Introduction

An acquaintance with the topic of Research.
Introduction

Expression is beauty; beauty expression
Pleasure is also beauty in my comprehension

Zindagi kya hai anaasir main zuhur-e-tarteeb
Maut kya hai enhin ajza ka praishan hona

Explanations:

Knowledge is a limitless ocean, difficult to transverse yet we try to fathom and cross its limits with a pious aim to find out the precious pearls and shining stones for intellectual satisfaction and practical use. But we cannot claim perfection because perfection is related to one of Divine’s attributes; ‘He’ is perfect in all dimensions and is also creator, sustainer, nourisher and finally destroyer of all. However, we start our journey in the field of knowledge as a lover of wisdom and endeavour to find out the way to reach the goal—the goal is Reality—or to break out the riddles of the world, life and truth for our gratification. Success depends entirely on the keen interest and genuine enquiry carried out in this course. This is a job of philosophy of which aesthetics is a very interesting and useful branch. Aesthetics as a science and philosophy of art comprises of poetry, painting, music, sculpture and architecture (architecture was added by Hegel). Poetry tops the galaxy and is treated to be the sovereign but side-by-side it is abstruse yet we are not hapless because we follow and interpret the verses according to our ability, efficiency and amount of caprice and ambition to comprehend.

Consequently, I composed the first two lines. The first line is expressive of the identity between beauty and expression; it is Crocian view, truly followed by Collingwood. In the second line I have tried to procure the meaning of pleasure in terms of beauty, as Freud in his theory lays greater stress on Id which means pleasure, related to sex. Id is a pleasure seeking principle in its form and structure. Pleasure by itself is a pleasant phenomenon, may thus be called beauty. But for Keats “truth is beauty and beauty truth”. For Ruskin aesthetic taste is good. For Hutcherson beauty and virtue are apriori ideas but for hedonists beauty and pleasure are co-relative or beauty is nothing except pleasure.

In this respect, it seems appropriate to quote here Poincare’s view put down by Prem Lata in her paper “Musical Creativity—A comparison with Science”, which relates beauty to pleasure and vice versa. In her words, “the scientist does not study nature because it is useful to do so, he studies it because he takes pleasure in it; he takes pleasure in it because it is beautiful.” the point is obvious because the
pleasure and beauty coincide with each other, when nature is studied and experienced by the scientist. Aesthetics also has the same position, i.e. a scientific probe or profound study in this course by ascertaining the notions of beauty, beautiful, pleasure and pleasantness as one suffice to conclude that pleasure and beauty are identical but apparently, as there appears no distinction between pleasure and beauty, because to say that I desire pleasure is to say that I desire beauty or vice versa; further, to say that I desire good is to say that I desire beauty or pleasure, or to desire truth is no more than to desire good or beauty or pleasure. But after all ‘the truth’, ‘the good’ and ‘the pleasure’ merge in one ‘Absolute’, or better to say culminate into one ‘Sublime Beauty’, which is truly speaking the pinnacle of all such values of life and the world (Satyam, Shivam, Sundaram). Hence, the pleasure comes to be epitheted as ‘bliss’ and bliss as pleasure. However, there can be an internally minute distinction between pleasure and beauty, comprising the distinguishing features of essence and its attribute – beauty is essence and pleasure is its attribute with the addition that ‘attraction’ is also one more characteristic of beauty as I ponder and opine. Hence, any object of beauty must express these two attributes, i.e. pleasantness and ‘attractiveness’. A beautiful object means a pleasant and attractive thing that is why we desire it. A fragrant rose blossom is desired because it is pleasant and attractive. We want to live more and more on the earth because we think and believe that life is beautiful, expressed in the form of pleasantness and attractiveness. But we like to avoid death as much as possible, as we think and believe it to be an ugly phase of life and the world. ‘Wise like to live, fools like to die’. A completely successful expression of pleasure and attraction in life is beauty, a completely or partially impeded expression with its two essential ‘characteristics, i.e. Pleasantness and attractiveness, in life is ugly. For Croce a successful expression is beautiful, an unsuccessful is ugly. Collingswood: argues in favour of art proper by distinguish expression of emotion from arousing of emotion. Expression of emotion is beautiful.

The second lines have been chosen from Pt. Brijnarain Chakbast’s Deewan, a renowned Urdu poet. In the spirit of materiality or in the caprice of spirited factuality Chakbast explains the life and death on the realistic edifice. He thinks of life as an expression as well as a coherence of a few elements. So also the meaning of death, according to him, is basically related to dispersion of such elements. Hence expression of coherence is life and expression of dispersion is death. But I have the opportunity to interpret the life as beauty, and death as ugly. Chakbast, as I think, being a poet casts light on the formation of life and the world, irrespective of its animating or inanimating structure which is a configuration of certain elements or a symmetrical expression of elemental coherence, becoming beauty involving pleasure and constructing a magnetic field of attraction. But apart from this process of integration, symmetry, coherence, and conformity of parts to parts and parts to whole Werner Heidelberg says “Beauty is proper conformity of the parts to one another and to the whole”, if the process happens to be reverse, i.e., the elements are disintegrated or decentralized or dispersed, then the ugly phase of life will emerge, the doleful experiences will open the windows in the mind and the

---

*Sublime is used in the sense of grand or exalted, not as feeling of awe or overwhelming of a thing.*
degrading process in life will come out; the existence will go back to non-existence, called in plain language as 'death'.

I might have commenced writing my thesis with the plain language of prose, but I preferred to begin it with poetry. The topic of my study and research pertains to art and beauty, and in all forms of art and beauty poetry is on the top of the galaxy in comparison to other forms of the fine art. Humboldt's view seems to be cogent to refer. He says, "Poetry precedes prose: before producing prose, the spirit necessarily forms itself in poetry." But Leonardo in his artistic whim had tried to prove the superiority of painting on poetry because he thought, "... that divine power, which lies in the knowledge of the painter, transforms the mind of the painter into the likeness of divine mind, for with a free hand he can produce different beings, animals, plants, fruits, landscapes, open fields, abyssis, terrifying and fearful places." He again contends that the painter must be a universal master. Once again he stresses his notion concerning to superiority of painting to poetry and music both by saying that painting is a science and the painter is expected to have the knowledge: (1) Mechanical and Scientific or Knowledge from experience and knowledge independent of experience and (2) Knowledge of man that can be acquired by careful observation of life. But I do not agree with Leonardo's view. I argue against him in the way I think befitting here. Leonardo forgets the vast field of poetry in which poet's imagination penetrates into the minute particles of life and nature and accompanies it to the hilltop. He does not leave any aspect of life and the experiences of the objectifying world to bring them to his images and to portray them in his or her poetry. Although he or she likes to use rhetoric too much to express his or her feeling, his or her emotions and his or her experiences intending to enable the readers to understand and interpret the verses on their own accounts. The spirit of expression and efficiency to have access to the hilltop of real and imaginary phases of life and the world are basically related to and come out from our inner self, and are most important in discussing, apprehending and explaining the feelings, emotions, imaginations, experiences and values of life and nature as a whole. The spirit and efficiency as detailed in the preceding lines in reference to poetry, I think and believe, may also have the same position and status in a painter's mind but I may contend and disprove the thesis of Leonardo in the panorama of the Limitations of the medium of expression in the sphere of painting, and availability of a vast field of medium of expression in poetry. No doubt, a painter also likes and has a great amorist of fervour and impetus in his mind to express his feelings, emotions, imaginations (tinge of reality or fiction) to his possibly and completely convincing means and manners but he fails to achieve this goal because of the uncontrolled limitations: The medium of expression in painting remains enclosed to mixing of colours, use of brushes of different sizes and shapes, papers, canvases and consistent or inconsistent strokes of pens and pencils which are insufficient to express what a painter desires to make expressed or what a painter desires to make explicitly and impressively conveyed to others. But the poet is lucky in this matter; a vast ocean of words, phrases, metaphors, rhymes, assonances, alliterations and techniques of expressing feelings and emotions etc, exist in reality that enables the poet to express himself or herself with perfect plausibility, placidity and contentment. Thus, the painter can display his efficiency of creativity by utilizing a number of materials or
the means of expression that is limited as yet, although he can once again use them for seeking expression in toto and in an articulated manner; even then he cannot reach and touch the totality of the phenomena of life and nature. A painter eventually and doubtlessly may have capacity, efficiency and energy to imitate, describe and reproduce the experiences of life and nature. He can also express the impulses of pleasures and pains, delights and grievances by moulding, shaping and reshaping the facts in close context to his world of imaginations through his master piece paintings and designs. Moreover, he can impress the feelings on and arouse the emotions in the perceivers' mind to maximum, but he cannot defy challenging the superiority of poetics on paintings in the field of art.

Before marching ahead, to my mind it appeared essentially expedient to sketch out the history of aesthetics, but another idea pertaining to the topic of research and study restrained to cast light on the history here and now. The task of ascertaining the historical background of art and aesthetics shall be dealt with properly, but later on as to deal with the prolegomena of the topic of research in continuity is an unavoidable exigency.

Now, continuing the study, I choose the term 'expression' to elucidate and ascertain its meaning first; it is for the reasons that I want to produce such a thesis on expression that may, to my good belief, be a comprehensive, genuine and commendable work, it is intended so.

The term expression implies a number of meanings. As such the term has been defined and interpreted differently from time to time by thinkers of the east and west from different viewpoints. We can say that the creation of the world is nothing except a divine expression. But the expression of the creation is manifold in the nature. A fragrant flower, viz, rose is beautiful because we are attracted to it or in other words, the fragrant rose expresses one of our feelings, which we have for our good taste. The rose as well as all other things in the nature looks pleasant and attractive. We feel a sense of deep joy in us to see them. This is all due to our nature that we want to enjoy the things, which are related to expressing our feelings and emotions. Hence, the things, which are related to expressing our feelings and emotions, appear beautiful, pleasant and attractive to us. Such glamouring things in life enchant us all: It is a psychological fact. The things attractive and glamouring in the nature have efficiency of expression in true sense and thus, we like to perceive them again and again. But we do not like, generally, to perceive those objects in the nature, which lack the capacity of expression. Subjectively, we can say that a piece of stone lying on the street is not beautiful for a lay man, as he admittedly lacks the depth of knowledge: The sources of his knowledge are limited; he can not cross the limits and remains deprived of the seriousness of apprehension. It is, I think, a logical saying that there is a vast gulf existing between the apprehending and conveying powers of a learned or say, a philosopher or a scientist or an artist who has a helmet of profound thinking and understanding and a man on the street without helmet. Comparing the separate position of a philosopher and a non-philosopher in the matters of problem-solving efficiency Croce vindicates the superior status of a philosopher. He proclaims, 'The answers as to what art is may look the same in appearance in both cases, but are different in fact, owing difference of richness in their internal content. The answer of the philosopher worthy of the name has
precisely the task of solving adequately all the problems, which have arisen, down to that moment in the course of history, concerning the nature of art. On the other hand, the answer of the lay man, operating within much narrower limits, turns out to be powerless outside those limits. But it is meaningful and attractive for a scientist who is working on stones, and the stone as such expresses its value to him, but not for a layman. Chandrashekhar thinks of science as having an aesthetic character and he presents an insight into the quest for beauty and truth in theories of physics. He goes on discussing the similarities and differences in creativity of Shakespeare as a dramatist, and Beethoven and Newton as scientists. According to him the aesthetic base of Einstein’s theory of Relativity is also worthy to note. Moreover, truth and beauty as well as motivation and creativity are also found in all the sciences but the criteria of beauty in science differ from those of art and aesthetics, as S. Chaudhri in his article ‘The faculty of Criticism’ clearly mentions, “To be beautiful, a living creature, and every whole made up of parts, must not only be present in certain order in the arrangement of parts but also be of certain definite magnitude. Beauty is a matter off size and order. Like wise, a physicist a mathematician, and a Macro-Causalist may have the same amount of interest and pleasure in discovering the scientific laws and the structure of atoms etc., they all have a quest for truth, which is interpreted as beauty by well-known English poet Keats. According to him, ‘truth is beauty and beauty is truth

A drama, a poetry, a dance, an idol and a painting and all such phenomena may have beauty if they have potentiality of expressioning some or the other emotions of human beings, if an emotion is expressed successfully in any or in all of these forms of fine arts, we will have a sense of beauty, otherwise not because expression at the mental level is necessary for generating beauty. (Croce).

**Croce, Freud and Expression:**

Croce and Freud are the two prominent and great thinkers in the history of philosophy and psychology respectively who have attempted to explain, interpret, and expound the term ‘Expression’ in its essentiality as referred to the Problems of Aesthetics or Art and Beauty. Croce means and defines expression in terms of beauty and beautifulness. Expression according to him, is intuitive and also it is mental and spiritual; to him mental expression is only worthy to note in the field of art and literature.

In the history of aesthetics none before Croce, the Italian thinker, has ever tried to make the use of the term expression, (well known and commonly used in practical life with its simple meaning) in its real, proper and widespread artistic meaning. He was first among the aestheticians of his age that for the first time focussed his attention on the value and importance of this term. He succeeded in his attempt to the greater satisfaction of artistic mind. The meaning of ‘Expression’ was ascertained and brought about as a full-fledged aesthetic expression inhering beauty as its essential feature or essence. He was profoundly right in his thought and theory in proclaiming expression to be ‘Beauty’. To his mind expression is always mental.
and that which is mental is self-experimental because self-experience is dynamic, real intuitive and beautiful. It is astonishing and melancholies too that Croce was not paid deserving heed nor was given proper importance by the thinkers of the west as says D. Ainslie, "I believe that Croce will one day be recognised as one of the few great teachers of humanity. At present he is not appreciated at nearly his full value". All credit goes to Croce for making the term expression familiar and luminous by proving himself to be a masterly expert and worthy of the science of eloquence in all its aspects criticizing and refuting the views of his predecessors Croce succeeded to give a radically changed and probably a quite new meaning and reshaped it in terms of beauty as spirit of expression. Moreover, Croce's expression is not only mental but also intuitive as he writes, "............intuitive knowledge is expressive knowledge. Independent and autonomous in respect to intellectual function; indifferent to later and empirical discriminations, to reality or unreality, to informations and appreciations of space and time, which are also later: intuition or representation is distinguished as form what is felt and suffered, from the flux or wave of sensation, or from psychic matter; or this taking possession; is expression to intuit is to express; and nothing else (nothing more, but nothing less) than to express." Croce interprets expression in the spirit of idealism and recognises expression as beauty. A thing is beautiful if it involves expression but it is always mental, intuitive and spiritual. Intuition appears to be some wondrous faculty of our mind as different from reflection. Intuition is, probably, sufficient to inculcate the meaning, value, and usefulness and widely spread operation and scope of expression as beauty, beautiful and good art in our understanding as well as in all our aesthetic experiences.

If the meaning of 'Expression' as intuition, as Croce interprets, is taken for granted, then it may also be assumed as beauty, i.e. intuition itself is expression and that which is expressed is beautiful. Croce goes on saying time and again that a successful expression of an emotion is a good art and if there appears hindrance due to any sort of reason, it will be called a 'pseudo art'. He emphasises the proper sense of the term expression, setting aside all ambiguity in this respect.

Albeit, Croce likes to maintain the use, essence and virginity of the term expression in his book entitled 'Aesthetic, as Science of Expression and General linguistics.' His aesthetic approach to the term 'Expression' appears to be somewhat spiritual in nature. He is not seemed prepared to give room to any material or phenomenal approach appears to be unique and praise worthy in this regard, I may not be wrong to say that expression as an aesthetic term has been under discussion for long but not in its real sense, and Croce, to have, not only keen interest in it but also to make expression as a central figure of his theory of art. Thus for the first time in the English realm Douglas ensile, the translator of Croce's work 'Aesthetics as Science of Expression and General linguistic' hailed he spirit and aesthetic calibre of Croce. He writes "Benedetto Croce, .......is essentially Neapolitan, and rarely remains long absent from the city, on the shore of that magical sea where one ulyssis sailed, and where sometimes yet .........we may hear the syrens sing their songs. But more wonderful than the song of any syren seems to me the theory of aesthetics as the science of expression, and that is why I have overcome the obstacles that stood between me and the giving of this theory, which is my belief in the truth of the
anguish-speaking world." He further states, thus I conduct there brief remarks upon
the outer on the aesthetic, to its study will be grateful for raving placed in their hands
this pearl of great price from the diadem of the antique parthenope. So he was a
great thinker of his time, born in 1866 and passed away in 1953, leaving behind him
an epoch and worthwhile work in aesthetics; unfortunately, he could not obtain the
appreciation as much as he deserved.

Croce deals with aesthetic as a whole of philosophy making no difference
between history and philosophy. According to him philosophy is unity, which
comprises to all branches of knowledge whether it is aesthetics or logic or ethics or
any other discipline. He treats aesthetics as a science of expression. He bases his
aesthetical views on his idealism and seems too much interested in another but much
more discursive concept, known as ‘Intuition’ intuition has been a subject of
discussion hither to from the beginning of Renaissance. Thinkers of the middle age
have also taken it (intuition) for their rescue in the field of epistemology, but
nobody could deal with intuition so properly and lucidly as Croce has dealt with. To
Croce’s mind the concept of expression and the concept of intuition are not the two
terms, which can be treated altogether different from each other. Croce, in this
case, vividly and aptly proclaims. “To intuit is to express and nothing else
(nothing more but nothing less) than to express.” Moreover, he says “Every true
intuition or representation is also expression.

He opposes all sorts of duality as regards the nature of expression and intuition. All forms of expressions as well as
intuitions are ultimately one and the same. He thinks, “Art is expression of
impressions, not expression of expression.” He disbelieves in dual functioning of
expression. For him expression is intuition, it is spiritual knowledge, it is theoretical
or aesthetic knowledge.

In his epistemology, Croce makes difference between ‘Intuitive
Knowledge’ and ‘Intellectual Knowledge’ and determines the status of intuition
superior to logic. He thinks that all creation is creation of the self-experience,
nothing outside or apart from it. He bases his doctrine of expression on his spiritual
idealism and commences his doctrine of aesthetics by an analysis of the activities of
self-experience. According to him there are two types of activities, which can
articulately be associated with human mind or spirit: these are theoretical and
practical, both have knowledge of particulars and knowledge of universals; each
second of them depends on the first. In theoretical activity there is an intuitive
knowledge or knowledge of particulars (aesthetics) and there is an intellectual
knowledge; as knowledge of universals (logic). In the same way the practical activity
contains the knowledge of particulars in the economic interests and that of universals
in the moral field. But he is not clear in his notion of intuition: sometimes he
explains intuition in terms of sensation, sometimes in terms of impression and also
sometimes he says that intuition is independent of concepts. After all, on some
other place of his work he declares clearly its dependence on the intellect as he says,
“what can intuitive knowledge be without the light of intellectual knowledge? It is a
servant without a master, and though a master find a servant useful, the master is a
necessity to the servant since he enable him to gain his livelihood. He goes on
adding to it, “intuition is blind; intellect lends her eyes I think he follows the
footprints of Kant who says, “Concept without precepts are blind and precepts
without concepts are empty." In my opinion Croce creates confusion in his writings by certain contradictory statements, e.g. Croce discussing the nature and scope of intuition says, "but since knowledges of reality is based upon the distinction between real images and unreal images, and since this distinction does not at the first moment exist, these intuitions would in truth not be perception, but pure intuitions" he says further "where all is real, nothing is real."

I would like to critically evaluate his doctrine of Intuitionism in the succeeding chapters of my thesis. Croce adopted a historical method of approach on his own accounts he critically evaluates the theories of his predecessors such as the theories of Greeko-Roman Antiquity, Hedonism, and moralism, mysticism. Ferments of thought in the seventeenth century Aesthetic ideas in Cartesian and Libnition school, and the "Aesthetic" of Baumgarten, Giambattista vico Minor Aesthetic doctrines of the 18th century and doctrines of the same period.

Moreover, Croce does not like to overlook the individual philosophers of the past. He chooses Kant, Schiller, Schilling Solger, Hegel, Schopenhauer Herbert, Friedrich, Schiemacher, Humbolt and Stienthal minor German aestheticians viz Krause tradeoffs, weisse etc. Aesthetic in France, England and Italy Francesco de Sanctis, Aesthetics of Epigone, Aesthetics Positivism and naturalism aesthetics psychologism and other Recent Tendencies and lastly Croce deals with the historical sketches of some particularly doctrines devoting to as many as 54 pages in his work Aesthetic

Croce appears to be Hegelian in his dialectic explanation of the problems of art and beauty (a little difference lies there), but D.Ainslie has defended his independent position as he says. "As regards Croce's general philosophical position, it is important to understand that he is not a Hegelian, in the sense of being a close follower of that philosopher." Apart from this, Croce can also not be called to be a Kantian in his philosophy, though he has close affinity with him (Kant) in his epistemological theory in which he provides eyes of intellect to eyeless intuition seems to have very close relationship with the Kantian theory of knowledge.

Albeit, Croce develops his Idealism as well as the theory of art quite independently from any of his predecessors or contemporaries. A detailed and critical exposition of his theory in this regard will be produced in the main chapters of the thesis.

A similar way of expression in Indian aesthetics is also found. Abhinav Gupt in his commentary Anand Vardhan's 'Dhvannya Loke' tries to solve the problems of Lakshana and Vyanjana. He thinks that in sound system of suggesting the Lakshana and Vyanjana are different. Where Lakshana is, there is no Vyanjana, but I say that Lakshana and Vyanjana are complementary to each other. Hence, the meaning of Vyanjana may also be associated with expression as beauty.

Another thinker in the field of psychology is Dr. Freud whose ambition to know the causes of abnormalities and profundity of learning, popularised him through out the whole globe, as a propounder of the psycho-analysis school in the field of applied psychology.

He (Freud) was an Austrian who had started his career as an expert of medical science. But soon he gave up his medical practice and joined a school of psychology in France. He began to work on the diseases of such nature, which have
their causes in the deep layers of mind. His associate was Charcot who helped him in his studies and fulfillment of his desire to lore and learning. Charcot enabled him to find out the causes of mental diseases, viz Hysteria, Phobia, Dispophobia and all such abnormalities through mental analysis a new method and technique in the field of psychology.

Consequently, Dr. Freud produced essentially a new theory of the causes and remedies of abnormalities before the world. He divided the mind from two different angles-topographical and dynamic. He said that the causes of all sorts of abnormalities were lying deep in the unconscious level of mind. The unconsciousness is one of the three phases of mind, the most important, highly valuable, and most operative in the life of man. He lays greater emphasis on functioning, controlling and leading power of this mysterious principle. He attempts to explain the total inner as well as outer personality of man through it. This is very important phase of our mind, essentially sexual or pleasure seeking principle to which as Freud named ‘Id’ or ‘Libido’, the term used from dynamic viewpoint.

Id or Libido is sexual all through because it is a pleasure seeking principle or a phase of our mind, Dr. Freud, tries to explain the whole life of man, from top to bottom by this single principle. He is confident enough in his studies and researches that the Id or Libido or the unconscious level of our mind. He shows as to how does the personality of man passes out through the various stages of development? According to him, the expression of Id or Libido may be seen in all the stages of the development of mans personality; from early childhood to youth and onwards. Thumb sucking, and cralling resisting and passing again and again the urine by the child, emergence of Narcissism and Oedipus complex etc, in the course of personality development are such in which the expression of Libido, the pleasure seeking principle prevails through out.

The expression of Libido, the pleasure seeking principle, may also be interpreted, as I think, in the form of beauty and beautiful. A thing is pleasant means it has some beauty for us. Beauty is there in a thing means that thing expresses some of our desires: To say that we desire pleasure is to say that we are proned towards beauty which comes out from the expression of the pleasure seeking principle Id or Libido. “The desire of different men are determined by the total nature of the point of view which the men occupy, what they desire depends on what they like; and what they like, as Ruskin was fond of insisting, is an exact expression of what they are.”

Although, the term expression was used for exploring a psychological phenomenon by Dr. Freud but it may have some aesthetic meaning also. It may be interpreted as having an aesthetic lust and lusture, text and texture, meaning and manner having close relationship with human life. So far as the similarity between pleasure and beauty is concerned I may say that pleasure is generally taken to be an emotion arising from perception of beauty in nature, but I find a close affinity as well as resemblance between the two terms. To my mind pleasure appears to be beauty because if.” Truth is beauty and beauty truth" and if good is beauty in ethical field of knowledge then why not pleasure is beauty. We perceive beauty and take pleasure means that the pleasure itself is beauty. The nature outside creates a sense of beauty in us, which, in my view is what we call beauty. One may say that
pleasure is an aesthetic experience but this experience is called taste or Rasa in Indian aesthetics; words differ but meaning remains unaffected.

I think that beauty is essence of expression and so also the essence of pleasure is beauty. Hence the term pleasure in Freud appears to be closely related to the term expression, as both have the same value and status. Expression in Crocian aesthetic theory is ‘Beauty’ and in Freudian theory ‘Pleasure’ seems to be at par with that of Crocian theory of expression. Since pleasure implies beauty and beauty inheres pleasure, therefore, expression as beauty and expression as pleasure will have the same and equivalent meanings and also in all senses, in lust and lusture.

The term Id or Libido in Dr. Freud’s theory has the same field of expression for its existence and operation as the Crocian expression. Hence, the term ‘expression’ in these two great philosophers must have equal position, value, importance, meaning, usefulness and so on and so forth, though the approaches differ but the spirit is one and the same.

It is a psychological fact that everyone likes pleasure and repulses pain; pleasure is form of expression. It is beauty and beautiful both-noun and adjective. Expressions are of many kinds viz; expressions of feelings and emotions, thoughts and ideas, likings and disliking and so on, but ultimately all sorts of expressions stand pleasant and beautiful. However, that which is pleasant is, no doubt, beautiful but if we feel any hindrance in the way of the expression of our emotions, we think that we are in a great predicament, in a state of restlessness, in a condition of bitter experiences, in distress and uneasiness, which may be called as an ugly phase of life.

**History of Aesthetics:**

In the history of aesthetics we find as many as three words which have been used in different senses arising ambiguity, misunderstanding and great confusion. These are ‘Aesthetic’, ‘Art’ and ‘craft’. I would like to discuss definition, nature and subject matter of aesthetics after casting light on its historical background. In Greek antiquity the works techni and poises were employed for denoting the meaning of art. Aristotle used poises for representational art the word techni was also used to signify the material productions; both these terms were related to the craft or to an specific skill but side by side “.............they could signify the knowledge and inventiveness required to make effective use of the craft and skill, (interestingly, the German kunst.... has something of a similar etymological flavour and conceptual range)”\(^4\) In Latin it was ‘ars’ which became ‘art’ in English, moreover, ‘ars’ has its root in Greek linguistics as ‘artious=complete’, perfect or befitting. This meaning brings artious to Greek meaning of ‘Kalon’ but it connotes excellence or perfection and also beautiful. For expressing beautiful as an objective in Latin the word ‘Pulehrum’ was used as equal to Greek ‘Kalon’.

The concept of beauty was brought to significant change in the 20th century as it was conceived of as a quality or attribute that is discovered in object of nature. But the 19th century philosophers thought that beauty was not an attribute or quality in things except an idea in man’s mind. Francis Hutcheson obviously claims
that the idea of beauty was created in us by a certain condition in things, the so called 'uniformity admits, variety'. Afterwards beauty was token to be a value and also as a real quality in things. But onward generations in the history of art began to discriminate between craft and fine art. Craft was confined to the skill of certain physical productions, like carpentry and smithy etc but fine art was taken to be poetry, music, painting and sculpture. Among the Indian aestheticians Bharat was the representative who produced Natyam and proclaimed that Drama was the absolute form of art as it was expounded over to poetry, prose, music, dance and recitation of songs etc. But modern expressionists referred art to the expression of emotions and nothing more than expression.

Craft

Greeks have no use of the word aesthetics. I think the word aesthetics was not either designed or coined or discovered by them. The word ‘craft’ was under usage and poetry was also treated to be particular craft. Plato and Aristotle too had no idea of either art or aesthetics. What they had in their minds was the term ‘craft’ which was taken to be special skill to produce things of use instead of things of beauty. Plato’s thought was altogether pertaining to things only. As such he describes craft as "......of pertaining to thing, perceptible by senses things material, 49 as opposed to things thinkable or immaterial. I do not say that Plato, Aristotle or Greeks were not aware of beauty and beautiful but I emphasise that the concept of beauty was not related to aesthetic (craft) in Greeco- Roman antiquity as is today. Plato in his ‘Republic’ produced two phases of beauty, but both were metaphysical having no relation to aesthetics. Plato undertook the term beauty in the form of an idea (general or universal) and also beauty as particular, which is many in the universe. Still he did not define aesthetics in terms of beauty. Plato hails poetry but repudiates painter, calling him to be an imitator of imitations because what an artist or the painter produces in his pointing, is related to nature only. Since nature, according to Plato, is a true copy of the world of ideas; in other words the world of senses is a copy of the spiritual world, the artist copies the copy and thinks himself to be a great artist while he is merely a copier. That is why Plato proclaims that the artist has no place in our society and he should be removed and doubly removed from the society. Collingwood in this respect says aptly that not only the other forms of craft but also Plato has described poetry as badly as we think. Hence, there was no alliance between beauty and art in Greek philosophy. In the words of Collingwood, “if we go back to the Greek, we find there is no connexion at all between beauty and art”. 50 In this respect, criticising Plato, Collingwood again says. “The theory of beauty is thus, in Plato, connected not with the theory of poetry or any other art, but primarily with the theory of sexual love, secondly is the theory of morals (as that for the sake of which we act when action is at its highest potency, and Aristotle similarly, of a noble action, says that it is done ‘for beauty’s sake’), and thirdly with the theory of knowledge, as that which lures us onward in the path of philosophy, the quest of truth”. 51 In Plato’s spirit we can say that poems of Homer are so conceived
as jolly as good, and the pleasure, therefore, can be interpreted as aesthetic experience.  
Craft is a skill taken for granted is different from art proper. If craft is a skill then it means smithy, metallurgy, carpentry, surgery, and even poetry can also be called a certain forms of craft the idea of fine arts, as is today, was also not in the Greek mind. But they brought a little change in the means and manners of Greek thinkers who put up another Latin word 'ars' that afterward became 'art' but it was also not different from craft in its essence. In the early modern English, the word art was meant to be special form of book learning, such as grammar or logic or magic or astrology.

In the Renaissance the old meaning and sense of the term 'Art' was re-established-say 'craft.' But during the late 18th century a radical change was brought about in the sense and meaning of the word art; the distinction between fine arts as beautiful arts, and useful arts was made. In the 19th century the word arts was singularised as art, dropping 's' as it was thought to be unnecessary addition. In this period art was completely bifurcated from the craft. B. Collingwood writes that at this point of disentanglement of art from craft is theoretically complete. But only theoretically the new use of the word 'art' is like a flag placed on a hilltop by first assailants; it does not prove that the hilltop is affectively occupied.

**Art and not Art**

Collingwood; a renowned aesthetician, differentiates between 'art' and 'not art.' The term art has been taken into common usage, although it involves a number of meanings. But what shall be the actual and proper meaning is a matter of investigation. Collingwood in this respect aptly says that the word art if used improperly, will be called pseudo. A pseudo art may have certain grades in it. Hence Collingwood thinks that the word 'art' requires proper attention. In this temptation he thinks that there are two kinds of artists.

1. Artist aesthetician.
2. Philosopher aesthetician

Both will be discussed in the chapter 3rd but the ambition to know what art is, motivates to enquire into the nature of art, which will have two stages:

1. If the term 'art' is meant for any sort of satisfaction, it will arise confusion, and by means of satisfaction the term art cannot be defined.
2. If art, the term, is defined in any way then its common usage will be pushed out from the field of investigation and onward studies. Collingwood is not prepared to assign any such meaning to art, which stands inadequate.

**Present situation in art**

Casting light on the nature of art Collingwood attempted to show close kinship between artist aesthetician and philosopher aesthetician for this purpose he
says that the aesthetic theorists, poets, painters, sculptures, conspicuously made attempts to bridge up the gap between the two-artist aestheteician and the philosopher aestheteician. These agents tried genuinely to display their calibre, efficiency and superiority in the field of philosophy and psychology.

In 19th century the artist assumed that he has got a top rank in the society he did not like that his artistic creation be criticized by ant philosopher. I think the artist was not close to society before the beginning of 19th century. That is why he began to establish sweet relation with the individuals of the society. However, the artist reshaped his doctrine of art with a view to exert too much influence on the changing society. In the words of Collingwood “in this new sail a growth of aesthetics theory has sprung up, rich in quality and on the whole high in quality”.

Different meanings of art

I would like to undertake the business to discuss here different meanings of art so as to make the difference clear and convincing between what is art and what is not?; what is art proper and what is art improper?; what things are mistaken for art proper and what not.?; what is good art and what is Pseudo-art?; Doing this business we can easily make the proper meaning of art as clear, expedient and comprehensive as is essentially needed for inculcating the genuine idea of art in the reflective mind of all those who are interested in it.

Generally, art is meant for all that creation or creations, which represents or represent or expresses or express (whatever case may be) any feeling or emotion or experience of life and nature in such a way as to make that creation or creation beautiful and pleasant, but Collingwood, 20th century aestheteician, contends three meanings more and says that three meanings are mistaken for the meaning of proper sense of art. Accordingly there are obsolete, analogical and courtesy meanings of art.

Obsolete meaning:

It may be called an old and discarded meaning of art. To know it is to go back to the history of Greek philosophy, the period, which provided springing opportunities, to Greek thinkers for bringing about the conclusions of their profundity and investigations in the field of lore and learning. Plato in republic (Timaese), Aristotle in metaphysics and all other Greek thinkers of the time had the term craft instead of art. Craft was meant for a specific skill to produce the things of use and consumption. Consequently, carpentry, metallurgy, goldsmithy and all other such skills and productions there of were treated to be craft. Plato praises poetry and acclaims music but he does not accord any chance to an artist who is said to be an imitator of imitation (nature). Collingwood repudiated obsolete meaning of art.
(2) **Analogical meaning**

Analogical meaning is found involved between the experiences of one culture or civilization and experiences of any other one. We know well that the bents of minds, eloquence of languages, methods and styles of expression and trends and manners of living differ from culture to culture. What we think, interpret and represent through our language in India, we find mostly different on English soil. Now, the question rises up as to how we can let an English people know what we feel. When he or she utters that Indians are black? Or what an English person find in him when we, the Indians, say that Britishers adopted the policy of divide and rule to rule over India for about a century. As the experiences, the feelings, and the modes of thinking, state of mind and so on are such as to basically differ from culture to culture, the best and possible strategy in hand remains to communicate or obtain such experiences and feelings etc. analogically. We are just to either translate our experiences analogically or to make explained all such phenomena by means of analogy. As such we can be at liberty to either translate the things of experience in real spirit of the word meanings or just to employ the method of analogy in two or more different languages. No other alternative remains. Collingwood again declines this analogical meaning of art.

**Courtesy meaning:**

More artistically and more excellently the word art in its courtesy meaning is related to the things of importance. It is a descriptive meaning of our motives, feelings and emotions. People in their whim and caprice are seen prone to claim or disclaim certain titles of qualities and disqualities, like gentleman, sweet singer, hospitable and so on. Descriptively, it is due to the fact that they think that they have or they have not these qualities, which connote such qualities or disqualities or involve certain motives and emotions to which they are aquatinted or not acquainted. "But when the descriptive motive is overshadowed by the emotional one, the word becomes a courtesy title or dis courtesy title as the case may be." Art in its courtesy meaning is also untenable.

Some other meanings of art may also arise because of its (art) wrong interpretations. If art is not taken as art for the sake of art, the art may be assumed to have certain qualities and resemblances of all such things of our lives and nature that appear as art, but actually they are not art. In this category the glamours of science, means of amusement, technique of propaganda or advertisement, wonders of magic, puzzles of reflection, eloquence of exhortation and lastly the words of instructions are included. Apparently, all these activate and generate the meaning and sense of art proper in human mind but it is all in sheer appearance, not in actuality. Thinking abruptly on the aims and objects of art proper we can aptly say that artistic creation or creations are meant for contemplations, consumption, recreation and description.
but is not in the case of art proper as Collingwood notes. I like to keep all this at pause here and to consider ‘art proper’ as a new matter of discourse.

Art proper

Every artistic creation express intrinsically and articulately some of the emotions or feeling of life and impressions laid by nature on our thinking mind. Moreover, the artist desires to make the spectator or the audience fully explained and acquainted with all his aims and objects to which his creation appears in the form of expression. It is because artist and artistic creations are inter-related to each other. No concession in this relationship is admissible. If the expression in the artistic creation is complete, vivid and successful then the purpose of the artist is said to be fulfilled. For if the expression of emotions in the artistic creations does not happen to yield the desired aims and object of the artist then such creation will be treated to be a pseudo art. Here again my business is to distinguish between a good art and a pseudo art or in other words between art proper and art improper or moreover, what is art and what is not? A good art or in other words an art proper is always expected to be contemplated on its expression or expressions because a good art or art proper is not in any case in objects of consumptions or amusements or conjurals or any other such things. Art is proper is always self-expressive in its aims and objects. Any obstacle in the way of expression makes the art incompatible, incomplete, improper and pseudo. As already explained above the spirit of the art proper basically lies in expressing certain emotions or ideas or experiences which are meant to be contemplated on. The contemplation of the reader or the spectator or the audience will suffices to know and apprehend the emotion and the feelings of the artist; and thus enable them to relish the taste and texture contained in such artistic creation without delay. A sufficient amount of light is this respect I will like to cast in the succeeding snipers appropriately and adequately.

Another point is worthy to note. Collingwood obviously says that there is a difference between a craft in which amusement, magic, puzzles, instructions, propaganda, exhortations, metallurgy, carpentry and all other types of such creations are included, and art proper which is limited to expression of emotions only. But Collingwood goes on distinguishing, further more between useful art and fine art. According to him the word art is a genus of which the fine arts and the useful arts are the two species. In useful arts all forms of craft have been assimilated but the fine art is thought to be that which is related to fine or beautiful. In fine arts there are poetry, painting music and sculpture, which are in my view, express or represent beauty. But Collingwood says that the work fine arts is obsolete and can, in no case, be admitted to be different from the craft or the products of artefacts it is because the artist produces things perceptible which are related to the technical theory of art. However, the meaning of art in the sense of craft is not tenable. According to him artistic creation must have two processes viz. (1) mental process of imagination (2) mental process of expression; without these two processes nothing can be said to be artistic creation because art has no connection with beauty as there was no connection between art and beauty in Greek thought. In this panorama Collingwood
says, “the phrase fine art further implies that the bodily or perceptible work of art has a peculiarity distinguishing it from the products of useful art, viz beauty. This is a conception, which has become very much distorted in the course of many centuries speculation on aesthetic theory, and me must try to get it straight.” Albeit, Collingwood is not prepared to relate art with beauty and he illustrates arrogantly the Greek view saying, “if we go back to the Greek, we find that there is no connexion at all between beauty and art.”

I do not agree with his theory. The question can naturally be arisen about the status of artist and his creation, which requires an answer. To this I may be allowed to cite certain examples from fine art. Suppose an artist who claims that he or she is a good painter, say Fida Husain, Late Mohd Rafi or the present Lata Mangeshkar, the melodists, Amjad Husain, Bismillah Khan, the masters of Sarode and Shehnai respectively, Nirala and Mahadevi Verma, Ghalib and Iqbal, the great poets and the architect Sheerazi (who designed Taj Mahal); and if Dilip Kumar or Madhubala or dancer Helen are said to be the artist of fame and popularity then on what grounds Collingwood can say that they are not in the class of art proper because their artistic creations are meant for useful art; it is also their means of livelihood.

Moreover, these artists of fame and familiarity have had attracted and pleased not only to the Indian people by their praiseworthy artistic performances covered and conquered by a wide range of their influences in the world but also they have had exerted sufficient amount of influence on the whole globe. They are ingenuous, good and proper artists, and on no reasons, implicit or explicit, they can be banished from the artistic zone. They are the best creators of the artefacts (not in the sense of craft), best critics of the social totems and taboos and best ameliorators in the field of the human life. The question is raised, time and again, that the so-called artists involve their artistic creations to the means of their livelihood, to the means of the amusement of the people and to other purposes, then how can they be regarded as artists in real and proper sense? while the art proper is for contemplation, for expression of emotions and for reproduction of such emotions in the audiences. But it is absurd to say and recognize art proper as for mere contemplation because an artist is not a craftsman having a limited range of his work and influences. He covers a wide field in which amusement, criticism, rhetoricism and fair desires and ambitions to be fulfilled must have their glorious and glittering existence at par with contemplation. It is correct to think of art as for the sake of art or to think that art is for contemplation, but other factors and side issues can on no accounts be ignored. Notwithstanding all this, the same question may again be arisen that if the artists who presume art and its creation as means of certain ends then they are not artists in proper sense and they have no room in the field of art and beauty. Inspite of their best of artistic creations is it not a tainting question if anyone is dogged to banish such artists from the field of art. Now what place can they have in art if their creations are means to ends? Should the so-called artist be banished from artistic or aesthetic filed? Can their artistic creations of beauty and pleasure be ousted from the category of art or aesthetics? If we keep Collingswood’s doctrine and criticism in this respect, we can easily answer ‘yes’ but as a research scholar in the field of aesthetics I have right to clear the point that the answer to the aforesaid question. If ‘yes’ is taken for granted, then it will be a great deal of doom for such
artists. Moreover, I say that on no grounds an artistic creation, expressing beauty and pleasure, and is meant for sale and consumption, be treated to be unhealthy then it is right to say that the art proper is related to the expression of emotions; and expression is always beautiful and pleasant provided it is successful (Collingwood). If a painter or a singer or a poet or an architect, or an actor or actress or a dancer and so, may have the efficiency and skill to express the emotions through their respective means, viz, colours, melodies, rhythms rhymes and so on and so forth, i.e. to say through any sort of language then they must have the status of an artist and deserves a title of that effect. It is abstruse as to why such artists be tainted with not artists. It will be a dishonour, degradation and great in justice with them.

Consequently, suppose a painter depicts a portrait in which he accompanies his artistic efficiency to its apex of art and does not allow anyone to perceive and appreciate it, I can aptly say that what shall be the use of that good skill devoted to the buried portrait. Actually such creation will serve nothing in the field of art or aesthetics. The purpose of artist in creations must clearly be displayed as to enable the audience to know, understand and evaluate the purposeful emotions expressed, provided the audience has an art experience because the spirit of art is not embodied with mere purposeless contemplation, it is rather free and fair without any such embodiment. A purposeless art is nothing more than a jejune. A masterpiece work of art must have the spirit of publicity inherent in it otherwise what can be use of an artistic creation. A purposeful creation is art proper and a purposeless creation is pseudo or to say no art. Further, the artist is expected to provide a privilege or opportunity to have experience of the emotions contained and expressed in such creations. As such, on the pinnacle of the useful expression of emotions in art, the efficiency and artistic calibre may be displayed and disclosed to the audience; if the audience response properly to the artist or are impressed by his creations and apprehend and generate the expressive impulse in their minds and are acquainted with the aims and intents of the creator and find themselves in the same situation which compelled the artist to create such a work or art then naturally we will feel bounded to give honour and regard to such an artist for his praise worthy works. In this context Mackenzie distinguishing a painter from a good person says that a painter who knows to create things of art beautifully but unfortunately does not produce any such painting or if he drops the artistic activities for sometimes but he will still be called a good painter. It is because the knowledge and efficiency of a good painting he has. No matter he gives up producing paintings or he is at pause for some times. But according to Mackenzie a good man is one who not only knows what is good but actually he exercises the knowledge of goodness in his behaviour, on account of which he can be called a good man, other wise not. In his words a good painter is one who can paint beautifully: a good man is not one who can, but who does act rightly. The good painter is good when he is asleep or on a journey, or when, for any reason, he is not employed in his art. The good man is not good when he is asleep or on a journey, unless when it is good to sleep or to go on a journey. Goodness is not a capacity or potentiality, but an activity.

My stress is on efficiency in genius of the artist that goes to make a person artist in real sense. To say that skill or efficiency is not needed except the expression, is to deprive art from its real spirit, real nature and real value. Hence, I
am right to say that the skill or efficiency in artist and the usefulness of his creations should necessarily be considered to be the most important elements in the field of art. Craft, although, is a specific skill may not be confused with art proper in which all the branches of fine art are included.

Aesthetics

Casting a great deal of light on the historical background of aesthetics we have discussed the origin, derivation and development of art in the preceding discussions and expositions under a wide range of discourse. Eventually, the term aesthetics came as a subject through the process of development in the history of aesthetics as a co-relative to 'ars' or art. Baumgarten holds the credit to use the word aesthetic or aesthetik replacing art for the first time in 1750. F.N. D. Ansilie writes in this prospective that, "Baumgarten for drawing the attention of the world to his obscure name and for reprinting his latin thesis in which the word aesthetic occurs for the first time, and Schleimacher for the tributes paid to his neglected genius in the history of aesthetic."

He (Baumgarten) defines the term aesthetic as a science of sensitive cognition only, ignoring its intrinsic relation with beauty. The British started its inquiry into the field of aesthetics treated individual as "most individual in the individual and took it to the height of aesthetic ideas, observing and training the artistic sense analysing the conditions of disinterested pleasure: this knowledge of the phenomena of feeling and perception had taken extension initiated by Baumgarten who flourished in between (1714 –1762) under the name “Aesthetica” was so far characteristically concerned about the theory of beauty as to hand down the term aesthetic as the accepted title for the philosophy of the beautiful. But George atten and urine contented aesthetics as an obscure knowledge of our feeling. As such they defined it as “..........a science that was concerned with the obscure knowledge as obscure, the knowledge in the fords of feeling, the knowledge that does not admit of adequate presentation in words.” To their mind the knowledge of our feelings and emotions as beyond description due to inadequacy of the language. Aesthetics in the same period was considered to be a latin word which stands for ‘something quite different’ but something quite different, as I, think, means different from craft implying and expressing the beside meaning of fine arts.

"Hegel conceives aesthetics as a philosophy of fine arts." "Schiller thinks that aesthetics is no more than a sphere of play" (Spiel). He attempted to establish a harmony between natural and spiritual hemispheres. Some other idealist thinkers hold the view that aesthetics is primarily concerned with “.............a theory of beautiful in general whether in art and nature.” Croce, an eminent aesthetician of 20th century, defines aesthetics as “.............the science of expressive (representative or imaginative) activity.”

F.N. Croce over runs the claim that Baumgarten was first in rank to use ‘Aesthetics,’ as a term in the field of art:
It is worthy to note that he is an idealist who believes in spiritual kingdom of life and nature but declines the concept and existence of God. His idealism provides a rich ground on which he erects his doctrine of aesthetics. Collingwood a contemporary to Croce as emphasised the ideally psychological structure of art or aesthetics and repudiates its natural aspects. There are thinkers who advocated that Aesthetics and art are the two different notions but are intrinsically interrelated. As such, before investigating the concept of the aesthetic by looking its relationship with art, we may find it useful to note the term ‘Aesthetics’ this is usually understood as referring to a style of theoretical inquiry-philosophical, psychological or sociological, as the case may be-as distinct from the aesthetic mode of awareness with which such inquiry deals. But sometimes this distinction is blurred, and ‘aesthetics’ is used where it would be more accurate to speak of aesthetic awareness (or experience, interest, appraisal etc, rather as ‘ethics’ can be ambiguous as between the study of ethical behaviour, attitudes, standards, selves. Conversely, ‘aesthetic’ is sometimes used to denote theoretical inquiry especially in respect of art, as when some one speaks of Collingwood’s aesthetic meaning, Collingwood’s “theory of art” in this reference three things are considerable: (1) aesthetics generally referred to theoretical enquiry viz, philosophical, psychological and so canonical stands different from an aesthetic sense of awareness, (2) it is also used as the theory of aesthetic awareness in complete conformity with ethics but it appears to be ambiguous because ethical enquiry is resulted to the behaviour of man while aesthetics has its concerned with art and beauty, and (3) the term aesthetics is adequately related to the inquiry in art which is treated be its accurate and plausible meaning in its inquiry, so the relationship between aesthetic and art is self evident and keen and compatible.

Indian Outlook

Prof Hiriyanna considers aesthetics as an enquiry into the character of beauty in nature as well as in art. But in Dr. Kanti Chand Pandey’s opinion “aesthetics in the context of Indian aesthetics, means the “science and philosophy of fine art.” By fine art he means, “which presents the absolute insensuous garb, and aesthetical, as distinct from the utilitarian, with a work of which gives rise or leads to the experience of the absolute.” in Indian Aesthetics there are architecture, music and poetry, only the three forms of fine art-no other form accepted by the Indian Aestheticians of the ancient period as philosophy of fine art. Aesthetics has been classified into “Rasa-Brahmavad” “Nad-Bramavad and “Vastu-Brahmavad”. But as science it concerns with techniques of all the three Vedas. Poetry holds highest position in all three kinds of fine art. But since drama includes both poetry and prose and all other helping literature, therefore it is highest in all form of poetry.
Origin of art

The origin of art, particularly of drama in Indian aesthetics is traced back from religious trinity-Brahma, Vishnu and Maheshwar, which exposes clearly the religious character of Indian aesthetics. Bharat pays obeisance to Brahma in his Natty Shastra. Brahma is regarded to be the originator of drama, and Vishnu the originator of dance. Abhinav Gupta too has the same opinion. From Bhart's time from i.e. 500 A.D to Bhatt Lollata (circa B 50) the problem of aesthetics was mainly of technique, not of beauty. It is, therefore, clear that the nature of Indian aesthetic is in no case similar to that of western aesthetics.

To sum up the historical account of the subject and the subject matter of aesthetics, I have to conclude eventually that the aesthetics can be excellently defined as a normative science of beauty and or art of expression. It has a long history of its emergence and prosperity. In the Greek antiquities the philosophers procured no such term. The word craft as a specific skill was in vogue but it was not allied to beauty. There after the word 'ars' or 'art' came into existence and its alliance was established plausibly with beauty. In 1750 the word aesthetics was probably coined and brought to light in the field of art for the first time by Baumgarten.

In 19th century it was recognized as an art and as the subject of contemplation, text and texture and meanings and manners; the modes and manners and meanings and measures of craft it is, thus, because aesthetics was treated to be an absolutely philosophical term in its meaning and application, in both of its aspects, viz connotation and denotation. All forms of the fine art - e.g. poetry, music, painting and sculpture were brought under the unfolded umbrella of the aesthetics, in 20th century different schools of aesthetics sprang up. Croce, Collingwood, Carrit, and other idealist thinkers endowed it with some new and peculiar meanings and enriched it with glamours of life and nature. In this context certain new theories were put up and distinguishingly altogether new interpretations of art and beauty were produced. Expression, intuition, representation, perception, impression and imagination etc. were taken to be the specific concepts to explain and expound the articulate meaning and specific subject matter of aesthetics.

Germany became the seat of art and artistic creations; painting was taken to be a momentous art. Dadaism, expressionism and surrealism emerged and developed as a revolt against devastating and dreadful pictures of consequences the World wars. It was an obvious anguish and resentment of the artists who tried to express their grievances by their art in thrown items e.g. bottles, papers, cigarette

F.N The compilation of drama began from Bharat's Natyam in 500 A.D and ended with Abhinav Gupta (950-1020 A.D) Ibid P.2
cases, wires, nails, pegs, pins, cards and all waste things were utilized to ridicule the combating and disturbing elements in the nature of man. The expressionists founded their art on the edifice of the quite new and thrilling points displaying their curiosity to express and to ridicule the war like nature of man in a nastily manner.

A large number of aesthetic problems were brought to light and the solution were attempted to be worked out; the first and foremost among the problems (still under discourse) has been the problem of beauty and ugliness, others are the problems of the form and matter, role of language, importance of imagination, different approaches to beauty, nature of the sublime beauty, good art and pseudo art and so on and so forth. A great deal of light will be cast on in the succeeding chapters.

Apart from the western outlook on the historical development of aesthetics, its nature and purview, the Indian aesthetician considered it quite differently. In their temptation and quest for sublime beauty they fathomed the ocean of art and aesthetic profoundly and said, ‘the sublime is complete unity of truth, good and beauty (Satyam, Shivam, Sundaram)’ in Bharat Natyam a great deal of stress has been exerted on the nature of drama. Drama being the cardinal art, which comprises of poetry, painting and sculpture too, no isolated status was granted to any of the ingredients of fine art. Drama was taken to be the root of all forms of fine art.

In modern era Chandrashekhar and a few prominent scientists viz, K.C.Gupta, K.G. Subramniyam, Premlata Sharma, Supriya Chunduri and Sitanshu Roy etc, made conspicuous affords to show a close affinity between science and art and among their creations as such. To accomplish this goal, i.e. to bring about the relationship between art and science and to explain and expound the nature of such creations, they attempted to define beauty in art and science in the spirit of the strict sense of science and scientific manners. Their efforts have not gone in vain to make the point clear that the art and science both have the spirit of beauty, an aesthetical tinge and motivation all alike. In this respect Chandrashekhar had written a trustworthy book entitled “Aesthetics and Motivation in Arts and Science”. He attempted to inculcate the idea to work on his pattern in the minds of the present and also intended for on coming generations. Consequently, the seminars were commenced to be organized by such scientists who believed in Chandrashekhar doctrine. In this panorama of S.Chandrashekhar’s ideology contained in his work “Aesthetics and Motivation in Art and Science” a new impetus was obtained and a collection of 13 research paper read out in a seminar, were published and widely circulated under the same title as “Aesthetics and Motivation in Arts and Science”(1969) The collection and publication of all such research papers was edited by Dr. K.C. Gupta who says that his edited book is based on the work ‘truth and beauty,’ aesthetics and motivation of science, by the Noble Laureate S. Chandrashekhar. He writes that aesthetics in arts, be it poetry or painting or music or dance or some other form, is a well-studied subject: the same cannot be said of sciences. However, many do accept that the pursuit of “basic science” brings in sensitivity to and criteria of beauty, truth, harmony, order and pattern”. A large number of scientists like Poincares, Einstein, Heidelberg, Dirac and many others have eloquently expressed their deeply-held convictions on the relevance of aesthetic
considerations in scientific pursuits. Finally, aesthetics is precisely beauty and excellently it is a science and art of beauty, if defined and explained properly.

Art and aesthetics are the two terms denoting one reality, no difference in their spirit or essence or field of work. Fine 'art' or 'arts' means art proper, not craft; spread over poetry, painting, music and sculpture etc. But in Indian aesthetics drama is chief one; it includes all forms of art. Beauty is related to successful expression of emotions; as such, it is called a good art (Croce) but expression of emotions, it is concrete, empirical and transcendental both the philosophy of idealism gives it the status of a concept or an idea expressed and relished by spectators, audience and readers along with himself. Even then the problem of beauty and ugliness is the principal one. Sublimity in aesthetics requires a great deal of discussion and exposition for its own sake. Keats holds the view that "beauty is truth and truth is beauty." But I say beauty is pleasure and pleasure is beauty because the inner character of beauty is pleasure; we like and desire to look at a fragrant rose flower because we get pleasure, which induces fervour in us to remain in contact with such an object of beauty. An object of beauty as the rose flower is, expresses beauty in terms of pleasure and attraction, the two basic characteristics of beauty. A sufficient amount of light will be thrown on this matter in the succeeding chapters.

Moreover, the means and manners for expressing an emotion differ from person to person or artist to artist. No amenity in this reference is probably possible. Artistic taste or art experience enables and provides opportunities to apprehend and relish in the emotions expressed. Art is not for enjoyment, it is likely for contemplation; it is beyond the access of a common man because he can never grasp the spirit and motivation of the artistic expression and creation. He will always pay attention to the index of amusement ignoring the essence of art.

For this purpose I choose Sir Walter Scott, Mirza Ghalib and Mahadevi Verma, the poets of higher possibilities who explained the expression of love in their verses as differently as speculated.

Sir Walter Scott.

True love is the gift that god has given, to man alone
Beneath the heaven it is not fantasy's hot fire
Whose wishes, soon as granted, fly.
It liveth not in fierce desire,
With dead desire it doth not die.
It is the secret sympathy,
The silver link, the silver tie
Which heart to heart and mind to mind
In body and in soul can bind
These lines of Sir Walter Scott are self-expressive, not need any more explanation.

But Mirza Ghalib thinks and expresses love as

Ishq se tabeeat ne zeest ka maza paya
Dard ki dawa pai, Dard be dawa paya

**Explanation**

In Urdu poetry the word Ishq has always been used for the spiritual or transcendental love. Ghalib expressing the motion of true love in respect of God imagines the life of love as a good taste or experience which he (Ghalib) succeeded to obtain because of this transcendental love, i.e. it is love that made the poet’s total being useful and excellently valuable. He goes on expressing the outcome of this love as painful having no cure on its own account, although he is optimistic about the cure. Metaphorically Ghalib conceives the life of love as pain giving having no cure, but for coming out of this grievous situation he is confident that his love with God, some or other day, will lead him to have access to God. But as He is neither embodied nor is He limited so the quest to get Him is also ceaseless and perpetual. As such the pains of love are also ceaseless, the flame of love in heart can never be extinguished. The same idea has been expressed.

**By Shelley**

Our sincerest laughter
With some Pain fraught
Our sweetest songs are those
That tell of saddest thought

Out of Mirza Ghalib’s two lines, the second one seems paradoxical. But there is no paradox as he expresses two of his mental conditions in which one and first is related to optimism and the second belongs to pessimism. He is pessimistic more than optimistic as he says:

Aah ko chaahiye ek umr asar hone tak,
Kaun jeeta hai teri zulf ke sar hone tak.
Hindi poetess Mahadevi Verma expressing the emotion of love utters-

Main phoolon mein roti, wey baalaraun mein muskate
Main path mein bichh jaati hun, wey saurabh mein ud jaate

**Explanation**

Mahadevi Verma was a romantic (Chhayavadi) poetess having a flavour of mysticism. She has been successful in her attempt to transfer her personal and empirical experiences of love to impersonal and transcendental love. But in the lines illustrated she appears to have her inclination to empirical love as dominant. The interpretation of these lines in my view is entirely related to sensuous love. No doubt thinkers are there who place these lines in the spiritual kingdom of love but I disagree with them.

Mien phoolon mein roti, wey baalaraun mein muskate.

May be apprehended as expressing the intensity of her love to her beloved (Preetam) who is away from her. It is deplorable condition of the poetess. She is feeling an acute pain and discomfort because of the separation (Viyoga) but her beloved not caring for her, is leading a happiest life. He is laughing; he is smiling which cause a deepest sense of sadness, grief and sorrow in her heart and mind. It is easy to understand, not abstruse because this line expresses one-sided love.

In her second line she proclaims that she has, although, surrendered herself to her beloved (Preetam), still he is not prepared to give her any lift. It is remarkable when she utters that her beloved flies away in smell, can be interpreted as her beloved’s perfectly neglectful attitude towards her, which is not applicable to God in any recourse. However, it is my personal outlook, no intention to derogate her pious and placid imageries.

Another expression of pathos involving expression of separation has been attempted to be composed in the following two lines of my own:

Nain bane hain barkha jaise, pooche na koi Muskan kahan
Neeras jeewan bita rahi mein, jeevit hain Armaan kahan.

*(Chetna)*

Concluding all this with my own views and remarks on beauty and expression, it is excellently good to say that beauty is essentially one and transcendental; the expression of which is nature it is transcendental; all spiritual and
physical expressions as beauty in the world or basically the expressions of sublime or transcendental beauty. True love is an emotional phenomenon, its expression in different ways may be observed but it is not possible to restrain it from expression. Love is sacred if it is disinterested; true love lies in the Core of heart and creates a mental feeling of discomfort and uneasiness until it is expressed and until accomplished in sublime beauty. Transcendental beauty is the shelter of all such expressions of love; there is only one eternal beauty, beyond our speculations. It is ultimately sat, chit and anand, realizable through spiritual ascention. I do not refute love and beauty based on empirical facts and phenomena as advocated by certain tinkers of the world.
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