§ 1. INTRODUCTORY:

Every special form of art criticism like literary criticism, criticism of painting, of music etc., has its own special terminology and it is a known fact that the terminology of the criticism of one form of art cannot be applied to another form exactly in the same sense. For each form of art has its own special characteristics, special advantages and peculiar limitations. What the musician can achieve, the painter cannot achieve, in the same sense and vice versa. Because one is a temporal art and the other visual (say, spatial). But, the creation of a painter lasts long while that of the musician dies in the air the moment it is created. Movement is the soul of one art and spread-out-ness is the basis of the other. We again and again speak the word "rhythm" in the case of music and though sometimes we use the same word in the case of painting, it is not exactly in the same sense in which it is used in music. The unities that we speak of in a drama, in a painting or architecture, however, may resemble each other; yet in the matters of detail, there are characteristics peculiar to each form.

Each kind of art criticism has a different terminology, each having a specialized meaning. Our purpose here is not to study or determine the meaning of all the numerous terms but only to analyze the most basic concepts of all the forms of art criticism. But we must remember
that since our analysis of these concepts is only quite general — i.e., not taking into account its special form when they are applied to particular cases — we shall try to give an analysis of these concepts only in a general way. We should also remember that our analysis will be done only from the point of view of observing whether each of these terms is a special form or device of the principle of coherence which we studied in the previous chapter.

With regard to the number of such most general concepts, there is no agreement among the critics. This is perhaps due to two reasons: some critics emphasise one special point of view in the criticism of a work of art and hold that all the other points of view can be either included in or derived from the one point of view which they cling to. Secondly, mostly in the modern times, the critics themselves have become divided into opposing schools so that the function and the philosophy of criticism of each critic is irreconcilably peculiar to himself. Our object here is neither to bring about a synthesis among these extreme points of view nor to uphold the view of any one critic. We shall, therefore, try to study only such concepts which have been in use and which have played a dominant role in the history of criticism of all the forms of art.

Form is the most general term of all the kinds of art. Unity is also spoken of repeatedly. Proportion, rhythm, balance, contrast, evolution and other terms are
also found quite frequently. By far a satisfactory enumeration of the basic concepts of criticism is given by Prof. Parker, who says that there are six concepts of principles such as: (1) Organic unity, (2) Theme, (3) Thematic variation (4) Balance (5) Hierarchy or the principle of subordination; and (6) Evolution or the principle of development. Though this enumeration is quite helpful from the point of view of understanding the fundamental principles of aesthetics, it does not quite satisfactorily serve our purpose; for it cannot be applied to the arts of all the traditions. To point out but one case, the second concept of the list namely "theme" cannot be applied in its usual and real meaning to the music of India. What is the theme of Rāg Mālkeus? One may speak of its bhāva or rasa, but what is the "theme" in the sense in which it is used in the case of a European symphony?

So we shall make our own extremely limited list of concepts and analyse them. Our list includes (1) Form or Unity, (2) Rhythm and (3) Symmetry. Wherever it is necessary we will show how other concepts not included in our list can be explained in terms of these concepts. In the end we shall also show how all these concepts are the different forms of one and the same principle—coherence.

§ 2. FORM:

When we use the word form it should not give rise to the idea of something antithetical to the content or matter, existing in an unchanging pattern. That out view

1. Dewitt. H. Parker: The Analysis of Art. Ch.II.
of aesthetic form does not accept formalism we will see in a later context (Ch.V). So we will only concern ourselves with the term form which means for us the central principle that holds the work in a way it is. Here, form is not the type — like when we say in literature short story, novel, biography, drama, epic or lyric etc; nor is it physical shape. "... the form that enables the artist to perceive and to create turns out to be something much larger than a pleasing arrangement of lines or tones."2 When we say that particular artist has a very fine sense of form; we mean that all the parts in his works are so proportionately maintained that they cannot be treated even as "parts of" the work, but as the work itself. Form, in other words, stands for the principle of unity; it is "the organic unification of the several expressive constituents."3 Every work of art is a combination of various ingredient elements; music is a temporal unity which holds together a number of tonal developments, variations in pitch, volume of sound, beats etc. But all these are subordinated to one form so that each of these elements has its place in the one purposive development. In this development, the sense of proportion is very important. No good musician will allow any element to dominate the other elements or any element to sink into insignificance. Each part has its due, but it is there as it is determined by

2. James L. Jarret: The Quest for Beauty.
the whole. Here the question whether the whole is prior to the parts or vice versa does not arise. But logically, and not temporally or sequentially, we can say that it is the whole which is the music or the painting etc.; and what we call parts are only the way in which we can mark the development of the whole.

Unity is a concept which was introduced into the terminology of art criticism by Aristotle. Aristotle speaks of the unities of place, time and action in tragedy. He also says that a tragedy should have a beginning, a middle and an end. What Aristotle means by his beginning-middle-end rule is quite obvious to any student of literature. We should note that what we mean by form is not in Aristotle's sense. For a beginning, middle and end are only marks representing the sequential order of an event. But when the drama is actually presented to us, this sequential order may not be strictly maintained. In a drama, a portion in the end part may be presented first and then the whole of the prior story may be shown in a different sequential order. This is a matter of technique that a writer may device. But when such a method of presenting the story is devised, as spectators, we will try to visualise or arrange the whole story in the natural temporal order of the successive events. Here unity means the ideal arrangement of sequences. But we cannot accept this to be what we mean by form. Form for us is how emotions are integrated together and bring us, the specta-

4. See Prof. B. S. Mardhekar: Two Lectures on an Aesthetic of Literature. First lecture on "Form in Literature".
tors, to a particular state of experience. In order to bring us to this particular state of emotional experience how the various incidents etc., in the drama act on us, is what we mean by form.

Form, as Santayana says, is the "Unity of a manifold" or we may express it as the unifying principle of the multiplicity. It is the underlying principle that runs through all the parts of the component elements in a work of art.

Drama is a form of art which like music expresses itself directly in time. But what is the meaning of form in the arts like painting, architecture and sculpture? Here also form means how the whole is expressed. This implies how the parts are held together and the relation between the parts and the whole. Speaking of the relation between the parts and the whole, Aristotle says that the part is that which cannot be removed without affecting the whole. Though it is a negative description, it clearly brings out the necessary relation between the parts and the whole; it expresses very clearly the meaning of the term unity.

The concept of unity implies the concept of harmony. Harmony either in logic or in aesthetic, is not merely the absence of rift but it shows the positive and mutual relation of the various parts. Says H. Read: "The work of art has an imaginary point of reference (analogous to a centre of gravity) and around this point the lines, surfaces and

5. Sense of Beauty. p.73.
masses are distributed in such a way that they rest in perfect equilibrium. The structural aim of all these modes is harmony and harmony is the satisfaction of our sense of beauty.\textsuperscript{5}

Harmony is explained as "the representation of all opposed elements in a work of art in such a way as to become a pleasing unity. Since quite generally the task of art is to bring the distinct parts into a unified whole, or to demonstrate them as components of one unified law and thus to excite aesthetic satisfaction, harmony is the main requirement of every art."\textsuperscript{7}

Harmony is a word which is mainly used in music, but in painting also we speak of the "harmonious play of colours or lines". And though the same word is not used in every other forms of art, the concept of harmony is applied. Harmony, which also means necessity, demands that in any part of the work of art of any form, there must not be inconsistency: Thus we say that the action of a character is inconsistent, thereby meaning that the particular action under discussion is quite incompatible with what the character represents to us before and after that action. After all, characters in literature are what we are made to imagine (and infer) about the persons whom the author depicts; our imagination will be constructing the nature or the personality of the characters in a particular way. But if the character does something which

\textsuperscript{6} The Meaning of Art. p.15.
is not in accordance with our aesthetic expectation and if that strange thing is done without sufficient reason being given, we say it is an "inconsistent" action; or we say that the character behaved inconsistently. This is nothing but a case of applying the law of contradiction in the realm of imagination.

In painting, dancing sculpture etc., also we speak of the word disharmonious. The aesthetic failure of a picture is ascribed to the disharmony of colours. In a sculpture the volumes may be disharmoniously shaped. There may be disharmony between the significance and the expression of the different parts of one and the same picture or image or a dancing pose. To illustrate with but one example: if the hand of the dancer is in Patāka mudrā, the palm is held up above the other dancer who has knelt before the former; if the face of the former expresses anger with contracted eyebrows and pointed look, there is disharmony between the expressions of the hand and the face; the hand means protection, and the face, vengeance. Every work of art should aim at avoiding such disharmony.

Concluding our analysis of the concept of form, we shall note that form means the unifying principle or the way in which the unity of the work of art is maintained. And in this function, unity implies proportion and the necessary relation of the parts which are harmoniously expressed as the parts of one whole. In the preceding chapter we had observed that in the case of logical coherence the parts or the particular judgments owe their truth to the
whole of which they are members. Remove the membership, they are nowhere, they lose their significance. In the aesthetic whole also the particular events or lines or tones etc., have their significance because they are the "events of", "lines of" (etc.), a whole. Among a number of judgments in a logical whole, if any one judgment gives a contrary suggestion to that of all the others, it is the sign that the whole is not completely true as long as it cannot or does not change itself or change that judgment of contrary suggestion. Instead of changing or removing that one judgment, if the whole itself has to change, then it becomes a new truth, the old whole being considered a falsity. So in the case with the aesthetic whole. Unless the disharmony is removed it is not a work of art and when the disharmony is removed it is a new work however much it resembles the previous one.

§ 3. RHYTHM:

We may say in a metaphorical way that rhythm is the soul of any form of art experience. The word rhythm occurs more often in such temporal arts like music and poetry which are predominately based on time. Rhythm implies a certain progressive movement in which some significance is repeated in a certain measurable manner. Or we may say that rhythm is how we consciously feel the progressive change of a movement. Literary critics and critics of music are unanimous in emphasising this point. "By rhythm in language is meant any noticeable series of accents."  

Rhythm is "melodic or harmonic recurrence which is a principal element in the measured movement of poetry."\(^9\) "... When any kind of pattern or design is perceptible in the movement, the language becomes rhythmical."\(^10\) It is "a subtle feeling" which "must govern the periodic progress of sounds in harmony with the emotions it is desired to express."\(^11\) In painting, rhythm is "the repetition of masses, usually in a diminishing sequence."\(^12\) "Rhythm may be roughly defined as a recurrence of similar phenomena at regular intervals of time...... Regulating of time intervals is a sine qua non of rhythm."\(^13\) Explaining the concept of rhythm, the Oxford Companion to Music says "... every requirement connected with all these time-features has been met with accuracy and judgment.... The words 'accuracy and judgment' used above, represent a necessary combination."\(^14\)

The definitions that we quoted are unanimous in agreeing that rhythm implies a movement at a certain regular interval. Now, this interval cannot be simply a mechanical interval. Rhythm is not simply the mathematical division of time into, say, sixty seconds a minute. The regularity that we speak of is from the point of view of the sense or the significance which the movement has; i.e., the

---

significance itself expresses or moves in a rhythmical manner. Rhythm, in this way, is neither an abstraction nor a fixed pattern, but it is an adjective, it is a how, how the aesthetic experience takes place. If the experience takes place in a significant and progressive order then only it becomes rhythmical. In the previous chapter we noted that the imagination in its process of integration gains the value of permanence. With regard to the value of rhythm the same theory can be said in the words of Sri Aurobindo when he says: "When mankind found out the power of thought and feeling thrown into fixed and recurring measures of sound to move and take possession of the mind and soul, they were not discovering a mere artistic devise, but a subtle truth of psychology" that "a balanced harmony maintained by a system of subtle recurrences is the foundation of immortality in created things and metrical movement is simply creative sound grown conscious of this secret of its own powers."\(^{15}\)

We should not think that rhythm is a quality which exclusively exists in the elevated level of experience called the aesthetic experience. In all our everyday experience we may observe a sense of rhythm. When we walk, when we breath, when we just listen to the temple bell, we do them rhythmically. Experiments in psychology have shown that the church bell is heard rhythmically though the actual sound of the bell is mechanically monotonous. The ding, \(^{15}\) Future Poetry: pp.25-26.
ding, ding, ding, monotony will be heard as ding-dong, ding-dong. Even if we want to walk unrhythmically, we cannot easily do it and we cannot easily beat with a hammer unrhythmically; we cannot do so because it is against the principle of the economy of our energy. Arrangement or being unified in a basic form is the very nature of experience, either the ordinary day-to-day or aesthetic or cognitive. But this form or the unifying principle is not properly realized in everyday experience. When it is realized up to the clearly, perceptible degree, to the significant extent, experience becomes rhythmical whatever its content be. If this principle is realized rationally it is called logical coherence and if it is realized imaginatively or emotionally it is called rhythmic. From this point of view the difference between ordinary experience and the aesthetic, or the ordinary experience and the scientific (logical) is only a matter of degree; as the difference between the hot and the boiling water.

When the poet begins to write a poem, in his mind either consciously or sub-consciously or for that matter unconsciously a certain vague base is felt. And his poetical imagination moves according to the form or the structure of this base. This base may not be a rigid and fixed pattern. As the poem develops, it may transgress and overflow the boundary of the base; but the overflowing current comes back to the original form may be to move away again. It is through this process that the base becomes more and more marked and as the result of the contrast—i.e., the
movement transgressing the base and coming back to conform itself—it becomes more significantly cognised. When once the base becomes clear to the imagination, even if a stop or a temporary silence ensues in the middle of the flow of poetic imagination, the reader tries to apprehend even that period of silence by fixing it in a particular place in that base.

We may just observe the relation between metre and rhythm. Though it is a matter of investigation and opinion of the experts in the subject with regard to the details, we may note that metre is "a series of accents which is not only noticeable, but also forms a definite repeating pattern." Abercrombie who defines metre in this way, defines rhythm as "any noticeable series of accents," in language. It is plain by his definitions that metre is a pattern which is super-imposed on the rhythm of the poem. It is true that when poets could not clearly express themselves in the existing patterns of metres, they experimented and started new metres. But the fact that the poets of a particular period generally write in the same metre and that though metres change, the rhythm of the poem may not change; and that some of the most pregnant poems are in prose; shows that metres can be consciously devised while rhythm is not something to be added consciously.

In logic we have a number of types of reasoning. The categorical, the hypothetical, the deductive, the inductive patterns etc., can be compared with the metres in

poems. Nobody can limit the forms of reasoning in logic and say that he has exhausted all the forms of reasoning; for, as we fact new problems and explain new vistas of experience the intellect devices newer and newer methods of demonstrating the coherence of its understanding. One form of reasoning—say syllogistic—may be more comfortably suited to demonstrate the coherence of one type of experience or problem. But it may not work with the same comfort when we encounter another type of problem. What makes truth is the significance or the coherence which expresses itself in all these forms of reasoning. In the same way what makes a poem a poem is not its metre but the rhythm which expresses itself in it. Just as it is possible sometimes to appreciate the coherence of a case without reducing it or without being able to reduce it to any existing form of reasoning, so also it is possible to compose and appreciate a poem without being able to classify or recognise its metre.

Here it may be asked: We illustrated the concept of rhythm taking the example of poetry and what is true in the case of poetry in this respect is also true in the case of music. For, in poetry it is the progressive development of sense (with the musical effect of the words too) that makes it rhythmical, while in music the developing movement of sound itself gives the sense (it may not be verbal) and thus rhythm is produced. But can we speak of rhythm in the case of non-temporal arts like painting, sculpture and architecture?

This question requires us to answer from two points
of view, which are of course inseparably connected: (1) the philosophical and (2) the concrete art criticism.

It was Kent who clearly said that space and time are the two unifying principles of all our intuitions or perceptions. Kant further said that time is the unifying principle of the inner intuition while space is that of the outer intuition. With regard to the extent of the operation of the two principles, Kant said that time, though the unifying principle of the inner intuition, is also the unifying principle of the outer intuition along with space; whereas the latter cannot be the unifying principle of the former. So time is a principle that integrates all the forms of our intuition, inner and outer. Whether Kant's contention is completely right in the light of the most advanced modern physics is altogether another big problem. But this much is undisputed that space and time are interdependent concepts.

To come to the concrete art criticism: We shall take the case of plastic arts which do not involve time in the sense that they do not move in a successive temporal order. A picture is a solid, unmoving object like a sculpture and a temple. It is spatial. But does it not include the time factor in it? It is not the time at which I the beholder look at it, but the time in the picture itself, as it is intended by the artist himself. Though a painting is a spatial spreadoutness, this spreadoutness is shown to us in a certain manner. The path that is shown across the lawn in the picture may be very long, starting
conspicuously, seeming to grow smaller and smaller and ending in an almost indistinct touch. The mountain range in the background may continue wave-like, ending imperceptibly in the snows. Even in the case of a portrait, there is the movement of the eyesight (line) from the nose to the ear and to the wall which is behind the person. The temple wall and the Gopuram (tower) are shown in successive profiles which compel us to see it in a particular way—which makes our imagination move in a particular manner. In all these cases the artist compels us to perceive the distance or the sense of change, the intensity of colour or the movement of lines etc., in a successive manner.

Now, what is time if it is not this perceived change or succession?

It is true that in the case of music right from the start, the direction of the movement is unalterably imposed on the listener. But it is also true that if one should see a painting or a sculpture or a tower in the right way, he should start from the angle in which the artist wants him to and move his eye according to the gentle or rugged persuasion of the lines or the masses.

What this discussion points to is this: Aesthetic experience involves the whole of our experience. We cannot say that painting and sculpture are purely visual while music is exclusively auditory while literature is completely imaginative involving concepts or images. To say otherwise is only to stop at the threshold of the experience and not to enter the core of it. It is true that in one
form of art one particular faculty is more predominant but it does not and cannot completely exclude the others. In this sense there is music in painting and a "building up" (a spatial phrase) of sound in music. Rhythm is basic to all arts, temporal or plastic. In the words of a modern student of aesthetics and art criticism: 17 "There is no rhythm (if one gives this word a precise meaning but as general as possible) unless there is an organization of a continuous succession through the cyclic repetition of the same basic scene (which is of course susceptible of various concrete forms). There can be purely spatial rhythm."

That time and space in art too are not exclusive of each other is made clear by a great artist and thinker, Rabindranath Tagore. In his opinion harmony and rhythm are "the static and the dynamic aspects respectively of the same principle of proportion. The two complete each other. Without rhythm, art would be lifeless, even if it carries harmony of parts. Without harmony, on the contrary, art would be anarchic, even if it is lively." 18

We saw earlier that harmony is nothing but the principle of coherence in the aesthetic sphere and now this detailed discussion shows that rhythm is harmony looked at in a different perspective.

§ 4. LAWS OF RHYTHM: COMPARISON WITH THE LAWS OF THOUGHT:

The late Prof. B. S. Mandhekar, one of the very few original modern Indian aestheticians has made a convincing

18. Dr. V. S. Narevene: Rabindranath Tagore: A Philosophical study. Ref. No.21 to Ch.VI.
attempt to correlate the principle of rhythm and the laws of thought. He has only stated the correlation between the two in a very clear manner but without explaining the details which he could have done quite illuminatingly. Since he made this attempt in one of his lectures, perhaps time did not permit him to enter into details. Here we shall not only state his position but add our explanation entering into some details that follow from his position.

Prof. Mardhekar holds that rhythm is not a noun in the sense it is never geometrical. "It is in fact an instance of the nominalising process of language and is really the name not of an object but of a quality of experience.... is not an entity by itself; it is an adjective of experience." He further says that an experience is a relation between the subject which experiences and a world as the object that is experienced. The world of the object of experience consists of entities and relations. These entities and relations themselves are related to each other in various ways. But out of there we can recognise three basic ways in which they can be related: (1) Two entities may be related to each other; (2) One entity and one relation may be related to each other; or (3) Two relations may be related to each other. As the examples for these three ways or relation, he gives the instances: (1) If the apple is on the table, the two entities are spatially related; (2) If the servant puts the cat on the table, then the "entity" servant is causally related to the spatial

19. See his Two Lectures on our Aesthetic of Literature: Second Lecture on Rhythm in Literature. The subsequent quotations from Mardhekar in this section have
relation between the cat and the table; and (3) If the
colour of an object A is like the colour of a certain
person's dress B, and the colour of another object C is
like the colour of another person's dress D; then the re-
lation of similarity exists between the two relations of
likeness—i.e., between A and B; and C and D. In the same
manner, relations can exist between any number of entities
and relations, and between relations themselves.

Following these illustrations, he further goes and
says that "while different entities may be interrelated
in a number of ways, and while different entities and dif-
ferent relations may also be related in a variety of ways,
relations can be interrelated only in two ways. To put
it a little differently, only two types of relations can
exist between different relations. Different relations
can be interrelated either according to the principle of
coherence or according to the principle of rhythm. In
the first case, the relations are inter-related logically;
in the second case, they are inter-related aesthetically."

What Prof. Mardhekar means is this: all of our
phenomenal experience is relational. But in the developed
form of experience, we can find the relation between the
relations themselves. In the yet undeveloped stage of
experience, we find relations between only the entities. The fact
that we can see the relation between relations themselves—
i.e., we can compare two or more relations and try to
hold them in one principle—indicates that we have reached
a certain point of development in our experience. But
it should not be forgotten that we are not treating relations themselves as entities. Relations are always relations of something or between the entities. But our mind has the capacity to view these relations in one grasp. Now, if the mind holds these relations strictly from the point of view of discursive thinking, it is called logical, following, in the words of Prof. Mardhekar "The principle of coherence is obedience to the law of identity and excluded middle". And if the experience is aesthetic, "it will follow the principle of rhythm obeying the laws of harmony, contrast and balance". Now, just as logical coherence can be defined (or explained, if the use of the term "to define" is objected) in terms of its own laws—namely the laws of thought like the principles of identity, contradiction and excluded middle—the aesthetic coherence of rhythm can also be stated in terms of its own principles—namely the principles of harmony, contrast and balance.

Out of these two sets of laws, each set can be stated or expressed in three ways. We shall first see the first two laws of logic: the principles of identity and contradiction. These two principles are just two aspects of one and the same principle. By identity we should not mean bare identity or tautology, but it is actually the principle of significant consistency or logical coherence. Since we have seen in detail how the principles of coherence and contradiction are the two aspects of one and the same principle (see Ch.III), we need not indulge in discussing it here once again. We shall therefore state
instantly how Prof. Mardhekar states the principles of harmony and contrasts and we shall find out whether we can discover that these principles also are the two aspects of one and the same principle. The principle of harmony states that "if two relations are simultaneously given such that one of them either is or tends to be identical in quality with the other, then the relation between them is that of harmony". (our italics)

In order to appreciate the significance of this statement clearly we may briefly comment upon the words, (1) relations (2) "is" and (3) "tends to be".

(1) It is not the entities as such which produce aesthetic harmony but the relations that govern them, (2) these relations are identical in the sense they are governed by the same principle; and (3) the phrase "tends to be" implies that perfect harmony is not yet realized or exhibited in the work of art. This implies (a) That either the artist has deliberately done so in order to maintain a condition somewhere between the point of contrast and of harmony; or (b) he has fallen short of complete success in artistic execution; or (c) the relation of harmony is deliberately made rather implicit. But what is interesting for our study is that in any case it is the principle of harmony that operates. Aesthetic harmony implies a multiplicity of objects and relations which are governed by one unitary principle. And its counterpart, logical identity, which is not bare identity, also implies a multiplicity (at least two) of terms.
The principle of contrast is stated by Prof. Mardhekar as: "If two relations are simultaneously given such that one of them is or tends to be opposite in quality to the other, then the relation between them is that of contrast".

We need not again comment on the possible implications of the phrase "tends to be" in this definition also. We shall only note that while the principle of harmony states the identity of two relations, the principle of contrast states the difference or opposition between the two. Now, how can the two relations oppose each other unless both of them are held together by a common relation of opposition? As Prof. Parker rightly puts it: "... contrast is never by itself aesthetically satisfactory, for the contrasting elements must offset each other, they must balance"... And "balance is equality of opposing or contrasting elements. Balance is one kind of aesthetic unity, for despite the opposition of the elements in balance, each needs the other and together they create a whole." 20

The phrase "relation of opposition may appear to be a verbal makeshift and so we shall illustrate it by taking a concrete example. In a musical concert where a duet is going on between the Tabalji and the instrument-player, whatever tune the instrument player produces, the Tabalji repeats on his instrument. But what the Tabalji's instrument gives is only the time structure—the counting of beats and not the unbroken continuity of tunes, produced by the instrumentalist. Thus both these are opposite 20. D. H. Parker in Problems in aesthetics. Ed. by.
in the sense they are different. But the result of this opposition is the unity of the effect. To put it in another way: one and the same musical development is illustrated in a more clear manner by two instruments of different qualities. The principle of contrast emphasises the multiplicity; but it is the multiplicity of an aesthetic whole which the principle implicitly expressed.

What we want to point out in summary is this: that the principles of harmony and contrast are two faces of one and the same principle. Without any contrast harmony cannot even manifest itself just as contrast is no contrast if it does not suggest the contrast unitary principle which holds together both the sides. And what is true of this statement about the principles of harmony and contrast is equally true about the principles of identity and contradiction.

Whether the principle of excluded middle in logic is an independent principle is a matter of controversy. But we shall observe that it is a by-law or a corollary of the principle of contradiction. When stated strictly, contradiction rests on the disjunction of the form A or not-A which are mutually exclusive and totally exhaustive. When the principle of excluded middle says that any one side of this disjunction must necessarily be true, it implies that the disjunction is based on a significant negation. That the soul is either red or not-red is not a case for excluded middle; for here the disjunction is

Morris Witz, p.178.
not based on a significant negation. To be more basic in our argument: the law of thought is one and one only which may be stated in three ways. Just as consistency and contradiction are two ways of stating the same principle, so also contradiction and excluded middle are different ways of stating the very principle. We may now state and explain the principle of balance, the aesthetic counterpart of the excluded middle in logic. In the words of Prof. Mardenkar: "If a group of inter-related relations can be divided into two halves such that the number of relations in one is equal to the number of relations in the other, then the relation between the two halves is that of balance."

Excluded Middle in logic asserts the truth of one side of the disjunction or contradiction because it is the business of logic to enquire into the truth of its subject. But in aesthetic experience our aim is not to assert the truth or otherwise of any part but only to experience it. Therefore this side of the argument is absent in our concept of balance. But the concept rests on, like Excluded Middle, two halves which are equal and opposite to each other. Here equality is important, because we should have the equal intensity of feeling. But in the excluded middle of logic the A and not-A may not be equal in the mathematical sense. We cannot validly make even an attempt to see whether the not-red of my coat is equal to its red-ness. How can that which is be equal to that which is not? That apart, the two principles—balance and excluded middle—are similar in that, while the former stands
in a middle point between the principles of harmony and contrast, the latter expresses the truth that both the principles of consistency and contradiction cannot be applied in the same respect and at the same time. It says that either the positive predicate or the negative predicate must be true; which again is nothing but another way of stating either the principle of contradiction or that of consistency, depending upon which one we choose for interpretation.

While the principles of identity and contradiction correspond obviously to those of harmony and contrast, the principle of excluded middle makes it difficult for us to compare it with its aesthetic counterpart, namely balance. It is because while the first two principles simply state the modes of the inner coherence of thought, the third—excluded middle—speaks something about the truth-claim of the first two. But in the case of balance which is purely an aesthetic principle the question of truth-claim does not arise. And it is at this point, we can say, that coherence distinguishes itself into two distinct spheres and function, defying our attempt at any further comparison.

We had already noted at the outset that the three laws of thought are but the three ways of stating the one law of thought, which is coherence. In the same way, the three laws of aesthetic experience or imagination—harmony, contrast and balance—are the three ways of stating the
law of imagination, which is rhythm. These three laws can never be seen in complete isolation in any work of art. In one work, contrast may seem very explicitly and in another the artist might have been successful in showing the balance, as another might have achieved the expression of harmony. In the same way in our reasoning and statements we express in different ways the same connotation, such as "Duty is duty", "under no circumstance do I fail in my duty" and "Either I will do my duty or die".

§ 5. **SYMMETRY:**

The term "symmetry" is used more in architecture and the other plastic arts than in temporal arts. Evolution or development is a word which is more in use in temporal arts like music, drama, novel etc. But as we have seen earlier, we cannot make a hard and fast division between the temporal and the non-temporal arts. Symmetry implies a certain unity of mass related in a rhythmical manner; but usually it is related vertically, balance being the concept used if the relation is horizontal. Now, this rhythmical mass relation of the units and the end of this progressive movement is determined right from the base; so that the end and the beginning and the body will form one whole. In the case of a story of music this form is called evolution. Evolution implies that every other subsequent event is a natural outcome of its precedent point so that the end is an event whose necessity was in the beginning. Evolution is a process of development, of dis-

21. Parker. Ibid. see p.180: "balance as an element in the complex structure we call rhythm."
-tinctly markable stages, the later stages accumulating the value of the earlier ones. This process comes to its completion when the whole movement ends in its natural unity.

A question has been asked by Prof. Parker whether evolution is genuinely distinct from rhythm? The answer of Prof. Parker himself is, it is distinct from rhythm in that if rhythm is not combined with development, there cannot be evolution. This answer of Prof. Parker takes for granted that there can be rhythm without development like in the case of simple measured sounds that we hear while travelling by train. But more measured change of sequences will not produce rhythm if it does not convey any significance and the moment the change gains significance the change is a process of development. The fact is, wherever there is rhythm there is some significant movement and no movement can be significant if it is not towards a certain fulfilment. Prof. Parker may be right in his distinction in fixing up the precise meaning to terminologies from the point of view of practical art criticism. But our point of view is not to define the terms of practical criticism, but to see the common inner principle that governs all these concepts.

Symmetry is used in the case of spatial arts while evolution is used in the case of temporal arts. As we saw above, both of them are basically the same concept. Santayana says that symmetry is what metaphysicians call the

principle of individuation. In other words it is the principle of unity.

CONCLUSION

The concepts that we tried to analyse in this chapter are in no way exhaustive; nor are they mutually exclusive. They are not exhaustive because the technical critic may evolve and define newer and newer concepts as the modes of artistic expression and the corresponding points of view of criticism change. We have left without considering many other concepts -- to mention a few, tempe, climax, complication, volume, modulation etc., etc. But the analysis of the meaning of all these is simply a matter of detail. So, instead of entering into that task we may come to see the results of what we have done so far.

First we tried to understand the meaning of form which implies proportion and unity and harmony. Then the analysis of the term rhythm revealed to us that it takes different forms like the principles of harmony, contrast and balance. We further saw that these three principles are not mutually exclusive. And lastly, we noted, that the concept of symmetry or evolution can be explained in terms of rhythm. Whether rhythm is basic or evolution is basic or any other concept is for us a superfluous question. For us the basic thing is the development of the imagination or emotional (aesthetic) experience. And in this experience one may speak of rhythm or evolution or

proportion or what not. As our aesthetic sensibility becomes finer and finer we learn to appreciate each of these concepts on its own unique value. In fact acquiring this capacity adds to the value of our aesthetic judgment; but only as long as we do not forget that each of these has its value because it is a form of the inner coherence in the imaginative development of experience. Just as in logic the knowledge of any number of rules is a positive aid for us to understand and appreciate the inner principle of coherence. But the moment we elevate any one or more of these rules, either in logic or in aesthetics, to the supreme position forgetting the inner principle, we become not only blind to the nature of the whole, but dogmatic.