

A Reflection on the Posthuman Human: *The Postranshominescent*

Orsola Rignani

University of Parma, Parma, Italy

The essay presents a reflection on the current human condition, the novelty of which reveals itself to be an-already-always-been that continually begins and renews itself in the space of generative and inventive relationality, expressed, in its toti-potentiality, by Posthumanism and by Michel Serres. In this horn of abundance, pre-existing and passing beyond form a single body, seeking their expression in an inchoative composed neologism as *postranshominescent*.

Keywords: human, *postranshominescent*, novelty, Posthumanism, Michel Serres

Awareness of the Novelty as a Construction of the New (Human/Humanism): An Urgency

Postranshominescent sounds like tongue twister playing skill with two prefixes (prepositions) and an inchoative neologism; but, if it really is a game, we know that the game as such is valid insofar as it is played according to non-arbitrary rules. Therefore, here the linguistic punishment of the pronunciation and/or writing of an unlikely word underlie choices/rules of combination between prefixes (prepositions) and the inchoative: between *post* (after), *trans* (beyond), and *hominescent* (beginning to be human) are no joints that could suggest the idea of compositions, juxtapositions, accidental additions, or hierarchical relationships. *Postranshominescent* is rather a synthetic term that respects diversity and the individual and does not subsume nor devalue the particular but completes it; it is a new term that summarizes effect/reaction, passage, crossing, change, in an initial or processual perspective.

The prolongation of a pre-existing phenomenon in new forms, conveyed by *post*, and the passage beyond a term, and the change of condition, conveyed by *trans*, are in fact a single body with the “new” beginning of the humanization process expressed by the inchoative term *hominescence*, invented in the early 2000s by Michel Serres (Serres, 2001). Therefore, *postranshominescent* expresses the collection and declination of what I see the general request common to the reflection of Posthumanism¹ (Braidotti & Hlavajova, 2018; Rosendahl Thomsen & Wamberg, 2020; Baioni, Cuadrado Pereyas, & Macelloni, 2021; Ferrando, 2019) and of Michel Serres² (Rignani, 2012; 2014; 2016; 2018; 2019; 2020; 2022; Watkin, 2020), i.e., the repositioning of the

Orsola Rignani, Ph.D., assistant professor, Department of Humanities, Social Sciences and Cultural Industries, University of Parma, Parma, Italy.

¹ For an overview of the various orientations within the Posthumanism, I refer to some recent manual and glossary contributions as well as to the bibliographic references contained therein: Braidotti & Hlavajova, 2018; Rosendahl Thomsen & Wamberg, 2020; Baioni, Cuadrado Pereyas, & Macelloni, 2021; in addition, a synthesis of all these topics is provided by Ferrando, 2019.

² As regards the themes of this contribution, on Serres I recommend Rignani, 2012; 2014; 2016; 2018; 2019; 2020; 2022; Watkin, 2020.

human³ (Rignani, 2012; 2014; 2016; 2018; 2019; 2020; 2022), now more than ever binding in war, pandemic, and post-pandemic contingencies.

The urgency of becoming aware of the objective novelty as one with the urgency of the construction of the new itself, which means in particular the urgency of becoming aware of a “new” human being as the urgency of its realization (new way of being in the world and of corresponding with the way in which the world is and is changing), is therefore what seems to emerge as a whole and comprehends and opposes by generalizing⁴ themes such as the declinations and individual currents of Posthumanism and/or the orientations connected with it, as well as the relations between Posthumanism and Transhumanism (in its various proposals and interpretations) (Sorgner, 2020; 2021). As it also seems to me to re-comprehend by generalizing the humanistic, anthropocentric, specistic, dualistic (soul/body, subject/object, language/world, nature/culture) perspectives.

In manifesting itself as an overall context that entertains with these, that neither they come to constitute alone moments details and/or exceptions, a non-oppositional or subsumptive relationality but precisely a generalizing one, such urgency proposes, conveys and promotes the synthesis—that which the same *postranshominescent* neologism expresses, i.e., a (past) present/future of (thought of) relationships, and federative, inventive, and creative ties, and therefore, almost like a Chinese box, a systemic-ecological-transversal-inclusive-federative work on the human.

In *postranshominescent* are (the thought of) effect/reaction, change, relationship, transformation, to fluidify, hybridize, contextualize, and relativize definitions, categorizations, partitions, and periodization, obsolescent in their claims of absoluteness and exclusivity. The man—male, white, western, schooled, etc.—as the fulcrum of classical, humanist, and modern humanism, the *anthropos* as a species ontologically, ethically, and epistemologically central, human language, memory, calculation, and will as *agencies par excellence*, soul as essence of man they come so to contextualize and be completed in the context of the request for the awareness/construction of a de-anthrop(ocent)ricized and re-co-belonging human/humanism. So, ultimately, it is a question of thinking/returning, echo(nto)logically, to a human in relation to a relational world from which it has self-excluded (classical age, humanism, modernity, etc.). In other words, it is a question of de-anthropocentering/de-anthropomorphizing—without abolitionism and/or extinctionism—the world, in order to grasp and/or to allow principles common to all entities and their interrelationships to emerge from within.

The urgency of the repositioning of human as urgency of the awareness/construction, in the “restoration” of co-belonging to the world, of a “new” human, it seems therefore, as I said, the inheritance, the delivery, and the general task of the Posthumanism and of Serres, an inheritance/delivery/task that, in its developments, can’t help but collect suggestions from the Posthumanist and/or Serresian reflections themselves. Thinking/building an age of synthesis, in fact, can’t help but consider, for example, the composite Serresian proposal of a federative and inventive relationality. As well as, on a theme like the pan-/a-centrism, inter-involved with

³ Although I have always doubted, and continue to do so, the heuristic profitability of the “assessment” of Serres’s Posthumanism or not, especially considering the fluidity of the Posthuman and the intellectual independence of Serres himself, I have nevertheless found and highlighted isomorphisms between them in relation precisely to the conception of human and of the interface between it and the world. I have developed these positions specifically in Rignani, 2012; 2014; 2016; 2018; 2019; 2020; 2022.

⁴ Re-comprehending by generalization of points of view is one of Serresian’s figures of thought, that is, so to speak, an approach that consists in reconsidering the individual “point of view” in a generative synthesis that does not cancel out the particular but completes it.

human/other-than-human inter-relationality, Posthumanist and Serresian suggestions of a participatory relationship between human and the world are essential.

All this tries to think/build the *postranshominescent*, as such co-belonging, inter-implicated, constitutive of a synthetic, relational, possible reality, in which the differences between the entities reveal themselves only from degree and not from substance.

(Thinking) Relations

Postranshominescent is therefore, as I said, a *synthetic* neologism that *synthesizes* two prepositions and an inchoative, i.e., that is built in relationships, and at the same time, synthesizing them, completes and renews them: prepositions, Serres teaches (Serres, 2003; 2010; 2014; 2015), express, open relationships, passages, and possibilities; the inchoative marks the beginning of a process, which as such makes possible and inaugurates relationships; the synthesis of the prepositions and the inchoative completes them, bringing out a new relationality. *Post* returns the idea of the persistence of a phenomenon over time in new forms and therefore expresses an effect/reaction; *trans* says a change, a passing beyond, an overcoming; *hominescent* conveys the idea of the beginning of a process of humanization which, as Serres affirms (Serres, 2001, p. 21), inaugurates new relationships of man with his own body, with his fellow men and with the world.

Around the *post* Posthuman was articulated as, overall, post humanism, post anthropocentrism, and post dualism (Ferrando, 2019), that is to say as an effect/reaction to the humanism supporting the idea of man exclusively as male, white, Western, educated, etc., of the ontological, ethical, and epistemological centrality of the human species, of its separation and superiority with respect to other species and the rest of the world, but also as the permanence, under these new forms of the human.

On the other hand, around the *trans* Transhumanism was declined as, in its general and more “striking” lines (Sorgner, 2020; 2021), a proposal for improvement/strengthening of the human in the expectation of its overcoming towards a meta-biological condition of immanent immortality.

Posthuman/Posthumanism and Transhumanism, therefore, while moving from a common instance of rethinking/repositioning of the human, in articulating and specifying themselves they have diverged and settled on positions that are at least apparently difficult to reconcile.

However, in the face of these divergences, which sometimes seem to accentuate with the articulation of reflections and contributions, the approach of synthesis and/or the Serresian figure of opposition by generalization can be used, which, so to speak, completes the single components, i.e., *post*, *trans*, and the *inchoative*, bringing out a “new” relationality. *Postranshominescent* therefore indicates, as it is worth reiterating, a (new) beginning of the humanization process in the combination of effect/reaction (*post*) and change (*trans*), i.e., in the persistence of human/ humanism in new forms, according to a transformation, a passing beyond, which while renewing itself indefinitely does not tend and/or reach the transcendence (of human/humanism itself). Ultimately the message is: change *plus* transformation *plus* new beginning, but always of the human and in the human; and, therefore, a new process, always in any case of anthropo-poiesis, in and through a relationality that emerges as the engine of repositioning and renewal, or even the condition of possibility of the human, not just transhumanizing.

In other words, it is the relationship that creates the being, which on its turn is a relationship; so as that the *postranshominescent*, synthesis, completion, renewal of relationships, relationship-of relationships, is such in and for the relationship (welcoming and projection) with the world, and made up of relationships; which

therefore (re-)emerge in their cruciality, asking so to speak to be (re-)known, (re-)considered, and (re-)thought.

All this in, for, and through the body, which, embodied soul as well as animated body, becomes the constitutive dimension of the human, as a threshold of encounter and exchange, a ground of interbreeding, of welcome and projection, invasive and invaded, possible, plastic, transitive, in continuous metamorphosis in the hybridization processes with the non-human animal, with nature, and with technology (Rignani, 2022).

The Ecological Body

Therefore, if relationships make up the world and the world is made up of relationships, which the present and the future can no longer ignore, and if with this the human and humanism can no longer exist in a classical, humanistic, modern, anthropocentric, and dualistic meaning, but instead they can and must exist/(re-)construct themselves relationally, this *postranshominescent* condition is played out specifically and significantly for, with and in the body precisely, that—Posthumanism and Serres they support, so to speak, in unison-constitutes, as mentioned, the relational-anthropo-poietic dimension, as an *ecological* psycho-physical space of passage, transition, and exchange.

Resistant adhesion margin, excess, interstice of dividing lines, sudden flash of unpredictability: as such, the body constitutes for Serres the anthropo-poietic relational dimension; that is: only and precisely because it is not reducible to technology or otherness in general, but instead it (inter-) relates, hybridizing, with them, and therefore precisely does not “dissolve” in them, the body is the space for and of the construction of the human (Serres, 1985). And therefore it is always worthwhile to invoke, at least as a memento, a “supplement” of this neuralgic terrain of generative, federative, anthropo-poietic relationship, which Serres considers as such as pre-positional, i.e. preceding any position, blank for possibilities, omni-valent, virtual, capable, cognitive, inventive, constructor, under construction, in the possibility of the relationship, in the exchange, in the *m dange*, in the transmutation of the inside into the outside and vice versa, as well as in the overcoming of the *limen* same between the two; in short, *hominescent* (Rignani, 2016), that is to say, crucial junction of the new humanization process, which Serres sees to be characterized and articulated precisely around the (new) relationship(s).

Therefore, if the new human is and is going to be such for and in new relationships, at all levels of these relationships the body stands out as a referent: on a subjective level it is a question, for the human, of new relationships precisely with the body itself, which loses the role of obstacle, tinsel, to assume, by virtue of its (re-)emerging characteristics, that of double and companion (Serres, 2014, p. 204); on an objective level it is a question of new relationships with the world, with which the establishment of a federative relationship is made unavoidable, and of which the body becomes one of the primary actors, as a place of encounter, exchange and hybridization; at the collective level, finally, it is a question of the transition to connective relationships, in the virtual space produced by computer networks, in the context of which the body, so to speak, actively enters into (inter-)relationships of hybridization, subjectivation-objectification with technological supports. Serres, therefore, points to the body precisely as a space of (inter-)relationship which, for and in the (inter-)relationship, builds and constructs the human, and does so for the senses and in the senses, for metamorphism and in the metamorphism, for whiteness/toti-power and in whiteness/toti-power (Serres, 1985; 1999; 2003).

It is thus therefore that, in being crossed *by* things in exchange *with* them, the body, *hominescent*, possible in possibility, is precisely built, and with this it constructs the human.

The inventive synthesis that can be made of the Posthumanist and Serresian proposals on the body therefore primarily points to the idea of an ecological psycho-physical body, that is, as it were in deactivation

on the level of being and in (re-)activation on the level of generative relationality, with all the constellation of dynamism, virtuality, possibility with which the latter is inter-involved and which the latter conveys, which means, as mentioned, that the body is such *in* the relationship *and for the* relationship, with its potentiality; and that vice versa the relationship finds a crucial junction in the body, which, in this sort of circularity, constitutes the dimension of the human.

Passage, mediation, transition, and intentionality mean overall, along the thread of relationality, for the body, and therefore for the human, a return to things (moving to see them, visiting them), de-anthropo-centr/morph-ization/recognition of world in its principles common to all entities, different not in essence but in degree, immersion in it in adherence to its deviations, bifurcations, singularities, (re-)discovery of co-belonging.

All things, however, can and do happen specifically in silence, such as muting, listening, excess, overcoming the “point of view”, deciphering, participating, loaning of “voice”, (re-)aestheticization. The general message projecting from Posthumanism and from Serres is in fact, ultimately, that of reduction to silence as a condition of immersion in a pregnant silence, a place of encounter, of exchange, of knowledge, of generation (Serres, 2010). Silencing, moreover, is not putting aside, eliminating, abolishing, extinguishing, but rather rediscovering, restoring, re-aestheticizing (Serres, 1985): muting *the language* of the human word—considered “paradigmatically” by exceptionalist and exclusivist anthropocentric humanism one of the peculiarities of man as well as a way, so to speak, for the latter to impose himself—on the way to let *the languages* of the body emerge (senses, metamorphic plasticity) and, together with them and for them, (those of) things. However, it is not a question of abolishing the word, but of making opposition by generalizing it to the idea of its exclusivity, in the wake of the Serresian suggestion for which language is not only the language of speech but also of taste and the word itself is one among the many forms of language—as Posthumanism indicates—and “has value” in so far as it adheres, participates, enters things, rather than imitating and representing them (*ibid.*).

Taste, savor, touch, feel, visiting the world, metamorphically conjugate with it: the silence (of the word) is therefore (re-)emergence of the senses in their intentional attitude and (re-)emergence of the metamorphic-conjugative plasticity of the body (Serres, 1999) and, in and with this *body*, recognition, participatory deciphering, capturing, intercepting the world in its varieties and agency, as well as loan of voice to it (Serres, 2010).

It seems to me, therefore, that I can say that silence constitutes a factor, indeed a fundamental condition of the process of recognition of the (human-and-of/in/with-) world along the thread of generative, inventive *full-bodied relationality*: *it is in it* that sight returns and is a visit to the world, that smell returns and is sagacious, that taste returns and is wise, that touch returns and is contact, and that, overall, the body emerges in its metamorphic plasticity and in its virtuality. And it is always in it, with and for this *relational body* and *full-bodied relationality*, that the wind (re-)emerges in its drawing the sand, the waves and the clouds, the water in its carving on the stone, the trees in their calculating, in the circles of the trunk, the time; in short, that the world (re-)emerges in its variety of contingent, colored, tasty, fragrant singularities, all—to say it with Serres—emitters, receivers, exchanges, conservatives, dealers of information (Serres, 2015).

One step back and one forward on the part of the human, along the thread of *relational body* and *full-bodied relationality* therefore marks the re-aestheticization/recognition of the world: the silencing/silence of the *word* is the backward step which, so to speak, is inter-involved with and functional to step forward

constituted by the (re-)emergence of intentional, excess, conjugative (and in this cognitive) sensitivity, and body plasticity, which, as joint/junctions of generative and inventive relationality, promotes the projecting, in their sensitive-aesthetic-agentive dimension and scope, of the singularities and therefore of the world, which these same, combining, compose.

Full-bodied immersion in the world, capturing, appreciating, restoring its varieties in silence: it is, ultimately, the Serresian and Posthumanist *envoi*, that, as mentioned, re-wraps and unwinds some of the threads that make up the weft of the *postranshominescent* body, which, in the generative synthesis between the *postrans* idea of its persistence in new forms and roles according to a continuous overcoming not (necessarily) aimed and arriving at technological reductionism, and the *hominescent* idea of its construction and construction of the human in the being crossed, irreducible possible in possibility, by things and in exchange with them, emerges as ecological. That is as a *carrefour* and catalyst of *relationships*, *silent* listener and thereby recognizer of itself and of the world, in a bond of co-belonging as the flywheel and cipher of the new human/humanism, *postranshominescent* precisely (Rignani, 2022).

The body, psycho-physical, in its *jutting out ecological in silence*, ultimately appears as a sort of open system, nodal to the activation, and implementation of that process of human re-positioning which, according to Posthumanist and Serresian instructions, consists precisely in the awareness and construction, restoring its co-belonging with respect to the world, of a “new” human/humanism; no-more-only classical, humanist, and modern, no-more-only anthropo-centric, no-more-only dualist, no-more-only exclusivist, no-more-only exceptionalist, but relational-generative, inventive, federative.

Postranshominescent, then? Yes! But, at this point, is it possible to try to sketch its profile? To prophesy its present/future?

Postranshominescent

Postranshominescent idea/term of synthesis probably expresses and points out, as I have argued so far from various angles, our present future condition (but also restorative, so to speak, of an “original” state), of which, at this point, it seems appropriate to try to return and launch a general outline, that is some trait that suggests what could be or become its appearance.

Moreover, it is a question of suggestions of *principle*, both *for reason* and *at the same time as a function* of the inchoation-virtuality of this same condition; that is, of suggestions whose summary nature is, so to speak, determined by this inchoation-virtuality, but also which, on the other hand, are summarized so as not to deprive this condition of its inchoation-virtuality.

And then the physiognomy that is emerging is that of a human in whom everything is in continuity with everything, that is, everything *is (in) relation* to everything, and who, for and in this relationality, is built. This is true both for the improperly called internal and for the equally improperly called external—which in relationality, however, cease to be such—soul, body, and non-human otherness. *In the* human, physical and spiritual they are, ubiquitously, (in) a relationship of continuity and flexibility, constitutive of an animate body and embodied soul, in turn an eco-logical system, relational node with non-human otherness and in as much as this anthropo-poietic dimension.

So much so that it becomes a *flatus vocis* to speak of cognitive processes from the senses to the intellect, of distinction and hierarchy between sensitive and intellectual functions, of the place of the soul and of the senses, of sensorial specificities with reference to this animated body and incorporated soul, which, excess,

intentional cognitive synesthesia neutralizing edges and boundaries, flexibly receives, intercepts, exchanges, knots, unwinds relationships and in this it continuously forms, deforms, transforms itself. All this, insofar as it *has a certain "structure"*, that is, it is not a simple content or container, but *is something—like a possibility—, has a "structure" that is not but can*, that is, it is *virtual*. Therefore, the *postranshominescent* human is (in) an (inter-)active relationship with and in the world, to which and with which, as every other entity, each according to so to speak quantitative but not substantial differences, responds, corresponds, co-belongs, according to the "principle" that we are all in this together, but we are not one and the same.

In other words, if it is the relationship that creates being, which is precisely a relationship, it is a relationship federative of otherness and therefore generative in the encounter. The whole is more than the sum of the parts, the synthesis respects the individual and completes it, the encounter is added value, novelty, invention: for, in, and with this texture and in the awareness of it, the *postranshominescent* is being built, as an element of dynamism of thrusts and counterthrusts of the world, invariant through their variations.

It is therefore necessary to reiterate that the *postranshominescent* returns, is, comes to be *in, for, and with* the world, according to an inter-implication, so to speak, between these three prepositions (it goes without saying, but it is good to repeat it from time to time, that I am speaking here, and so far I have always spoken of the world not in a categorical sense, that is, as a category in itself and undifferentiated in itself, but in the plural sense, that is, as plurality, variety, productive synthesis, varied of irreducible singularities, dynamically, generatively, inventively inter-connecting, such that the universal "lies" in the singular and the singular "refers" to the universal).

The *postranshominescent* returns, is, and comes to be *in* the world in the sense that it is actively and creatively immersed in it: it knows by exceeding itself and taking a substantial part in things; intervenes by modifying; impacts; it is link that creates links; it builds, as Serres puts it, bridges of flesh, metal, stone, words (Serres, 2013), even between heterogeneous entities or at first apparently unapproachable, giving rise, in the combinations, to novelties; it technically/technologically objects its own organs and functions; it is crossed, infiltrated, hybridized, modified by technology; it is drawn on the skin by time and things; it adheres to the latter in their singularity and in their combinations; it learns by imitating them; it temporarily metamorphoses in them, according to contingencies.

It comes back, is, and comes to be *for the* world in a sense so to speak subjective and objective at the same time, that is, "subjectively", it tends "essentially", relationally, intentionally to the world and, "objectively", it receives a "hydrostatic thrust" from the world, a cultural-creative impulse.

In this sense, the world, as Posthumanism and Serres point out, is a swarm, both temporally and spatially, of unforeseen, and unpredictable discontinuities, interruptions, resumes, jumps, turns, changes, deviations, intersections, changes, accelerations, decelerations, which open faults of novelty and unprecedented scenarios and which at the same time give rise to the invention.

It comes back, it is, and it comes to be *with* the world in the sense of co-belonging, that is, in the sense that we are all in this together, but we are not one and the same, and that this is an entity of co-belonging: constituting and thereby constituting co-belonging.

To return, to be, to come to be *in, for and with* the world, ultimately means, for the *postranshominescent*, (to try to) exceed the human (centered/centric) point of view, without however transhumanizing; recognize, in the silence of one's own voice, the variety, the singularity, the agency of things and with this the centrality of each one and none, and therefore the emptiness of the very idea of center; being in co-belonging co-belonging.

All this, as a relational and possible entity, in the “universal” relationality and in the possibility and virtuality with and by this inter-implicated and/or conveyed.

Postranshominescent is a *neo-logism*, and this intervention is opened by talking about *novelty*; but we know that *novelty* is not an anodyne term/concept: it is a hot potato that burns and that you want to get rid of as soon as possible by passing it on to others, and it is a winged horse that leads to *new skies and lands*. Distrust, repression, enthusiasm, traditionalism, newism are all in all easy and immediate; a little less easy and immediate is instead to detect and question the obviousness and recognize and challenge the appearance, the generalization and the epidermal reaction. Undoubtedly the *new winds*: as I observed at the beginning, a new way of being in the world peeps out, that is, to correspond with the way in which the world is and changes.

Is it then the *novelty* that literally is such *with respect to* something, or is it the recognition, finally ec-centered/centric, “silent”, of the already-always-been? What is changing? “You can’t go down the same river twice” because we change or because the river changes? What, then, comes to mean and imply the urgency, gathered at the beginning, of the awareness of a new human being as one with the urgency of its realization? Is it precisely the repositioning of the human?

The answers must be premised that, if there is one thing that has been emerging in this reflection, it is by now the impossibility of proposing either the *aut aut* or the dualisms, the *tertium non datur*; so, the answers themselves, so to speak, include by generalizing them disjunctions and exclusions, in some cases also induced by the same questions. Given this assumption, I can answer affirmatively all the questions, making alternatives the inter-involved members of a single body of reflections. And so I can say that the *postranshominescent* (we) is a new way of being in the world, that is, of putting oneself in correspondence with the way in which the world is and changes; is new *compared to and* it is an ec-centered/centric, “silent” recognition of the already-always-been; you cannot go down into the same waters twice because you change and the waters change; it is the acquisition of awareness of being new and of the urgency to fulfill oneself as such; it is repositioning.

It’s *postranshominescent* neologism itself that expresses a new way of being in the world, not only/not so much as a neologism, but in its composition, as I said, of two prefixes (prepositions) denoting effect/reaction and change and an inchoative designating a start. Through the stages of this reflection, it has emerged with ever greater clarity that the *postranshominescent* is discontinuity in continuity, that is, it is a *new incipient always human, in the world that (since) always changes thanks to relationship*: it is new with respect to Man (white, male, Western, cultured); it starts to be new; not transhuman; its novelty is substantially the rediscovery/restoration of co-belonging with respect to and with the world in its perennial relational change; an acquisition of awareness which, for its part, is one with the urgency of the ever further realization of this condition.

And so effect/reaction and change come to form a single body with the “silent” “ec-centered/ec-centric” recognition of the already-always-been, and with human repositioning: the effect/reaction and the change with respect to Man are one with the overcoming of points of view, the silencing of the human word, the intentional listening to “otherness”, the recognition that we have always been in this together but we have never been one and the same, the repositioning, that is, placing ourselves-again in the “place”—the creative relationship of co-belonging—from which we had removed ourselves, the re-bringing ourselves back to our “natural” order.

At this point, by applying to newism and “conservatism” and to their alternative/dialectic the approach adopted up to now the opposition by generalization, one can read novelty and constancy as two “moments” of

an overall vision that encompasses them by completing them, in the sense of the *new recognition of the already-always-been*. So, this same recognition is precisely novelty, action, change, process of construction, and realization—first with (the attempt to) the very removal of the anthropic point of view—centered/centric—and the already-always-been state, in turn, is relational dynamism and incessant inchoation.

To reposition ourselves, then, is to place ourselves again in co-belonging in and with the world, that is to return, beyond anthropocentrism, to the “natural” *status quo ante*; which is precisely action, a continuous process of promotion and realization of the human in its federativity with the world and the relational dynamism of the latter.

So, have we always been *postranshominescent*? Yes, even if *lato sensu*; because it is necessary to shift the meaning of effect/reaction at the head of the *post* towards that of change at the head of the *trans*. However, having done this, we can see that we have always been, in fact, inchoative, in transformation, co-belonging in and with the world making itself in relationship. Therefore, *postranshominescent* is the human already-always under construction in the creative relationship of co-belonging with the already-always-transforming world in the relationship; and, in fact, the novelty in the face of all this is awareness, recognition, repositioning, in the meanings expressed above.

Ultimately, we have always been *postranshominescent* because we have always been inchoative in and with the world making itself in the relationship; the *post* has always been an engine, resistant to repetition, obviousness, and habit; the new is this recognition itself; and the recognition of the already-always-been, is precisely action, dynamism, process of construction (human in and with the world).

Relation, contamination, infection, diversity, deviation, de-codification, opposition by generalization, gratuitousness, prescription, variety, possibility, process, flexibility, invention, silence, all in this together but not one and the same thing: we have always been *postranshominescent* humans with Posthumanism and Michel Serres...

References

- Baioni, E., Cuadrado Pereyas, L. M., & Macelloni, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Abbecedario del Postumanismo*. Milan: Mimesis.
- Braidotti, R., & Hlavajova, M. (Eds.). (2018). *Posthuman glossary*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Ferrando, F. (2019). *Philosophical posthumanism*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rignani, O. (2012). *Umano? Una domanda per Italo Calvino e Michel Serres*. Fidenza (Pr): Mattioli 1885.
- Rignani, O. (2014). *Emergenze “post-umaniste” dell’umano. Prove di analisi storico-comparativa dal presente al passato e ritorno*. Milan: Mimesis.
- Rignani, O. (2016). *Emergenze “post-umaniste” del corpo. Una prova di analisi “orizzontale” via Michel Serres*. Milan: Mimesis.
- Rignani, O. (2018). *Metafore del corpo post-umanista: Michel Serres*. Milan: Mimesis.
- Rignani, O. (2019). Toward a posthuman humanism: Serresian federative humanism between natural contract and political ecology. *Philosophy International Journal*, 2, 1-6.
- Rignani, O. (2020). The relevance of Michel Serres’s idea of bodily hominescence for a convergence of posthumanism and transhumanism: A trans/posthuman body. *Philosophy Study*, 10(2), 119-126.
- Rignani, O. (2022). *Umani di nuovo. Con il postumano e Michel Serres*. Milan: Mimesis.
- Rosendahl Thomsen, M., & Wamberg, J. (Eds.). (2020). *The Bloomsbury handbook of posthumanism*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Serres, M. (1985). *Les Cinq Senses (The five senses: A philosophy of mingled body)*. (M. Sankey & P. Cowley, Trans.). London: Continuum.
- Serres, M. (1999). *Variations sur le corps (Variations on the body)*. (R. Burks, Trans.). Minneapolis: Univocal.

- Serres, M. (2001). *Hominescence*. Paris: Le Pommier.
- Serres, M. (2003). *L'Incandescent (The incandescent)*. (R. Burks, Trans.). London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Serres, M. (2010). *Biogé (Biogea)*. (R. Burks, Trans.). Minneapolis: Univocal.
- Serres, M. (2013). *L'Art de ponts. Homo pontifex*, Paris: Le Pommier.
- Serres, M. (2014). *Pantopie: De Hermès à Petite Poucette*. Paris: Le Pommier.
- Serres, M. (2015). *Le Gaucher boiteux. Puissance de la pensée*. Paris: Le Pommier.
- Sorgner, S. L. (2020). *On transhumanism*. Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press.
- Sorgner, S. L. (2021). *We have always been cyborgs. Digital data, gene technologies and an ethics of transhumanism*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Watkin, C. (2020). *Michel Serres: Figures of thought*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.