The aspect of Rococo in the history of relativity of time and truth

The article is devoted to the analysis of historical interpretations of concepts of time and verity, which had further a key role in formation of the humanities. The concepts of time and verity, developed by the Rococo writers, are investigated particularly.
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Historical writing is a discipline, whose object is past, which is measured by time and attested by verity. Therefore, key notions of historical writing are time and veracity. These terms sound quite simple and obvious. Nevertheless every epoch always had its particular idea of what they actually are. The books of American historian Donald Wilcox and British scholar Gerald Whitrow are dedicated to phenomenon of different perceptions of time and verity from prehistory to the present days. My claim is that we should not treat the words “time” and “truth” or “veracity” as defined notions, equal to all countries in all epochs, I argue that time and truth are relative and sometimes ambiguous categories. The goal of this essay is to illustrate how relatively the time frames and concepts of truth were regarded in different periods. The background for this survey is two extracts from Donald Wilcox’s and Gerald Whitrow’s books.

Both authors start their texts with descriptions of situations, where people are struck with a discovering of those aspects of the time which were unfamiliar to them before. For instance, Gerald Whitrow mentions, how the workers in eighteenth century England believed they would lose a few days of life after alteration of the state calendar [2, p. 3]. Donald
Wilcox uses a scene from Italo Calvino’s novel, where the protagonist fails to isolate and fix in time a sea wave as a constant object. What is mutual for Whitrow’s English workers and Wilcox’ fictional character from the novel and why do they cite these examples? By these examples, the case of temporal discrepancy is illustrated, when individual “is here, but could not be here, in a world that could not be but this” [3, p. 3]. Thus, Mr. Palomar and English workers got into clash of two different times. As we can see, texts of Donald Wilcox and Gerald Whitrow start from the same issue of phenomenon of two times overlapping. Wilcox postulates his passage about Mr. Palomar as a metaphor of twentieth centuries overlapping. At the same time, in twentieth century it was believed, that in previous epochs time and space were “objective, continuous and all-embracing” [3, p. 6]. In this moment Wilcox and Whitrow bring up a question, whether it is true, that temporal and factual relativity were invented or discovered in twentieth century? Apparently not, as for both authors argue that relativity of time and factual events was particular to every human culture in all times. To argue their negative answer on this question, they demonstrate a wide range of examples from the very prehistory up to modern days, where the temporal and factual discrepancies are not treated as problematic, but as relative ones.

According to Wilcox, from the very beginning of history writing its premises were extremely opaque and relative. Here Wilcox argues that relativity is first of all a logic principle, as for he defines it as a task of reducing complex processes to the simple events [3, p. 6]. Wilcox puts an emphasis on relative character of pre-Newtonian history: “the achievements of Athens in the Golden Age of Greece, the rise and fall of Rome, the coming of Christianity and the growth of territorial state all of these were conceived in relative time” [3, p. 12]. He also places into domain of relative historical dating those communities, who did know Newton or did not accept his paradigm – they either existed before, as ancient or medieval historians, or belong to another scholar tradition like China does. To illustrate: “For historians before Newton the time frame did not include a group of events; a group of events contained a time frame” [3, p. 9].

To summarize, accepting of Newtonian system is commonly believed to bring more exactness into time measurement, and therefore, into historical writing. Consequently, this system was treated for a long time as counteracting to a temporal relativism. We can draw a conclusion, that orientation on Western-European BC/AD dating system often served as a distinctive token between “more-“ and “less-” relativistic historical systems. On the other hand, Gerald Whitrow describes the opposite point of view, where the whole groups of people manage to express temporality without even having the categories of time in their language. Consequently, the point that both author observe is whether the use of accurate and flexible dating system ensures the non-relativity in historical writing?

Ancient historians claimed there is an indissoluble connection between history and truth. At the same time, they perceived truth in a totally other way as we do. First of all, truth was subdivided into categories depending what time the event took place. Thus, truth of those historical events, which were close in time for the historian and could be dated more precisely, could be named “acriberia”. But in case, when the event could not be testified with arguments like documents or eye-witnesses, a special kind of truth should have been created for the public. This truth was a writer’s persuasion in his own moral reliableness, and it was called “aletheia”. According to Wilcox, the second sort of truth might be partly transmitted with a notion of verisimilitude. As we can see from the text, aletheia, wishful verity, was a supreme kind of truth. Consequently, we can observe supremacy of “convenient” verity upon the accurate reflection of the facts, which is the typical feature of relativistic approach. Gerald Whitrow proves this statement: “Although civil time is based on natural phenomena, we have seen that only religious but purely political considerations can influence the construction of a calendar…” [2, p. 120].

For Renaissance historians the events of the past were intelligible from the words this past is told. That is why the true historical past could be reconstructed. The humanists did not have doubts that this reconstruction is itself the ultimate reality [3, p. 237]. Their prior concern was the reader’s full confidence to the written story; therefore, some incredible facts had to be made more probable. Thus, the verisimilitude of the past became superior to its factual veracity. This fact leads to conclusion that Renaissance approach to history writing regarded the past as a relative material.

Baroque historiography developed the new system of dating. It could date the events which did not have any intrinsic relationship to one another and could quantify their temporal distance. On the other hand, the new system also was a relative one, as for its inventor considered the reference point of this system purely arbitrary. Nevertheless, the new system was approved by Newton and implemented
into scientific use in eighteenth century. It brought more accuracy in dating and provided an ability to attribute the wide range of different phenomena to one exact period of time.

The aspect of Rococo’s views on time still remains uninvestigated. First of all, this epoch is usually postulated as one which kept the attitude of existence of time as a global dimension only. To illustrate, Russian philologist Alexandr Mikhailov describes the authors of that epoch: “They depicted not a true life of their epoch, but some idea concerning the life and man, justifying this substitution by attractive seducement of charming Bacchantes and sultanas” [1, p. 318]. Therefore, the creators of Rocaille ideology paid more attention to particular details and events. The question we raise is whether these authors could dispense with the notion of time measurement while working with a description of minor events and particular punctilious details? It seems to be generally accepted, that Rocaille literature tradition inherited Baroque stele of precise novels with their temporal infinity. From the other hand, as it was mentioned above, the approach of appreciating time as something which requires wise spend, was generally implemented at the beginning of 17th century, especially typical it was in Jesuit colleges in the whole Europe. If to follow this thought, another issue appears – how should we attribute a special approach for time, particular to Rococ? Is there an opposition between Baroque precise in real and vague in fictional life time and Rocaille time, which was regarded as so insignificant in real life, as for the human’s existence was divided on two periods only – the youth and the old age, whereas literature applied timely-oriented metaphors of change of human emotions? First of all, it worth noticing, that Baroque description of emotions of literary characters was a template one. All heroes behaved according to mechanism, which was put by the authors in their interpretation. The adventures of Baroque heroes could last decades if to measure the approximate length of their actions by “real” human time. What is undoubtful is that Rocaille tradition discovered the very possibility of juxtaposition of literary fiction and real life. The first was mocked for the total lack of resemblance with the last. The main reproach of Rocaille authors, given to Baroque tendency, was “longness” and “boredom”. We argue that the very possibility of perception of literary longness was a great discovery in the domain of literary critique. Consequently, we may notice that Rocaille tradition preserved more connection to relatively newly invented doctrine of the value of time – we should not spend our one on reading boring and two long books. In precise tradition fictional characters live in their proper, intrinsic, fictional time, which does not correlate with real one. Rocaille heroes, from the first glance, seem to discard the nuances of time, they have just distinct beginning and distinct end in their actions. They remain unchangeable through the period of their literary action. But differently from Baroque, the emotions and actions of heroes are spontaneous. Moreover, at least theoretically, but they are tended to replicate the conduct of true living people. Time is rarely mentioned in compositions of early Voltaire, Marivot, Crebillion-son, Gresset and others. But is intrinsic to their protagonists, as for they imitate real people. The key figure of rocaille plot is a noble man or woman, commonly young. Rocaille despised the representatives of the third estate with their constant attempts to leave its legitimate secondary place. In the same time, nobility never was so deeply engaged into business activity, which required accurate measurement of time. Therefore, time was important for school, clergy, merchants and scientists. To sum up, the Rococo heroes were well-acquainted with the dimension of accurate time, but discarded it as something trivial, which is appropriate for those, make a practical use of time. The question is whether this neglect for time measurement was a token of disdain to time, or, probably, a sign of protest against the turning of the life itself into a subject of trade or negotiation? Petit-maitres argued they knew right way to live best of everyone. Therefore, their principal art was an art of right time spending [9, p. 373–374]. Generous attitude to time was one of the principle features of really sophisticated person, of a true noble man. To conclude, we can say that time to rocaille person, fictional or real one, was too precious a value to try to measure it.

For Enlightenment a correct recognition of the time was believed a guarantee of success in working activity. Another sufficient contribution of eighteenth century was a forward-looking attitude to time. Traditional doctrine of Enlightenment historical idea presupposes that time is linear, nothing substantially new could occur in universe, and mankind will just go to progress. Progress is as an idea of supreme good which is sure to come once upon a time. Therefore, believe in progress is frequently treated as a supreme truth of Enlightenment. But if to check up the correctness of this concept it does not correspond to Enlightenment thinkers’ points of view. To illustrate, Rousseau discarded the modern civilization and idea of progress, Voltaire did not believe in physical and biological evolution [2, p. 148] and Immanuel Kant believed that only
physical universe was the product of continual change and development. Gerald Whitrow demonstrates that every remarkable scholar of this period has his own concept of time and verity, and verity could be also a non-progressivistic one. These arguments prove the relativity of the very notion of single Enlightenment concept of time or verity.

Newtonian approach to history is a line of discrete events which could be arranged on a single axis in a single space. From the one hand, Braudel seemed to accept it [3, p. 12]. From the other hand, Wilcox notices, that Braudel understood how threatening the hypothesis of his own model of time would be to his colleagues. These two facts demonstrate the practical relativity of historical time. In my opinion, if to accept the Newtonian approach to history is a line of discrete events which could be arranged on a single axis in a single space. From the one hand, Braudel demonstrated the practical relativity of historical time. In my opinion, if to accept the Newtonian approach to history is a line of discrete events which could be arranged on a single axis in a single space. Rocaille writers perceived time as an ambiguous category, which had to be measured in relation with what individual do they talked about.

Our general conclusion is time-reckoning is primarily a conceptualization of existing social structure. Time and truth are established on mutual agreement, thus, the relevant concept of verisimilitude of history was superior to its factual accuracy. This fact was convincingly argued by Gerald Whitrow and Donald Wilcox.
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