latin culture. In its basic concept lies what scholars call *theology of history*. Thus, history is conceived as knowledge that teaches us about the order of past things, but always acceptable only as a means of facilitating the understanding of the Holy Books.

Ernest Robert Curtius, by applying the *historical-philological* method, reaffirms the *continuity* of the Greek-Latin tradition, in no way logging and qualifications as the dark time for the Middle Ages. However, if for the ancient Greek the *poetry* was *getting a metaphysical value not from the subjectivity of the poet, but from supra-human authority*, in Latinity the difference lies in the fact that the *creator* is only God, the Transcendent One, while the human creations must exactly comply with his will revealed in the Bible, which *is written with His own finger*.⁷⁾ But, if the conception of the metaphysical sphere changes or let us say of the relationship of man to Gods and God, this means a conceptual difference yet it does not even mean a discontinuation of narrative discourse, which nevertheless progresses in its historical course. The interpretation of the Holy Scripture is done through the arsenal of Greek tropological knowledge, even by reducing the pagan part of the Holy Scripture, or even by avoiding the poetic hexameter towards the lines of prose, as the formal change of the sacred text. From this it results that the ratio of writing with rhetorical features, even when related to the theology of history in literary sense, is not faded by the figure. Subsequently, theological-historical discourse can be considered a special literary form, even on the principle of a retrospective survey of the literary heritage and why not the return of the religious myth to the canonical religious text. Therefore, it seems that the relation of literature to history is so intricate, that strict definitions were not required, nor even seen at the horizon of generic research of medieval literature. Moreover, this intricate discursive relationship is also present in the Renaissance period, where by using theoretical conceptions of Antiquity and Latinity, it was required from the historical discourse to interpret the myths and culture of tradition carefully in order to establish historical 'truth'.

The quest for historical truth led to strict interpretations of tradition that in certain instances Herodotus was called the "father of history", but also the "father of lies". Nevertheless, it is precisely the Renaissance that restored the idealization of myth, whether it is religious, national or political.⁸⁾ Even the Illumination, which was gripped by the *rationality* of the exact knowledge required undeniable truth, its connection to the authentic concepts of the individual could not change the history-literature inter-discourse. Even the researcher Peter G. Bietenholz states that "historians must understand that they cannot reproduce what has actually happened. They can only create the literal illusion of earlier reality (...) Like fiction writers, historiographers have to rely on the "inner eye" to witness the events they want to describe."⁹⁾ This scholar also emphasizes and insists that in the fragile division of genre, historically, we are dealing with the interaction of *history* with *tale*, in the chronological and philosophical arch of Western culture from antiquity to modern times. But we can emphasize that the Greek-Latin antiquity of historical narrative discourse tried *to remove it from mythical confession*, by categorizing it as a literal sub-form. This philosophy of historical narrative turns into a nominative epithet as an *intention for the truth*. So even when vague events, which could not

be constructed on the basis of the document, took the *history* epithet, transforming into works that pretended the removed discourse from excessive imagination and fantasy. The denomination itself *history* was intended to create a novel that close to reality, but never without “excluding” the imaginary. Explosion of the term *history* occurs precisely with the Renaissance and then with the Illumination, even as a stronger awareness for the historical sense.

Path of differentiation

However, it is the stage of Romanticism, which in some way gives history the path of differentiation or at least the need to seek its own place within the framework of humanitarian disciplines. Returning to the concept of Aristotle, where *poetry was considered more philosophical*, causes *history* to require a generic and gnoseological redesign at the new ages. Perhaps, the new cultural, ethnic-national developments which have influenced to bring history closer to politics, to create only the “image” of differentiation from hermeneutics, poetics and rhetoric, hence from its hybrid tradition as a special form of *text of pragmatic value* as Gadamer calls it. History as a literary form of politics for the past fades particularly when the forms of ethnic-national ideas develop. This popular phenomenon urges the historian to investigate events and texts of the past, hence in the *document*, to strengthen the politics of the present, to recreate the tradition which allegedly resembles.

Nonetheless, did this difference significantly change the discursive immanence itself of the historical text? Did the historical text achieve to release from the *fable* or from *rhetorical* figuration and maybe even by the *re-creation of the textual world*, which necessarily relates to the re-creation of the fictional world? The arbitrary response to rhetorical questions turns out to be: no!

The American scholar, mainly of Romanticism in Western Culture, Professor of literature and history, William Trent, in a lecture held before the Historians League of Virginia in 1906, gives some interesting annotations regarding the relation of history to literature. Outlining the archeology and the history of the problem, Trent sees history as a part of literature, despite its distinctions in the romanticism phase in Western literature and culture. *Mixed with literature, mixed with philosophy, colored with patriotism, colored with partisanship, springing out of the darkness of unconsciousness, ending in the darkness of confusion, history obviously had little chance to grow into a science, though a spirit of investigation and a demand for truth were then abroad in the world, as well as a zest for speculation in philosophy.*¹⁰⁾ These historical constants, which through the era of discursive shifting give way to the text with historical premises, are made with a view to justifying the modern differentiation of the historical text from literary, anthropological, sociological and political texts. However, even when history, in terms of the term research, reaches the degree of maturity to be distinguished, Professor Trent refuses arbitrary differentiation, but reiterates that its relationship with literature, even reshaped, is

natural, except generic distinctiveness, so formal, to target the *truth*. Therefore, the forms changes, but like history, as well as the literature seeks the truth. While the historian should have the knowledge of literature to recreate the world of things happened, the writer must have the knowledge of history to elevate her figure. An example of this relationship is the dramatic text and the literary text. *Both history and drama are more than literature; but in their best estate are literature*,¹¹⁾ emphasizes Professor Trent.

Thus, history in modern times is re-dimensioned in the thematic separation plan, even as a consequence of new political, economic and technological developments. However, when the history topics are based on the singling out of specific cases of events that have had an impact on the ethnic-national path as an identity subject, in terms of discourse, no fundamental difference is still being investigated, although the so-called *scientific historic concept* is strengthened. Since the basis of historical research remains the quest, the finding of the document, the artifact, etc., even as a beautiful surprise of the realization of the desire to shine the fate of the fathers, yet it is the interpretation of the historian, the reconstruction, through the historical text, he that the document as a fact ascribes with fiction to result in the historical research text. Accordingly, briefly stated, illumination and romanticism want the *document* as a starting point for *historical narrative re-semantisation*. But let us bear in mind that the great desire to have the *document* has not denied the literary tradition of recording historical events through the popular epic, whether it is hereditary or reconstructed as a spirit of the outbreak of national identities. Moreover, the literary tradition has recorded many events removed in time by recreating myths about historical figures, which later turned into interesting topics for history in the documentary truth search plan. From this it emerges that interdiscursive history-literature generics can then be debated, even as the impossibility of differentiating the language as arbitrariness or motivation. But, if we forget for a few moments the symbiosis of discourse and deal with the intent of historiography to prove the truth, again we encounter a highly challenging problematic. Historical truth is always seen with doubt, but its ideal has protected the ethics of the historian or his politics to write with the faith of the enlightenment of the past. The ethics of finding the document and then reconstruction of the event have enabled the multitude of historical interpretations based on exactly the same document or documents that have communicated with each other thus resulting in many historical interpretations, nevertheless, documenting and documentary. However, this goal of truth is hardly challenged when it was expected to further insist on the value of its writing or heritage.

Contesting the authenticity

Historical truth was attacked precisely by relativizing the *authenticity of the document*. This attack did not come from the philosophers of history, nor from the

scholars of the classical school of historical and political studies. The attack was launched as a result of the explosion of social, anthropological and philosophical-literary theories of the 60s of the past century into the European scholarly space. Over the mark of structuralism and post-structuralism was highly philosophized with respect to the concept or basic "place" of history: the archive. If a historian, let us classic historian, saw the archive as a place of documentation, as the center of his research offset, whose interpretation would reconstruct the context, the structuralist principle attacked exactly the archive not seeing it as a center but as a fully interpretable process. Therefore, if any document was relativized to the extent of its identification with fiction, it is not surprising even the veneration of the French idea historian, Michel Foucault, who in some way translated historical narrative discourse into the *new myth*. Foucault emphasizes that fiction has never been separated from historical writing irrespective of what topics the literary historian has treated. Moreover, this philosopher thinks that even in the fictional discourse can reign the goal of truth. *I am well aware that I have never written anything but fictions. I do not mean to say, however, that truth is therefore absent. It seems to me that the possibility exists for fiction to function in truth, for a fictional discourse to induce effects of truth...*¹²⁾ This Foucault thought is not his isolated veneration but it represents the spirit created against traditional codes in human knowledge. It also reinforces the achievements of analysis fragmentation in the field of deconstruction of human discourse in order to exclude the author as authority, the avoidance of intent on literary texts, the reinforcement of linguistic arbitrariness over the teachings of Saussure, which stimulated structural philosophical-literary knowledge, achievements that led to the relativization of the intention for authentically motivated truth, reinforcing the layer of political interpretation of the current cultural heritage.

Michel Foucault is taken as the reference to all these constants of cultural studies, for the fact that for a long time he was a professor of the history of ideas and institutions.¹³⁾ Being a historian of ideas, however, Michel Foucault, among other things, was a *kind of historian*. However, on the principle of relativization of the archive, this researcher managed to establish other concepts for historical research. *Epistemology, archeology, problematic and genealogy* are its operational notions, raised in philosophy of argumentation on the basis of harmonization of the historical and actual interpretation of human processes, which in fact are *counter-punctual strikes*¹⁴⁾ to the very tendency of history to become independent discipline, so in fact they demand its leaning towards the social sciences. If Michel Foucault came to these conclusions, this philosophy probably has a *history*. An early history search related to the spirit that was later called *structuralism*, which roots began in the 1920s of the previous century, from the philosophy of *arbitrariness of linguistic sign* of Ferdinand de Saussure, who emphasized that language is an autonomous communication tool and as such it is able to build its own apparatus

and for itself which would be dealt by *linguistics*. This idea, which was developed until the formation of *semiology*, so that all human knowledge could be seen on the principles of the sign communication, had an enormous influence on the concept of the universality of the method, which touched philosophy, literary studies and why not historical studies. If Saussure is taken as the initiator of the outburst of the systemic and systematic idea, then anyway as his successors in other fields may be considered Roland Barthes with *structural literary semiology*, Jacques Lacan with *structural psychoanalysis*, Claude Lévi-Strauss with *structural anthropology* etc. So, *structuralism* required the stability of the system, which, like Saussure's *langue*, is a thought concept, while the author as a plus voice, but shrill voice, which fails to change the structural pillars of the self-sufficient system by being dependent only in his responsibility to link the predetermined units of the system, according to the concept of *bricolage*, which in its structural research outset was later presented by the philosopher Derrida and French theorist Gérard Genette. However, since the concept of the structure was based on a linear connection, while it meant a center, the flaw of this fundamental concept made Jacques Derrida, who instead proposed the *game*, emphasized the lack of *structure structuralism*, *difference* in the sign system, etc. This resulted in a powerful relativization of the discourse, which at the same time denied the frustration of the author within the system, reinforcing the tendency of losing the *author's intent* to target the life of the text without the presence of any validating authority. *The whole history of the concept of structure, before the rupture I spoke of, must be thought of as a series of substitutions of center for center, as a linked chain of determinations of the center. Successively, and in a regulated fashion, the center receives different forms or names. The history of metaphysics, like the history of the West, is the history of these metaphors and metonymies.*¹⁵⁾

Stimulating the lack of a center, transforming the traditional history of metaphysics and traditional history of history into a metaphorical and metonymic conception, namely abstraction and reflection, connotes the loss of enlightenment rationality, the loss of the tendency of romantic enlightenment and modernism for the sake of the *game* which goes for the sake of relativization of any discourse in humanities. Such a *game* implies the *deconstruction* of history, an action that is contrary to the traditional *construction* of the phenomena and events of the past. This philosophy received the epithet of post-structuralism and had tremendous influence on European and American intellectual circles.

In the way of the concepts of modern scholastic trends, a special role in western culture is the emergence of the *history of ideas* that originate from the University of California, Berkeley, specifically by the professor of *cultural poetry* Stephen Greenblatt, who spoke the term *new historicism*. Greenblatt, a professor of Marxist theories, in the field of culture proposes *circulation*, that is stated simply, the combination of old materials, whether literary, historical, as dialoging with

the past in order to create the new effect, or new cultural history over *mimetic* principles.¹⁶⁾ This means that the *new historicism*, trying to distinguish itself from the views of structuralism and post-structuralism, develops a concept that is related to the literary and historical tradition, nonetheless with a view of seeing it from the present and to ascertain that the canonical works of this inheritance should be seen as a product of circumstances that the author actualizes as an interlocutor, considering the current social, cultural, political and ideological effect of representation time. Thus, the new historicism requires in the historical ascending curve, but observed not by what originates from the text, but by the circumstances that have conditioned the text.

As seen in general concepts, these currents of knowledge do not accept the relevance of the document, the author, and the canonical work, whether it be premises of historical or literary discourse. Then again, we must emphasize that such trends with the epicenter of the French neo-leftist knowledge, although “tired” by extreme positivism, even with the intend to soften a bit of strong Marxism, exhibit their philosophical and literal dissent not as rejection, but as reevaluation of ideological concepts that required the transfer of cultural, political and national authority from the high canonical culture in the subculture, which for the resource has the feeling that tradition should be recreated rather than preserved and continued with motivated supplements on the path of its evolutionary identity nativity.

This recreation will be done through the reinforcement of the concept of communication, which makes the system to be understood, yet the canons to be used by being shadowed or fragmented to the extent of the tendency to eradicate the *work* and to launch the concept of the *text*.¹⁷⁾ As noticed, we have moved even further. The problematization of the discourse relation between history and literature does not constitute a fundamental problem. We should also emphasize that no one to date has discerned, even failed, to divide the history discourse from literary discourse. But if in the light of romantic and post-romantic developments the *document* was enforced, it is the theoretical-critical trends of modernity which overthrew the classic concept of history that it should be *more than literature* in the search for the *truth*, to restore again in the game of a neo-myth, which was already associated with the amalgam of other knowledge as a wave of general cultural studies. History was taken the right of aiming the truth, and this tendency traditional historians harshly criticized as *the killing of history through criticism theorists and social theories*.

Thus, the relativization of canons, heritage works, had such a strong influence on the production of explosion of forms of theories and criticism, that these forms have now become a library in themselves, a great knowledge of the knowledge, which, in fact, have removed the naturalness of the previous culture. This meta-knowledge, which, melted in the theories of various dimensions, claims deconstructive analysis

of the past, even with the intention of revisiting it, in fact risks becoming an aid mechanism to forget the past. Meanwhile, in the literary plan, this wave attacked the *author* as the sole validating principle of the text, aiming at anonymity as a philosophy of deletion. Whether it is time for reevaluation of this phenomenon in the historical field, not historicist, reconsidering the position of historical discourse in relation to the very nature of literature as a fictional phenomenon, we do not know and cannot prejudge it.

Aletheia: Aim toward revelation

We have outlined this fragile view of this relationship to emphasize the intricate link between historical discourse and literary discourse over time, to see either the melting trend or the differentiation of disparities, especially when they are encountered in narrative literary forms, which are especially stressed in modern times. But when we are related to the concept of the goal of the ideal of truth, we should think about its own conception. In many philosophical-historical debates, but also in religious semantics, *aletheia*, the concept of Greek antiquity, was implied as a goal *for truth* or *its revelation*. The second, the revelation, is the meaning that given to *aletheia* by the German philosopher, Martin Heidegger, as the opposite of coverage. However, if we comment on Heidegger's philosophies, it appears that the aiming for the truth originates from the free involvement of *Dasein*, to show the being itself through *aletheia*, which is achieved through questioning, thinking, as well as the discovering path of the truth. *Aletheia* seems to be the path to truth through the revelation. But without the free being, which is included in the *aletheia* of the aiming of the truth, there is no history. Because, *only human existence is historical. "Nature" has no history*,¹⁸⁾ said Heidegger. In addition, in his lectures on the philosophy of history, Heidegger ascribes to its everlasting presence in being. *What does history mean? The past, we think, the thing that happened. But is history just the past? No! History is all that happens: history is what has happened, but also what is happening and what is going to happen. Historians does not consider history as such a totality of happenings will fail*.¹⁹⁾ However, if the revelation (*aletheia*) of history was seen by Heidegger as a work of historical *material* to aim the truth, this philosophy changed in regard to *aletheia*, which *artistic beauty* possesses, which aims at a particular form of human truth. *Thus, in a work truth is, not just something true, but what it is in the work/piece. The painting of the farmer's shoes, the poem that speaks of the Roman fountain, is not just a manifestation of what those isolated beings are - if in fact they manifest something; rather, they show what happens in the matter as a whole. The more essential and clearer the shoes are attached to their essence, the more direct and inclusive all the beings maintain a high degree of being within them. This is how the self-revelation of Being is clarified. Such light merges its radiation in the work as well. This radiation, shared in the work, is*

*the beauty. Beauty is the way in which the truth essentially happens as non-revelation.*²⁰⁾ In other words, *aletheia* (revelation) as a way of aiming the truth of Being exists in history and literature. However, if history is a continuous process of the revelation of the historical human being and aims the totality of clarity, literature through essential beauty as a non-manifestation aims a particular form of the truth of Being. With some minor differences, which can be emphasized in the views of totality for history and the non-manifestation for literature, we return to Aristotle's coordinates for these two primordial phenomena of human being.

We took Heidegger to emphasize the existence of *aletheia* towards truth, in various immanent forms, in both discourses, history and literature, but also to re-emphasizing the phenomenon of influence of this thinker into the philosophies of structuralism and post-structuralism, philosophies represented by the French theoretical-philosophical circle of the 1960s and 1970s. But we have to re-emphasize that exactly the forms of Heideggerian truth were disliked by this circle and as such they grew powerfully in social sciences. A strong *stimmung*, against the truth of the text, whether a historical, literary, or canonical authoritarian, also occurred with the wave of postmodernist discourse, which came as an extension of the post-structuralist theories and especially after the philosophies of the postmodern state of Francois Lyotard, scattered across all pores of human knowledge. What did the postmodern state mean? The rationalistic scientific idea behind the Enlightenment, then the great narratives of Romanticism, whether cultural, national or political, but also the concentration on the self-sufficient forms of Modernization, in general social culture and knowledge, are seen with suspicion by *postmodern politics*. The post-structuralist sequence the postmodernism, strongly supported in the *technological advancement of cybernetics*, which, according to Lyotard, dictated the *postmodern state*, insisted on the *fragmentation of knowledge*, which was becoming necessary for consumer needs as well. By not going into the dimensions of the demand for fragmentation in the discourse of the exact, political, social sciences, etc., we emphasize that in the field of history and literature it was required that narrative develop in the *interest of simplification*.²¹⁾

This meant the game of language, which through its avant-garde immanence implied postmodernism as a prerequisite of any scientific and cultural innovation, thus attributing to the notion itself the ahistorical dimension, even with the leftist tendency of retrospective illusion! *A work can be modern only if it is initially postmodern. Such postmodernism, meaning modernism understood in this way, is not modernism, but remains in a developmental state and this state of its is constant.*²²⁾ In addition, breaking the rule, respectfully the canon, is the author's duty, who is referred to as the substitute of the philosopher or as an instance *that replaces the philosopher. The postmodernist artist or writer is in the position of the philosopher: the text he writes, the works he produces are not in principle governed*

*by pre-established rules, and they cannot be judged according to a determining judgment, by applying familiar categories to the text or to the work. Those rules and categories are what the work of art itself is looking for ... Let's start a war against totality.*²³⁾

The war against totality, the destruction of generic normative norms, and the game of language, which in essence legitimizes the game with the aiming of the truth, legitimize the permanent postmodern state, which strengthens the paradox and irony by fighting the static forms of textural structure. However, as far as self-definition of postmodernism is concerned, we are not able to find any approximate or consensual determination of scholars and theorists of human sciences. What is known by Frederick Jameson, the theorist of this stream, is that one of its fundamental postulates is *the loss or destruction of historicity* and, jointly, the questioning of reality, that is, of truth. However, by the same theorists who strongly proclaimed this philosophy (Linda Hutcheon, Terry Eagleton) later said that *postmodernism has come to an end*,²⁴⁾ because the world is now reshaping itself. However, no one doubts the legacy of postmodernism, which has already left a considerable amount of signs of generic fractures, which are noticed in historical and literary literature, as well as in school experiments and architectural fractures. However, this legacy, seen in relation to the philosophy of history, continued the attack on the principle of the archive and the document up to the degree of its similarity to the fiction, "allowing" the historian to never have the habit of validation towards the truth of its text. In literature, postmodernism, always under the shadow of modernity or its sequence, used the politics of its depravity, while in relation to the tradition it exerted irony and parody to the degree of contempt! Thus, concealed in the formwork game, postmodernism, emerges as an ideological sequence of authoritarian fracture, just as structuralism and deconstruction did, the basis of which was in the Marxist theories hybridized with cultural theories.

Breaking the power, the sign, the intent, the ethics and the author's poetics to the extent of the extreme depreciation of his presence in the text structure means denying the work and referring the game. Favoring the game with stabile discourses means the writer's production and effort. But, we must emphasize that the distinction between the *author* and the *writer*, is essential for us. If the *author* creates literary, historical, and hereditary monuments, the *writer* creates textual production, which, coated in fashionable way, even with the unification of the global political standards, at its most, enforces the *repetition*, which is closest to forgetfulness. The author enforces the identity on his way to the global, while the writer tends toward the global to dissolve the identity toward extreme relativity, who on his way, may miss the basic distinctive signs. However, despite the post-posting of other disadvantaged games, postmodern poetics now pass on inheritance. Nonetheless, the new movements give signals for a "death" of this political-philosophical stream, not denying at all the sensational impact on western and world's culture.

Therefore, the relation between literary and historical discourse is not becoming clarified yet it is becoming more complicated.

As it can be seen from this article, the synchronization of discourse forms has been and remains the immanence of these two cognitive forms, which in a specific way aim the truth. However, another important element remains the *thematic relation*, whether that of the particular event addressed in the historical discourse or, as such, dealt with in literary discourse. Subsequently, the element of this nature can be considered as the aspect of conceptual and poetic *intercommunication*.

As we emphasised, this ambiguity provokes many discussions hereby melted within philosophical ideas and literary theories with the prior aim in finding best possible ways toward idealized truth both in discourse of history and literature.

NOTES

1. Aristotle: Poetics, translated by S. H. Butcher, Part IX in <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/poetics.1.1.html>
2. See Herodotus of Halicarnassus: The Histories, Pax Librorum, 2010.
3. John Marincola: "Herodotus and Poetry of the Past" in Herodotus, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007, p. 15
4. See Mathieu de Bakker: "Character Judgement in the Histories: Their Function and Distribution" in A. Tsakmakis & M. Tamiolaki: Thucydides between History and Literature, De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, 2013, p. 23.
4. Cicero: De Inventione, LEOB Classical Library 386, Cambridge, Ma, and London, 1949, p. 55.
- 5 Ibid, 56.
6. Hanna Arendt: Between Past and Future, Viking Press, New York, 1961, p. 52.
7. Ernst Robert Curtius: European Literature and Latin Middle Ages, PUP, Oxford, 2013, p. 154.
8. Donald R. Kelley: Versions of History from Antiquity to the Enlightenment, YUP, 1991, p. 219.
9. Peter G. Bietenholz: Historia and Fabula, E. J. Brill, Leiden, New York, Köln, 1994, pp. 1 – 20.
10. William P. Trent: The Relations of History and Literature, The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1906, p. 458.
11. Ibid, p. 467
12. Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge, Pantheon Books, New York, 1980, p. 193.
13. Keith Windschuttle: The Killing of History, FP, New York, 1997, p. 24.
14. Thomas Flynn: "Foucault's mapping of history", in Cambridge Companion to Foucault, Cambridge, 1994, pp. 29 – 45.
15. Jacques Derrida, Structure, Sign and Play in Macksey & Donato, 1970, p. 249.
16. Stephen Greenblatt: "Towards a Poetics of Culture" in Southern Review 20, 1987, pp. 3 – 15.

17. Roland Barthes: "From Work to Text" in *The Rustle of Language*, Hill and Wang, New York, 1986, pp. 56 – 64.
18. Martin Heidegger: "On the essence of Truth" in *Basic Writing*, Harper Collins Edition, New York, 1993, p. 127
19. Martin Heidegger: *Nature, History, State: 1933 – 1934*, Bloomsbury, London, 2013, pp. 25 – 26
20. Martin Heidegger: "The Origin of the Work of Art" in *Basic Writing*, Harper Collins Edition, New York, 1993, p. 181.
21. Jean-François Lyotard: *The Postmodern Condition*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1984, p. 7.
22. *Ibid*, p. 79.
23. *Ibid*, pp. 81 – 82.
24. Linda Hutcheon: *Postmodern Afterthoughts*, Wascana Review, p. 5.

REFERENCES

- Aristotle, *Poetics*, translated by S. H. Butcher, <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/poetics.1.1.html>
- Cicero (1949). *De Inventione*, LEOB Classical Library 386, Cambridge, Ma, and London.
- Kelly, D. R. (1991). *Versions of History from Antiquity to the Enlightenment*, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Curtius, E. R. (2013). *European Literature and Latin Middle Ages*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Arendt, H. (1961). *Between Past and Future*, New York: Viking Press.
- Herodotus of Halicarnassus (2010). *The Histories*, Pax Librorum.
- Derrida, J. (1970). *Structure, Sign and Play* in Macksey & Donato.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Marincola, J. (2007). "Herodotus and Poetry of the Past" in *Herodotus*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Windschuttle, K. (1997). *The Killing of History*, New York: The Free Press.
- Hutcheon, L. (2002). *Postmodern Afterthoughts*, *Wascana Review of Contemporary Poetry and Short Fiction* 37.1.: 5 – 12.
- Heidegger, M. (1993). "On the essence of Truth", *Basic Writing*, New York: Harper Collins.
- Heidegger, M. (1993). "The Origin of the Work of Art", *Basic Writing*, New York: Harper Collins.
- Heidegger, M. (2013). *Nature, History, State: 1933 – 1934*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Mathieu de Bakker: "Character Judgement in the Histories: Their Function and Distribution". In: A. Tsakmakis & M. Tamiolaki (2013). *Thucydides between History and Literature*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Bietenholz, P. G. (1994). *Historia and Fabula*, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill, Leiden.
- Roland Barthes, R. (1986). "From Work to Text", *The Rustle of Language*, New York: Hill and Wang.
- Greenblatt, S. (1987). "Towards a Poetics of Culture", *Southern Review* 20.
- Flynn, Th. (1994). "Foucault's mapping of history", *Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, Cambridge.
- Trent, W. P. (1906). The Relations of History and Literature, *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 13, No. 4/1906.

✉ **Dr. Nysret Krasniqi, Assoc. Prof.**

Department of Literature

Faculty of Philology

University of Prishtina

10000 Prishtina, Kosovo

Email: nysret.krasniqi@uni-pr.edu