

# Kant on Aesthetic of the Beautiful

Mubasher Mehdi

Govt. Emerson College Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.

**Abstract**— *The theory of aesthetic and beauty is very old. It includes taste and principles of pleasure and displeasure as well. But it is tied with the theory of arts and nature and function of art also. The beauty or appreciation of beauty, the aesthetic and its concept, is also related to the age old precepts of subjectivity and objectivity also. In even ugliness, can we see the elements of beauty? Basically beauty is pattern or structure. In most ugly creatures like lizards and cockroaches, we can trace the beauty, regarding the theory, that, pattern is in essence, the beauty. If structure and pattern is beauty, then how the sublimity is achieved, which directs the pleasure principle in watching a pattern? So, it becomes well established that an object of beauty must create attraction and appeal to the senses. Here, it could be easily discerned, that there are certain things, which are beautiful and others not beautiful. Definitely, this leads to a broader and generalized concept of beauty, which enlarges it to a theory of aesthetic, which is appreciation of beauty, and includes the effects of beauty, pertaining to pleasure or displeasure. The theory of aesthetic also includes the analysis of arts as well. As every art has an effect on senses, which lies in the paradigm of cognition and intuition, and romance in the broader sense of "Romantic". The term "Romantic" could be well said at least about the nature of one sublime art, the poetry; whose romantic aspects create a deep impact on minds of the people. From the Romantic here is meant the poetry like of Wordsworth, Keats, Shelley and Coleridge. In other genres of literature, we can say, the novels of Hugo, as Romantic. The aesthetic and aesthetes have been attracting the people throughout the history. In defining the aesthetic, there is the interplay of taste as well. This taste phenomenon has multiple aspects. It could be from developing the inventions, to the development of culture, and recently the development of highly precision oriented weapons, though which is the more matter of business, but also a form of taste also. The "aesthetic" is also conjoined with the concept, that how it develops or grow. By this is meant that whether in a free state, it flourishes; whereby questioning individual liberty, in the ancient or modern sense, and also along with it, this becomes imperative to the modern state structure, human rights, and havoc brought by war. In this era these*

*questions are fundamental to the appreciation of aesthetic.*

**Keywords**— *Art, beauty, cognition, intuition, taste.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the commentary on Rousseau's most influential work, "Emile" it is described that "One fine summer's day in 1749, a solitary walker on the road from Paris to Vicennes, had as the story goes, a vision.

The solitary walker was Jean Jacques Rousseau. The vision occurred as he read a newspaper advertisement about an Essay Contest sponsored by the Academy of Dijon. The subject proposed for the essay was "Has the restoration of the sciences and arts tend to purify morals? "From the moment I read these words, Rousseau later wrote," I beheld another world and became another man". He entered the competition, and his essay won first prize. In his discourse he took the negative side, or, as he expressed it, the side" which becomes an honest man who is sensible of his own ignorance, and thinks himself none the worse for it" (Perkinson, 1980:128).

In the same commentary it is said that, "Progress in arts and sciences, Rousseau argued, has added nothing to our real happiness, has corrupted our morals and vitiated our taste" (Perkinson, 1980:128, 129)

### *Newton and Naturalism*

Before Rousseau, Newton and his laws brought a considerable change in the perception of human mind and the society created by human beings. The Newtonian laws are natural laws, which have presence in nature. The third fundamental law of Newton is "Action and reaction are equal but opposite". This brought a different view about the movement of History. The law in its essence being dialectical poses that history and its course is successive. Every action in "history" has a counter reaction, or every event has a specific opposite event. In this way history moves forward in intervals and intermittently.

As any event in history has a considerable opposite event, the dimension of history could be termed as there are certain stages in history, and which if had passed, never come again.

The Newtonian laws have basis in Galileo's precepts. As

Galileo's thought was different from the physics of Aristotle, taught in church, therefore Galileo had to suffer at the hands of the church. But Newton's laws were accepted as they had no contradiction towards Church. And moreover, after Henry VIII, the powers of Church were also not the same as in the times of Galileo.

The Newtonian laws are simple and have a ground in nature; therefore, they formed the naturalistic philosophy, of which one of the proponents is, Rousseau. Rousseau in the above mentioned quotation negates the modern format of sciences and arts, and considers it to be fatal to the most fundamental concern of every philosophy, the development of ethics and morals. He sees that only by getting closed to nature, we can find peace, solace, freedom and happiness.

### ***Rousseau and concept of free society***

The notions of peace, freedom and happiness are closely related to each other. According to Rousseau, sensibility lies in awareness of ignorance, the human Instincts and impulses, could only be satisfied in a free society.

If freedom is achieved, it makes explicit, the satisfaction of human instincts and by their satisfaction, happiness, is also achieved. The question to derive happiness is then related to the principles of delight and pleasure.

In other words if we are able to form a free society, our desires and wants have a balance, and also that did not take us to anarchy, which is an ugly and hotch potch condition. Moreover, in the development of a free society, the morality or morals are not lost. By the presence of morals, the degeneration of society does not occur, but a state of equilibrium prevails. This very balance and proportionate state, refers to happiness, delight and pleasure, which are embodied in the larger paradigm of the appreciation of aesthetic or aesthetic itself.

The present state of the world which is heading to worst anarchy is due to the loss of that very equilibrium, because still free societies are absent around the globe.

### ***Aristotle on nature and function of Art***

Before commenting on the present chaos around the world, see what, Aristotle says about the appreciation of aesthetic and the function of art. Commenting on Aristotle's "Poetics" (Gassner, 1951:XXXVII) says "Half a century earlier, an introduction to a combined edition of Aristotle's "Poetics" and S.H. Butcher's notable commentary would have been unnecessary. Today, however, Aristotle's thoughts on art are apt to seem remote to the general reader and disputable to critics".

This is twentieth century, criticism on Aristotle's theory of

art. This shows the importance of his early work in the domain of giving critical theory about art, aesthetics and esthetes. This places Aristotle at a very high stature in even modern critical thought about art. The work of Aristotle is unique in its perspective and is still unparalleled in the history of arts in general and in literature in particular.

Viewing "Poetics" generally as a work on art, Gassner (1951:XL) points out "Still, it is one of the marks of the comprehensive Greek mind that the practical involves the ideal. By viewing art in terms of its effects, Aristotle places humanity squarely in the center of his esthetics. He makes humanistic values paramount from the beginning by asking right or at least, the current, modern question of how the artist can please men.

Certain things are suggested from the above views about Aristotle's theory of art and artist. Aristotle places humanity at the center of esthetics. This means that there should be a balance and proportion. This also means the method to appreciate the beauty in itself. Other thing, which is inferred from it is, that following proportion or balance, the morality of rightness should not be ignored. This is the imperative question and every age has its own answer, according to the independent course of history, which determines the human values of rightness. But more important suggestion in the above criticism is about how art and artist can please men.

This is the fundamental question about the function and effects of arts. This poses another question, what is tradition and what is change?

### ***Notion of Globalization***

The modern society is facing globalization. This is the age where computer, CDS, television and other several modern instruments have changed and replaced the old methods of almost all the arts, from music to dance, theater and poetry. Every dying age with its tradition tries to assert and impose its effects on the following and coming age. It is similar in arts and artistic pleasure, disseminated to the people. The audience has changed due to the interference of machines, and specially in this second decade of twenty first century, hastily the things are changing due to the advent of rapid development of modern machines, which are even used in the performance of performing arts, a chief delight for people, and the matter of book is also now questionable, as this age demands quick retention of and display of everything. Though novel is still written but its length has been considerably reduced, if compared with the novels of Nineteenth Century and Twentieth Century by Hardy, Dickens and Lawrence. The film is replacing the novels but

still it is read as the book reading generation is still there.

### **Traditional and modern approach towards art**

But the traditionalist approach or the maintenance of tradition is also there right in the middle of the modern art and artist who becomes global by using different modern tools. This shows that tradition of arts and novelty of arts goes together. Whereby the subject of poetry has changed by the poetry of people like Jack Kerouac (San Francisco Blues) and Arthur Rimbaud's remarkable poem (A Season in Hell) which have described the modern trauma. The case of poetry is not the only one where the audience is appeased by the notions propagated earlier by Aristotle regarding tragic effects and their sublimity in people, every art has got a new audience which is under the suppressive havoc of war and anarchy. The poetry of sixties as by Sylvia Plath and Frost may have relevance today, but the term used social media, collectively for modern transmission of information and arts, has drastically affected the modern mind.

But even today in the presence of modern guitarists, and singers the voice of Lata, Phill Collins, Madona's (Bed time stories) Hoffman's Comic roles, Ravi Shankar beats of Sitar, Misry Khan's Alghoza, Beethoven's Sunata and Rembrandt's and Chughtai's miniatures, haunt and become a panacea. This means that past fuses in future, and tradition and modernity move side by side". This leads us to the notion of classic or true art in art.

### **Idea of classic**

The question of classic or true art is conjoined with the concept of sublimity in art According to (Gassner, 1951: XLI) elaborating the question of true art, Aristotle says, "True art is akin to philosophy in arising at general truth and co-ordinating the data of existence".

### **Aristotle on function of art**

Further (Gassner, 1951: XLI) points out that, "actually Aristotle says it is actually more philosophic than history." Art according to Aristotle is order, where, to the inartistic or unphilosophical observer, life is only a whirl of action and a chaos of emotion. Aristotle considers in literature, the tragedy as the highest form, and its writer creates a logical sequence and a causal connection of events. The crude matter of life assumes significance from the shaping hand of the artist. The Aristotle's theory of poetry in view of Gassner (1951: XLVII) has affected writers as Ben Jonson, Milton, Dryden, and Lessing, Goethe and among other luminaries of the literary world (Gassner, 1951: XLVII)

cites the example of recent dramatists as Maxwell and Miller. Miller, (Gassner, 1951, XLVII, XLVIII) says, being so closed to contemporary social world scene in "Death of a Salesman" followed the practice of Aristotle by making his hero possessing a high stature.

Gassner (1951: LV) further explores the notions of Aristotelian concepts and says that, Aristotle has before him the examples of Odyssey and Iliad. He considered epic poetry at a higher stature. It is also maintained by Gassner that if Aristotle has before him, King Lear, Hamlet and Antony and Cleopatra, his views would have been different about epic poetry and drama. Moreover, novel according to Gassner now is a new Kind of epic; but this is questionable as we have still examples of writing long poems, as written by Walt Whitman, "Leaves of Grass".

Aristotle as Butcher's translation of "Poetics" depicts, says that epic poetry and Tragedy, Comedy and Dithyrambic, music of the flute or lyre, or dance, are all "imitation". But they differ in three respects: The medium, the objects, the manner or mode. This is the most distinctive aspect of all the arts (Butcher, 1951: 7)

In Aristotle (Butcher) defining the arts, dance is the fusion of language and gestures of body. It may be appealing to the infants as well, but as we distinguish history from poetry, same is the case of mature music, dance and poetry. He is of the view that the store-house of poetry may be the legends of the past, but it is description or representation of the universal through particular. It is not inductive or empirical. It is not "what has happened" in history, but it is "what may happen" (Butcher, 1951: 163).

Citing the example of the Herodotus, Aristotle places the comments that it could be versified, but even then it will remain factual. In poetry, the facts are transcended. It must be "What ought to be" in other words. Defining a fine line between philosophy and poetry he links that philosophy discovers the universal from particular, but poetry represents the universal form particular. And herein lies the sublimity of the poetic art, which following the law of "Probability" and "Necessity", being creative though fictive as well, and here he gives example of Homer's characters being superb than ordinary men. Discussing the theory of "Fine Arts and the end" (Butcher, 1951: 160) expounded by Aristotle, the chief end of artist, art or poetry; being sublime or the finest of all arts, as massively still appealing to the senses, as in ancient times, Aristotle is truly modern like Hegel and in his theory, he is seen "Becoming not Being". As it is now well established that arts' function is to give delight and also to the senses, but it must not be of inferior rank but sublime. To the end in itself is not separated from

the object itself.

The appreciation of beauty or aesthetic has a reference with Platonic and Aristotelian concept of "imitation". Aristotle, it must be premised at the outset, has not dealt with fine art in any separate treatise, he has formulated no theory of it, and he has not marked the organic relations of the arts to one another. Further, while his love of logical distinctions, his tendency to rigid demarcation, is shown even in the province of literary criticism by the care with which in the "Poetics" he maps out the subordinate divisions of his subject (the different modes of recognition, the elements of the plot, etc), yet he nowhere classifies the various kinds of poetry, still less has he given a scientific grouping of the fine arts and exhibited there specific differences. But from his writings several aesthetic related questions have been answered. (Butcher, 1951, p.113)

According to Butcher, Aristotle was the first one to do distinction between fine art and useful. Butcher says: "In the history of Greek art we are struck rather by the union between the two forms of art and that by their independence. It was as a loss for art when the spheres of use and beauty came in practice to be dis severed, when the useful object ceased to be decorative, and the things of common life no longer gave delight to the maker and to the user". The theoretic distinction between fine and useful art needed to be laid down, and to Aristotle we owe the first clear conception of fine arts as a free and independent activity of the mind, outside the domain from that of education or moral improvement (Butcher, 1951:115).

### ***Aristotle's Doctrine of Art***

"Art imitates nature", says Aristotle, and the phrase has been repeated and has passed current as a summary of the Aristotelian doctrine of art. Yet the original saying was not ever intended to differentiate between fine and useful art, nor indeed could it possibly bear the sense that fine art is a copy or reproduction of natural, objects. The use of term "nature" matter beyond dispute and for nature in Aristotle's view is not the outward world of created things; it is the creative force, the productive principle of the universe. The context in each case where the phrase occurs, determines its precise application. In the "Physics" the point of the comparison is that alike in art and the nature there is the union of matter with constitutive form and that the Knowledge of both elements is requisite for the natural philosopher as for the physician and the architect. Moreover, art in its widest acceptation has, like nature, certain, ends in view, and in the adaptation of means to ends catches hints from nature that is already in some sort an

unconscious artist. (Butcher, 1951:117)

If we consider this notion, that nature is the creative and productive force and the principle of the universe, then it means, artist imitating nature is the part of the very significant macrocosm, and then presenting art he is depicting a greater reality and he is also describing or enacting significance. But in this world in which we are living, people like Jacques Derrida; proposing the theory of deconstruction says, that as the world has lost the axis or central point by becoming unipolar, meaninglessness and insignificance has become our fate. Though this is a serious question of "literary theory of today" and it is being answered in the form of the theory as well, but we can very well see that the hallmarks and land marks of our present civilization have been devastated. The several notions of our present civilization have been demolished, because we have entered into a worst chaos, anarchy and war. These notions of our civilization have degenerated, which means that in the present day civilization there was something inherently wrong and this takes us back again to view Aristotle, Plato and also thinkers and naturalist philosophers like Rousseau and Kant. This will enable us to locate destructive constituent of our civilization and also we would find and perceive that whether the over-powering issue of being highly scientific, and thereby making several intelligent machines and inventions, where we stand. Moreover, the philosophy of past, like of Aristotle, Plato and Kant, Hegel, and Rousseau, could lead us to change our perceptions.

### ***Fine art and Peace***

The discussion of fine art and its ends is more significant now than ever. Because only it, and only it is the way from where we can propagate peace, and the fine art as we have seen in the above discussion, touching and brewing itself to attain the status of philosophy or thereby becoming highly and delicately classical inform though even remaining modern in content.

### ***Aristotle Again***

As we have furnished that the question of fine arts, aesthetic and appreciation of beauty, are very valuable things for our present day civilization, we again shift our attention to or once again to Aristotle, because that is the first leading source of these very concepts

While art in general imitates the method of nature, the phrase has a special reference to useful art, which learns from nature the precise end at which to aim. In the selection of the end she acts with infallible instinct, and her endeavor

to attain it is on the whole successful. But at times she makes mistakes as indeed do the schoolmaster and the physician, failures rather than mistakes they should be called, for the fault is not here, her rational intention is liable to be frustrated by inherent flaws in the substances with which she is compelled to work. She is subject to limitations, and can only make the best of her material. These are the comments of Butcher (1951:117) on the imitative concept of art by Aristotle.

From it at least we can gather a suggestion that man has to be closed to nature and specially the artist, in order to produce the original work of art. And it is true.

since primitive times, till now; nature has been guiding the man and artist, and also a scientist sometimes or in essential, following the course of nature; and scientist in this domain becomes artist, as the guiding principle is the same and along with the utilization of the material, the source, being called as the nature. Our Pakistani modern poet "Allama Iqbal" in one of his poems says:

Tu Shab Afridee, Charagh Arfidum, Safal Aridee, Ayagh  
Afridum, That is "ye made night, I made lamp, Ye made  
earthen cup,  
I made goblet,

### ***Man, nature and Peace***

Elaborating the designs of nature, commenting on Aristotle's concept (Butcher, 1951:118) says: The higher we ascend in the scale of being, the more does nature need assistance in carrying out her designs. Man, who is her higher creation, she brings into the world more helpless than any other animal unshod, unclad, unarmed. But in his seeming imperfection lies man's superiority, for the fewer the finished appliances with which he is provided, the greater is his need for intellectual effort. By means of the rational faculty of art, with which nature has endowed him richly, he is able to come to her aid, and in ministering to his own necessities to fulfill her completed purpose. Where from any cause nature fails, art steps in.

This is a very overwhelming and a very substantial concept of art-as we know that the same faculty of mind is involved within the work of scientist and artist, so on both of them, then also lies the responsibility, as being the imitator of nature, they must not be destructive. As they are the vanguard of any human society, this responsibility increases ever the more. The discovery of penicillin and invention of dynamite have underlying the same quest of scientific inquiry and also of chance playing its definite role in these discoveries, but the affect of both is very different. This poses a question. The question is not of discovery, but its

use after being discovered and invented. Einstein became the highest proponent of using atomic energy for the peaceful activities. But it's wrong, world is not driven by scientists or artists, but rulers with a different psychology of the flair of power. Why we become or a man as a ruler become destructive? This is a question spanned over history of mankind. To think about total peace is considered to be idealism, and an illusion. And illusion and reality, work side by side. It seems that man is in still an initial phase of learning from nature, but has attained a power and a displeasing one, which also has its basis in being guided by nature, but the scientists and artists of today seem to be disheartened by the fierce use of weapons by the man, though which also are a kind of his achievements in furthering his processes of civilization. Peace seems to be a far cry. But definitely, in its inherent capacity, the war on this present globe of today is feverishly also creating a need for peace and harmony.

The appreciation of beauty is also a relative question. For a certain martial man gun is the center of attraction and for some other man, the smile of Mona Lisa, and reading "Hamlet" is more important. Though we can say that at certain scale their centers of attraction may have a same frame or working of mind, but then here comes the question, how we can nurture the principle of creating art and thereby creating a mindset to negate the attraction of gun. This is the question of this global world now, where we are living. It is an ironical fact that Lady Diana was and is considered as the symbol of peace, liberty and love, but her son, Prince William fought and command the army in Afghanistan. Whereas he should have arranged a march of peace, he performed his duty of Prince, commanding a war, which to him may have seemed, more substantial.

### ***War and Appreciation of beauty***

The appreciation of beauty and the propagation of the appreciation of beauty must be done passionately. By the appreciation of beauty or aesthetic, we can solve the problem of war or at least make its intensity a bit less. The aesthetic of beauty or the perception of beauty, in terms of art and art in general is our focal point of discussion. Again shifting our attention towards it and also penning down some issues related to it and the modern world as we also have to explore about the notion of the art of weaponry as a taste, so after a relevant digression, we go back to Aristotle. Butcher (1951:121) in his commentary on "Poetics" says: The term "Fine art" is not the one that has been transmitted to us from the Greeks. Their phrase was the imitative arts, modes of imitation" or sometimes the "liberal arts".

**Imitation and Aristotle**

“Imitation” as the common characteristic of the fine arts, including poetry, was not originated by Aristotle. In literature the phrase in this application first occurs in Plato, thought not improbably, it may have been already current in popular speech as marking the antithesis between fine art and industrial production. The idea of imitation is connected in our minds with a want of creative freedom, with a literal or servile copying: and the word, as transmitted from Plato to Aristotle, was already tinged by some such disparaging associations” (Butcher, 1951:121).

Elaborating and commenting further on the concept of “imitation” Butcher says: Here lies the explanation of the somewhat startling phrase used in the „Poetics”, Ch.ii, that men in action, are the objects imitated by the fine arts:- by all and not merely by dramatic or narrative poetry where action is more obviously represented. Everything that expresses the mental life, that reveals a rational personality, will, fall within this larger sense of „action”. These actions may not be over a period of time but they may be only for a moment (Butcher, 1951:123). This could be then inferred that macrocosm or external world had no place in Aristotelian design of fine arts.

Aristotle based his practicing principles of fine arts on Greek dramatists and poets. For these dramatists and poets the external world had a value as a background for their work of art. Therefore, the imitation nearly could be defined as a likeness or reproduction of an original and not a symbolic representation. Regarding the sensuous perception of the objects, they are the impression on the mind like that of a signet ring, and the picture so engraven on the memory is compared to a portrait. Thus the creations of art are, as it were, pictures which exist for the „phantasy” (Butcher, 1951:125).

Discussing the image-forming faculty, by which we can recall at will pictures previously presented to the mind and may even accomplish some of the processes of thought. It represents subjectively all the particular concrete objects perceived by the external senses. From these „phantasms” or representations of the imagination, the intellect abstracts its ideas or universal concepts. Without the imagination the intellect cannot work through lack of matter. The idea, therefore, which is purely intellectual, implies and contains in itself whatever is universal, that intelligible, in the object of sense. (Butcher, 1951: 126)

**Road of Senses and art**

This means that food for thought is derived from senses.

Through senses we can develop imagination. Without imagination, we cannot generate intellect and art. Here, is also the place for phantasy as well. As phantasy is part of imagination, therefore art is conjoined with it. Though only imagination does not produce art, because imagination is an impression of senses and it must be then wrought in mind through the process of thought. In other words, imagination derives its working ground from senses and senses are then the sources of impression and these impressions after passing through thought processes, though which may be in the medium of language, as in case of sublime poetry or dramatics. As the medium in music and dance is different, in case of impact or affect, great art plays the same role.

Now the work of art is as it appears to senses. Art addresses itself not to the abstract reason but to the sensibility and image-making faculty; it is concerned with outward appearances; it employs illusions; its world is not that which is revealed by pure thought; it sees truth, but in its concrete manifestations, not as an abstract idea. Art does not attempt to embody the objective reality of things, but only their sensible appearances. Indeed by the very principles of Aristotle’s philosophy it can present no more than a semblance for it impresses the artistic form upon a matter which is not proper to that form. Thus it severs itself from material reality and corresponding wants the real emotions, the positive needs of life, have always in them some element of disquiet. By the union of a form with a matter which in the world of experience is alien to it a magical effect is wrought (Butcher, 1951:127).

**Music and Aristotle**

Music also has a special reference in Aristotelian theory of arts. He sees in it the architecture of the soul.

According to him it bears something highly moral and ethical. As before him was his own choruses and lyrical music, he saw in music, everything from courage, temperance and mildness to anger. And all these feelings were directed by rhythm. In the Problems” we find it said, Melody even apart from words has an ethical quality” (Butcher, 1951:131).

**Finer arts and Aristotle**

Painting and sculpture working through an inert material cannot indeed reproduce the life of the soul in all its variety and successive manifestations. In their frozen and arrested movement they fix eternally the feeling they portray. A single typical moment is seized and becomes representative of all that precedes or follows. Still shape and line and color even here retain something of their significance, they are in

their own degree a natural image of the mind, and their meaning is helped out by symmetry, which in the arts of repose answers to rhythm, the chief vehicle of expression in the arts of movement (Butcher, 1951: 135).

Even dancing, we read in the "Poetics", imitates character, emotion, action. The expressive power of dancing, admitted by Aristotle and by all Greek tradition, receives its most instructive commentary in Lucian's pamphlet on the subject, which when due allowance is made for exaggeration and the playful gravity so characteristic of the writer, is still inspired by an old Greek sentiment. Rhetoricians and musicians had already written treatises on the art, and Lucian in handling the same theme imitates their sense-philosophic manner. Dancing is placed in the front rank of the fine arts, and all the sciences are made contributory to it. The dancer must have a fine genius, a critical judgment of poetry, a ready and comprehensive memory, like Homer's Caches he must know the past, the present and the future. Above all he needs to have mastered all mythology from chaos and the origin of the universe down to Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, and to be able to reproduce the legends in their spirit and their details (Butcher, 1951, 136, 137).

From the above discussion we have seen the early store house of knowledge of the arts in variety and their effects in terms of aesthetic. All the works of art have commonality in them. One art is more scientific and subtle and delicate than the other. All these arts collectively appeal to the senses and in an underlying form all these arts are designed scientifically. We can see from poetry, which is considered as a sublime art, most ancient, most forceful, and in it all the other arts are somehow or the other fused. As dance is based on poetry, so is the music, sculpture also portrays verses of various kinds as a concept. The element of beauty or aesthetic appreciation is also closely related to all finer or liberal arts. As we have seen that Aristotle says that these arts are brought out from within the soul of a craftsman and they depict the outward reality, though severely senses are involved in making them ripe, and in the mind all these are generated, either in phantasy adjoined with imagination, and leading to initiate the outward reality, through inside vision, making every particular the universal and in the end giving delight again to the senses of those who watch them. Here artist is not a mere copier but the one who consolidates the significant reality through different media, but remaining in its highest sense, convener of aesthetic, beauty and delight. This question of appreciation of beauty also leads then to the question of ugliness or ugly. We can say that which is chaotic, asymmetric may be then ugly.

As principles of aesthetic and appreciation of beauty have been thoroughly discussed in reference to Aristotle and his comprehensive theory of fine arts, which is related again to aesthetic, where he has discussed all the arts, their principles, mediums and effects, we move on to see Kantian nature of aesthetic, keeping in view Aristotle as the first one to take up this issue, and what Kant as a naturalist has to say about that.

### *Kantian and concept of aesthetic*

Sometimes it is interesting to note the biography of a thinker, or a philosopher. It gives a clue about his parentage, brought up, and nurturing, which would shape his thoughts and later nurtures thinking. Immanuel Kant was born at Konigsberg (Prussia) on April 22, 1724. Some have seen significance in the fact that his father was of Scottish descent and have thought, that this have accounted for the thinkers of that country. It seems to me less farfetched to attach importance to the pietistic atmosphere in which the young Kant was brought up by his parents, a pietism which constituted a reaction against dogmatic Protestantism, a pietism which valued exaltation of the spirit, confidence in good intention, from *Gesinnung*, more than theological science, and to ask whether this does not show a correspondence with the role which this kind of religion will play in the philosopher's thinking. It is less farfetched to realize that his mother, Anne Reuter, who would seem to have exerted upon him a very special influence, strove to make him share her feeling for nature, and to associate this fact with the attempt which he will later make to combine his religious belief with his admiration at cosmic phenomena, to observe that while he was a student at the university of Konigsberg he showed a marked preference for Latin studies, because the Romans made cult of duty and discipline, and that he continually quoted these lines of Juvenal: *Sum mum crede nefas animan proferre pudori. ET propter vitam vivenci prederere causas* (Consider it the worst of iniquities to subject one's spirit to shame and for the sake of life to lose the reasons for living).

From the age of twenty-one and over a period of ten years Kant acted as a tutor in families of the East Prussian nobility (The Huslsens, the Kayshlings), granted that he thus acquired a certain knowledge of the world and also of that morality which Neitzsche later dubbed the "master morality" and against which the author of the "Critique of Practical reason" was to react so forcibly, still, if one can judge by the fact that a number of his former pupils were the first to abolish serfdom on their estates, it would seem that his teaching already included that respect for man as

man which was to be the basis of his ethics (Benda, 2003: 2,3).

In 1786, while Kant was living almost a celibate life, one day he received „Emile“ by Rosseau, and was overjoyed. By that time, he had written „Philosophy of Law“ (Benda, 2003:4).

Emile“ is a remarkable book of Rousseau on education and training of character Rosseau argued that “progress in the arts and sciences, has added nothing to our real happiness, has corrupted our morals and vitiated our taste. Mankind, he claimed, should lift up hands to heaven and pray: “Almighty God! Thou who holdest in the hand the minds of men, deliver us from the fatal arts and sciences of our forefathers; give us back ignorance, innocence and poverty which alone can make us happy and are precious in thy sight” (Perkinson, 1980:129).

This sounds outlandish. Children of enlightenment, we tend to hold that the advancement of knowledge or the advancement in the arts and sciences is somehow connected with the advancement of happiness, morality and taste. How could Rosseau have denied this? (Perkinson, 1980: 129).

#### **Rousseau as a naturalist**

Our chief concern is the appreciation of aesthetic developed by Kant in his almost last treatise “Critique of Judgement” but Rosseau and Kant as belong to the same period, therefore „the“ thoughts of Rosseau are also valuable to be discussed. Rosseau wanted to reconstruct the political thoughts of his times. He also attacked on the prevailing doctrines of philosophes. The Newtonian laws in the preceding century brought a change. As Newtonian laws were observable and natural so the fundamental philosophes, according to Perkinson are as such: „For the philosophes, the most crucial problem of modern civilization was the problem of freedom. They proposed that man could be free only if he lived according to the laws of nature. Having witnessed the remarkable results of Newton and the discourses made by other scientists during the preceding century of genius, the philosophes argued: (1) that there were natural laws that regulated society, (2) that a free society was one that followed these natural laws, and (3) that reason could discover such natural laws, since they were in harmony with the canons of reason (Perkinson, 1980:129).

Rousseau“s comments on art are very significant. He says: Before art had molded our behavior and taught our passions to speak an artificial language, our morals were rude, but natural” (Perkinson, 1980:130).

The underlying thought in this quotation tends to pose that

perception of beauty which is directly related to art and art is directly related to construe morals, has been propagated by Rosseau. Here reason is ignored as Perkinson says: Starting from the same premise as the philosophes, to live according to nature is to live morally.

Rousseau concludes that progress in the arts and sciences contributed to the corruption of morals simply because he rejected their second premise to live according to nature is to live according to reason. Completely ignoring “Natural laws” and following Montaigne (whom he called wise), Rosseau equated “Nature” with “Primitivism”, thus placing nature in direct opposition to civilization. By restricting “Nature” to its factual or “primitive” use, he was able to argue that nature and reason were antithetical. The progress of reason which advanced sciences and arts, made society less natural. Once man had developed the cunning of reason, morals became corrupted” (Perkinson, 1980:130-131).

This may be the greatest debate. As all of the Grecian philosophy rests on empirical reason, so it is not easy to deny the role of reason in human judgment and other activities, especially in sciences and arts. The man“s mental faculty has surpassed the boundaries of skills, all due to the scientific reason initiated by Greek philosophers. It is not easy to demolish all the hallmarks of reason on which the grand building of human civilization is constructed. We have discussed the views of Aristotle on the perception of beauty and appreciation of aesthetic, and that aesthetic which prevailed in his times/on which; he knitted his theory of fine arts. Actually Rosseau wants to say beneath the surface, about the qualitative change in human civilization as general and in man“s perception as particular. Moreover, his famous doctrine of freedom of society is also attached with his refutation of the advancement of sciences and arts. He considers that this is not advancement, but this is a reversal. Why? Because man has not learned to live in accordance with nature, which according to him has not only the only source of inspiration of his development as his ultimate guide. Definitely if dialectically seen he is in search of that beautiful art which pleases the mind and restore in him composure, harmony and morality.

#### **Kant on Aesthetic**

However, Kant in his remarkable book “Critique of Judgment” has another view. In its first section of “Critique of Judgment” and the book “Analytic of the Beautiful” remarking about his theory of taste as “OF the judgment of taste: Moment of Quality”: he says: If we wish to discern whether anything is beautiful or not, we do not refer the



representation of it to the object by means of the understanding with a view to cognition, but by means of imagination (acting perhaps in conjunction with the understanding) we refer the representation to the subject and its feeling of pleasure or displeasure (Kant, 2008: 35).

Here Kant is of the view that beauty and its object is related to the subjective pleasure. Here taste, also is defined as a tool of judgment. Though Kant has not negated that the role of understanding is omitted here, but he emphasizes the role of imagination as a pivotal part. As far as we have seen discussing the Aristotelian theory of arts that it also rests on delivering pleasure to the others and also Aristotle says that imagination is the sole property of creation, as creation is based on imaginative feelings and artist recreates the artistic crafts like poetry or drama, deriving through the principles of life and it is not all removed from reality, because the poet or any other artist recreates.

Kant has also referred to the taste as such a thing which judges the beautiful. Kant further delineates "The judgment of taste, therefore, is not a cognitive judgment, and so not logical, but is aesthetic, which means that it is one whose determining ground cannot be other than subjective. Every reference of representations is capable of being objective, even that of sensations (in which it signifies the real in an empirical representation). The one exception to this is the feeling of pleasure or displeasure. This denotes nothing in the object, but is a feeling which the subject has of itself and of the manner in which it is affected by representation" (Kant, 2008:35). This means that pleasure or displeasure is subjective and in terms of sensations. How?

The sensations are implicatedly present explicitly in mind which does reasoning in discerning various ideas. Moreover, sensations as are felt by mind which is material, therefore, they are real or empirical. The case of taste as the judge of the beautiful is different. In case of taste almost all the arts, from cooking to the admiration and keeping of weapons, chivalry, carnivals and special events are also included.

Kant giving his views on ordinary sensation of delight says "To apprehend a regular and appropriate building with one's cognitive faculties, wherever, the mode of representation is clear or confused, is quite a different thing from being conscious of this representation with an accompanying sensation of delight. Here the representation is referred wholly to the subject and what is more to its feeling of life, under the feeling of pleasure or displeasure) and this forms the basis of a quite separate faculty of discriminating and judging, that contributes nothing to knowledge. He further elaborates "Given representations in

a judgment may be empirical, and so aesthetic, but the judgment which is pronounced by is logical, provided it refers them to the object by them. Conversely, even if the given representations be rational but are referred in a judgment solely to the subject (to its feeling)" they are always to that extent aesthetic" (Kant, 2008: 35, 36).

Kant wants to say that any representation that is solely subjective and stirs the sensational faculty of mind, in its conveyance through means, is aesthetic. Moreover, even if it is rational or logical but if it is directed to subject (or its feeling) that is to the extent of touching the phenomenon of aesthetic.

Further Kant discusses the case of delight. He points out that it involves interest along with the presence of thing or object, judged for beauty. He says that in our judgment we should set aside the object and focus on how we judge that object. He quotes Rousseau who was against the vanity adopted by the rich people on superfluous things which are return of the sweat of the people. Kant is in favor of judging the object impartially for developing and analyzing in the paradigm of taste.

Initiating the discussion about "delight in the agreeable is coupled with interest". Kantian concept is that the senses have a vital role. Agreeable is that which the senses find pleasing in sensation. He comments that which is sensational is agreeable, and as it pleases, so consequently pleasure giving sensations though being agreeable may be of different degrees regarding sensations again and are attractive, charming, delicious, enjoyable etc. In this context he remarks as such "But if this is conceded, then impressions of the senses, which determine inclination, or principles of reason, which determine the will, or mere" contemplated forms of intuition, which determine judgment, are all on a par in everything relevant to their effect upon the feeling of pleasure, for this would be agreeableness in the sensation of one's state" (Kant, 2008:37).

Kant has tried to define two terms, sensation and agreeableness. Actually he wants to say that the senses are the main source of determining pleasure. It is the senses through which we see the phenomenological world and perceive it at various degrees. It is also through senses we try to explore reason within us. The senses are also the source of pleasure which is internal and leads to gratification. And those things which are present for creating within us an urge to see symmetry, harmony, beauty and pattern and also are analysed by mere intuition are agreeable. In fact, Kant has determined the role of senses, the only mean of perceptions and the major source of receptivity of pleasure and gratification.

Further Kant analyzes the pleasure principle as that an object is an independent piece of delight and in terms of feeling through sensation is subjective. Describing and discerning the „good“ and agreeable he puts that „good“ is a concept commended by it. It could be useful, which is in turn pleasing, but which in its own account is good is “good” in itself. This conception of good is an implied one having an end which has an interest of delight. The pattern pleases what so ever it is like and this delight in the lines or foliage, making it beautiful, is different from agreeable. But this should have any concept. The concept of agreeable which is pertained to senses is not interchangeable with good. That which could be brought under reason, apart from sensation, that object may be identified as good (Kant).

These are not simple or mere statements. Here Kant has clearly demarcated the boundary of the receptivity of senses and the stream of reason. It seems that reason may have any relation to the senses, as all the knowledge is perceived through senses, but how it is given to the furnace of mind, which acts on it with multiple impulses and then after a complex process of thinking emits it out as a rational thing. The reason though has a food from senses but the analytic faculty of mind works on it in a different way. The reason in itself is a very vast and extensive phenomena. The reason is developed through constant brooding, thinking, training, conditioning and constantly the mind rejects and accepts the various external and internal forces and then thoroughly digesting, throws it from mind. The reason is the major tool of philosophers and of philosophes and it is not a mere reception of senses.

Human mind is yet to be explored even in this post- modern world as well. Since Socrates to Kant, Rousseau and Jacques Derrida, it is a legacy and lineage of philosophers who have tried to describe the mind which may be the essence of man; also it is the store-house of knowledge, because it contains a grand heritage of man in the form of language, and something which is beyond perception, something beyond physics. As it seems that Kant has given clue about the greatest faculty of man, the mind and reason, anything which is accepted under reason is termed as good. Comparing three delights (Kant, 2008:41) points that agreeable and good are attended to the faculty of desire and the former is pathologically related and the latter is a practical delight. The presence of object and the subject are required in both of the faculty of desire. The case of taste is different as it is independently judged from the object and contemplative (Kant).

This may be implied that if the judgment of taste is contemplative, so, it is a matter which is variable. The taste

varies from person to person and nation to nation collectively. And taste is an apparent thing also. It is not rooted deeply on mind and also presence of object is not needed to judge it. The taste may be called as a flair or euphoria for something even immaterial or imaginative. In taste may fall fantasy as well. The taste may also be termed as fashion and style and thus a surface level idea which has no concept related background. And taste may generate from anything in common use.

Kant delineates that agreeable, beautiful and the good are three different relations of representations directed to the feeling and pleasure of a subject. He plainly says that agreeable is „gratifying“ beautiful is „pleasant“, and good is „esteemed“. Further suggests, “agreeableness is a significant factor even with animals devoid of reason, beauty has purport and significance for human beings, that is, for beings at once animal and rational (but not merely for them as rational beings, as spirits for example but only for them as both animal and rational), where as the good is good for every rational being in general, a proposition which can only receive its complete justification and explanation in what follows of all these three kinds of delight, that of taste in the beautiful may be said to be the only and only disinterested and free delight, for, with it, no interest, whether of sense or reason, extorts approval. And so we may say that delight, in the three cases mentioned, is related to inclination, to favor, or to respect. For favor is the only free liking. An object of inclination, and one which a law of reason imposes upon our desire, leaves us no freedom to turn anything into an object of pleasure. All interest presupposes a need, or calls one forth, and, being a ground determining approval, deprives the judgment on the object of its freedom (Kant, 2008: 41, 42).

Kant has discussed also the matter of inclination here. It is clear that we have certain instincts which have to be gratified like hunger. In the case of inclination, there is no choice; it could be as inferred from the suppositions of Kant. He says that desire here determines man’s inclination. Moreover, he says that when one gets satisfied then only the taste could independently been evaluated. He is of the view that after the fulfillment of needs, from among the crowd is determined who has taste or not. This is a simple proposition. This means that our desires and inclinations have a priority over taste. As it is mentioned by Kant clearly that after hunger is gratified by a crowd only then the matter of taste comes and it is an obvious one.

The matter of subjectivity lies in close ties in determining the object as beautiful and universally beautiful. Kant explains that judgment of beauty without interest leads to

the concept that it is same for all. Here he again discusses that when subject freely likes an object, he will talk about the object itself. This is a very long debate in literature of the World. We can see that if we detach ourselves from the object and try to define its features of beauty even then we are somehow or the other; which is aesthetic dimension of beauty, we are still dictated by that very object in a sense that we are describing and that involvement of describing it makes our perception subjective. As this is a long debate in the history of philosophy as well, so we can say that there is no independent beauty. The beauty and its concept may be immaterial, but it could not be detached from the watching eyes and its implication on mind, which itself takes impression from senses. It is therefore when we say that there is generalized or universal beauty, even then the goals of objectively defining the beauty could not be touched.

But in certain cases beauty may touch universal concept. As we have seen already in this article, where we have discussed the theory of fine arts by Aristotle. The universal concept or admiration of beauty is the pleasure through representation of an object and somehow, by creating a fine line, that this pattern or this body may be called as universally beautiful. But even then, inclination and judgment could not be detached as the impulses directed to any work of art, may have a variable impression on the minds of several people. But it could be said that the parameters set by the philosophers and even within those parameters though subjectivity intrudes, that may be called beautiful.

Moreover, the idea of fundamental taste propagated by Kant is also this, so we cannot have anything absolute, not even morals, for which Rousseau and other naturalist philosophers have emphasized. The concept of the universal beauty is enrooted in myths, which may be real as their analyses are now being done by social anthropologists.

### ***Kant and war***

In our abstract and early in the article we have touched the subject of war, along with weapon making and manufacturing, weapons selling and buying, and weapon recycling. The war is as old as human past. In Greek and Rome people have an admiration for Knights, which prevailed until now in the respect for today's soldiers. If weapon making and manufacturing, selling and buying, weapon recycling may be considered as an art and collectively be added under the term „chivalry“ then it could be clearly said that it is also an aesthetic and taste, and may fall under the Kantian aesthetic of the beautiful. As still in many countries of Africa and Europe and Asia,

weapon keeping is a phenomenon of taste and specially among the martial races, so it becomes a subject of today and very relevant, because we are seeing a worst war scenario all around the globe and the war which pronounced as the most deadly and unique one. In the matter of the judgment of weapons, the taste in very Kantian terms of aesthetic is involved. It has been throughout the history of man that among warriors and warring nations, the development of weapons as was and is a necessary evil; there it has been a part of taste as well. Rather this taste phenomenon has led the man of today who has developed so much lethal weapons, though for this development of weapons there are sociological, psychological and political factors also present.

Tracing the history of war, arms and armour since prehistoric times, with a context of judgment of taste, Berenda Ralph Lewis writes like this: One day, long, long ago, too long for anyone to know the date some prehistoric person picked up a tree, branch or stone and hit someone also with it. This was the beginning of warfare, and one way or another, human beings have been fighting each other ever since. The weapons they have used over the centuries have, of course, changed a great deal. So have the means by which combatants in war have sought to protect themselves against attack.

Primitive weapons like the branches of trees or clubs developed into bronze, iron or steel swords and lances, and then into guns, machine guns and bombs. Bigger weapons began with simple catapults that flung boulders. Ultimately, they became artillery guns that could fire shells at targets several kilometers away. Today, we have a whole range of guided missiles and rockets. Similarly, protective armour has progressed a long way from the first prehistoric wood or hide shields. In medieval times, armour took the form of whole suits of chain mail or metal plates which covered a fighter from head to foot. Later still, in our own century, the suit of armor became a weapon itself, in the form of armour-plated battleships, submarines, aircraft and tanks.

These days, many people believe that war is wrong and wicked and that talking over disputes peacefully is much better than settling those disputes by fighting. And the same, no one denies that an enormous amount of skill and effort has gone into warfare over the centuries and that the history of man the fighter is full of courage, enterprise and tenacity” (Lewis, 1977: 2).

Richard Tuck is his book "The Rights of War and Peace" under the subtitle "Political thought and the international order from Grotius to Kant" opines in this way, "In all his mature political writings, Kant stressed that Hobbes was right in his characterization of the state of nature, and that as a consequence the fundamental moral duty men are under is to leave the state of nature and enter civil society. Repeatedly, he described the state of nature in the most accurately Hobbesian terms, most strikingly (perhaps) in section 44 of "The Doctrine of Right" in *The Metaphysics of Morals*. It is not experience from which we learn of men's maxim of violence and of their malevolent tendency to attack one another before external legislation endowed with power appears. It is therefore not some fact that makes coercion through public law necessary. On the contrary, however well disposed and law-abiding men, might be, it still lies *priori* in the rational idea of such a condition (one that is not rightful) that before a public lawful condition is established, individual men, peoples and states can never be secure against violence from one another, since each has its own right to do that seems right and good to it and not to be dependent upon another's opinion about this. So, unless it wants to renounce any concepts of right, the first thing it has to leave the state of nature, in which each follows its judgment, unite itself with all others (with which it cannot help interacting), subject itself to a public lawful external coercion, and so enter into a condition in which what is to be recognized as belonging to it is determined by law and is allotted to it by adequate power (not its own but an external power)" (Tuck, 2001:207, 208).

Tuck elaborates this passage so, "The first part of this passage was of course extremely sensitive reading of Hobbes, fully alive to the fact that Hobbes did not suppose that men in the state of nature were inherently aggressive, and to the fact that it was conflict of judgment which constituted the Hobbesian problem; that it was consciously a reading of Hobbes is illustrated by a remark in his lectures on natural jurisprudence where he made a similar point, and then observed that "Hobbes and Rousseau really have the same idea about this".

Tuck's commentary on Kant's international relations is significantly so brought, "Kant's ideas about international relations have this same complex connection with Hobbes's ideas. Like Rousseau, Kant saw very clearly that the Hobbesian theory entailed no end to the state of war, for modern states are inextricably involved in a continuous and destructive warfare: in the section on "The Right of Nations" in *The Metaphysics of Morals*, he gave an extremely Hobbesian account of the internal state

of nature, even down to ascribing to states the right to commit pre-emptive strikes against one another (The Doctrine of Right section 56). Rights in a state of nature, for both individuals and states, were for Kant „provisional“ in character that is they must „Leave open the possibility of learning the state of nature and entering a rightful condition, (The Doctrine of Right section 57, also Section 99). But on Hobbes's argument“ all the rights which he ascribed to men in a state of nature were of this kind, and Kant seems to have questioned this much less than one might have expected (Tuck, 2001:214,215).

Kant however said that in addition to active violations a state may be threatened. This includes another state's being the first to undertake preparations upon which is based on the right of prevention (its preventions), or even just meaning increase in another state's power (by its acquisition of territory (potential *tremenda*), (Tuck, 2001:215).

This is a wrong to the lesser power merely by the condition of superior power, before any deed on its part, and in the state of nature an attack by the lesser power, before any deed on its part, and in the state of nature an attack by the lesser power is legitimate. Accordingly, this is also the basis of the right of a balance of power among all states that are contiguous and could act on one another (The Doctrine of Right Section 56) (Tuck, 2001:215).

## II. CONCLUSION

The discussion in the article started from the perception of the beauty and through the ideas of the Master Aristotle. He defined a grand theory of fine arts, and laid down the parameters of the several arts, from poetry to dance and music. He determined their media as well. After exhaustive review of Aristotle's ideas we saw the supreme ideas of aesthetic propagated by Kant and we have slightly touched the naturalist philosopher Rousseau as well. In Kant we have exhaustively seen the precepts of beauty, good and moral good and agreeable, related to aesthetic. We have attested in our article also about the war and warriors and arms and armour. It was interesting to note that Kant depicted the roots of war in his different doctrines and saw it as inevitable but he also wrote „Perpetual Peace“. The war is not only detestable but destructive and devastating. We have also seen that how development of weapons is a new of kind of aesthetic correlated with Kantian theory. The philosophy defines everything from man to state and man's nature. The civilization has also rested on philosophy. But the history of man is of barbaric nature. It could only be hoped that someday man will give up fighting

with each other and nations will stop doing wars. A renowned Pakistani Poet Faiz has said: “We the one who are affected by extreme gloom, we the one whose bile is like canker, our morn is not at the sky, but where thou and I, are standing, the dawn of morning is right here”.

#### **CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS**

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

#### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Benda J (2003). Immanuel Kant, Rupa & Co.
- [2] Butcher SH (1951). Aristotle’s theory of Poetry and Fine Art. Dover Publications, Inc.
- [3] Kant (2008). Critique of Judgment. OUP.
- [4] Lewis BR (1977). Arms and Armour, Transworld Publications Ltd, London.
- [5] Perkinson HJ (1980). Since Socrates, Longman Inc.
- Tuck R (2001). The Rights of War and Peace OUP.