THE ARTS, CRITICISM IN INDIA AND AESTHETICS

The subject posits some relations which are not alike obvious. Today, nobody questions the relation *of art* to criticism and aesthetics. Philosophers even insist that 'the fact of creative art is that upon which all criticism and all aesthetics depends'.[1] But, in spite of their common linkage with art, the relation of aesthetics to criticism is not so manifest. Yet it is being increasingly realized. It is now possible to regard aesthetics as a philosophical study of the problems of criticism;[2] and some eminent critics hazard the view that, though every art needs its own critical organization, its theory of criticism may well get assimilated in *aesthetics* as soon as the latter 'becomes the unified criticism of all the arts instead of whatever it is now'.[3]

A thorough discussion of this triple relation is not here possible. The warrant of this essay is rather its viewpoint, its continual concern with the Indian scene. Yet, partly by way of justifying the manner of my attempt, I have to open with some remarks on the problem in general.

I. The Problem Generally.

(*a*) It is today common to regard aesthetics as the study of aesthetical discourse. I do not think this conception does *due* justice to the importance, in aesthetics, of the fact of art experience. But the point that I wish to *press* here is that aesthetical discourse admits of a distinction which should be drawn. It is not merely the public critics, scholars and men of general culture who speak of art. The artists themselves do so; and *their* language, though often quite unclear, is generally closer to the fact of art as a creative something than that of the others. Their words refer to details of fact and effect from the viewpoint of making; and are often cryptic. They do not *directly* cater to the need to understand. Yet, if they are attended to, they often come to convey very vital sense. How exactly this happens will be clear only when the reader turns to my discussion of some concepts of Hindustani music. And, for the present, we have to be content with a general stress on the requirement that, if

aesthetics be regarded as 'logic of the talk about art', the discourse of the artists themselves must be given due heed.[4] It is certainly true, but *not enough* to say that 'the character of the language used by the critic is different from the character of the language used by the philosopher of aesthetics'.[5] The words *and imagery* that the artists use about art make a third distinct kind; and are of vital moment to aesthetics.

(*b*) As for criticism, I think its aim is to reveal in discursive prose what the critic finds embodied in the work itself.

This, however, is true only of what I may call 'first order' criticism: that is, of criticism which is concerned directly, and as a rule merely, with singular works of art. Critics, here, record their reactions in episodic forms like the daily 'critical' write-up or the periodical survey of 'the cultural stream'. But criticism has also been regarded as a systematic dealing with the basic concepts, theories and problems relating to a particular art.[6] *Its* concern with individual works is not so direct and unremitting as that of the other kind.

Here, one can easily see the critic's link *with aesthetics*.[7] But I must first explain, and partly justify the meaning I have given to criticism.

The critic, I insist, *reveals* what may not be evident to the untrained eye; and he does that in language which conveys understanding. What he says is of course grounded in, but it does not seek to duplicate his own experience of art. Criticism is, therefore, a distinct activity. To have an experience is one thing; to seek to explain the details of its object, is quite another. In the latter case, the manner is frankly discursive; and there is a necessary use of language with a careful eye on its aptness to the apprehended character of fact.

But here, at once, we must mark two necessities:

First, what we find in the work is 'embodied'. The aesthetic and the perceptual, the virtual and the actual, are both here fused.[8] The words of the critic, on the other hand, can never bodily capture what is directly given,—say, the heard lilt of a melody or the seen recessiveness of colour. No criticism therefore, is a substitute for art; and, like real prayer, direct contemplation of art necessarily steps out of the world of mere talk into 'the private and secret presence',[9] of the Other.

Secondly, though he cannot but notice them with utmost attention, the critic does not merely borrow the words the artist uses in speaking of his art. Critical attention is at once a stress towards analysis; and the routine 'talk' of the artists is, by the critic, necessarily thought out, revealing new neanings or linkages of concepts. I hope to make it clear a little later in this essay.

As for the critic's basic *criteria* I get at them thus :

Art is 'creative' in at least three senses. As activity, it is a kind of making;[10] and, as a product, art is *emergent* in the sense that its net character can never be wholly forethought. Further, as activity, it is not the mere construction of a useful object, but the creation of an intense and organic[11] unity for mere contemplation. It is not *meant* to be used.[12] But it has a life of its own, its own world of semblance and magic; and *this* can be manifest only to him who views it truly,—in depth, to be sure, but without denaturing, so to say, its details into fragments.

If this be true, and I have purposely chosen the least questionable 'truths' about art, the critic's main task, it would seem, is to explain what a work of art 'says' and how it has been structured into its uniquely significant form; and his basic *criteria* can only be unity, complexity and intensity of regional unity.[13] To look for these features in our response to art is to follow a viewpoint that is truly aesthetic.[14]

Is criticism important ? It obviously is. As expert commentary on individual works, it makes us see what we may otherwise easily miss. This enrichment of perception is by itself no trivial matter. And as scholarly attention to the basic concepts and problems of the arts, criticism makes for a systematic and growing body of knowledge. Nor can we deny that critics sometimes bring to light young artists of promise, even new forms of art; and may unceasingly work for a better awareness of the value of the older ones.[15]

(*c*) To the question, how criticism is related to aesthetics, our answer could in brief be as follows :

The main task of the public critic is of course to attend to individual works. Yet, in writing on them he cannot avoid using general words like *form* and *expressiveness*. True, he is not

bound to discuss their meaning in detail. But, implicit though it is, his use of such words can only benefit from a careful study of what they mean in aesthetics.

The scholarly critic, on the other hand, pays explicit attention to the key notions of an art; and so often does the same work as is done by aesthetics, though perhaps a little less intensely. This happens, for instance, when Frye discusses symbols, meaning and rhythm.[16] We must, therefore, remember that what is opposed to the aesthetician's emphasis on general categories is not such systematic criticism, but only criticism of the 'first order'[17] At the same time neither criticism of the general kind nor aesthetics can overlook for long the fact of art-experience.[18]

II. About This Essay :

These are the generalities which this essay seeks to illustrate. Its warrant is clear. Two features of our cultural life since the attainment of independence have been an increased interest in the arts and frequent art-criticism. But *aesthetical thinking* in relation to these has been very unsatisfactory. It is this defect which I here seek to remedy, of course quite imperfectly. We have five rich styles of classical Indian dance; quite a few *gharānās* of vocal music; and considerable activity in the field of drama and painting. But these are yet to receive aesthetical cognisance, though most of our art and music colleges have rightly made aesthetics a part of their syllabi.

From this total viewpoint, however, my venture is quite inadequate. It takes no notice of our literature, sculpture and architecture today. But, on the other hand, it does pay serious, though limited attention to contemporary Indian painting, our rhythm, music and dance; and also to specimens of our 'critical' writing today. Some notice of the contemporary art of Bangla Desh is another redeeming feature. Above all, nowhere in the article do I say anything that is ungrounded in my own experience of art;[19] and only such works of art have been referred to as are accessible.[20]

There is a larger relevance, too, of some parts of this essay. 'Internationalism in aesthetics' is not a mere cry. The demand arises from the quite proper awareness that the more numerous and dissimilar the art that we survey, the greater will be the

advance in our grasp of the subject, of its concepts and problems; and the fuller the curb on the urge to generalize. How this is in fact so should become clear when we turn, in this essay, to some select features of the Indian arts.

On the other hand, I am heavily indebted to Western aesthetical theory and critical writing today. This should be generally manifest in my attempt to be clear about the meaning of concepts, instead of merely quoting from our own ancient writings on the arts. And in my very appeal, towards the end of this article, for attention to the Indian arts, I am prompted by an utterance of a modern aesthetician :

" ....Aesthetic categories now in operation are not a procrustean bed to which the products of the creative....artist must be fitted at all costs."[21]

III. Our Arts and Criticism .

(*A*) *Dance :*

On criticism in relation to our dances—of which I choose *Kathak*[22]—I may only make some quite general remarks :

1. A few clear types can here be distinguished. Of the extracts cited below, referring to the same danseuse, the first is somewhat analytic and elaborate, but the second is just a single, quintessential insight. The third, by contrast, is (in the main) mere praise, though not, therefore, necessarily untrue :

(*a*) " The opening *chaturanga*, a rich blend of various elements of dance and song, impressed us with a recurring posture of opulent beauty portraying Saraswati. The Meera *bhajan* and Radha-Krishna *nritya*, which followed, were not mere....spectacle. Rani Karna has a striking ability to embellish the *bhajan* with a variety of beautiful and *expressional* postures, so rare in *Kathak*. Her *amad* of the *Chandrakans*[23] *abhinaya* composition, and... communication, through subtle *abhinaya*, of such difficult ideas as '*ek prāna dou swarup*' were....perfect. The movements were throughout effortless, unhurried.... The *ang*[24] though....(articulating) in great detail....the meaning and imagery inherent in the song, was appealing due to its own symmetry and poise ".[25]

(*b*) " Rani Karna was dainty and lucid ".[26]

(*c*) " ....Is not only one of our most graceful Kathak dancers,.... (but) is.... known for having considerably enriched and beautified this system.... It is doubtful whether (in this respect) any single person has achieved as much in a quiet and unostentatious manner, as Rani Karna ".[27]

The first, I explain, is *aesthetic* because it speaks of the ' unity and complexity ' of the dance. The various elements—like *ang, āmad, abhinaya* and posture—are here not only identified in respect of their beauty and significance, but are shown as *related, in terms* of *concordance, recurrence and relief.* The second critical notice too seizes two features; but these relate to the overall manner, rather than to inner details. The third one, I fear, is not even truly ' critical '; for ' the real concern of the evaluating critic is with positive value (of the work) rather than with the greatness of its author '.[28]

2. As a systematic attempt to fix and inter-relate the meanings of the basic concepts, criticism here is however generally poor. My own first venture in this direction–though it sought to discuss the art's very bases, like *thāt, āmad* and *nikās*, if only from the viewpoint of rhythm–was, at places, heavy and obscure. Consider for instance, what I said there about *layakāri* :[29]

> " *Layakāri* is the temporal representation of the diverse as articulating, vivifying,....variegating and manifesting—but by no means exhausting or disrupting—the original continuum."[30]

And now compare this with the following characterization of *laya* reached through the analysis not only of our *alāpa* as it appears, but of such phrases of our common rhythmic discourse as *laya kā chukkur* and *laya ki kāt tarāsh :*

> " *Laya* is musical duration which is controlled—but not necessarily with the (objective) aid of beats—in respect of its speed; and which permits such a variety of pace, emphasis and arrangement that it seems utterly removed from what we commonly mean by time. In *alāpa* (we must add) the regulation of *laya* is much more subjective than in the case of rhythm or rhythmically organized singing."[31]

This should be quite intelligible to those who are even fairly familiar with the broad features of the music of India.

B. Rhythm :

Though (as regulated duration) it permeates *all* music and dance, *laya* belongs mainly to rhythm; and so I may next invite attention to criticism *in relation to rhythm.*

1. *Meeting a doubt*

But first a doubt must be faced. Is rhythm an independent and important art at all ? For, if it is not, it has little right to separate attention.

Now, in so far as its core is the problem of the very nature of art, this question is not only an aesthetical, but a metacritical one.[32] The thoughtful critic is certainly sometimes moved to reflect on the key terms that he uses in his daily work,—say, art, form and content; and it would therfore be no digression if I here deal with the question just posed. Now, in defence of our rhythm, my argument is briefly as follows :

In the West, it has been held that an art is eminent if its medium of communication is not commonly used for non-aesthetic purposes. Consider, for instance, the following comment of Herbert Read on Schopenhauer's well-known thesis that all arts aspire to the condition of music :

> "....Almost in music alone, it is possible for the artist to appeal to his audience directly without the intervention of a medium of communication in common use for other purposes. The architect must express himself in buildings which have some utilitarian purpose. The poet must use words which are bandied about in the daily give-and-take of conversation...."[33]

I comment that, if we admit the test, here hinted, rhythm should be ranked higher than music; for whereas musical notes are in fact employed, say, by quite a few roving sellers in their typical voices, or may be heard as a bell chimes the hours—uses which are both inartistic—the mnemonic syllables or *bols* of rhythm[34] are *never* employed for any non-aesthetic purpose.

Again, our rhythm seems quite true to the ideal of *pure* art. The syllables of *tāla* do not refer to anything external. A good solo rhythmic recital charms us mainly with the excellence of its inner organization, though the euphonious quality of playing also counts. Of course, if he so decides, the drummer can produce *bols* that resemble everyday sounds and familiar happenings—such

as the movement and noise of a train as it steams out, accelerates and comes to a halt; but whenever this is attempted, those who understand rhythm only feel amused.

I may add that a full length exposition of our rhythm can be so winsome that it may induce in knowledgeable listeners a state of intense absorption or *tādātmya*[35] with the winged, variform beauty of rhythm.

Finally, rhythm may be said to be a *distinct* art in so far as it has its own independent criteria of evaluation. In perhaps no other art is the precise point or region of organization—or the dominant motif or movement—so clearly identifiable as in the region of our rhythm. Our reference here is obviously to *sama*, and to the shapely *āmads*[36] that make it seem unmistakable.

2. *A clear deficiency*

Our rhythm is indeed remarkable for its subtlety and richness; and the music of India is grounded in long and impressive traditions of rhythmic practice. Yet 'critical' reaction to *expositions* of rhythm has so far been very superficial, confined, as a rule, to the merely perceptual features of fluency, sharpness and softness. I have never seen in such criticism any intelligent reference to details of rhythmic *structure*.

In respect of a serious study of rhythm's basic *concepts*, however, a start has been made. Elsewhere, as already hinted, I have sought to fix the meaning of *laya* after examining most of the popular phrases of our rhythmic discourse; and here I may briefly indicate how such basic criticism may be done—a little differently, that is, by emphasising details of rhythmic practice and of contemplation of rhythm rather than mere rhythmic discourse—in respect of *SAMA*, which is perhaps the most important word in the region of our *tala*.

3. *'Criticism' and a Concept : SAMA*

To facilitate discussion, I begin by proposing a definition, though in fact I have reached it only as the end-term of enquiry :[37]

> *SAMA* is the first or focal *mātrā* (or beat) of the rhythm-cycle as treated musically, spoken *or* merely contemplated in idea.[38] In principle, it is to be kept in mind continually as the major accent of an even flow of *laya*; and is, in fact, often sought designedly to work up effects of beauty.

Let me now explain this definition by attending to its key words, and making the necessary distinctions :

(*a*) As the source of rhythmic design :

As the *first mātrā*, the ' sama ' is a *stimulus*. It impels and enables the mind to get tuned to what is to follow. But, we must note, it is the first beat not merely numerically, but as the pace-setter. The time taken in articulating the *sama-bol* itself directly fixes the speed of the flow that follows. Putting the two ideas together, we may speak of *sama as the source of rhythmic design*. The flow of the cycle not only begins from, but is determined by *sama*.

(*b*) As focal beat :

The sama, however, is not merely the first, but *the focal beat* of a cycle. From it we set out, and to it we return.[39] This is quite common knowledge. But we are prone to forget this, and often say merely that the *sama* is the first beat, ignoring the necessary complement : ' of the cycle '. The flow which it initiates and completes is really implicit in what we mean by *sama*.

It is, I may add, *sama* as the focal point of a cycle which lends to rhythm, and to music which repeats a cycle clearly,[40] a suggestion of self-completeness. This is quite missing in *alāpa* where we only have *laya*, no *tāla*. *Alāpa* works up an atmosphere which may well seem infinite. But it never appears self-complete.

(*c*) A beat or a *mātrā* ?

Yet the *sama* is a beat or *mātrā* too. As such, it enables us to measure the flow, to steady or vivify the *laya* whenever necessary[41] as after the execution of intricate patterns—and to keep it generally under control.

Such talk, however, is a little glib; and we must make it clear what it means to say that the ' sama ' is a beat *or* a ' mātrā '. A *beat* is a recurrent stroke, or its sound or moment. Repetitiveness, so clear in rhythm, is implicit in the very meaning of the word. A *mātrā*, on the other hand, is a measured quantity. This word is closer to measure than to recurrence. It does not, however, signify complete separateness. In fact, to speak of a measured quantity is at once to imply the complement—' of something '. The *mātrā* here is a measured accent *of a chosen stretch of laya*.

rather than judge how long the *sama-bol* lasts. It does in fact occupy some time. But it now *seems* instantaneous, like all acutal reaching at *and as* the end of a journey. We do not measure time when a tension is relieved, or a target just attained.

C. Music .

From rhythm I may now turn to music which, as a rule, includes the former as a necessary element.[49] Here, because of the limitations of space, I choose only a few major points for very brief discussion :

1. Music criticism too, as done in present day India, is distinguishable into types. Besides the ones already mentioned in the context of dance, the approaches that are here seen follow *different ways of rising to the general from attention to the particular.* Thus, as in the following ' review ' of the late Ustad Dabeer Khan's *bilāskhāni*[50] *alāpa* on the *veenā* in his National Programme of May '56, the mere perception of one subtle detail may lead to an attempt to explain why *svaras* of one kind differ (in effect) from those of the other :

> "....a consistently immaculate rendering of ' re ' as emanating *from within* the ground 'sa'—....deeply bestirred, sweet and soulful....Here at once one feels impelled to compare the *veena-alāpa* with the quivering sensuousness of touch seen in *sitar*-playing, as (sometimes) in the hands of a Wilayat or Halim. The secret of the difference seems to be this. A note which turns and twists before it has steadied itself seems flippant...., and is prevented only by its sweetness from appearing....vulgar. The vibrant *trail* of a steadily rendered *svara*, on the other hand, produces–specially when the tone is deep–an irresistible impression of deep inward feeling (and) power...."[51].

Criticism of this kind is obviously a blend of phenomenological fidelity, some understanding of the ' why ' of effects, and a measure of generality.

2. Alternatively, the ' critical ' notice of an individual recital may seek *to fix, though implicity, the essence of the type of performance* represented. As an illustration, the following remarks on a Ravi Shankar—Ali Akbar *jugalbandi*[52] should here serve :

> "....the two performers....try to reinforce each other's effects by matching playing in one octave with similar or simultaneous playing in the other; and by trying to articulate audibly what the partner's playing, as it ends, demands by suggesting, either as continuance or as a repartee. The one reinforces, completes, or just caps with the dainty individuality of a single note, the meaning or the manner of the patterns of the other. Sometimes it appears as if one heaves a sigh and the other lends a tear to it."[53]

The criterion here suggested is that *jugalbandi* is music which is not merely conjoined, but complementary.

3. Another distinct kind may be identified where the critic's reasoned *objection* to a single defect of playing at once fixes and *inter-relates* the meaning of some concepts of music. See, for instance, what 'a music critic' once wrote on a recital of Ravi Shankar,[54] today our best known musician :

> "I come now to an evaluation of his *gatkaari*[55] in general. What is the aesthetic character or significance of a *gat* ? I think the *gat* is to instrumental music what the *sthayi*[56] is to singing. It is the basis of the creativity which follows.... If that is so—and I am convinced it cannot be otherwise—the *gat* must have a character of its own. It must have some centralized significance; it must appear as a continuity with a distinctive centre. That centre is the *sama*....
>
> But, I hasten to add, the aesthetically central is a fount of value; it not merely is, but determines the beauty of that which encompasses it. Now, if the *sama* is to retain its true character as an aesthetic centre..its..place in the economy of the tune, it must..first..have an unmistakable sharpness about it; and secondly, it should appear not merely as the last note of the tune, but as the logical culmination of a self-evolving pattern. Putting the two together, it may be said that the *sama* should not merely come, but *emerge*, The entire manner in which the *gat* gathers up its loveliness and finally delivers it, as it were, to the *sama*, is the *amad*..It is this fact of *amad* which makes the old masters say that the approach of the *sama* should be visible from a distance, as it were. Now, in..*gatkāri* last night, the distinct sharpness of the *sama* was,

> as a rule, there, but the impression of *amad* was generally missing, so that (the) *gat* would appear as a mere succession of notes that..had..no aesthetic necessity about them, no compelling purpose taking them all towards a common goal."[57]

Three concepts are here thought out, in relation to one another—*sama, āmad, gatkaari*; and analysis is germane to the ultimate finding.

4. The most important kind of criticism—here, as in relation to the other arts—is however that systematic attempt to fix the meaning of concepts[58] which is not subject to the stress of submitting the ' copy ' to the Press soon after the recital. In this context, I propose only to explain how, as already said, the critic not only avails of, but at once interprets the language that the artists use about art;[59] which is, in my view, partly what Frye means by saying that ' the axioms and postulates of criticism.. have *to grow out* of the art it deals with '.[60] The concept that I choose is : *āmad*, a word which is used (in music) for a particular part of the *sthāyi* or *gat;* and I reproduce, very briefly, the gist of my argument developed elsewhere.[61]

The cue is here provided by a vocalist's remark that ' from *there*, higher up, *the āmad should seem* to come, *directed at this point* '.[62] This ' point ' here referred to is the *sama*; and the other italicized words, at the very first impact of critical thought, deliver (correspondingly) the following distinct ideas ; point of emanation, self-activation, orientation or design , and terminal propriety.[63] The moment this ideal material is referred to the evidence of actual listening, thought is enabled, with surety, to characterise *āmad* as :

> " that identifiable section of the flowing form of a *sthāyi* (or *gat*), in and through which the flow seems to activate or regulate itself perceptibly at a particular point of the rhythm-cycle, and therefrom to move towards, and attain the *sama* in a well-designed way; which attainment at once seems a self-completion of the entire *bandish* as a dynamic design."[64]

I have so far found this definition quite adequate to niceties of *āmad* in actual good singing.

The *artist's* talk, I repeat, is built around insight and imagery. The critic analyzes it. But the step to verbal meaning, if carefully taken, is neither a caricature of fact nor an unrewarding

duplication of it. It is a quite proper supplement of sense to sensibility. And there is no reason why analysis that unknits insight, and traces intimations in its own self-consistent way—without yet shutting out the breath of further fact—should not at once enrich, though it cannot replace, our response to beauty; *and* aid, quite visibly, evolution of concepts that are not only helpful to critics, but acceptable, if only made intelligible, to those who *practise* art.

D. Painting

1. In my treatment of criticism relating to our painting I propose to *emphasise* what has so far been implicit; I mean the supreme importance of noticing minutely what is there in the work, Failure to meet this requirement at once makes 'critical' writing a bit too general, unhelpful to the reader; and, may be, itself rather indefensible.

The critic's right to generalize cannot as such be disputed. But its exercise must be responsible; and this calls for a close observation of details. Where this balance is observed, as in Herbert Read's following comments on Vermeer, criticism is not only respectable—partly because of the aptness of its words to what is in fact there—but at once a tempting invitation to art :

> "Every painting of Vermeer's is bathed in....serenity.... There is no violence in his work, of thought or action. There is an eternal stillness, of music that dies on the echo, of the mind entranced by a message of love, of fingers that gently guide a thread of lace, of a tiny pearl suspended in delicate scales. Even Clio's eyes are downcast, as if embarrassed by the symbols of Fame she is compelled to hold."[65]

What one 'finds' in a painting, after hours of reverent watching, may well overrun what first meets the eye. But it should yet be traceable, naturally, to the work, from which we set out, and warranted by what is found therein. This is the crux of the emphasis, in aesthetics today, on art as *embodiment*. What a painting 'means' is inseparable from, though not tied down to what it shows.

2. Consider, now, a specimen of our own critical reaction to the 'award-winners' at the National Exhibition of Art held in 1973:

"....We have, for example, Satish Gujral whose 'Construction I' typifies sophistication thematically and in the use of materials which are very contemporary and modern. On the other side, we have Ramachandran's 'Kali Puja' which is uncompromisingly figurative, metaphorical and humanistic. G. R. Santosh's painting is a phenomenal exaltation of the sensuous to the super-sensuous region, in contradiction to Anupam Sud's superb surrealisic composition which breathes the thematic eclecticism of yesteryear. Jeram Patel's 'Black III', superb drawing that it is, is the crystallization of subconscious and observing imagery."[66]

Now, I do not deny that these remarks are mostly *applicable to* the works in question. But do they at all try to reveal inner detail ? And in suggesting that a work is good because its theme is 'sophisticated' and its materials 'contemporary', is *any* appeal made to *aesthetic* criteria, any insight given in relation to structure, any tempting cue provided for the eye ?

The Commissioner's[67] comments are relatively better. Yet I do not think they are throughout true to the 'award winners' or quite adequate to their richness.[68] But I must turn to the works themselves,[69] which can all be seen at the Akademi :

(*a*) *Construction* I. (57 Satish Gujral) :

It struck me as a rich and powerful, but by no means exaggerated image of the main features of our life today—of its domination by mere literacy and the mechanical, perhaps also of its neat division of functions. There is here no interfusion of elements, and it *is*—if we *think* of the materials used—an 'assemblage' of quite diverse materials. But it would be wrong to say that it appears to *contemplation* a mere juxtaposition of the various. For, its geometry of designs does not merely dominate and organize the centre—where it certainly persists, for the eye, in spite of the shiny, fickle surface—but permeates the work, so that the details seem akin by just sharing shapeliness. The lines here *define* what they fringe, circle or run through; there is no fuzzy detail; and a certitude of manner and design here overtops everything. That indeed is why the many 'things' lifted bodily from life—say, the letters and the one peg—only seem true rather than trivial. Clearly contemporary in feeling, the work is a sure solid work of precise assembly. So here I agree with the Commissioner unreservedly.

One reason why he commends the work is that it advances 'the possibilities of the use of varied materials such as aluminum, copper .. wood in the making of an artefact.'[70] Now, this *is* true. But I want, in this context, to point to a detail of manner. The materials have all been used, in this work, with such subtle restraint that *their innate suggestion of the third dimension is kept quite subdued, though the whole construction does not seem a flat surface either.* (The first part of this finesse was not so manifest in the adjacent[71] No. 58, Construction II, by the same artist).

(*b*) *Black* 3 (268 : Jeram Patel) :

What the Commissioner here says utterly bewilders me. He admires the work (also) for the 'profound awareness' it embodies 'of growth and development in nature'[72]. Now, I realize that what is profound is not only true, but deep or difficult to get at. But I have failed so completely to blink *the shrunken carcass* that the drawing at once shows, and to find in it *any* real suggestion of growth and development, that I remain unconverted. This detail recalcitrates the reason for the judgment.

(*c*) *Composition* (283 : Anupam Sud) :

To the Commissioner this Composition suggests :

"....the constrictions of claustrophobia and the fractured attempts of humanity to overcome this."[73]

I partly disagree, and once again on the basis of what the work really shows. Some constriction is of course here suggested. But the print is, on the whole, too well lit to generate the impression of a morbid dread of *closed* places; and if we attend, as we should, to the composition as a whole, the constriction in question would seem to relate to the deeper darkness of loneliness. *This* singleness, I believe, is a want of communion—see the figural *estrangement*; and no mere solitariness. It is not numerical, but of spirit —a void on the inside; and our many amusements, the work further shows, are hardly any filling. (I notice that the balls *in* the box only make it seem dark and empty). We could title this work, quite aptly, as 'The Mystery and Melancholy of Loneliness'.[74]

(*d*) The curiously titled, "....", (128 : G. R. Santosh) not only invites, but holds attention, by virtue of its sheer visual quality; and what it suggests follows straight from what it seems—to a patient, watchful eye. Thus, the pivotal oval shape is no

opaque 'lingam' but an orb of light, which reflects—*its own self-completeness.* (The feeble inner shapes are not to be missed). *I* regard the work as a beautiful symbol of the subtle idea that the Spirit is Beauty and a Light self-luminous. One could add : It is free too; for the orb seems suspended, not really put on the pedestals. Yet, it does not seem to hang in a mere void either. For, the propulsive red of the rim framing the orb is deftly held back by the blue of the bigger outer border; and a plane is duly created for the light to illuminate, *but not to rest on.* (I find it difficult to think of a better visualization of the Upanishadic idea that Pure Consciousness illumines, but does not depend on the objective).[75-a]

That, as the Commissioner says, the significance of the work is both 'sensual and supra-sensuous' is perhaps true; but his suggestion that it refers to 'the generative principle (and) embodies also a vision of life forms'[75-b] is more what one may decide to read into the work, than its own direct language.[76] Nor do I here find any 'emanation'[77] symbolized. Both theologically and otherwise, the word means that which issues or proceeds *from* some source. But what one here finds is an oval light just nestling securely within, *not coming out of* the darkness, not even illumin*ing* the latter,—a suggestion that is visibly there in the second painting of the same artist, the adjacent[78] No. 127, which has seemed a superior work to many partly because of its *better* handling of black.

(*e*) *Kali Puja* (112 : A. Ramachandran) :

This too is a painting that grips us with its power and skill. As the Commissioner tells us, the draughtsmanship and composition are both here excellent. The lines that bound the figures have been *made* somewhat fuzzy, so as to match the work's spilling fervour; and the artist almost says so by providing some relief of unmistakable linear clarity, as in drawing the nearer forearms of the two figures that people either end-side.

Nor can one miss the work's inner tensions. I get them thus. The design of the background colours favours, in the middle, a clockwise movement of the eye. By their *vertical* convergence they draw attention to the mid and make it seem central. What is more, the quiet blue strip that tops the garish rear imparts a slight

backward tilt to the upper, richer background; and as we follow, horizontally, the fine line cleaving the yellow from the rest, it may seem *there* collapsible–and possibly upwards, as if tending to sweep off the figures, of which the three larger ones themselves seem somewhat pulled up.

What is here admirable is no ' mere arrangement of figural motifs ',[79] but the creation of such varied forces; and what the whole work images is no ' cold terror '[80] but the hideousness–and, one could *add*, the exhaustion–of sacrificial worship and frenzy. The addition is perhaps warranted by attention to postural *manner*, but I am surer of the other word *hideousness*. *It* includes ugliness, which ' cold terror ' does not. And ' the telling glint '[81] of which the Commissioner speaks—referring, I suppose, to places where the figural pigment looks a little worn off—if taken together with the protrusive, ribbed appearance of the figures generally, and with the raw-hide look of one overidden figure, would itself seem to warrant the word I have chosen.

3. Sometimes, and with this I turn to comment in a word, on the art of *Bangla Desh*, our critics ' remarks provoke aesthetical questions that we are yet to pursue. See, for instance, the following comments on the panel, ' Bangla Desh ' — 70 '[82] by Zainul Abedin :

(*a*) " Zainul Abedin presents a panoramic view of humanity felled."[83]

(*b*) " Curiously, works on *the birthpangs of Bangladesh*— Abedin's big drawing and Aminul Islam's painting with a panel of skulls and bones at the base—*fail to be deeply stirring*."[84]

The first of these is obviously too brief to be helpful. And it is the second one to which I invite attention, confining myself to the work of Abedin. If in saying that it is not ' deeply stirring ', only a fact is being stated, I have nothing to say. But if it is suggested that *because it does not move us deeply, the work is not good art*, a question may at once be put : Is the goodness of art to be judged essentially by considering whether it moves us ?

And now see what the work itself is, and says—and does—to a more intent eye. Its flowing linear manner is demanded by the bloated bodies, and also by the reference that it is a flood-

swept region.[85] It certainly did not move me to tears. But it made me *think* of the tragedy; and, on closer attention, realize its grimness. Its net meassge is that of a stark and lurid, not a howling tragedy. What conveys starkness, or almost stamps it on the eye, is the sheer protrusion of knuckles—of the end-figure on the onlooker's left; and *lurid* is the word for the lustreless light enshrouding the work,—an effect that I attribute, in part, to the artist's imaginative use of chalky lines.

What fills the work is silence, not mere atmosphere. But it is closer to pain than to peace, and may even deeply touch us if we survey the details. I think here of the row of corpses and carcasses —with some infants too, asprawl; and of the two tragic terminii,— the knuckles so bare, and the sole survivor with everything *behind* him, and a dear dead beside, in utter desolation. The briefest pause of fancy at any one of these may well make us grieve. That we do not do so is a compliment to the artist's own austerity.[86]

It *is* a great work. To complain that it is not 'deeply stirring' is merely to forget that the artist here portrays, detachedly, the aftermath of a tragedy.[87]

IV. Criticism and Aesthetics

The context now demands some attention to criticism *and aesthetics*. Some remarks on this aspect of the subject have already been made, though not quite explicitly; and here I choose simply to show how the *conscious* employment of an aesthetical *theory*—rather than the merely *incidental* use of aesthetic *concepts* —can enrich and vivify our response to art. The art I turn to consider is the sculpture of Henry Moore. And the theory that I choose is Langer's well-known view that 'sculpture... is essentially *volume*, not *scene*'; and that sculptural volume includes the surrounding void which the work seems actively to organize, in its own unique way.[88]

The method I suggest can of course be *avoided*. One may rely simply on a concept, aesthetic or generally philosophical. This has in fact been done by a critic, perhaps our most regular writer on painting and sculpture, in his comments on the four original bronzes of Henry Moore exhibited last year at Lalit Kala Akademi, New Delhi :[89]

> "In the sculptures of Henry Moore...one encounters what might be termed *the naked necessity*. (They) are *naked* in the sense that they are simple and artless, that is, they appear to be what they are without affecting a stance or a situation... Our response is...of complete acceptance... Moore('s) proposition (is) that there is a call, and that life grows...only by a response to that call... This (naked) *necessity*...is to voice—in the volumes of the sculptures—the vision of that call...."[90]

The key concept, here, is *naked necessity*. True, it has not been left wholly unexplained. But, my complaint is that even in the complete 'review' to which the extract belongs, there is so little mention of the details of the bronzes that no *insight* is provided into the magic of the art or into Moore's individual manner.

Now, let me 'look' at the bronzes from the viewpoint I have chosen : that is, of sculpture–space relation :

What *distinguishes* the eleven inches' Reclining Figure (done in 1939;[91] No. 1 in the Catalogue)[92] is *its oblong aperture*. It lends life to the figure not only by letting some light, but by inviting the eye to look through it *recessively*, so that the space therein seems to be show*ing* us the inside of the figure. This space, here, is certainly no mere emptiness. It has been so organized that it actively determines our response to, and is really a virtual part of the work.

Of No. 3, too—I mean the seventeen inches long Reclining Figure[93]—I could say something sensible, from the same point of view. The space, here, seems to *meander* in and through the work. As a result, the figure looks ethereal; and, to speak from the other side, *the space here does not merely fill or encompass the work, but seems to carry it aloft*. This effect is very different from what one finds in the case of No. 4, the three quarter figure (bronze : 1961)[94] which merely *fills* space like brute matter; and also from No. 2, the fourteen inches high 'Family Group' (1946) which seems *wrapped in* space.

This Family Group[95] (No. 2) is richer than the other bronzes. I say so because it blends the abstract and the human elements as one :[96]

A measure of emotion is here quite manifest. The man's hands pledge both love and security—to the child that is settled in one, and to its mother assured by the other.[97] There can be no doubt about this, partly because of the distinctness of the man's fingers. The parents, however, do not simply hold the child. They are themselves held as one by the love that they share; and to this semblance of feeling the work's formal features conduce quite directly. Thus, their knees tend to converge, and the effect of being-together gains visibly from the drapery that *enfolds* the mother.

Nor is the inside here any less organized. Close to the end-figures, the space so rounds its own empty form—and so carries attention—that the cavitied bellies do not disturb or arrest the eye; and we merely *sense* the ascesis symbolised.

The heightened protrusion of the (man's) elbows and knees adds to the effect, and the overall suggestion is that the couple have nothing to live by, and to face life with, except their own common love. The polished material too looks not only like flesh, but pared, as it were, to suit the fine sentiment. What is offered, on the whole, is not the mere beauty, but the *power* of expression—a quite clear instance of Moore's own avowed faith that a good work of art is :

> " a penetration into reality, not just...the provision of pleasing shapes..., but an expression of the significance of life, a stimulation to greater effort in living."[98]

V. Our Arts and Aesthetics

This brings us to the last section of the essay : *our arts* and aesthetics.

The need for aesthetical thinking in relation to our arts (and criticism) is, I hope, by now clear. The way to meet this need has also been indicated, though clearly imperfectly.[99] So, here I may simply show, in brief, how deeper attention to our own arts is likely to have a vital bearing on our attitude to the problems, concepts and conclusions of Western aesthetical theory.[100]

Consider just one problem, that of the key aesthetic concept. Mr. Reid chooses *embodiment*, and argues that it is preferable to *expression*. Now, we could here protest thus, on the basis of some well-known features of the music of India :[101]

(*a*) The importance of *alāpa* is to us well known. True, like every other kind of Indian classical music, it too has to conform to a *rāga* or melody-type. But, as rightly contemplated, a good *alāpa* recital is (on the whole) neither 'expressive' nor a mere 'embodiment'. It is rather a kind of musical atmosphere which may seem quite disembodied from the[102] plural details of the *rāga*. What is embodied is *confined to*[103] that which embodies it. Here, on the other hand, what one experiences is a sweet, intense *diffusion*.

I feel implelled, at this point, to make two extra remarks :

First, *alāpa* (at its best) is a good instance of what has been called 'uniform'[104] and shows all the essential features of the sublime.[105]

Secondly, *alāpa* (as we hear it today) does not quite square with the established Indian theory that every *raga*, as a rule, caters for *a* '*rasa*'. To me, it seems truer to speak of the remarkable *effects* of *alāpa*. I say so in the light of my own experience as a listener. The two best *alāpa* recitals I have heard are : one in *gurjari todi* by A. Rahimuddin Khan Dagur[106] which seemed exceptionally sweet, tender, chaste and tranquil; and the other in *soordāsi malhār* by Dagar Brothers—the late Nasir Moinuddin, and Nasir Aminuddin Dagar[107]—which was remarkably deep, spacious, at places awe-inspiring and even sublime. But I could not honestly associate any *one rasa* with either of these recitals.

(*b*) Again, in small, intimate gatherings of knowledgeable listeners—where our artists, as a rule, feel freer to perform—the music does not merely occur 'before' us as a set, predictable movement, but grows directly under the stress of our response to it, which is often quite audible. To say of such music that it *embodies, rather than creates* significance[108] would be only to miss its free, improvisatory character which is here its manifest essence.

(*c*) All this is clearer in the region of our rhythm. Here, a solo recital which is not merely competent but aesthetically good, is one which teems with suggestions of creative freedom and vitality. Thus, some patterns may end a little before, and others slightly after the fixed location of the *sama*, not marking it directly—as is the common requirement—but suggesting it by the very designed quality of avoidance. One *can* speak of the coy, blushing quality

or the ebullient self-assertiveness of such patterns, but as ' forms of feeling ' they do not *directly* appear; and though ' form ' is here suggested by the drummer's very refusal to be correct, the suggestion is—in the aesthetic contemplation of such patterns—throughout subject to our felt awareness of a sweet, *flowing* wilfulness.

Here, too, a side comment may be made—not on ' embodiment ', but on the general relevance of our rhythm to aesthetical thinking on *form*. It is freely admitted that inspired artistic content may well burst, as it were, the bounds of prefixed limits,—heightening, in the process, ' form ' as internal structure.[109] But it is not *so* easy to realize the other half of the matter,—say, the truth that our awareness of ' form ' may be heightened even by the act of falling daintily *short* of the normal stretch, in response to the immanent needs of design.[110] Yet this is exactly what is done by our patterns that are made to end a little before the *sama*.[111]

Even generally—in the execution of any pattern—the drummer may, with guarded abandon and distinct aesthetic gain, shorten or withhold one syllable, or tarry at or displace another against their set speed and location, without of course failing to mark (or suggest) the *sama*. And when the playing quickens, he may unleash a torrent of patterns that climax at the *sama* brilliantly and are made to reach it variously. They are all themselves designed, it is true; and they keep to a measure. But the playing as it seems, directly and on the whole, is an upsurge of the very spirit of creative freedom, a flooding of embankments, as it were; and to speak of it as ' embodied ' meaning would be to interject, quite wrongly, the attitude of analysis—and with it a suggestion of inertness—into the undivided dynamics of actual aesthetic experience. One might as well say of a waterfall that it ' embodies ' a flow or is *embodiment*.

Dept. of Philosophy,
University of Delhi.

S. K. Saxena

NOTES

1. L. A. Reid : *Meaning in the Arts*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1969, 27.

2. See, for instance, Monroe C. Beardsley : *Aesthetics : Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism*, Harcourt, Brace & World Inc., Yew York, 1958.

3. Northrop Frye : *Anatomy of Criticism*, Princeton University, Press, Third Printing, 1973, 3.

4. This is specially important in the region of Hindustani rhythm, where the language of our unlettered *Ustada* is, in respect of its subtler details, quite removed from the way the critics speak of rhythm. As to how such attention can actually help us in understanding the basic concepts of our rhythm, see my article : *The Concept of Laya in Hindustani Music*, Indian Philosophical Quarterly, Poona, January, 1974, 124–143.

5. Reid : *Meaning in Arts*, op. cit., 22.

6. This is the sense chosen by Frye. See his *Anatomy of Criticism*· op. cit., 3.

7. Because of its bias for the general in our talk about art.

8. I accept this central meaning of Mr. Reid's thesis of *embodiment*, though not the way he argues that his chosen word is superior to 'expression'. For the *dis*agreement, see my article : 'Embodiment and the Quest for Key Aesthetic Concepts' in *Contemporary Indian Philosophy* (II), George Allen & Unwin (in Press).

9. Frye : *Anatomy of Criticism*, op. cit., 27.

10. For the view that art belongs 'in the order of making', which is quite different from that of knowing, see Etienne Gilson's *The Arts of the Beautiful*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1965, 9.

11. As to how the character of a work of art is 'organic', see S. K· Langer's *Problems of Art*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1957, 134–35.

12. It *can* be used, but it is not *meant* for any utilitarian purpose. And if we merely use it—say, a small sculpture as a paper weight—we take no notice of its features *as art*.

13. For Beardsley, these are the 'general criteria of artistic goodness', M. C. Beardsley : *The Possibility of Criticism*, Wayne State University Press. Detroit, 1970, 100.

These criteria are surely different from the moral metaphors that Frye wants to keep away : sincereity simplicity, and the like. Frye : *Anatomy of Criticism*, op. cit., 21.

14. Cf. " ....Gratification is aesthetic when it is obtained primarily from attention to the formal unity and/or the regional qualities of a complex whole.... "

Beardsley : *The Aesthetic Point of View*, published in Metaphilosophy, Vol. I, No. 1, January, 1970, 46.

15. Thus, in modern India, the recognition of *Orissi* as a distinct style of classical Indian dance came largely because of the efforts of the late Dr. Charles Fabri, an eminent critic. Again, after long years of comparative neglect, the *dhrupvapada* style of vocal *alapa* has reaffirmed itself partly as a result of the critics' repeated emphasis on its unique aesthetic features.

16. Frye : *Anatomy of Criticism*, op. cit., Essays 2–4.

17. Reid seems to ignore this in his following sweeping utterrance : " For the critic, the pull is towards the work, and this being so, he may forget his linkage with the ideas which lie beyond his work ". Reid *Meaning in the Arts*, op. cit., 36.

18. It is by keeping this in mind that we are able to avoid the emptiness of *a priori* aesthetics. *Ibid.*

19. I entirely subscribe to the view that philosophy cannot " talk relevant sense about 'art' without first-hand, discriminating experiences of works of art." *Ibid* 21.

20. Though not all of them in India. I have Moore's bronzes in mind as I soften my statement. To *them* I turn in Section IV of this essay.

21. Reid : *Meaning in the Arts*, op. cit., 27.

22. The classical dance of *North* India.

23. A *rāga* or melody-type.

24. In Kathak dance, *ang* means bodily bearing, generally.

25. Link, New Delhi, 3–12–'67, 40.

26. The Hindustan Times, New Delhi, 15–2–'69, by Prof. Mohan Khokar, noted for his comprehensive knowledge of Indian dance generally.

27. The late Dr. Charles Fabri writing in The Statesman, New Delhi of 18–4–'64.

It may be that my protest applies only to the *extract* cited, and not to the total review.

28. Frye : *Anatomy of Criticism*, op cit., 27.

29. *Layakāri* means rhythmic manipulation.

30. S. K. Saxena : *The Role of Rhythm in Kathak*, Marg, Bombay, September, 1959, 48.

In a general way, this definition is true; but it is obviously not easy to follow.

31. S. K. Saxena : *Aesthetic of Hindustani Music*, Sangit Natak, Journal of the Sangit Natak Akademi, New Delhi, April–June 1973, 12.

For the details of how I reach this definition through linguistic analysis see my article : *The Concept of Laya in Hindustani Music*, op. cit.

32. It is of course aesthetical *too*. My suggestion here simply is that there are certain problems which are common to aesthetics and criticism of the basic kind.

33. Herbert Read : " A Definition of Art ', in *Aesthetic and the Arts*, edited by L. A. Jacobus, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1968, 4.

34. The grammatical function of mnenomic syllables or *bols*—like *ta*, *dha*, *dir*, *dir*—is to enable us to identify the different sounds produced by the drums when their particular (skin-covered) parts are struck in specific ways.

35. *Tādātmya* is imaginative self-identification with the essence of the other.

36. An *āmad* is, quite generally, a well-designed access to the *sama* the focal point of the rhythm-cycle. The ability to reach the *sama* beautifully, and with split-second accuracy is, I may add, an important criterion by which we judge the excellence of a rhythmic recital.

37. Whatever I now set out to say about *sama* is part of a paper submitted to Sangit Natak Akademi, New Delhi.

38. Here, I must at once make a distinction. As played on the drum or as merely spoken, *sama* is at once a *bol*. But, this is *not necessary* when we mark the ' sama ' merely in the mind. *There*, one is *not bound to speak* the sama-syllable : the marking may occur as an extremely light and merely ideal pecking.

39. In many cases, but not in all. A *sthāyi* or rhythmic pattern may take off from any *matra*. But when we indicate the character of a rhythm-cycle we begin from the *sama*. As for ' returning ', one may end the patterning *before khāli* from where the *āmad* may build up its access to the *sama*.

40. This happens when a simple *drut sthāyi* or *gat* is presented repeatedly.

41. For instance, when the main peformer is weaving a specially intricate pattern, the *tabla* accompanist may try to be of help by playing the *sama* and the approach to it specially clearly.

42. Assuming that *they* are being played, and not the simple cycle.

43. This, however, is only half the truth. For, laya too determines the proper location of *sama*.

44. Cf. S. K. Langer : *Feeling and Form*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, Third Impression, 1963, 31.

45. The relation here—though also one of perceptual difference, if the *mātrās* be regarded as *bols*—is basically an is interval of time.

46. I say, ' in part ', advisedly. For, besides *sama*, there are many other factors which ensure articulation in rhythm. What is articulate is (also) clear. *Clarity*, in turn, presupposes the right technique of executing *bols*; and their proper arrangement in relation to one another, for *any* two *bols* cannot be played close and properly. It also forbids *very* quick playing.

47. As in merely listening correctly to a rhythmic recital.

48. We cannot truly say : it *is* even. It is continually *kept* thus, though not necessarily with *conscious* effort.

49. To this general statement, *alāpa* is a clear exception. *Alāpa* is effective singing (and playing) without rhythmic accompaniment and language.

50. A melody-type, a kind of *todi*.

51. S. K. Saxena : *Music Criticism—Nature and Norms*, The Hindustan Times, New Delhi, 15.8.'56.

The citation is a slightly modified form of the original.

52. *Jugalbandi* is the Hindustani word for a duet.

53. S. K. Saxena : *Essentials of Hindustani Music*, Diogene, 45, Paris, 1964, 24. This quotation too deviates, at places, from as it was first written.

54. *My* concern, here, is only with the internal nature of the ' criticism ' being quoted, not with its aptness to the recital in question.

55. Skilful playing of the basic composition on a musical instrument.

56. First line of the song.

57. The Hindustan Times, New Delhi, 14–8–'55.

58. For any attempt to fix the meanings of concepts like *rāga, alāpa, sama* and *bandish*, see my article : *Aesthetics of Hindustani Music*, op. cit., 6–20.

59. This language itself, we may note, shows differences of idiom. Thus, whereas Chand Khan, the *khyaliyā*, speaks of the *rishab* in *rāga puriyā* as a *zarrā* (or *kan*) the alapiyā, A Rahimuddin Khan Daguar calls the same note *lajjit*, that is, coy, not assertive.

60. Fryre : *Anatomy of Criticism*, op. cit., 6, My emphasis, here, is on ' grow '.

61. In my essay, *The Fabric of Aamad : A Study of Form and Flow in Hindustani Music*, Sangit Natak, 16, April–June, 1970.

62. This remark, I gratefully recall, was made by Ustad Chand Khan, the well-knwon vocalist of the Delhi *gharānā*, during the course of a casual conversation with me, in 1950. As I here put it, it is almost a literal translation of the original remark.

63. All these features were illustrated *individually* in terms of regular compositions at a Seminar on ' Science and Music ' organized by the Sangit Natak Akademi, New Delhi, in 1970, in the morning Session of March 28. The ' compositions ' are now a part of the Akademi tape recordings, 742–748.

64. *The Fabric of Aamad*, op. cit., 39–40.

65. Sir Herbert Read's ' Critical Appreciation ' in *Vermeer* (The Masters, 2), Knowledge Publications, Purnell & Sons Ltd., Paulton, Nr. Bristol, 1965, 6.

66. The Statesman, New Delhi, 1–11–'75.

67. Wherever I speak of the Commissioner, the reference is to his comments on the award-winning works contained in the brochure : ' National Exhibition of Art 1973 ' brought out, for the occasion, by Lalit Kala Akademi, New Delhi. And what I set out to question, by and large, is not the choice of some works *in preference to the others*, but the way they are *interpreted* in the brochure in question, hereafter referred to as : *The brochure*.

68. Probably because of the limited space he could use.

69. In doing so, my purpose is simply an academic one,—that of showing how important it is to note the details of the works; and how if this requirement is met, the choice of apt words is facilitated.

70. *The brochure.*

71. *Adjacent* as placed in the Exhibition.

72. *The brochure.*

73. *Ibid.*

74. I may add that I was here reminded of Chirico's : ' The Mystery and Melancholy of a Street '. I attribute no borrowing to Miss Anupam; but what put me in tune with her work has certainly been the art of Chirico with its well-known emphases on the mystery of solitude and our recurring emptiness; and on the rapid obsoloscence of our everyday interests. And it struck me that Chirico's painting in question shows a girl with a hoop; and that hoop—croquet—*balls* is an easy mental glide.

75.a But I do not insist on this meaning.

75.b *The brochure.*

76. At this point, the artist himself agrees with me, but *I* here go on by what I find in the work itself.

77. *The brochure.*

78. *Adjacent*, again, in the Exhibition.

79. *The brochure.*

80. *The brochure.*

81. *The brochure.*

82. This was No. 3 at the *Exhibition of Contemporary Arts of Bangla Desh* held at Lalit Kala Akademi, New Delhi, from Nov. 22 to 29,'73.

83. The Sunday Statesman, 25–11–'73.

84. K. C. : 'Abstracts from Bangla Desh', The Hindustan Times, New Delhi, 29–11–'73. My emphases.

85. The theme of this work is not the birthpangs of Bangla Desh, but the flood that devastated the land in 1970.

86. It is noteworthy that the panel does not show any face expressive of sorrow.

87. Cf. " ....The lack of emotional involvement in Lycidas has been thought by some, including Johnson, to be a failure in that poem, but surely the correct conclusion is that Lycidas, like Samson Agonistes, should be read in terms of catharsis with all passion spent."

Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, op. cit., 67.

88. S. K. Langer : *Feeling and Form*, op. cit., 88–9.

Notice may here be taken also of *Moore*'s own view that the sculptor, as an artist, is concerned essentially with 'masses of varied size....cncesived conceived *in their air-surrounded entirety*, stressing and straining, thursting and opposing each other in *spatial relationship*'.

Henry Moore : Vol. One—Sculptures and Drawings, 1921–48, (edited by Percy Lund), Humphrites & Co., London. My emphases. This, and the following citations from this work, all are from pp. XXX–XXXI of the book.

89. The reference is to the exhibition of Henry Moore's works—including 68 photographs of his sculptures—held at Rabindra Bhawan, New Delhi, from Dec. 6 to 15, '73, under the joint auspices of the The British Council and Lalit Kala Akademi.

90. 'R. L. B.' writing in Thought (Delhi) of 22–12–'73; 20. My emphases.

91. Bronze cast of lead original in the Victoria and Albert Museum London. Collection : British Council, London.

92. Distributed to those who visited the Exhibition.

93. Done in 1950. Bronze maquette for Reclining Figure 1951 (76 ins. long) commissioned for the 1951 Festival of Britain. Collection : The Artist, Much Hadham Herts.

94. 15 ins. high Bronze (Edition of 9) Collection : Miss Mary Moore, London.

This Bronze, No. 4, looks clearly brutal, and it is merely *in* space; which suggests the interesting idea that, as a general requirement, we should perhaps expect a sculpture to be *rightly related to (its) space rather than to give a specific shape to empty space.*

95. Bronze maquette for Family Group 1949 (60 ins. high) in bronze commissioned for the Barclay School, Stevenage. Collection : British Council, London.

96. Moore himself insists that " if both abstract and human elements are welded together in a work, it must have a fuller and deeper meaning."

Henry Moore : Vol. One, op. cit.

97. The one resting on the mother's shoulder.

98. *Henry Moore : Vol. One*, op. cit.

99. So far as our music is concerned, a summary account of the main aesthetical problems relating to it has already been attempted in my article : *Aesthetics of Hindustani Music*, op. cit.

Elsewhere, I have indicated how a specific aesthetic problem may be discussed in the context of a single Indian art. See, for instance, my essay : *Form and Content in Hindustani Rhythm*, Sangit Natak, 18, Oct.–Dec.,' 70, 5–19.

100. At least one clear point, in this direction, has already been made: I mean, the possibility of questioning Read's argument as to the (possible) supremacy of music, on the basis of the evidence of our rhythm.

101. What follows is a slightly altered version of some parts of my article : *Embodiment and the Quest for Key Aesthetic Concepts*, cit. op.

102. Though not *opposed to*.

103. Confined not inextricably, but originally, so that its release or unravelling is a *subsequent* matter.

104. Bernard Bosanquet : *A History of Aesthetic*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1956, reprint, 276.

105. The neglect of the *Sublime*, in present day aesthetics, surprises me. Literary critics certainly do not hesitate to use the word (See : Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism*, op. cit., 66) and when philosophers give so much attention to the Janus-word ' good ' there is no reason why they should ignoer the Sublime.

106. Radio Sangit Sammelan, New Delhi, 1956.

107. In Vishnudigambar Jayanti, New Delhi, 1957.

108. I guess it is exigencies such as these—though probably not exactly this one—that compel Mr. Reid to add ' creative ' to *embodiment*. His total formula is : *Creative aesthetic embodiment*.

109. Thus, see : " Form does not lie simply in the correct observance of rules. It lies in the struggle of certain living material to achieve itself within a pattern. The very refusal of a poet to sacrifice what he means to a perfectly correct rhyme, for example, can more powerfully suggest the rhyme than correctness itself would ". Stephen Spender : *World Within World*, Hamilton, London, 313–14.

110. But I think here of a practice of Rodin. Once he had succeeded in finding the exact movement or expression in a figure or bust, he would often stop and leave, say, the hands and feet unfinished—without detracting from the seeming self-completeness of the works as contemplated.

111. Such rhythmic patterns are called *anāgat*.