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Chapter I

PROBLEMS OF AESTHETICS

"Ugly brings beautiful in prominence."

(St Augustine)

Aesthetics is a science of art and beauty. It involves a few but most important problems to solve; among them the problem of beauty and the problem of ugliness are treated to be first and foremost. Let us begin our inquiry into the nature of beauty from the questions; what is beauty? What are its kinds? Is beauty subjective or objective? What are canons of judgement in respect of beauty? What is sublime and after all what is ugliness and how is it related to beauty? In order to answer these questions it is necessary to examine and evaluate the various theories of beauty put forward by the thinkers from Greek antiquity to the present time. But it is a tedious job because such a vast ocean is not was to traverse.

What is beauty?

A profound study in the historical and background of beauty encourages me to define beauty first and then proceed to turn over the pages of history. My studies in the field of aesthetics have given me an idea of definition of which pleasure and attraction stand as two essential properties or characteristics of beauty. I am not in favour of beauty sensuous, as Hegel conceives of, but I contended that another type of beauty is also there; it is spiritual or ideal beauty. But above these two types of beauties, i.e. sensuous and spiritual, there is a sublime beauty to which St. Aquinas conceives as the divine manifestation. In the words of J.A. Mahon, "When we resound to the perception of beauty we are responding to either a reflection or a particular manifestation of the real thing, i.e. merely the appearance of beauty rather than beauty proper. When, on the other hand, we conceive of beauty, we are apprehending beauty proper. How we come to conceive of beauty proper varies from theory to theory. Either knowledge of beauty is deeply embodied apriori of our minds (Plato 1997A, 1997B), or beauty is a divine attribute, to know through its manifestation on the earth (Aquinas 1964-1976)." On the postulates of the two essentially peculiar characteristics of beauty we can easily put up a definition of beauty in the following words:

'Beauty may be defined as an excellent experience of pleasure and attraction to which an object of beauty necessarily implies and expresses.'

The definition, I think and believe, is most satisfactory as it characterizes beauty as a matter of pleasure as well as a matter of attraction. It means the essential qualities or the essential characteristics of beauty are: (1), pleasantness and (2), attractiveness, which an object of beauty necessarily inheres, and on account of which such object is called beautiful. In other words, a beautiful object evokes the
experience of pleasure and attraction of the object in the perceiver. Further more, the object of beauty embodied in an idea (general idea), as I think, must express these two essential characteristics, i.e. pleasantness and attractiveness for being known or experienced by the subject. The mention is not here of beauty in art because there is manipulation on the basis of perception and imagination in art. However, It is necessary in all forms of art because description of natural beauty 'as it is', will be a mimic; Plato opposes and condemns vehemently to such artists of mimic. He proclaims that the artist is liable to be doubly removed from the society; although he appreciates poetry in which music is treated to be the source of remembering the real abode of the soul.  

The pleasure or pleasantness and the attraction or the attractiveness, the essential qualities of beauty, are co-relative as well co-existent. As such, where one is, the other necessarily follows. The views of modern aestheticians of 20th century viz, Croce and Collingwood are somewhat different; in their opinion aesthetics is a science of expression. But Hegel and Kant support the view that pleasantness is the essential characteristic of beauty evoked by the object of nature. Hegel exerts great stress on the sensuous beauty of things of nature. He claims that the idea expressed in nature is beauty while Kant, on the other hand, undertakes this job not through the speculation but through reflection as R. Hopkins says, "Kant claims that the judgement of taste, as judgement that some particular is beautiful, exhibits two peculiarities. "First-- The Judgement of taste determines its object in respect of delight (as a thing of beauty) with a claim to the agreement of everyone, just as if it were objective." II Peculiarity- “Proof are of no avail whatever for determining the judgement of taste, and in this connection matters stand just as they would were that judgement, simply subjective." Subjectively, the nature of aesthetic judgement is undetermined as thought by Kant. But Hegel's approach to beauty appears merely speculative. As Hegel does not like to come out from the superfluous ranges of sensuous beauty, he may be said to be a speculative theorist. We may aptly quote here the words of Stephen Bun gay who writes, "We might now say that Hegel's aesthetics is speculative theory of art as the locus of beauty..." yerik Newton (1893) contends that beauty can not be defined. Adopting the Moore's pattern he says that Beauty is not analyzable. But he thinks that pleasure is the beauty's chief attribute, trying to explain it on mathematical postulates. He, however, takes images of beauty depending on personal experiences and culminates into subjectivism. He emphasizes love of beauty in creation of art. In the eyes of M. Ficino (1433 –1499) beauty concerns to charm to be found in the harmony of elements. So also Chakbast in his lines-

Zindagi kya hai anaasir mein zuhur-e-tarteeb.
Maut kya hai enhin ajza ka praisan hona.

Expresses the same system of life and death (also it is quoted in Introduction) and also the Charvak theory of elements in which the diversified proportion of the four material elements gives rise to life – I interprete ‘life’ as beauty. But apart from material explanation of beauty Ficino adopts an other view, the view in which he
utters to ascertain beauty, as “That of the soul is perceived by the mind; that of the body by the eyes, and that of sound by ear alone.” Further, Ficino argues that “Beauty must be incorporeal as light is incorporeal being property of virtues, sights and sounds.” He, however, culminates his theory of sensuous beauty (apparently) into transcendental elementalism. He thinks that all kinds of beauty are incorporeal but he is unable to explain how all kinds of beauty can be counted in the manner adopted by him. Albeit, he rejects out rightly the Platonic explanation of beauty in which beauty has been explained in terms of Physical elements.

Giordano in his theory of beauty tries to make a plausible contrast between sensuous beauty and pure absolute transcendental beauty. Former is lower and limited but its love in right sense leads to stepping-stone to love of higher beauty. But the later is higher and unlimited for which, in my opinion, man ought to have loving passion and loving fervour because on the tenets of which he can rise very well from ordinary level to the higher one. It has been the aim of mystics since the time and again. But another thinker Nietzsche relates beauty to woman in his treaty ‘Will to power’ (Trans. By Levy, page 256). He puts up this notion in the following words. “Our aesthetics have hither to been woman’s aesthetics, in as much as they have only formulated the experiences of what is beautiful, from the points of view of the receivers in art. In the whole of philosophy hither to the artists have been lacking”).

E. F. Carrit, an English aesthetician, contends beauty as an ‘aesthetic experience’ and explains it in the light of ‘transcendence’. He speaks of ‘transcendental’ as a feeling directed to the whole world or to God but is not worthy to be recognized as beauty except that the “transcendental” means eloquently the aesthetic experience which is not “a mere feeling like warmth or repletion, but is truly significant of something and makes that something of the greatest interest, ..... is true, and we must try to discover in what sense.” In this recourse it is obvious that mere feeling, no matter if it is moral or divine or some other one, is not an aesthetic experience nor can it be called beautiful. But if the expression of emotion in true sense is there, the criteria of natural beauty will be in our hands. Carrit says, in this respect, “yet, if from, colour, movement, sound (and not merely human form or vocal sound) are naturally expresses of such mental state, they might often be found so in nature as well as when artificially exploited. Nothing is more obvious than that rose buds express our feeling of or about youth; spring like colours and sunshine those of cheerfulness; a stormy sea those of fears or sullen anger. No body made them to be expressive, but we, in accordance with our original or the second nature of childish and life long experience and culture, may find them so as naturally as we do smile or frowns”.

However, the over all explanation of beauty in Carrit’s thought is indubiously most astonishing description requiring a sufficient light on its nature. Carrit classifies natural beauty in four forms, (1) representative beauty, (2) formal beauty, (3) classical beauty and (4) romantic beauty. The description and classification of beauty is no more than a beauty empirical or natural, but simultaneously he argues, “Beauty, though we unreflectively ascribe it to things and sensa, cannot really be one of their qualities. We ascribe it to those, which have certain significance or expression for us. But significance or expression is a relation
between that which expresses and the mind to which it expresses or which expresses itself in it." In this context it is indubiously true to say that Carrit is a confused thinker who hankers sometimes for objectivity and sometimes for subjectivity. Favouring the 'significance' of things as beautiful he thinks that the aesthetic experience related to mankind is such a beauty which is subjectively formulated by the perceiving mind. Here beauty in aesthetic judgement emerges as purely subjective instead of objective because it is 'we' who allocate the significance to the objects and then we presume that they are beautiful. Accordingly, beauty is not a vehicle of transcendental feeling, it is related to our sense perceptions or to our sensous images with a certain kind of significance. Significance along with sensous images appears to be the actual spirit and real position of the aesthetic experience. Significance, denotatively or connotatively, is a matter of reflection. I do not like to raise such a question but what I think and believe in Carrit's theory of beauty, surmounts his abstruse description of aesthetic experience, as he ever and anon and manoeuvrely speaks of aesthetic experience as an emotional expression related to the objective world. I think that Carrit is not clear on the meaning and sense of 'Significance' and 'Expression', the two terms used distinctively implying almost the same meaning. If I say that the rose bud signifies something, the so-called beauty, or if we say that the rose bud expresses something, the so-called beauty, I contend that the meaning and purpose of these two sentences can on no account be different from each other. In my opinion Significance and Expression denote the same meaning, not the two different meanings. There are certain experiences implying a certain significance but are not related to aesthetic experience. It is because significance or expression is not confined to beauty only but also it covers the range of ugly aspects of life and the world in reference. A clumsy face signifies ugliness to the perceiving mind, it is observed by us. So also every expression is not aesthetic experience and also cannot be judged as beautiful because the entire object in nature is not expressive of beauty only but also all they express ugly phases of nature. In this reference Carrit's view that certain aesthetic experiences implying significance are not countable as aesthetic, seems plausible. Certain aesthetic experiences in the physical world do not provide us an articulate and self-expressive knowledge of the things in nature as against the knowledge of feelings and emotions elucidated and obviously apprehended. Further, the aesthetic experiences in the field of science and also in historicity have been considered to be different from the aesthetic experiences by Carrit. This view confronts to Chandrashekhar's doctrine of science and art. Chandrashekhar proclaims the aesthetic experience in scientific penetrations and he finds beauty in the analysis of atoms, in the profound study of certain kinds of actions and reactions in chemistry and in the researches of other scientific subjects and so on and so forth.

For Carrit significance is the characteristic of beauty, as considered and interpreted by me, and if it is correct then the objects signifying or expressing may categorically be deferred as beauty: Beauty in this sense is not more or less than aesthetic experience, which is I think, a praiseworthy attempt to reconcile the objective doctrine with the subjective theory of beauty. Carrit assimilates the idealistic theory in his doctrine and speaks of ideas to be the datum of beauty. It is nice to quote here, "We should be driven then to say that it is not physical things
which are properly to be called beautiful but only our "ideas" of them, the "sense" which we have in perceiving or remembering them or which we construct by combination of remembered sense; and what these sense are will depend not only upon the acuteness of our sense or the retentiveness of our memory but upon the degree and direction of interest, which is determined in many ways.10

**Degrees in beauty:**

A question of dignity may be arisen pertaining to the kinds or degrees of beauty. The answer to it is indispensable because without such an answer the notion of beauty cannot be put up articulately nor can it be apprehended in true sense. The discussion so far and so long on the nature, meaning and form of beauty suffices to consider reflectively the various degrees or kinds or forms of beauty, if possible because there is difference of opinion on this matter. However it is not easy to enumerate all kinds of beauty but our practical life persuades to procure the degrees in beauty by saying, "This idol is beautiful," "this rose flower is very beautiful," “this building is most beautiful,” “that woman is comparatively most beautiful,” “that woman is comparatives looks more beautiful than the woman standing in vicinity” and at last we proceed towards sublime, the highest beauty so far disclosed and perceived or apprehended ideally or spiritually. However, “the kinds of beauty will be as many as there are kinds of cognition and kinds of value that may be found in cognition.”10x

If we come to the realm of Indian aesthetics we just have an other classification of beauty, produced in the basis of two viewpoints, viz, philosophical and practical: Philosophically, beauty is dealt with intellect but practically it is dealt with intuition. The following map of classification reveals the beauty in degree or in kind:-

![Beauty Classification Diagram](image)

(Aesthetic Theories of India Vol.I (Dr. Padma Sudhi, CH I sec. II.).

This classification is seemingly paradoxical on certain grounds, though it is an undeniable fact that beauty can be considered under many heads but the head lines as beauty dealt philosophical and beauty treated artistically (as dealt and experienced in
the arts) are not very sound because art and philosophy are no doubt the two distinct subjects of study but are closely related to each other; separation of the two will concisely lead to dangerous points. Aesthetics as a science of beauty and art, comes out from philosophy as its one of the species and cannot be kept absolutely isolated from philosophy. Reflectivity, Beauty is that which is asserted as the ground of beauty, created by the artist in his artwork. Moreover, the distinction between the beauty in fine arts and beauty in poetry is not logical because poetry has always been treated to be the queen of all the forms of fine arts. So no discrimination is plausibly possible in this prospective. Another clumsy phase of this classification can very well be pointed out by putting down the confusion arisen in between physical beauty and the natural beauty. So far as I think physical beauty is related to individuality as woman beauty or else to some other alike. But the natural beauty is related to natural objects- the land -scapes, the rose flowers and scenes of hills and jungles etc. But these two kinds might be headed under one sub class of Natural beauty. Mental beauty and transcendental beauty may be interpreted as the two phases of one spiritual beauty. To borrow Croce’s expressionism is to conceive of beauty as intuition; it culminates, so far as I think, into transcendence or sublime. So the distinction made between mental beauty and transcendental beauty must have been reconciled, on one point only which has been overlooked, making the theory of classification complicated. Ethical beauty signifies the notion of good but why not truth has been placed as logical beauty, although Croce postulating his theory of expression on his idealism, had the opportunity to consider logic as an essential need for intuition: to him “Intuition is blind; intellect lends her eyes” (Aesthetic: Croce p. 2)

Acclaiming the classification in question I have to say that although such a classification is arbitrary and superfluous yet it is worthy to consider in the light of its practical utility. Schiller’s definition of the aesthetic experience is peculiar. According to him aesthetic experience is satisfaction of the play impulse in a peculiar sense; it is a happy and harmonious state of our sensuous or appetitive impulses with the rational and moral phenomna. Schiller sees greatest good in ‘virtue’ as against Kant’s notion of beauty. The satisfaction of the play impulse is beauty but it is a wrong view because subjectivity does not mean the fulfilment of impulses and desires of the ordinary level, as the word play impulse’ denotes. Schiller might have had explained it on some logical patterns but he could not succeed to get his goal, I think so.

Dr. Jhonson defines beauty as “that assemblage of graces or proportion of parts, which pleases the eye.” But Carrit adds “or ear or imagination” as the two more phenomena to be attributed to assemblage of grace. It is just a sensuous description of beauty in which qualities like charming, lovely, sublime or ugly or hideous or such which deliberately express the sense of beautiful, like physical objects having the qualities of colours, shapes, sounds, combinations or patterns of all these expressed qualities. This is all aptly related to human bodies and their faces, animals and vegetables, sky and its stars and to all other objects of nature, which have such quality that pleases our eyes and regulates out minds. Dr. Jhonson’s definition of beauty is no more than a description of sensuous beauty. It is at par with all those who considered and conceived beauty as purely sensous but phenomenally;
Hegel and Dr Iqbal are the suitable examples. Dr Iqbal, an eminent Indian philosopher and poet, puts up his notion of beauty in the following lines.

Speakth Beauty, one day, to God, in dreaming thought.
Life-infallible in the world, why ye giveth me not
Picture house is this world, Beauty heard in reply.
It's ballad of long dark night of non-being so high.
When we born of changing fate and changing set.
Beautiful is what, whose truth one day comes at rest.
Heard all this full moon, standing somewhere neigh
Diffused over all heavens, heard it morning star with sigh.
Hearing this from the star, dew was murmured by dancing dawn.
Heaven's mystery opened to the friend of earthly lawn.
On this of dew, a tide of tears bursts forth from blossoms' eye.
The tendered heart of a bud smallest, went into sad grievous sigh
Spring went out weeping, from the flowery field
Youth that cometh out for springing, went out waiting yield.

(Translated from Urdu)
"Kulliat-e-Iqbal"

Hutcheson, another subjectivist, defines, "Beauty is not in an object without relation to a perceiving mind." So also Plotinus, a Greek thinker, conceives of beauty as reflection. He says, "In beauty we see the reflection of our own spirits".

Criticising the above-discussed definitions of Carrit and others I have to say that Carrit's idea of significance in respect of beauty is rudimentary and clumsy and is not compatible. Significance is not a property of things to be called beauty; it is fundamentally an activity resembling expression through which something comes out not only as beauty but also as ugly. To say a rose flower is beautiful, is no more than to think of rose expressing beauty; such a beauty is not more than the significance or expression of the attributes of pleasantness and attractiveness. These attributes impress our reflective minds, and we just apprehend beauty in the form of such attributes. Significance or expression is not property; it is an activity through which beauty is brought to light. The signifying rose is different from the qualities signified; better to say rose expresses itself and impresses the viewer by its
pleasantness and attractiveness, the two essential characteristics of beauty. Actually what rose flower signifies, is confined to the expression of its characteristics of pleasure and attraction? Significance as explained by Carrit is not plausible or logical, as it is used as a new term in lieu of expression. Croce's expressionism, I think, has exerted too much influence on Carrit's theory of aesthetic experience. Croce talks of spiritual experience, Carrit talks of aesthetic experience; each of the two adheres experience as the spiritual or the practical relatively.

Dr. Johnson's definition of beauty is not up to the mark. The assemblage of graces, and the presence of a reflective mind (Hutcheson) do not clarify the meaning of beauty. Mere assemblage of graces cannot satisfy the aesthetic mind. Beauty may be contained in graces but without fair activity of expression, the mass of graces will stand meaningless. The presence of mind, as Hutcheson says, can work as media without which beauty cannot be realized. It is realizing mind that brings beauty in light, it is correct, but an excellent and most comprehensive explanation of beauty by means of reflective mind is not possible, as it requires some relational principles through which the reflective mind may have the knowledge of beauty existing outside in the objects of nature.

The view of Plotinus is seemingly subjective; he was a Greek mystic who tried to explain the life and the nature subjectively by adopting spirituality as the best technique to solve all the philosophical problems. His thought seems tilted towards sublime, yet needs exposition.

This is all fairly intended by me, not derogately because all these philosophers are great one and I have a great deal of esteem for all of them.

Meaning of beauty and meaning of ugliness

Defining beauty and exposing its meaning we can say that the pleasure and attraction interwoven together reveal the tacit meaning of beauty. It is easy to define and expound the meaning of ugliness on the same pattern that the pain and aversion interwoven together expose the tacit meaning of ugliness. The meanings of beauty and ugliness have been produced from an objective point of view. Subjectively, no standard for defining and exposing the meanings of these two terms is so far possible because the nature of subjective approach to beauty and ugliness differs from person to person and theory to theory. It means pleasures and attractions are the two essential characteristics of beauty, reverse to it, displeasure and aversion are the two negative characteristics of ugliness. Beauty evokes pleasure and attraction means, in modern Crocian language, as expression of pleasure and of attraction experienced by subject or the perceiver; contrary to it the object of ugliness is devoid of these positive characteristics, expressing displeasure and aversion to the experiencing mind or the subject. We like to see beauty but do not like ugliness, though existence of ugly is a universal necessity for ascertaining beautiful.

Hegel and Kant both have the same opinion about the nature of beauty but differ from the common meaning of the pleasure as Mothershill observes beauty as pleasure, but she interprets and explains the casual relation between beauty and pleasure as follows:
"The person who would be disqualified [from making a genuine judgement of beauty] is one who found nothing beautiful, whose pleasure in persons; objects, or events was always explicitly linked to appetite on need.........all that is required of a subject is that there be something he takes to be beautiful and further that at least one such taking be allowed by him to be aesthetic conviction. He can then concur in the claim and some judgement to taste are genuine judgements"  
(Mothershill 1984:176)

In my support of the definition that beauty necessarily implies pleasantness and attractiveness, I refer once again Kant’s insistence on pleasure. “Kant insists that no one is entitled to call object ‘Beautiful’ unless the pleasure it occasions him is not mediated by a concept, not conditional on an ‘interest’ not tainted by charm on emotions etc. To any such view there are two serious objections, raised by Mothershill, who likes to put up conceptual analysis of the casual explanation of beauty. She conceives her definition of beauty as to be resting on the conceptual link between beauty and pleasure evoked by beauty and other sorts of pleasures in the world.” Her solution is that an abject must evoke pleasure in the observer by virtue of its aesthetic properties; this is the basis of genuine judgement of beauty, according to Mothershill  

A definition that begins with pleasure but goes on to indicate the pleasure of gratified desires etc is closer to bring a restoration of the problem than it is to providing a key for its solution, seems to me correct...

Speaking truly, beauty holds the position as an apriori idea in our minds. It is not a logical concept so as to be formed by us; it is self generated and self-expressed. It is pleasant and attractive in itself. In this reference A. L. Cothey explaining the nature of beauty plausibly states. “It is an emotional element, a pleasures of ours, which nevertheless we regard as a quality of things.”

Again he cited a reference on beauty in which it is said, “Beauty is pleasure objectified.” It means the idea of beauty objectified evokes the characteristics of pleasantness and attractiveness in us.

Now it is clear that the definition of beauty in terms of pleasure and attraction is adequate and expedient, although the interpretations of pleasure may defer from person to person and theory to theory.

Regarding ugliness it is good to mention that the idea of beauty in our minds, or the objectivity of beauty in the objects will loose its value and existence, if the situation is found changed. Beauty or beautiful is related to the favourable and pleasant conditions of a situation but on changing phenomena the form of beauty will radically stand out rightly changed, i.e. if the mental condition or existing situation is changed, the result will come out as ugly. Thus the things in nature will not be perceived as beautiful; the characters of beauty-pleasure and attraction- will be hampered and the expression be impeded. As such, the same object of beauty will stand totally cut off from the idea of beauty existing in the mind. This is the ugly phase or the unpleasant and averse scene of the things in nature. For example, a beautiful woman is that who looks beautiful because her beauty evokes the sense of pleasantness and attractiveness in the perceiver. But it is not necessary to plunge into love with her as thought by some artists, but it is a fact that her beauty will be admired to its higher degree of limits by the perceiver because a beautiful object is always preferred and desired to be seen and praised again and again by the perceiver.
If an emotion of love is aroused then the situation will occur too serious to be described in words. To prove this fact I like to produce here Kalidas’s Meghdootam in which price’s valentine (verbal) was to be conveyed to his beloved, the queen of beauty, by the messengers, the gods of the clouds but the messengers of the prince, i.e. gods on perceiving the princess forgot their duty and words given to the prince and plunged into love with the princess, and tried to make explained theirs love to her. It was the sensuous love and ambition for her. It happened because of the fact that the princess had the characteristics of pleasure and attraction and had the power of expressing them perfectly.17

In the same way Wordsworth, an English poet of the nature, receives the impetus of composing a poem when observed artistically the movements of Daffodils in the field. He was impressed too much by the expressing nature of the flowers, as pleasure and attraction both impressed him to move his pen for the poetic lines, a stanza of which is referred as fellows.

“For oft, when on my couch I lie,  
In vacant or in pensive mood  
They flash upon the in-warded eye  
Which the bliss of solitude”

An idea of the beauty of dancing daffodils has been stated as ‘bliss of solitude’ Dr. R.B. Sharma commenting on Wordsworth’s daffodils says “Here the poet describes his mind as a seat of bliss, that is, perfect happiness, when he is in solitude, physically or mentally. It evidences his great love of solitude and by the same reason, of solitary, of solitary figures.18 It is precisely good to differentiate between pleasure and bliss. Pleasure is related to sensuous beauty while bliss to spiritual beauty but both are inter-related in fact

Some physicists as N. Mukunda in his article has quoted Werner Heisenberg’s definition of beauty in the following words, “Beauty is the proper conformity of the parts to one another and to the whole.19 The definition expresses beauty in art and science at par but an other kind of beauty has also been mentioned in which strangeness in proportion has been made the criteria of beauty. Francis Bacon holds the view that “There is no excellent beauty that hath not some strangeness in the proportion’20

But this is all a description of physical beauty only, in which objectively it is presumed that symmetry, order, coherence, harmony and proportion are such principles by which a proper judgement may be given on the beauty of the objects. A scientist does not have his acquaintance with an ideal beauty or sublime one. The scientist ignores the subjective approach to beauty, will or nilly.

In modern art beauty is treated to be a successful spiritual activity and contrary to it an unsuccessful activity is called unsuccessful expression. It is an intuitive expression or knowledge.21 Assuming the notion of expression, the activity which implies the successful and the evolving process may be called a full fledged form of beauty, while contrary to it, will stand ugly. In this sense the use of the
words beauty and ugly may also be undertaken in other fields of knowledge viz, there may be economic expression corresponding to economic beauty, ethical expression corresponding to moral beauty, logical expression corresponding to logical beauty and scientific expression, in the same manner, corresponding to scientific beauty. But for an unsuccessful activity, intuitive or expressive, we can use the words like bad, inexpedient, useless and so on for denoting the ugliness or ugly. But precisely a successful spiritual or intuitive activity or expression being beauty in itself cannot be attributed to either of the above such words which are taken to be tantamount to the term beauty and ugly in real and expedient sense. It is a mistaken view to treat, right, true, expedient and so on as beauty, and bad, wrong, false, inexpedient etc as ugly; No matter beauty has a positive while the ugly entails negative aspect of the phenomena. Albeit, both are spiritual activities with the difference only that a successful or retarded expression denotes ugly.

Beauty and ugly are inter-related phenomena their coexistence is self-evident. Beauty without ugly and ugly without beauty will come to a meaningless end. In my view, beauty as a positive value inheres pleasantness on account of which we are attracted and its contrary, the ugly is painful and involves the element of aversion. We judge, generally, beauty and ugly on the basis of successful and unsuccessful expression; it is from Croce’s point of view who himself is not very clear in his doctrine of expressionism as he sometimes thinks of expression as the only expression which has no degrees in it but some times he changes his view. He fails to explain the spirit of lucidity in a successful expression. Consequently, Croce explains expression as “Beauty as a successful expression is rather an expression and nothing more, because expression when it is not successful is not expression.” But this explanation of beauty and ugly is not very sound. However, “the ugly, with its corresponding displeasure was that aesthetic activity that did not succeed in conquering the obstacles that lay in its way; the beautiful is the expressive activity the now triumphantly unfolds itself.” Ugly, therefore, stands in complete confrontation with beauty because an activity, which is obstructed in its expression, is ugly and that which is conquering is beautiful.

**Subjective and objective approaches**

The problem of beauty and ugly can be studied and approached by subjectively or objectively. Subjectively, mental or mode of thinking may exert its influence too much on our mode of perception or as such to an object of perception. A man in happy mood perceives a thing of beauty in the situation most beautiful while the other in melancholious mood or as not having a happy mood may look the same object as painful and ugly. There are different theories of beauty in which the subjectivists theories emphasise the role of perceiver more than the object perceived because the statements such as “When I say something is beautiful I just mean that I like it,” and “Beauty is a subjective thing- it’s beautiful for you if you enjoy it and it’s not beautiful for me if I don’t are frankly subjectivistic.” But actually these are the two different ways of approaching beauty-subjective and objective. Objective beauty exists actually in nature and can never be judged as ugly, or as not
beauty, or as a pseudo art, or not an art, by any one who has an aesthetics experience. He is the only competent in passing judgement on beauty and not-beauty. It is an objective approach to the problem and is basically related to physical beauty, while Croce and other expressionists repudiate the doctrine of sensuous beauty; to them it is a mental expression which involves no higher and lower degrees, if it is successful, it is beauty or a good art, otherwise it is ugly or a pseudo-art. Since expression is beauty and obstruction in expression accompanies the notion of ugliness, then it is meaningless to say and recognize any abject of ugliness as to be entirely empty of the expression, where as a hampered expression is also there. However, a few characteristics of beauty as expression must exist in the object the so called ugly with the difference that the characteristics of beauty whatever is an object of beauty in the form of expression have their expression free, full fledged, clear, coherent, plausible and paramount on account of which a beautiful object is deemed as beautiful. While in an ugly object of the nature the expression involves only a few such characteristics (but other than pleasure and attraction) which are not inside and coherent rather such characteristics of beauty are found mostly obscure, inexpedient and implausible in the objects the so called as ugly, this interpretation and exposition of beauty and ugliness is given here from an expressionists point of view, otherwise mostly thinkers of the Greek antiquity as well as medieval and modern history postulated their doctrines on the sensuous property of the sensuous beauty; it is pleasure: even Kant and Hegel, the two most eminent philosophers, could not cross over the bridge existing between sensuous and spiritual kinds of beauty.

Expression is beauty and impeded expression is ugly, it prevails through out in objects of beauty and in those of ugly. It means that the objects by themselves are neither beautiful nor ugly; it is the activity of expression that makes a thing beautiful or ugly. But this doctrine of expression as beauty and as ugly, propounded by Croce and supported by Collingwood, is not seemingly well dressed for solving the most complicated and discursive problem of beauty. To my mind beauty is an inborn idea in the human mind. It is not logic of concepts nor a fanciful thought but a reality, indubitable. It is a General idea, which is one but many in particular corresponding to things of beauty and to things of ugly. This idea exists in the mind as universal and in things as particular. As a general idea or universal (Aristotle) the concept of beauty expresses itself through objects of the nature. Philosophically, the universal (general idea) of beauty may be comprehended and expounded as ideal or sublime beauty; it requires proper consideration so as to make the notion plausible. Beauty, as I think, is a ‘general idea’ which is one and universal in the doctrine of Plato and is related to hierarchy of ideas, if taken for granted then beauty as a general idea stands in the galaxy of ideas or universals and is entirely one, not many. But due to certain spiritual interference or activity or else due to material operations as Plato thought, the same one general idea of beauty seeks its expression in the objects of nature donning itself in the garment of particularity, may also be called ‘the process of particularisation’. In the process of particularisation or the activity of formation the one idea of beauty expresses itself in objects of nature as many. It is not my business to un sheathe the Platonic theory of ideas. My concern is to furnish the proof that beauty is a general idea in Plato’s doctrine, which is not fake or merely as
chimera in the human mind but it is a concrete idea corresponding to reality in fact and also in essence.

Now the question is where does this general idea of beauty or the co-existent idea of ugliness reside? "Who is its creator? Whether it exists in human mind or else its abode is a Supreme mind (ultimate reality). Adopting Berkeley’s ‘Subjective Idealism’ as previously alluded that this general idea of beauty and ugly is neither created by itself because idea is not ultimate reality, nor it is created by any finite being because a General does not depend on human mind. It is rather a creation of God in reality. Berkeley and all other theologian philosophers of the world hold this view. As such this idea and also the other ideas of truth, good, consciousness and perfection etc have the same status in the galaxy. All such ideas are placed in human minds by the generating and unifying whole good, truth, and beauty or knowledge, consciousness and bliss, which are the highest values of life, but not sheer ideas in finite minds; they have their corresponding realities in the world. A materialist does not believe in God is right to decline any such doctrine that makes spirituality possible on the ground that materialistic viewpoint regarding knowledge belongs to sense perception only. He ignores conceptual or intuitive knowledge. An idealist may also be one who believes in the existence of soul or spirit but does not like to believe in any personal or impersonal God, I have no concern to discuss except to cite the example of Croce who himself does not believe in God’s existence. But he goes on explaining his theory of expression on the postulates of idealism, in which he recognizes self experience as the only dynamic and spiritual reality: creativity is its essence and so he contends that the implied creativity expresses itself in two types of activities: theoretical and practical in which the later depends on the former, and again theoretical has two forms-intuitive knowledge and so on, but in no case he agrees with the notion of God. A great deal of light, in this reference, is expected in the synthetic theory of beauty, developed and expounded by me in the succeeding pages of the thesis.

Kinds of beauty and theories of beauty

Definition of the aesthetic postulated on the essential characteristics of pleasure and attraction is seemingly excellent and expedient but theories of beauty from Greek antiquities to present day aesthetics are many and require due consideration in the reference of the expediency of sense and meaning of the so called pleasure, as an essential quality or characteristic of beauty. The object in the perceiver generally evokes this characteristic. I present here an overview of possibly all such theories that have been produced by the philosophers through out the ages and suggest how they might, willy-nilly, be reconciled and recognized. Postulating the pleasure as an essential characteristic of beauty the history of the theories of beauty can be put into two main traditions. The division is based on the quality and kind of pleasure experienced and evoked by the object of beauty itself. As such, the following two traditions sprang up: - one Pythagorean tradition and two,
pleasure-principle tradition. A brief survey of these two traditions will suffice to know the nature and kinds of beauty.

(1) Pythagorean Tradition based on quality of the pleasure

Those theorists who advocate that the pleasures differ in quality; as such only sober, serious placid and contemplative kind of pleasure excited by a certain state of merely formal relations can be deemed to be the only pleasure quality or characteristic of an experience of beauty. In this regard, the nature, the music and all the intellectual constructs or reflective phenomena, viz theories postulated a mathematical edifice might be used to exemplify beauty in this tradition. Hence beauty is treated to be a relational property.23

Albeit, appearance of beauty and beauty proper are also distinct from each other. If it is so, then how can we discriminate appearance of beauty from beauty proper?; are the two very typical question. We have alternatively two theories in this respect; either we have an inborn idea of beauty in our minds as Berkeley conceives, or beauty so a divine characteristic which comes to our experience through manifestation on the earth as St. Aquinas proclaims. But in 18th century a common thesis was produced to allude to the knowledge of beauty in which it was said that we have an inner sense faculty of beauty that articulately responds to objects in nature and from which we obtain our idea or notion of beauty.

Theory of Relativity

In the prospect of quality of pleasure the Pythagorean theory can be determined to be a theory of relativity, as such according to Pythagorean theorists, there are two types of beauty—one is relative and the other is universal or to say absolute; both are embedded into one on the assumption that either relative is the manifestation of the absolute or both kinds of beauty are generated from different aspects of the one inner sense or faculty of beauty.

Even then no universal principle can be investigated by the analysis of the subjective approach to beauty, and hence, it is not possible to make conclusive judgement on beauty because apart from the objective judgments of beauty the subjective judgements are on no account stand absolute and universal; all such judgements differ from person to person and theory to theory. Yet, there is a need of universally recognized principles of judgements as writes Mothersill, “Kant, however, who investigated the nature of beauty through the mental condition necessary for its experience, concluded that there can be no principle of beauty. Yet reasoned that judgements of beauty are universal (Kant 1987)”24. It seems paradoxical as well as scrupulous. In my opinion the solution of such statements is possible, provided an impartial analysis of all such judgements is carried out.
**Disinterested-Pleasure-theory**

Under the Pythagorean umbrella disinterested pleasure theory of beauty was produced in 9th century explaining which Erigena conceived that a person whose mental state is related to gratification of desires, cannot experience beauty of the objects. So also Aquinas had maintained that the pleasure excited by beauty is not the same as beauty associated with biological pleasure. If pleasure so desired as to satisfy to itself, i.e. sensuous desire then it will have no pleasure of beauty. And if the mental state requires perceiving beauty with a state of contemplation involving perception and cognition then it will be, of course, a pleasure of beauty. Shaftesbury recognizes a lack of self-interest in pleasure seeking response to beauty, which is disinterest pleasure. The judgement of beauty according to Shaftsbury must be postulated on the universal feature of mind. He tries to avoid all possibility of egocentric phenomenon; the pleasure of beauty is like perceiving a solution to a problem, and enjoying it for its own sake. Finally, disinterested pleasure is mentally felt and experienced instead of taking it to be sensuous as related to gratification of human desires.

**Pleasure-Principle tradition**

Contrary to recognizing qualitative differences in pleasures of various types, the followers in this tradition maintain the state of Excellency at par in all kinds of pleasures. Consequently, objects associated with the sensuous pleasure, e.g. colour, taste, smell, touch and so on are such, which can exemplify beauty adequately. This tradition does not discriminate between pleasure of sense and pleasure of mind, between a pleasure of higher degree and a pleasure of lower degree, and between pleasure as pleasure and pleasure as bliss. All types of pleasures are equal in value in all respects and are liable to be counted for beauty without hesitation.

Pedagogically, it can be stated here that Aristippus in Greek antiquities and Bentham in modern era do not agree on making any qualitative distinction in pleasures; to them all pleasures are qualitatively tantamount in degree, as Bentham clears this point by uttering, "Quantity of the pleasure being equal pushpin is as good as poetry". But Lucippus and Mill investigated qualitative distinction in pleasures and determined their values along with quantity. Hence the standard of moral judgement, according to Mill, came out as good and greater number because for Mill good and number are explicitly related to the kind of pleasure, which procures "greatest happiness of the greatest number to human beings". He considers quality of the pleasure as of greater value. Hence, the role of pleasure seems to be conclusive in the field of ethics and aesthetics both all alike.

The pleasure-principle theory maintains strenuously all the pleasurable responses to observation of an object in nature or other, are counted for the expedient responses to beauty; as such all the aspects of an object in our perception are deemed to be relevant to a judgement of beauty including all the sensuous property. But "when all pleasures evoked by the perception of the object are counted as pleasurable
responses to beauty, beauty is collapsed into the agreeably sensuous and the good." Similarly, Epicureans contended good and beautiful as one and the same. This theory seems to be based on the dry acme of undressed pleasure.

In the 20th century the metaphysical concept of beauty conflated with the ontology of art. In this era a great deal of influence of Dr. Freud and Neo-Darwinians on art, plays and artifices, i.e. music and painting etc might be seen interestingly. Thus, beauty was conceived as a sublimation of desire yet the original purpose of desire remains an activity of procreation.

Guy Sir Cello propounds an other form of pleasure principle theory postulated on P. Q. D. formula. This theory imbibes relativity in its spirit and manner of expression. P. Q. D. means an object of beauty will be deemed to be beautiful, provided it contains ‘Property of Qualitative Degree to a very high degree. In this theory P. Q. D is taken to be completely free from any sort of deficiencies. The object is regarded meaningful with all its aspects in broader sense of its text and texture i.e., from sensuous to the formal as if the pleasure is aroused between sensuous and formal then there will be P.Q.D in a very high degree. The propounder Sir Cello speaks out colour of an object and the morals are possibly the objects of beauty. He argues that these qualities of an object, which are not enjoyed, are not beautiful. He banished out all such mute qualities from the field of aesthetic judgement, which are not enjoyed. Hence, according to him such mute qualities are not beautiful. Albeit, he introduces connoisseur conditions to conceive and judge beauty, not as a personal response but as a sufficient number of experiences of other competent persons also: such experiences are the experiences of majority, will be granted as true canon for assessing beauty, if difference of opinion is found. Guy Sir Cello has owned this pattern from J. S. Mills’s utilitarianism in the field of ethics.28a

Guy sir cello’s P.Q. D. theory is not tenable for as it appears tautologous. As regards the explanation of the property of high degree quality is concerned, it appears obscure as J. A. Mc Mohan criticising P.Q.D. theory of beauty says “Sir Cello’s theory is more complex and philosophically more interesting than the crude Freudian and neo-Darwinian stands of the pleasure-principle tradition, but it does not deliver what we need of a theory of beauty”28b.

**Physicalist’s worldview theory**

In modern science and technology Physicalist’s worldview theory provides an opportunity to comprehend and explain beauty on purely physiological grounds. Since the problem of subjectivity and objectivity is difficulty to solve through any universal principle, therefore, in this theory visual processes have been recognized to build up visual from of beauty in part or its visual primitives during perception. The visual form-construction is obtained by the canons of the form embodied in the visual system. Hence, the judgement of beauty would be lawful based on principles of perception. However, no such principles of beauty can be there except a physical one i.e., a rational basis for genuine judgements on beauty which leads to true possibility of mathematical, scientific, moral and intellectual beauty can be obtained, but it may be hampered because perceptual beauty and
perceptual principles run simultaneously some what in parallel way from the higher level judgements of a cognitive phenomenon. The Physicalist's worldview theory explains the nature of beauty on the postulates of physiology only, explaining beauty it is said, "The degree to which a beautiful object promotes an intellectual response, in the degree to which its beauty will be dynamic and relative, rather than constant and universal." But criticising this theory J. A. Mc. Mahon writes that this theory is not a theory of art and beauty as no assumptions have been made about them (art and beauty); it is because an artistic creation in art in itself may be pleasurable on the sensuous level without stimulating a response of beauty. Further, perceptual principles have evolved in response to survival pressures exerted by the organism, need interacting involve any personal perceptual judgement on beauty rather it has the characteristic of universality of beauty, interpreted beauty in terms of perceptual responses to the perceiver's mind. But it is not tenable because the relation between object and subject as regards beauty has not been lawfully explained.

**Modern theory of beauty:**

Apart from hedonistic theories of beauty as discussed above, in 20th century the theory of expression was formulated by expressionist thinkers who had related art and beauty to expression. Although expressionism as a school of art and literature had a long history but Croce and Collingwood have the credit to develop and produce expressionism in a convincingly excellent manners.

Accordingly, the intuitive expression was trusted to be art or beauty. These thinkers have keen interest in artistic beauty more than aesthetic beauty. Croce proclaims that only a successful expression can be called a good art while an unsuccessful expression stands pseudo. He does not distinguish between a lower expression and a higher expression. To him and also to his true follower Collingwood all expressions in art stand all alike. Croce and Collingwood both criticize vehemently the historicity of all pleasure principles and they emphasise the value and importance of expression in the field of art. This theory will be discussed and possibly criticised in the chapters meant for this purpose. But Croce is an opponent of all the hedonistic theories as he says; "..........the hedonists naturally do not succeed in seeing anything else in any activity but pleasure and pain. They find no substantial difference between the pleasure of a good action and that breathing the fresh air with wide - expanded lungs."30

In this reference Croce criticises all forms of plays: comic or tragic; all kinds of poetics: pathetic or rejoicing and all sorts of games meant for pleasure or recreation. For this very reason nothing of them can be granted for serving the purpose of art and beauty. He recognizes the process of expression through all such creations but not for the availability of pleasure. If expression of emotions is there in plays, poetics, paintings and sculptures then the art and beauty will excellently be there otherwise not. (Croce does not recognize the importance of emotion in art, according to my assessment, but he must had to give room to emotions, however at least in a tacit form) Further in this course he banishes the logical truths from the field of art, as he says, "The science of thought (Logic) is that of the concept, as that
of imagination (Aesthetics) is that of expression the well-being of both sciences lies in exactly carrying out in every particular the distinction between the two domains. 31

Emotizing the discussion on beauty and ugliness it is just to say that the problem is complex and mostly it has been considered empirically; even Kant himself could not surpass the physical sphere in his reflective explanation of beauty. All such theories except that of expressionists are found rotating around the sensuous pleasures. A very little attention we paid to sublime (grand beauty) but any one has produced no plausible exposition.

**Synthetic theory of beauty – developed and exposed by me.**

I propose two hypotheses to work on for answering the question what is beauty and contrary to it what is ugliness? First, we should consider beauty and there after in reference the problem of ugliness. Now, beauty is either a concept or an idea; as a concept someone in the history of aesthetics had evidently formed it sometimes and somewhere in the world civilization. Postulating beauty as a concept as constructed by someone, we can very easily content ourselves by assuming that there was no such thing as beauty in human mind with which he was acquainted from the times incommommerable; it must have been a primitive stage of human civilization. The alternate hypothesis is compatible to the theory of idealism in reference of which we can postulate our thesis on beauty and ugliness assuming that the a general idea of beauty and ugliness are not the two confronting i.e., beauty and ugliness are not the two confronting concepts rather are the two inborn universals or ideas in human mind (Berkeley’s style). Before onward developments of the theory it is precisely good to briefly deal with the genesis and the nature of ugliness side by side. Now the question is what is the status of these ideas in human mind? Who is creator? It is momentous to note that this thesis on beauty is synthetic and is intended to be postulated possibly on the most logical acme of idealism. Now the answer to the questions is simple: it is beauty sublime which is dynamic and unifying whole; it is absolute, conclusive; ultimate, self conscious, self luminous, creative and progressively dialectical reality, full of contradictions; such as beauty and ugliness, mind and matter or being and not being, consciousness and unconsciousness, finite and infinite, perfect and imperfect, pleasure and pain and so on and so forth. Sublime is not only full of contradictions but also all contradictories seek shelter in it and get the state of harmony, i.e. it is a reconciling principle in itself (Hegelian style). The sublime is generating reality of all such general ideas and is responsible for their inducement to human mind. It is again a self-evident fact that these ideas and the idea of beauty have not been created by any finite being, for, as all such ideas are independent from us; Berkeley holds this view. But how the ideas come to work in a finite mind is a problem to solve as yet. After the Aristotelian style we can say that the general or universal as an idea of beauty along with other universals may be assumed to be perfect in themselves, which have two sides of their own, viz as one universal and as many particulars, like a coin having ahead and a tail in which the universal is like a content and particular is like a form but actually both are one, not isolated rather one and the same with the difference that the universal as potentially
realizes itself as actual in the particular; it is all due to interference of the ‘Unmoved Prim Mover’; thus removing the short comings of Plato’s idealism in which Plato places his ideas, seemingly, above the stars. The idea of beauty in this regard may be explained with an excellent certainty by assuming that it has two phases of its expression— the nature and the spirit, the general and the particular, the content and the form, though all these modes of expression are co-existent. This explanation of the genesis of beauty and ugliness is not very sound and it requires some modification in which we can say that beauty is a divine manifestation in the nature. (St. Augustine’s ideal) but mere speculative supposition does not serve the purpose. In this respect the best and convincing solution, as I think, may be proposed under a precise and plausible thesis on my own account availing the opportunity to contend that beauty and the idea of ugliness come to human minds simultaneously from without, and are the two co-relative facts: that without is God. St. Augustine proclaims that ugly brings beauty to prominence. Hence beauty and ugly are the two complementary ideas or universals; the case of other ideas is also the same, e.g., truth and falsehood, pleasure and pain, good and bad, life and death, soul and matter and so on, even the idea of God itself is tied up with the idea of devil, though all such ideas whether general or particular are created and inculcate to human minds by God Himself (metaphysical style). I do not claim that idea is God or God is idea but I say that God generates the ideas for the welfare of human knowledge (epistemological explanation). However, all ideas are not divine creation some of them may be treated to be inventions of a human mind, I mean imaginary ideas contained in art, is a nice example.

Adopting but also differing from Hume’s notation and conclusion, whenever, I attempt to penetrate into the dominion of ideas or universals existing in my mind, I always find the idea of beauty corresponding to the objects of beauty existing out side. But the idea of beauty in its ultimate analysis persuades me to rise from the ordinary kingdom of facts to the transcendence of facts where I have an other idea of sublime as grand or sublime beauty or noble and great as a unifying and pacifying whole having truth, good and beauty or knowledge, consciousness and bliss (sat, cit, anand) as its attributes. Other ideas have different attributes, which are not the subject of my study. I intend to confine myself to the problem of beauty and ugliness only. All attributes remain blended together in a harmonious state. In support to this view the 18th century philosophers had taken the view that beauty is a quality or attribute as discovered in things by us, but in the same century certain philosophers refuted the theory adopted so. They did not recognize beauty as having quality or attribute and had claimed that beauty was not a quality or attribute in the object of beauty; it is rather an idea in the human mind. Francis Hutcheson says that the idea of beauty was produced in our minds by a certain condition to which a thing inhere, called ‘uniformity amidst variety.’ But this condition, i.e. ‘uniformity amidst variety’ appears to be analogically objective and was discovered in things erroneously. H. Bredin and L.S. Brienza say that the experience of beauty is subjective because if Hutchison’s theory is taken for granted then there would be no beauty, if there is no mind. It is not a real quality in things, it is rather a value. However, sublime is the generating acme of the idea of beauty and of all other ideas as it is perfect, active and living, not dead.
The sublime is God, omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent, eternal and transcendental reality as a whole. He manifests himself in the world; his manifestation the world is two fold—spiritual and physical though he is above all these 'as he is, so he is', as I think and believe and believe he is neither spiritual nor material as these two are his creations and the creditor can never be logically considered to have anyone or such created quality or qualities in his essence. Essence is there along with existence (contrary to existents) but essence is neither spiritual nor material, it is above all and is very difficulty to know as our intellect fiat to grasp it, but realisation through devotion (divine love) is passable in which our intuition play important role (mystical style). But 'as he is, so he is' is to be known as yet. To think and believe that the sublime or god is spiritual is simply to affirm and infer and not more not less than to affirm and infer. That he is spiritual on the bases of not having been able to cross over the bridge existing between mind (Spirit) and matter, and sublime.

The problem of beauty and ugliness is tedious one and no philosophers seem to shake hands with one an other as regards its solution. Whether solution is subjective or objective is a problem as yet. As the approaches differ, no uniformity in the conclusions is seen. As proposed above that idealistic standpoint interwoven together With theosophical doctrine of cosmology if those for granted then we can develop this synthetic. Theory of beauty on Platonic postulates as logically as possible. As already discussed, we can aptly mention here that beauty and ugliness, the two different universal ideas. As a noun we use beauty or ugliness but adjectivally, it is beautiful or ugly. An object is either beautiful or ugly due to the universals or ideas already existing in human mind. In elaboration to this theory I have to say that a thing is beautiful because it has the essential characteristics of beauty—pleasantness and attractive-ness, to which H. Bredin and L. S. Brienza manes as aesthetic properties or essential properties of beauty. Consequently, a thing depraved of such characteristics or properties will be deemed to be ugly. But every such idea corresponds, eventually, thee the particular object in nature. Hence, beauty comes as manifestation of the sublime, these called divine or God or Sublime beauty. The objects of beauty appear beautiful because of the Sublime manifestation as a Sublime Idea of beauty expressing itself in the particular form of the objects of beauty.

Sublime (grand) beauty is real and transcendental, its expression as manifestation on the earth forms empirical beauty. Transcendental or sublime is in eternal and manifesting and also creating and inculcating the idea of beauty in human minds. Truth, good and beauty and all other positive as well as higher values are there in sublime as its attributes expressed and experienced by ass the human being. Sublime expresses itself aesthetically in two forms.

(1) Spiritual form:

Spiritual beauty is there in the world and even out of it but it connotes perceived unless it again has its expression in physical object. The two properties of beauty, viz, pleasure and altercation have their value in a higher degree of
Excellency and are realizable through meditation, love and devotion. It is for mystics who realizing the spiritual beauty obtained a higher state of mind or consciousness in which they experience and taste a mysterious form of pleasure, the so called bliss and above it a wondrous and highly attractive state of estuary or rapture. The procedure adopted is such that first we realise ourselves as beauty embodied and there after graph of realisation ascends to bare spiritual beauty as an essential attribute or the sublime on no account the sublime itself. We know sublime or god through realization or the embodied self as beauty and there after realization of spiritual beauty as an attribute of the sublime. Essence and attribute are neither isolated nor one but distinction prevails between the two. Again we have to know and realize ourselves, our soul or our individual soul related to beauty first, thereafter-sublime beauty, neither spiritual nor physical may be realized. Complete merger of individual soul in sublime is not possible for a certain group of Sufism viz. Mujadid Alf-a-Sani, but Ibnu'l Arbi and Mansoor Hallaj recognize pure identity in sublime beauty in the fair and commendable caprice Mansoor Hallaj proclaimed, "Ana l Hague" i.e. I am reality (I am God, I am Sublime). But another great mystic thinker of endear known as Mujadid Alf-e-Sani contradicting the of pure identity says, "..............that which is not tea same as the manifesting agent is. It means the expressed or manifested. And the manifesting or exposing agent are not the same and one .............an artist tends to express the hidden or implied characteristics of his art and beauty, will produce first of all letters then sounds and other such media needed because without them the exposition is empossible." Dr. M. Hanif interpreting H. Mujaddid’s idea of art and beauty which was produced by H. Mujadid analogically in reference to the most controversial concept of Tawhid-e-Wujudi and Tawhid-e-Suhudi (pure identity and identity id difference), contends, I think H. Mujadid assumes and determines language by means of letters and sounds only, and takes it as a medium of expression. However, he tells us that the letters and sounds are nothing except mirrors of the exposition of the characteristics of an artist in her art-creations, i.e. it is language that implies the expression, but not the art itself; language is master and the art is maidservant Hence, that which will be expressed through the medium of language, will not be the same as its expressing agent; it would be rather a representational or reproductive phenomenon.

However, sublime as essence expressing and spiritual and physical phenomena as attributes expressed cannot be the same and the one but also cannot be isolated from each other. The idea of sublime beauty is a general idea in human mind, it is inborn or a-prior, expressing itself in two forms of particulars: (1) Spiritual (2) Physical. The ‘one’ appears as many; sublime beauty seems broken into spiritual and natural beauties having the two essential characteristics of pleasure and attraction

**Physical beauty:**

Sublime as grand, not as awe manifested in nature enables the objects to have and evoke the essential properties of beauty-pleasantness and attractiveness, and to be experienced by the subject the subject himself is a combination of the two
such expressions: (1) spiritual as the finite soul and (2) physical as the finite body. It is soul that expresses itself as life in human body and makes it either beautiful or ugly. If there is symmetry in the body, it is beautiful due to presence of soul in it, otherwise ugly, but spiritual expression is always beautiful; it is stricter of the body which is responsible for its looking beautiful or looking ugly. A grotesque woman cannot visualize herself to look beautiful though the spiritual expression, by which she contains life, is beautiful. Herder (1800) unites spirit and nature, pleasure and value, feeling and intellect and makes much of natural beauty. But contrary to Herder, Shelling and Solger utterly deny and reject any forms of natural beauty. They considered natural beauty as accidental affirm and argue in favour of art which alone can procure the criteria of its judgement. (System D. Transcend Ideal part VI 2) However, my notion of beauty is reared intrinsically with the spiritual, physical and above all these with the sublime beauty which generating and manifesting source of all such forms of beauty. Nevertheless, the separation of the soul from the body makes the body ugly and useless no matter it was liking beautiful in life the emotion of love has its value till the soul and body united together express the essential qualities of beauty as pleasure and attraction. But contrary to it no such emotion of live and attachments for such a dead and ugly body can be experienced, even the fair and symmetrical structure of the physical body will lose its characteristics of pleasures and attracting. A body without soul is ugly as the expression of spiritual beauty ended in all other objects of nature except animate bodies the criteria of beauty is different as all such objects of beauty in nature are devoid of spiritual expression, though they are under the same umbrella of divine manifestation which can be observed and visualised as much as an artist may like in his artistic creation. As such, the pleasures and attraction may be experienced easily and smoothly as evoked by such in animate objects of beauty. A rose flower is beautiful, a woman is beautiful, a bird is beautiful because they have the properties of beauty and attraction and evokes them in the perceiver’s mind and experience. Mostly theorists in the field of aesthetics have confounded themselves to the description of the sensuous beauty. Hegel (not clear), St. Augustine, Dr. Iqbal and even Kant all they speculate on sensuous beauty more than spiritual and sublime beauty albeit it is true to form the opinion and either none or a few have undertaken sublime as a major point to discuss. Freud’s view on sublime is quite different. He conceives sublime as a process related to the characterization of instincts of human being in terms of socially plausible means. His sublime is totally instinctive in nature and does not qualify itself for any spiritual kingdom.

Lastly, it is true to argue that the sensuous or physical beauty is altogether temporary while spiritual beauty as divine manifestation is recognised as eternal because of moral necessity, but it can neither be perceived nor can it be related to artefact. The presence of spirit in body illumines it and provides it those characteristics, which are needed for being called a living creature. The general idea of beauty remains in service as being eternal with sublime beauty; the particular idea of beauty expressed and articulated in body and soul passes away.
Other kinds of beauty:

An easy gong distinction can be obtained between real or natural beauty and empirical or artificial beauty, and between beauty intended and beauty expressed.

Real or natural beauty and empirical or artificial beauty:

There is a clear distinction between a real or a natural beauty and an empirical or artificial beauty, but the spiritual beauty is devoid of any such kind of distinctions in it. The sublime manifestation in nature is categorized as real or natural beauty. In this type of beauty there is no role of imagination or any sort of human interference. The aesthetic beauty is really speaking internally related to natural beauty and the subjective judgement requires some universal canons through which the natural beauty might be assessed without contradiction of opinions, but no universal criteria could be investigated so far. Objectively, the things in nature express either beauty or ugliness. But the standard of judgement as claimed by certain thinkers of the world that symmetry is the Universally accepted principle of beauty, has not been logically established because the jungles, the rivers, the disorders of hills and other such things not having symmetry or order or coherence, still look beautiful or pleasant and attractive. As such the principle of symmetry as a principle of judgement may stand partially true but not in toto or in statures.

If any object in nature is painted or a composition is made on natural grounds by a poet or palace or idol or statue is produced with an amalgamation of artist’s imaginations or impressions or imageries etc then the things so produced may have the efficiency to be counted for artificial or artistic beauty. The process of exaggeration or elimination or manipulation in shapes, in size, in facts and figures will now stand distorted. A grotesque woman adorns herself artistically so as to be looked beautiful and the perceivers are attracted and pleased by the experience evoked by such a women, the woman is successful in her beautifying strategy, aim and objective, but her beauty canon be accepted as a natural beauty. It is an artistic creation and nothing more and nothing less than a form of artefact. Notwithstanding all this, Hegel, though not very clear in his description of beauty and not denying natural beauty, conserves of “The beauty of art.... stands higher than that of nature; it is beauty born and reborn by the work of the spirit, and spirit alone is truth and reality; hence beauty is truly beauty only when it participates in spirit and is produced there from. Taken In this sense, the beauty of nature appears as mere reflexion of the beauty appearing to spirit, as an imperfect and incomplete mode, which substantially is contended within the spirit itself.”

Beauty intended and beauty expressed:

Another distinction between beauty intended and beauty expressed may be made on the basis of the distinction between an artistic beauty and natural beauty. Former is related to artistic beauty but the later has its keen affinity with the mental
or spiritual or intuitive beauty\textsuperscript{39}. The artist moulds and formulates the imageries, which are true pictures of the objects. The artist places them in his artistic creations in perfect conformity with his aims and intentions. The element of fabrication dominates and takes the things of art to far away from the facts of life and nature. What an artist thinks of beauty and how is he impressed by the objects, what ideas he forms and what technique he adopts to externalise all such intended manipulations in artistic creations is worthy to note. A formless stone will exemplify this fact. Suppose an artist works on a piece of stone and gives the form of statue to it, which expresses the aim of the artist in its higher degree of fabrication. The shape of the statue may or may not tally with the real picture in hand. His imagination to express beauty of his beloved as high as the full moon may be of great value for the sake of art. Collingwood urges that a work of art need not be what we should call a real thing.\textsuperscript{39} Beauty expressed is emotive and very little imaginative; emotions are mental or spiritual or intuitive faculty of our experience. Collingwood in this prospective urges that an artist must have certain unexpressed emotions within him and must have a overwhelming zeal to express them.\textsuperscript{40}

**Role of language in art:**

We think, we talk to other and exchange our ideas with each other, we imagine and form pictures of things in our minds, we paint scenery by using certain colours and depicting lines, we recite a poem and compose a poem. We vibrate the words of a musical instrument and create some tune or rhythm and so on. But all this is possible merely through the use of words determined language. In grammar the use of words in a proper manner and making sentences by setting the words grammatically is needed so as to make them meaningful and lucid. Language is not confined to the use of word and sentences only; it has a wide range of its action. In music and drama we use words and where expression in true sense etymologically is not possible or even translation is not possible, we use figures of speech, i.e., similes, metaphors and personification etc. But the use of gestures and bodily movements and the lines, colours and contours etc also have the same status as the words and sentences an sequent language. In art for creating beauty the different types of words and meanings are used or either self-expressive stand as suggestibility to understand by the recipients. But in no case language (in all its forms) can be neglected in the field of art and literature and also not in the life on earth.

**Role of imagination, images and imageries**

**Imagination**

Imaginations are the powers in artist’s mind; images are the mental pictures of objects in nature and imageries play important role in art. In all types of art making there is fancying. As already advocated that natural beauty is entirely free from any type of manipulation, be it a process of imagination, be it any type of technique, which are, impressed on the mind of an artist. But imaginations as the
mental powers of the artist have grave concern with art makings. For an artistic creation it is necessary to manipulate the images and utilize imageries in close context of the imaginative field of operation. It is not necessary to use imaginations in our ordinary life but when we enter the field of art and literature it is not possible to live without imagination. Images are the true pictures of the things in nature; the essential feature of an artistic creation is always founds related to imagination and description as H. Bredin and L. S. Brienza conclude that “Every object, every action, every habit, every ritual, not scholarship, that emerge in the course of human history and culture, have aspects of structure and content that are characteristically artistic.” Furthermore, Croce and Collingwood both emphasise the basically important role of intuition in art but on the role of imagination there is no such agreement. However, if the images, which are really speaking the picture forms of the object in nature and are impressed on the stratum of an artistic mind as stated earlier, are removed from the artistic mind then there would be no artistic creation because the bare imitation of the nature is not art proper, it is rather a mimetic representation of the nature. In panorama of the structure form and feature as considered by Croce and his follower Collingwood, the importance and essential need of imagination and imageries can never be overlooked in the field of art. Moreover, imaginations, imageries, images and impressions stand united in all forms of artistic creation. The contents of art are sensations, which form images of the object in the artist’s mind, but the artist himself generates imaginations guided by reflections. When the artist utilizing all these facts and figures impressed on his mind from within or from without happens to give shape or form to such imaginations by expressing them outwardly then we say that the artist has expressed a certain kind of emotion in his creation and we observe and contemplate his artistic creations and relish the taste contained in such a creation. Art is actually a dynamic activity in all artistic creations without which no creation is possible in true sense of art. If the imaginations are removed from the artist’s mind, there will be no art; it will be chaos. Croce determines the role of imagination as an essential necessity. He stresses on its absoluteness, as he says “if the absoluteness of these imagination denied, we must also deny intellectual or conceptual truth and implicitly morality.” Again, “If the absoluteness of these imagination were removed, the life of the spirit would tremble to its founda intions.” So also Collingwood urges, “The work of art proper is something not seen or heard, but something imagined. But what is it that we imagine? We have suggested that in music the work of art proper is an imagined time,” Now it is clear to what extent we can go into the activity of the artistic creation having a treasure of imaginations, images and imageries.

Imagination and fancy:

A most interesting and considerable comparison between imagination and fancy attracted the attention of the aestheticians. Imagination is such a power without which no creation in aesthetic sense will be possible but fancy is treated to be an exciting and combining phenomenon, which has been taken for granted by the aestheticians but Taylor states “Imagination is the power of depicting, and fancy and
evoking and combining. The imagination is formed by patient observation; the fancy by a voluntary activity in shifting the scenery of the mind. The more accurate the imagination, the more safely may a painter, or a poet, undertake declination, or a description, without the presence of the objects to be characterized. The more versatile the fancy, the more original and striking will be decoration produced. But Wordsworth raises objection on this comparison and tries to make difference by saying that imagination was a "conferring", or "abstracting", a "modifying", an "endowing" power. The imagination "unites" and "coalesce". It shapes and creates. But fancy on the other hand lacks these characteristics; it is just a mind's such a faculty which comes in action when imagination poses itself in the form of that energy of creativity which, I contend, is meta spacio and meta temporal, and cannot be encaged.

**Content and form:**

It is another problem but not so complex. Although views on this problem differ from one theory to another but the underlying spirit appears to be one and the same. There are thinkers who advocates strongly in favour of the distinction between contented and form as they claim that contents are raw material s for an artist’s creation. In all kinds of the fine art, viz poetry, painting, music and sculpture, feelings and the sensations, rather than impression, images and imaginations require form for their articulated and meaningful expression, unless expression of feelings or sense is there is no form; threes are formless contents to which our intellect provides form of clarity, expediency, meaningfulness. Eloquence and lucidity. Bare sensa or bare feelings can be of no value in art. Nevertheless, they are made valuable and useful if the garment of form is provided to them. As such, all kinds of sensations and feelings are implied in all sorts of impressions, images images and imagination for their vivid and excellent manipulation and eligible dominion as content. Abstract sensa accomplishes the concrete form in the artist mind and a clear picture of the plan of the work strides the mind of the artist. This activity as related to abstract and formless sensa and feelings, and concrete and formful concepts and images is, seemingly, one, not two but actually the activity involves the distinct processes of consent and form. Croce; I think is right to say that the "matter". Clothed and conquered by form, produces concrete form. Formless sense, as such, are the raw materials for a legitimate and eligible art and articulation, on the pinnacle of which the concrete form can be accomplished.

But an other group of thinkers in the field of aesthetics holds the view that the content and form in real sense are not the two distinct facts and figures; both are rather one and the same phenomena. In this reference Croce and Collingwood joining hands state obviously that the poet or the painter who lacks form, lacks everything. It is because he lacks himself they argue that the material en all kinds of artistic creations permeates the soul of art, i.e. the expression alone has the efficiency of expediency, articulation and the attributes of eloquence. The emotional bent and attitude of an artist get a clear way from their sobbing and moribund state which may exist, if the form and content are assumed as distinct from each other in form that
enables the poet or the artist to produce his emotional whims and caprices completely expressed in his artistic creation. Hence content and form are one, not the two but one and the same. Croce says "... ... it is most true not only that it has not no content." now it is clear that the view's defer on the problem of content and form but in my opinion. Content and form are the two distinct processes in which the beginning process in art is related to contents and the ending process is related to form. Contents are like the raw-materials, no matter, if any kind, but they are other than images impassions and imaginations its, which are impressed on the surface of the human mind in the first look of the nature and are bare and form less as meaningless and obscure to which the process of the activity of articulation and conceptualisation grants the meaningful form as perfection and concreteness. After this the artist ascertains a plan in his mind in close context of has imaginations, aims and intentions, attitudes and ideas. Such explain in the mind of an artist is externalised on the paper through an eloquent language; the poet requires words, rhyme, assonance, alliterating metaphors, and so on, the painter needs colour, paper, pencil, canvas, feels a the need of a certain kind of musical tunes and harmonious tinge, taste and rhythm; and the sculptor requires stone, unbleached, limes, bricks, iron and so on for execution and materialization of the so formed and chalked out plan. An artistic creation is made possible merely on the pinnacle of such a process of creativity involving the sensations as contents and conceptions as forms. It can be made clear by citing an example: an architect has a plan of a bridge in his mind. The plan is made on the basis of his sensation obtained from the nature and the thought or idea based on his imaginations, imageries and images; the plan is depicted on the paper now the plan of a bridge in an architect's mind is a form with contents not is elated from his imaginations and images which enable him to chalk out the plan of the intended bridge but when it is externalised on the paper and afterwards a bridge is built up from stones, lines and other such materials, we say that the creation of the bridge is done actually or the form is materialized perfectly. Citing the examples from Kant's theory of knowledge we can say that the cense are the contents or the formless contents upon which our intersect works and gives shape or form to them and brings the formless contents to the completely articulated form and excellently perfect knowledge but though intuition. The same is the case of content and form in all artistic creations kant was reflecting on art in the strict sense of sensationalism and conceptualism and had commendably postulated his doctrine of aesthetics on the pinnacle of sensations as contents and time and space as a priori forms of intuition, without precepts are blind and precepts without concepts are empty." in the same way every artistic creation whether it is poetry or music or painting or sculpture, must have sensa as formless contents and completely articulated plan of the work as form of the art in the mind of the artist it is incorrect to recognize content and form as one and the same. Feeling as feeling or sensa as sensa are formless but when they obtain expression in artist's mind, the form they get. Expression is spiritual or Intuitional as Croce says, but intuition is blind; it is intellect that lends eyes to intuition, means form is provided to the formless feelings or sensa.
Freedom, responsibility, criticism, rights and duties:

Impassioned desires and excited feeling seek their free expression in the antistatic creation. The artist, as such, does not like any criticism of his artistic creation or any kind of cordon on his right of freedom. He wants to express himself as freely as he can. He is found keenly interested and leaned to experiences of life and nature without considering his responsibilities, rights and duties in society. He wants to express himself in his creations, viz. poetry, music, painting and sculpture without delay, as the excited feelings put him in a very critical position until the such aroused feelings or emotions are expressed by him. But sometimes the unfavourable circumstances, socio-moral taboos and the political restraints strandline a top-hill and thus, hamper loch an artistic creations. This is worse and bafflingillation far the artist. Dr Sigmund Freud in 'totem and taboo' devoted a number of pages to explain and expound the adverse influences of social taboos on individuals personality Development. Those desires, which confront with the observances in vogue and prevalent protocol in society, are not allowed to be fulfilled; such desires are suppressed which reside in unconscious mind as obsessions. If the position of obsession persists long without remedy, the individual will have to suffer from disasters, dejections and melancholies in life, a number of complexes pertaining to abnormal behaviour will imminently develop in his mind. Despier rise from the inborn imputes, these are the natural endowment to human being and can hardly be controlled.

Consequently, the human personality may emerge and develop as a completely or partially distorted provided the desires are directly or indirectly obstructed or made abstruse. Desires are unlimited but the intense desires seek their prompt fulfilment because gratification of desires accompanies pleasure to man but social taboos or the unfavourable circumstances try to control and counter their gratification. As such the liberty of expression in dreams, daydreams slip of tongue and like other means. This is psychological fact, which is applicable in the field of art also. For if the liberty of expression in artistic is impeded, directly or indirectly, then the artist will naturally find himself in a disastrous situation in a tough and baffling position. A harmonious glittering and commendable picture of his art for which he has certain prospective in his mind may become as gloomy as the gloomy of hell.

The artist is a best critic in the socio-political field. He is also a best mellower in the society. He does not feel we to make human being conscious of the harmful aspects of the customs, mal-practice, which appear as good but are not good in reality. In these affairs the artist does not stand as and emotional being as to express his experiences for the sake of humanity through his artistic creations. Bernard show, for instance, was well inlay, such a dreamiest in the history of literature whose artistic creations were not meant for aesthetic enjoyment but were a medium of social criticism commencing and annotating on burdened Shaw’s aims and objectives Dr. Raghukul Tilak views him as, “Shaw sells his wares. Shaw’s fundamental aim in his plays is the battering of the lot of humanity by subjecting accepted conventions and institution to the cold, searching light of his penetrating intellect. All his place are about some important social level, or social institution
which the considers an evil, and which is scrutinized which coverage of
deredminaton. 

Moreover, an artist who has profundity and should knowledge of all such condemnable social taboos may have certain emotions, ideas or experiences in his head to which he disperse to express freely, but if the society does not allow then, it will be a doon of the artist and nothing else keeping his critical as well as liberal attitude towards the society he may have had an adherence to obtain complete freedom of expression in his artistic creations the critical attitude of the persons do not idea too provide him such lively of criticism. Albeit, the artist feels dejection, grief and distress on the hindrances. He desires free expression, as without which the artist cannot fees stated; rather he shall remain in a Perplexing condition. The artist may also become a victim of the people who dislike the criticism of the social customs, political conventions, social taboos, sanctions and protocols. I like to illustrate the Fida Hussain’s paintings, which were burnt down by group persons, as demonstrated paintings of Fida Hussain. Were discarded by a class of society on the ground that Fida Hussain painted the portraits of goodness nude and naked. Albeit Fida Hussain; I think has forgotten to devote even a little time to think over the nature or liberty, its purview and reaction antiquities, and consequences in context of the dogmatic set up the Indian mind or mental state Fida Hussain’s conscious or unconscious of the meaning of liberty and there by responsibility in the prospect of dogmatic set up Indian mind, caused him the loss of a number of master piece paintings which were worthy to be contemplated and interpreted in the field of art and aesthetics with due permission I would like to cite another typical example from the movies for making my viewpoint more clear and expedient. I believe that most of as very will known reactions, victimizations and sad consequences of the film director Deepa Mehta whose film “fire” was not allowed to ran smoothly by a class of our. So also her ambition to make another picture known as “water” was restrained and even the preliminary shooting was not allowed in variance and the shooting set was badly damaged and devastated. The director in her artistic creation, I think, intended A healthy and admirable criticism of the Brahmin priests and bourgeois regarding their sexual exploitation of the widows in the society; she failed as a class of persons (might be politically motivated) did not like any criticism the political, religious and social structure in which we have been palling our lives peacefully or restlessly.

Now, the question arises, if the society or the state does not grant the needed freedom of expression of ideas, thoughts, feelings, emotions and on the whole, the experiences of life to the extent as the artist needs for betterment of humanity in general because of the artist’s critical attitude which he wants to put up in his art to artistic creations, then what can be the fate of the art and its creations in true sense and what curses and dooms will occur to be faced by the artist in seeking and affording for a required freedom? The artist will have either to suffer and lament for the enchainment of such desire related to free expression or alternatively, he may resolve, in the lost resort to be a loyal page of the social dogmas, proto-types, taboos, likings and disliking of the people and all such social observances which are prevalent in society without considering their positive or negative operations on
human life. But for making an art proper or to say a genuine artistic creation freedom of expression of ideas and emotions is essentially needed.

Criticism is a right of the artist and also simultaneously the right of the audience in all fields and aspects of our lives whether it is socio-moral or socio-religious or political or any other but the artist as well as the audience have to know and realize the limits of freedom, decorum of responsibilities and sacred duties to be performed. Responsibility of artist is more than the audience in these matters. The artist will have to think over the exiting circumstances and the mental state of the people where the artist has to express himself freely and critically by means of his poems or paintings or plays. No doubt freedom of expression or freedom of criticism is a right, that is the spirit of true art and ingenuous artist without which the art is mere a jejune and nothing more than it. For this purpose, i.e. for obtaining and maintaining the real spirit in art the right of criticism and freedom of expression must be granted to the artist and be provide a golden chance to him to display his artistic creations without hesitation. The audience has the responsibility to consider the demonstrated creations in the prospective of good sense and emergence of the beneficial influences on the society. It is excellently nice for both artist and the audience.

However, freedom of speech or freedom to express feelings, emotions, ideas, impressions obtained from without or generated from within, imaginations and anticipations of life in nature or even out of it and kinds of experiences, bitter and sweet, be given to the artist with a view to enable him to nourish and nurture the higher possibility of artistic calibre, efficiency apex of creativity, artistic spirit and energy, powers of imagination, artistic whim and caprice, desires and ambitions, and there after to display, to motivate, to accelerate to his devoting mental set up dedicating all this to the sacred cause of social welfare and upliftment of humanity in general. To constrain and confine artist’s liberty of expression and critics is to decapitate the artist and his creations. As such the artist can never obtain the pinnacles of beauty, truth and goodness through his creations of poetry, paintings, plays and sculpture unless he is accorded the right of complete freedom of expression of emotions and such ideas that are meant for social criticism. Moreover, the audience can not have the real taste of art, if the audience is impassioned to make the artist victim of their resentments without considering the ins and outs of the arts and forgetting there duty or responsibility in this regard. Art in true sense and its underlying spirit may be apprehended by the audience if they have patience, impartial attitude and efficiency and experience (Rasa) of art, otherwise it is harmful to create state of pandemonium in society by tearing and destroying the artistic creations. Actually art is art, it is either free spiritual activity or nevertheless, it is a free expression of emotions. It is not for enjoyment, it is for contemplation.

To make the objects of nature embodied in art without manipulation by means of imagination and anticipations of life is to imitate the nature, which is not an art proper, but for real creation the artist ought not be placed in arena in which he is compelled to fight with the opinions of the common people. Any kinds of containments for the artist will dis balance his mental condition and he can not feel himself better than a neurotic patient, the cause of such disease lie latent in the deep stratures of unconsciousness as discerned and discovered by Dr. Freud who produces
his doctrine of expression on the pillars of suppressed desires in the field of psychology.

Certainly, rights and duties and freedom and responsibility are the co-existent and co-associated phenomena in our lives. The rights of one are the duties of others and vice versa. Likewise, freedom and responsibility are the two best consorts of each other, both are interdependent, no evince is required to justify the fact. The artist has the right of expression and he promulgates to claim such a right, if taken for granted, then it is also true that he also holds certain responsibilities to discharge. Before any kind of artistic display, e.g. plays, poems, paintings, dances, sculpture and music etc the artist will have to think over his responsibilities and duties towards the society and consider profoundly the existing circumstances, nature of soil, mental set up of the community and dogmatic slumbers of the lay as well as learned in the society as all they can skilfully play fouls with the artists and can drive out all his creation from the art gallery, no matter if it is art proper or pseudo by making the pendulum of peace and order misbalancing, causing a great humbug, creating roudism, acting cocaine and staging uncontrolled demonstrations against all those artists who ignore the emotions and mental bents of the common masses in their undue precipitation. It is a fact that the artist and creations cannot be excellently followed, interpreted and ascertained by a layman but the art or its creations are also not meant for those who are devoid of art-experience. The artist, after all has to live in society which is dominated by the persons of dogmatic nature who cannot be expected to have patience and tolerance to the extent needed for a artistic criticism. Such people will not allow to a liberal artist to express his heart feelings as he acts so, executing his right of criticism and overlooking his responsibility and duty towards the society, then it is natural that the deplorable results will occur and the artist will have nothing to defend himself except to feel lamented and disgusted.

The artist’s desires are found related to express his emotions through his creations. The desire to live, to rise, to be famous, to be rich in wealth and knowledge and to survive with off shoots lies latent in all human beings. If we analyse desire psychologically we find impulses underneath which are the real motivating forces to make man active in respect of obtaining his goal. The status of an artist in the prospective of psychological analysis of desire is not different from a common man. He too desires to live, to rise and survive not only with his off springs but also with his creation. But artistic creations require freedom of expression, of impulses as Bertrand Russell lays too much stress and highlights the importance of impulses of impulses in human life. He says, “impulse is the expression life, and while it exists there is hope of its turning towards life instead of towards death; but lack of impulse is death, and out of death no new life will come.”

It means as Bertrand Russell contends that impulses are the main tenets where from the feeling, the emotion and desired for their expressions come out. If the generating impulse is confined to or the free expression is restrained, the life of the artist will be like a body without a soul. Bertrand Russell’s explanation of impulse and desire is valuable. He says, “A man may write a book or paint a picture under the belief that he desires the praise which it will bring him, but as soon as it is finished, if his creative impulse is not exhausted, what he has done grows
uninteresting to him, and he begin a new piece of work. What applies to artistic creation applies equally to all that is most vital in our lives: direct impulse is what moves us, and the desires which we think, we have are a mere garment for the impulse”.

It is obvious that artists like all growing things, viz, plants, and trees, need for their prosperity and growth the favourable circumstances, right soil and ripe time and most truly a sufficient freedom from any opposition, but these can very well be restrained by socio-political and or socio religious institutions which live unfortunately on prototypes or antiquities; thus dooming and disappointing the artists and their artistic impulses.

The artist’s business is not to cultivate the emotion; his job is rather to activate the emotion for its proper expression in the recipient. He does not have the job of titillation in the audience or spectators or readers except expression as art. In these matters of artistic creations the critical aptitudes and freedom of expressions, the impulse of tolerance, pulse of positive responses and evaluative bent, the west is seen to be much more conscious and co-operative than the east.

Freedom and responsibility or rights and duties are birelational. Where freedom is, the responsibility is also there; right exist, the sense of duty bilaterally challenges. The artist has right to evaluate critically the socio-moral or socio-political structure of the human being through his paintings or poems or staging dramas with a good intention of bringing a radical change and reform in the society and in the bent of mind of the inhabitants. But he can not be put off from the responsibilities and his duties which he has to admit and execute voluntarily towards the community or towards a society or in general for the whole globe. Freedom to express himself does not mean to injure the heart feelings of other. Freedom of expression is confined to responsibility, which seems perging on the artist’s shoulders. As such the position of artists and recipients is reciprocally and equally, the same in this allusion of reciprocal collaboration between artist and the recipient, it is just to say that one who is endowed with the developed form of artistic sense or consciousness or to say, art experience, can very well apprehend in true sense the aims and objectives of the artist’s expression of emotions and the criticism which the artist undertakes for moulding the attitudes of the people. But an ordinary man who lacks such characteristics cannot know and apprehend as much as required in the artistic manner. Recipients responsibility, or in other words duty is to provide opportunity to the artist to express himself outwardly and criticise the prevalent customs and prototype, improper and inarticulate miens and manners to the cause of humanity. Artist is more humane than an ordinary person of society. He is a best critic because he understands more accurately the emotions expressed in artistic creations than anyone.

**Emotization:**

Aesthetics is a normative science of art and beauty having a number of problems to study and discerns; the problem of beauty and ugliness is the cordial one. Beauty is related to evoking the characteristics of pleasantness and attractiveness but ugliness is devoid of these essential characteristics, though it is
(ugliness) a necessity for making beauty as beauty, as said by St. Augustine, “Ugly brings beautiful to prominence.”

There are two traditions on thesis of beauty: one, Pythagorean and two, pleasure principle. Expressionist’s theory of beauty is different as they postulated it on the pinnacle of expression. Another synthetic theory of beauty has been produced by me in whom I attempted strenuously to prove that the sublime manifests or expresses itself in physical as well as spiritual beauty but sublime is neither spiritual nor physical, it is above all, it is sat, chit, anand, called as Brahma or God. His spiritual nature is inferred not discovered.

The problem of content and form is another discursive problem in which I defended the views of those who treated content and form as two different phenomena but are like the two side of a coin-head and tail. But Croce contends that feelings expressed are the contents and image as form are not different. I do not agree with him.

The role of language in aesthetic is much more momentous than any other factor. It is a universal fact that all thinking, imagining and conversational activities are made possible through language. Language is not constrained to words and sentences only, it has rather a wide range in which gestures, bodily movements, symbols and all such phenomena, by which expression of meaning is possible, are included.

Images are the true pictures of things in human mind, imageries are related to image making art and imaginations are those powers which enable us to imagine or form images of the objects as we like, but these are inter-related to each other, their use in art making activity is inevitable.

Impressions and imaginations are basically one in form and spirit both; the artist’s mind is dominion of such imaginations and the artist ingeniously utilizes them in his artistic creation without which there is no art.

The problem of freedom, responsibility, criticism, rights and duties have been dealt with side by side under one umbrella certain typical illustrations have been cited to explain these points articulately.

Freedom with responsibility, right of criticism along with a developed sense of duty has been suggested for the artists and the audience both. Freedom of expression of ideas and emotions with out sense of responsibility or duty may cause disastrous and doleful results and a state of pandemonium. The artist is expected to be highly cautious in these matters.
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