

STUDY THE CONCEPTION OF HISTORY AND TIME

Arjun R

M.Phil research scholar
Ancient History and Archeology
University of Mysore, Mysore-570006 India

Abstract— This paper attempts to address, as how history and time to be understood? How problematic studying the past is? It is a dilemma between static and variations in understanding time, Dilemma in prioritizing between emotions and intellect in the construction of historical knowledge. It is a friction between anachronisms versus historicism. Historians may create histories back to front; the results of such views are presented here, for readability, as a monumental setting, costs of characters and even a denouement: the present. Which passage will lead to the construction of history as accurate as possible? Is it by imposing historian's notion on a particular event and historical developments, by himself sitting on the judge mental position? Or by allowing the period to speak itself by understanding the fact that each period as its own predominant practices and the events of that era will reflect the practice of the future generation?

Index Terms— History, Anachronism, Historicism, Time.
(key words)

I. INTRODUCTION (HEADING 1)

What is time whether Past, Present, Future? This question is central. On many different levels of our understanding of what history is. Every domain as two approaches, empirical and theoretical likewise in history both empirical and theoretical deals with time. History arises with time. They both share symbiotic relation that cannot be segregated, mutually depended .it closely intervene where the ideas cannot be separated. Defining time has become so serious that numbers of writers, historians have devoted their life in defining it.

Time as to be understood both as a fact as well as as an idea. The fact part is fairly static, which doesn't differ at all, but there is lot of variations. For ex: there is no doubt in saying one day is of 24 hours. If time, is an idea it becomes relative phenomenon for example: one day is of 24 hours, the moment I start interpreting, when this 24hour begins? Then, there comes the problem because there is no uniformity. For westerns from 12 pm to 12pm is one day, whereas for Indians from sunrise to sunset. Time itself is an interesting category of historical inquiry. As a measure of

work or as the period required to execute a particular task, time already has a sizeable literature associated with it.

E. P. Thompson's essay 'Time, work-discipline and industrial capitalism' (past and present, 38, December 1967) is about time, or, more properly, the way in which perceptions of time have changed over time. He deals with this idea of time form the industrial revolution, in Europe. Industrial revolution introduced the factory system in the society. The production was non-mechanized, manual, they had their tools of their own in home, by the introduction of factory system, and the massive production took place in huge specific hall. By large number of laborers working together, places were clearly demarcated for reporting, eating, and working. Now the idea of time went under drastic change, now it was no longer seasonal neither it was natural rather now time is regulated by watchmen, the natural working time from sunrise to sunset now time became from factory bell by the foremen.

J. R. Hales tells us the renaissance Europe, 1480-1520 (1971), that in late 15th century and early 16th century, emotionally, year began with the first flower, the lengthening of the day, the first judgment on the winter-sown grain; while 'only those concerned with legal or diplomatic documents thought of the year as beginning on an official rather than a seasonal date'.

Carlo M. Cipolla as demonstrated in his clocks and culture (1967), while timekeeping and clocks have heavily influenced the nature of life in Europe, not all the societies follow the chimes or bells as the west has done.

Our concern here, though, is not with the way that historical actors understood their own time, interesting though it is, instead, we must focus on time in relative perspective; the relationship between past time and present time; there comes always conflict between anachronism versus historicism. Historicism is an idea that each age is unique and different and hence past to be studied from then and there, anachronism is studying past from present perspective. We risk removing any thread, which might connect our past and our present. This notion of time, of

change and continuity or similarity and difference is hardest balance to achieve; it is central to our understanding of the nature of history and the dynamics of social developments.

II. DISCUSSION

Now what history include, in general and in particular; history has a great variety of definitions and applications. In a broadest sense, it considers every actions and every thought of man that has had since his first appearance and records every significant advance and recession. It attempts to evaluate all the developments in Science, in Art, in Literature, in Philosophy, in Architecture, in Sociology, in Politics, in War, in Religion, and in Law. It sketches as complete a picture as possible of everything that has influenced man directly and indirectly.

The proceeding discussions clearly suggests that the understanding of past is problematic. The fact is that the historians or the student of historical enquiry fall victims of either anachronism or historicism, more often, sometimes consciously, unconsciously, and ignorantly. For example, James Edgar swain in his work 'History of World Civilization' (p. 67 second edition 1938), swain says 'the Egyptians made no clear distinction between architecture, sculpture, and painting especially those of inferior type. They may not be impressive, but one should not forget that they were pioneers, originators of civilization but they fell short of actually perfecting them'. Here the author is risking to remove the thread which connects our present with past. Here what we have to understand is that, what is the period of ancient Egyptian civilization and contemporary? Is it feasible to see them from our own present perspectives? What is imperfect for us may be perfect for them. Should we forget that they were in the very initial stage of developing their articles and they were the pioneers of civilization?

This (problematic anachronism) is not happening only with the writers of what we call middle age and modern age (gradually from last three decades the paradigm of some of the writers are free from anachronism) also with those individuals who came to India from west and East Asian provinces (Early Medieval India) as travelers, historians, ambassadors during the Islamic rule in India (1206-1526) like Alberuni, Utbi, Abdul Fazal, Badauni, Ziauddin Barani etc. who gave a great variety of valuable works containing literary skills and more often historical information along with making heroic characters and bringing the political upheavals, socio-economic and religious dominations. However, without understanding the simple fact of historicism they repeatedly made statements, "Ancient Indians (app. Until beginning of eleventh century) had no taste or sense of historiography; their scholars cared more for religious, spiritual and philosophical studies". Here there

comes the problem. What was considered as important for ancient Indians (Ancient India map) they concentrated on documenting it? They would have not taken pride in documenting military exploits. Where are these parts of facts hiding? Is it been over shadowed? Is the writer overwhelmed his notions? This is not only the case with few writers but most of them, throughout centuries, fallen victim to this kind of practice i.e. Anachronism.

Lucien Febvre of the French annals school highlighted, what he dubbed 'histoire – problem' as the way forward for all historians, while he was reacting against history written as a sequential story (narrative) it is arguable that all history –short of propaganda, of course –in concerned with problems. Gibbon's essentially narrative 18th century classic, the decline and fall of Roman Empire (1776-1788) was as much problem history as the Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the age of Philip 2nd (1949) which was written by febvre disciple, Fernando braudel both men concerned with the problem of great empires; each wanted to explain historical change and process through the particular vehicle they choose, whether the roman's or Spanish empire.

Wilhelm Dithey, R. G. Colling wood, James Derrida, Michel Foucault popularized this 'then and there approach'. They argue that there should be some restrictions on the narrative power of the historian and he should primarily allow the age to speak for itself.

Powicke; History is "the events of themselves" and he sees history "as a lofty mountain, cold and stark. Upon which the mountain's mind plays gleam. When the gleam has gone history is still there and so, naturally, the historian will know that his work is imperfect, this version transient, and his goal are still far away".

Karl popper; radically redefined historicism and rejected the notion of universal patterns in historical process. It is to be understood that each era will have some pre-dominant practices and the events of that era will reflect the practices of the future generation. We should look when it happened and where it happened.

Joan Scott; "traditional historians have always claimed ownership over history. How did they create this ownership? By creating an opposition between history and ideology, who were very strong believers of empiricist history, they believed in objectivity this made writing of history problematic".

This paper may sense as a one-sided argument or criticizing who choose their passage through anachronism and neither to make my paper to sit on a judgmental position by forwarding historicism. But As a student of history, I

would like to put forward few questions. Is it fair enough to construct historical knowledge by sitting on judgmental position and imposing our own notions on a particular aspect without leaving the period to speak itself?

Marxists concentrate heavily on economic interpretation of history. Marxism as an ideology emerged in Europe in 18th century. They use to interpret history that happened approximately 2000 years back. On the other side's, the concept of 'golden age' and the comparisons among great personalities for example; "political condition of the gupta period was stable because there was economic prosperity, so that that there was cultural developments". Here at no point of time author talks about or questions religious conditions. Without religious tolerance how could this been happened? Isn't it? Was it the period of mono religion? Was there prevailed only a single religion? If multiple, what was the stance of unity in diversity or co-existence? "Golden age Guptas", (chandra gupta 1st fonder of gupta dynasty c. 320 AD –golden age i.e. from the period of samudra gupta (335 C. E) till the late 5th century C. E) which is compared with 'percilean age of ancient Greece, (c 462B. C-404 B. C) why it is a golden age or why has been called as golden age? Because 'they (guptas) attained great height of cultural achievements, had well established civil, social, familial codes, had great autonomy of mercantile and industrial centers (sreni), providing large donations of land and immunity in revenue to the Brahmanas, the academic development in science such as astronomy, mathematics and astrology and also in artistic and literature, they used gold coins in their economic transactions'.

Yes, all these developments happened in that period, no doubt, in it, from the source of great varieties of inscriptions and coins found of their age and hence it may be called as golden age by considering the above parameters. But it is still dangerous to accept these facts and parameters without questioning. Firstly, where is she? Why she is not in history? Did they consider her as insignificant? Or we have considered her as insignificant? Should we consider her absence as insignificant, insignificant because she had already enjoyed the great prosperity, rights and liberty? Was she not a part of these achievements? Was the golden age was free from female immolation (sati)? She was always considered inauspicious and insignificant. Her activities are defined by political and economic aspect. Secondly, where is farmer? ('There was great autonomy of trade and mercantile, trade was profitable') then what was the position of farmer? Was he also profitable? Was he free from the exploitation by intermediaries' and merchants? Were they had the immunity in taxation? Thirdly, what we call lower class, shudras had an equal status or privileges with Brahmanas and kshatriyas? Were they not suppressed? Fourthly, who actually administered temples and religious activities? Guilds, Brahmanas, King. Was religion free from polity? Lastly, what

were the conditions of the people apart from the heartland of Guptas domain? Without tracking the answers for many questions, like those of above, how can we define golden age. how can we make comparisons?

King Thutmose 3rd- [c 1479-1447 B],) (conqueror of ancient Egypt what we call of 'The Imperial Age' [1580-1150]) has been nicknamed as Napoleon Bonaparte (1799-1814) of ancient Egypt. Here what is the period of Thutmose 3rd what is the period of Napoleon? Both showed their heroic in conquering the large territory and established and maintained large army but what about the intensions, reasons and purpose behind it? They differ. Gandhi with Italy's Mazzini. Cavour with Nehru. Subash Chandra Bose with Garibaldi. Their personal experience at the time of freedom struggle may be appeared more or less same but the surrounding conditions? The purpose and the vision behind it were different.

III. CONCLUSION

The most cause of all conflict is the judgmental position taken by the society it also includes writers, historians etc, by engaging themselves in appropriating roles and voice resulting in a totally contradictory image. Here I am not ignorant of the fact that all historians are based on ideology and we all know that he is both the perpetrator of the ideology and also the victim of that same ideology, But at the mean time it is our responsibility to always keep in mind that any writing in present becomes the source for the future generations. It is to be understood that each era will have some predominant practices and the events of that era will reflect the practices of the future generation.

The study of nature of history is not an easy job. History is an unending dialogue between the present and the past, but it is partial in a sense. Historical forces are both linear as well cyclical. Too much of value judgment is harmful; they spoil the historical facts; while there must be a limit in value judging. Historian must be selective, while writing the records. It is required to write down the past events through relevant records.

Namier remarks "the function of historians is akin to that of the painter and not of the photographic camera... what matter is history is the great outline and the significant detail, what must be avoided is To delay of irrelevant narration".

Each period has its own priority; each historical movement will perceive some pact of the knowledge system as good enough, which is recorded to posterity. The study of action, thoughts, and ideas of the people from their point of view .each historical period is inclusive, deterministic, demonstrable pattern that can be traced in the process of

historical change. This avoids projection of contradictory method of making history and the process of change can be traced. As above said, "Time is fairly static which doesn't differ at all but there are lot of variations".

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I take this opportunity to acknowledge my professor S .P Vasishwari, HOD History, Christ University, Bangalore.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anglois V.L and C. H. Seignobos – "Introduction to the study of history" London, 1912.
- [2] Burton Stein – "A history of India". Oxford university press-1988.
- [3] Gilbert J.; Garison S. J. – "A guide to historical method".
- [4] History, freedom and religion. Pp8, 13-14 the prescribed opposition doctrine of Oakehsott and through him, of cooling wood.
- [5] Jacques Pirenne - "The tides of history".
- [6] James Edgar swain 'history of world civilization' p n 67, second editions, London,1938.
- [7] Khurana K.L. – "concepts and methods of historiography" – second edition, Delhi, 2007.
- [8] M. Raghavendra prabhu – "History". Bangalore 2005
- [9] Reniger G. J. – "History its purpose and methods"- London 1961.