

**Eva Skopalová**

Institute of Art History, Charles University, Prague

### **The anachronistic conception of history and its impact on the “story” of Czech art**

My PhD research is focused on the application of the contemporary anachronistic conception of history on Czech art. My research is based on the contemporary theory of anachronism introduced by Georges Didi-Huberman, and further developed by Alexander Nagel and Christopher S. Wood. My aim is to create my own distinctive methodology of the anachronistic view of history applied to Czech art. Undoubtedly, there is the necessity to confront this methodological view with concepts of time from the perspective of philosophy (Leibniz, Benjamin) and the history of physics (Kepler, Bruno, and Newton) as well as contemporary theoretical physics (Einstein, Hawking). Their conclusions are close to those of anachronistic art history. For this reason, it is fundamental to study the history of art in relation to the natural sciences as a new perspective. As a first step, we may develop C. G. Jung's concept of synchronicity. In contrast to the conventional linear and homogenous notion of time, connected to some distinctive space and time, we can multiply these lines of time into numerous geolocations. Furthermore, Jung conceived of *a-causal* connecting principles, meaning connections across these time lines. To develop this idea, I am arguing that the structure of history, and the structure of time, is a decentralized hyperstructure, where we may develop various paths connecting works of art across and throughout the whole structure (in the words of Walter Benjamin, this idea is known as *constellation*).

The anachronistic view of time could be one of multiple methodological perspectives on art history. In these terms, the work of art is a heterochronistic phenomenon, just as our individual experience of present time, the “contemporary” (literally “with time” in Latin), is a composition of multiple times. That means we may distinguish several “layers” of time stacked in a work of art. I will present this view through five brief insights into the history of Czech art, for instance, discussing the baroque character of Czech cubism, the gothic expressivity of baroque painting, and the renaissance atmosphere of inter-war surrealism. These case studies are interwoven like Ovid's *Metamorphosis* and they are one of various perspectives on history. This perspective also means the end of art history as we knew it, it is an art history without artistic periods, where style is only a conventional label which invites

its own deconstruction. Every –ism has to be strictly connected to a specific time and place, which means it loses its general validity. Finally, this view gives a new perspective on the old art historical problem of “center and periphery”. This is one of the reasons why I have chosen to study Czech art in particular.

Problems and questions:

- Could the anachronistic perspective be considered a *method* in the original meaning of the word, as in “following the path”?
- How we can find the interconnections across the decentralized hyperstructure of time? Is intuition a valid epistemological tool? Where is the balance between original interpretation and art historical fantasy? Or, is the anachronistic perspective a visual metaphor?
- If we admit the heterogeneity of time, that also means that some periods in the linear view of time are dense and others sparse. How we can integrate this idea into the anachronistic conception?
- The great problem of anachronism is terminology, because we have to use terms derived from a linear view of time (such as time locators in speech, style labels connected to time periods, etc.). The question depends on whether to use these terms conventionally without their literal meanings or to invent bright new terms?
- And finally, if we argue that the anachronistic conception of time is more accurate, what does it really mean for art history as such? What are the consequences?