





































































implies an individualising force of the narration of the individual memory<sup>140</sup>. The “ground level” memory protects the tragic past not only from oblivion, but also from generalizations, clichés and anthropological trivializations.

In the context of certain current historiographic and social sciences debates, memory takes part in the return of the event in history and in the social sciences, since the questions regarding a past or present event are answered through Michel de Certeau’s words, stating that “the event is what it becomes”. Therefore, this potential fruitfulness qualifies a fact or an occurrence as an event. The testimony, the transmitted memory, oral history are associated with the phenomenon of returning to the event, since memory cannot exist outside the occurrence and of the event. Therefore, the “ground level” memory can be an event-based memory in its true sense. It incorporates three event functions, namely, potential fruitfulness, a heuristic function and a return to the difference. It gives the historical meaning its eventness. If the potential fruitfulness places the event between causality and consequences, the second function represents an opening towards new facts and new horizons of factuality and the return of the difference is imposed and maintained by the special focus placed on the story and storytelling. Transmitting a memory is a construction of the event, since instead of being shaped by the event, memory shapes the event<sup>141</sup>. The act of storytelling does not allow the event to fall into its impersonal neutrality.<sup>142</sup>

The credited events created by the testimonies and memories of the witnesses and participants are, on the one hand, constructivist in the sense that the testimony becomes material and event-based evidence inside a judiciary history and, on the other hand, besides the reality of the events, memory emphasises the interpreted event, namely the event “déployé dans certains de ses virtualités signifiantes.” The testimonies that re-centre the event therefore imply “exchanges between memory and history in order to construct a social history of memory”.<sup>143</sup>

The individualisations of the “ground level” memory, the re-centring of the soldier as the speaker are all openings that surpass both the standards of monumental history and those of the cultural history of war. They institutionalise “the plurality of the collective memory” and they deconstruct the process of remembering, understanding and mythologizing the past; they are able to construct and reproduce “the myths of modern memory,” since myths are “a fibre of our being.”<sup>144</sup>

Translated from the Romanian by Anca Chiorean

---

<sup>140</sup> J. Cl. Monod, “Les troubles de la mémoire et de l’histoire,” in *Concurrences des passés...*, 104.

<sup>141</sup> Ph. Joutard, “L’événement,” in *Actes des colloques d’Aix en Provence. Centre d’histoire orale*, 1986, 3.

<sup>142</sup> P. Ricoeur, *Soi-même comme un autre* (Paris: Seuil, 1990), 169.

<sup>143</sup> Fr. Dosse, *Renaissance de l’événement* (Paris: PUF, 2010), 295; See also A. Wieviorka, *L’ère du témoin* (Paris: Plon, 1998), 99; D. Radosav, “Memorie și eveniment. Câteva considerații” (Memory and event. Some considerations), in *AIO, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Orală*, VIII (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2007), 7-43.

<sup>144</sup> P. Fussel, IX.



