CHAPTER II

MEANING OF EXPRESSION

Discourse on the definition and different Meanings of the term 'Expression'.
Chapter II

Meaning of 'Expression'

This chapter deals with the different meanings and senses of the term expression. I have also attempted to define the term on logical grounds.

'Expression'

Language in the broader sense is the medium of expression in the totality of life. But the job of expression in the field of art and aesthetics is not easy, rather it is a complicated one: words and also sentences are ever and anon or often used and apprehended carelessly and mistakenly, or both - carelessly and mistakenly- at the same time, arising thus confusion and misunderstanding among the audience, readers and viewers (recipients). No clear understanding, hence, can be developed candidly without hesitation and without trifles because the debates are held, discussions are done and the communication of ideas or the communication of view points are carried out mostly by using ambiguous or excessively vague or unprecise or emotionally loaded words on the pinnacle of which certain types of unresolvable disputes, viz. exclusively candid and inclusively genuine disputes comprising of “disagreement in belief and disagreement in attitude”, merely verbally dispute, come out.¹ Resolutions are sought but hardly one can succeed. ‘Expression’, the term, also holds the same disputing position in its meaning, sense and use. For the purpose of clearer understanding and avoiding misunderstanding, the definition of a term postulated on logical pattern is necessary because it is definition that articulates the meaning of the term and clarifies the aims and objectives.

In the history of aesthetics, art and literature ‘Expression,’ in its meaning and purport, has been more disputed and more discursive than any other term from the Greek antiquity to present day. Consequently, expression emerged and evolved as a most valuable and excellently considerable term involving a number of such meanings, which have been suggested, interpreted and reinterpreted distinctively or indistinctively by different thinkers of different ages. Unfortunately, no consensus on its meaning, sense and use could be ascertained or investigated or brought to light before Benedetto Croce, an Italian aesthetician who was truly followed by W.G. Collingwood.

‘Expression’ in ambiguity has widely been used and freely been misused by all lay and learned in the fair context of its practical utility in life. “Expression” has been taken to mean different things by different writers, and while some have concentrated on the creative process of the artist, others have stressed the evoking of emotion in the audience” ¹ᵇ It is altogether momentous to annotate to its capability of covering a wide range of its action and applicability in the individualistic as well as collective life of human being. Everyone, whether one is in a bare surrounding of solitude or one is in a sweet situation of multitude, tries to express oneself to obtain
certain of one’s goals, and attempts to fulfill desires generating perpetually baffling
the person continuously through out the whole life (there is no end of desires). The
aims and objectives may be related to the life of the individual in isolation or
collectively to the society as a whole. As the term and its purport are akin to all our
cognitive, effective and conative aspects of life, it, therefore, excellently requires a
considerably sufficient amount of light to be cast on. Its glittering value, its blooming
nature and its hill top position in relevance to its objectivity as well as subjectivity as
a whole is such that can never be ignored. A conclusive viewpoint on its articulate
meaning, clear sensibility, legitimate applicability and wide spread purview is
needed as yet.

Continuing the discussion on the ambiguous nature of ‘Expression’ it is
precisely correct to say that the expression may be studied under two principal
heads- Affirmation and Negation-In the former, we just mean by expression only
those expressions which are nice, pleasant, advantageous, praiseworthy, valuable,
harmonious, expedient in spirit and in recourse and after all, all those expressions
which are, or may be called ‘beautiful’; but in the later, the meaning and sense of
‘Expression’ confronts with the former one, i.e. we mean by expression all that
which is worse, painful, doleful, harmful, notorious, dangerous, aweful, dissoante,
declining, and after all which are ugly or may plausibly be called ‘untrustworthy’.
The two fold meaning and sense of expression is intended here to display the
discursive nature of expression because it is not limited merely to positivity and
subjectivity but also it covers negativity and objectivity as well. Casting light on the
conflict between beauty and expression Winckelman’s idea of the relation between
beauty and Expression is genuine because in Continuation to this problem it has
obviously been explained that in the highest beauty i.e. sublime, there is a general
form of co-ordination and the apparent contradiction in Winckelman’s view, in lieu
of expressiveness, seems a direct anti-thesis and hence expression seems to be
determining factor in beauty. Actually, beauty is of the pure form, which explores
the fact that beauty is of shape exhibited as ‘unity in variety.’ In this respect Hogarth
may be well quoted- “The forms of a beautiful body are determined by lines which
are constantly changing their center, and consequently never form part of a circle,
but are always elliptical in character and share this quality which the contour of
Greek vases” 2 Thus differentiating expression in art from changing forms of
beautiful body it has been said that it is “The limitation of the acting and suffering
condition of our soul and body, of passions as well as of actions; in the widest sense
it includes our action itself, in a narrower sense, merely the play of feature and
gesture which accompanies the action. It is hostile to beauty, because it changes the
bodily form in which beauty resides and the greater this change is, the more
detrimental is expression to beauty.” 3 In the panorama of the antithesis pertaining to
expression and beauty it is concluded that beauty is first and expression is afterward,
the position of the two is separate in the field of art. But this is not a correct
antithesis. Really “beauty without expression would be characterless, expression
without beauty unpleasant.”4 But in the artists of Greek antiquity beauty was treated
to be the tongue on the balance of expression weighed out without extreme nicety
because it is the sum of the whole—“an element at once essential to beauty and
tending to destroy it.”5 It is a plain discourse on the nature of the beauty and the
nature of expression as well, in which the possibility of the elements related to ugliness remains prevailing. However, combining the partial beauties of nature can attain supreme beauty; it is an ideal form of beauty, which is made significant through the process of expression. Here the term expression appears to be made too complicated to reach any final discussion. Eloquently, it can be quoted as, “Dissonance is effectively expression; the consonant and harmonious want to soften and eliminate it. Expression and semblance are fundamentally antithetical. If expression is scarcely to be conceived except, as the expression of suffering-joy has proven inimical to expression. Perhaps because it has yet to exist, and bliss would be beyond expression- expression in the element immanent to art through which, as one of its constituents, art defends itself against immanence that it develops by it, its law of form. Artistic expression comports itself mimetically, just as the expression of living creature in that of pain.” To show the importance and actual sense of expression in art, it has been the aim of the author Theodor W. Adorno. But side-by-side it is attempted to make another point clear that expression is not confined to beauty in art but also it has the tantamountly the same position in the matters of ugliness.

Expression understood commonly is different from an artistic or aesthetic expression. Subjectivity and objectivity or subjectivity or non-subjectivity or objectivity and non-objectivity inclusive of all such phenomena which are interpreted as beauty or as ugly (as the case may be) are so much baffling elements (not attributes) in the nature of expression that can on no account be neglected, when anyone attempts to articulate its meaning and sense. Expression is sometime interpreted as a peculiar form of knowledge; Croce’s expression confirms this thought. It is knowledge, an intuitive knowledge; it is a spiritual knowledge over and above the logical or universal reasoning; it is, further more, a knowledge of particulars instead of universals and for this very reason it is aesthetical or it is beautiful, as I interpret Croce’s statement that “Every true intuition or representation is also expression that which does not objectify itself in expression is not intuition or representation…” Again he says that, intuition in the true sense of expression has several of its forms and all such forms are nothing except intuitive knowledge. In the words of Croce, “We may say thus add this to the various verbal descriptions of intuition, noted at the beginning: intuitive knowledge is expressive knowledge, independent and autonomous in respect to intellectual function; indifferent to later empirical discriminations, to reality and to unreality…. To intuite is to express; and nothing else (nothing more, but nothing less) than to express.” However, Croce and other expressionists in the field of art and aesthetics mean by expression as beauty, and as such, all expressions without restriction are treated beautiful. Free expression is interpreted as beauty and an impeded expression is actually no expression in true sense of the term expression; it is an untrue expression; it is ugly. Since expression of emotion in art forms the spirit of art, it is necessary that all such emotions, which are intended for art, must find their easy way in real sense of expression. So, “the means-and-ends, or technique, or terminology too is applicable to the meaning of expression, but until a man has expressed his emotion, he does not yet know what emotion is. The act of expressing is therefore an exploration of his emotion. He is trying to find out what these emotions are. There is certainly a directed process: an
effort that is, directed upon a certain end, but the end is not something foreseen and preconceived to which appropriate means can be thought out in the light of our knowledge of its special character. Expression is an activity of which there can be no technique. These lines obviously claim the activity of expression as a free act, but it is neither preconceived nor prior to its complete operation. No method, no technique and no way out in this regard unless the emotions, feelings, thoughts, and experiences of life on the whole find an easy and smooth line of expression.

Exemplifying the importance and utility of expression for making the point more clear, articulated and precise, I say that I love ‘A’, means I have an urge of love in me to which I want to communicate to my object that I love ‘A’, or that I want to enable ‘A’ to know and feel to what I think and feel about ‘A’? Such a feeling of love was lying latent in my inner self, unknown to me and also to A before its expression directly or indirectly through adopting certain means and techniques, such as becks, gestures, signals, flirts, writing letters, and so on, being the various forms of language. ‘A’ is loved by me, such a knowledge can not be believed to be present in A’s mind before bringing it to light by activation of expression or by processing the expression of the emotion of love. The activity of expression begins from one’s inner self and comes outward in a form of knowledge. Love is one of the most important emotions which is profoundly considered as the part and parcel of the romantic poetry. In the same manner and adopting the same style of exemplification if I say that B is good, it means that I have a feeling of likeness for B, which remains latent unless I avail the opportunity to bring about the feeling of likeness in true sense from my inner self and make it communicated to my object of love. This activity of bringing outward of the feeling of likeness for B is nothing more than an activity of expression: It is an ethical phenomenon that I utter the term good for B; it is also an emotional expression as distinct from other kinds of expressions viz. artistic, economic, sensous, spiritual, and so forth. Likewise, if you say that you like me, it means that you are expressing your feeling of likeness to me. It is a communication simultaneously, which you desire to let me know your love and affection, which you have in your heart and mind. Here the cognition of the causes of such expressions are meaningless because during the process of expression none will pay attention to such sort of knowability which has no immediate significance in the matters related to the expression of emotions. I illustrate a few more examples for our clearer understanding: If I go out for a walk in a greenland or hear music and other auditories or I say that I am wandering listlessly or intentionally in a landscape or just I say that I find myself in an imaginary world, or I say that this rose flower is very beautiful, or I have fanciful thought or an idea or I have experiences of life, bitter and sweet, then in all these matters I do nothing except to express my feelings, my views, my fanciful dreams, my experiences of life, my attitudes and so on; it is activity of expression that makes all such communications or utterances or judgements excellently possible. The widely spread umbrella or the limitless purview of expression is now obvious here. It is the activity of expression in real sense that over shadows all our feelings, emotions, ideas, thoughts, attitudes etc from merely mute reckoning of our life on the earth. As such, without expression the behavioural life of man becomes like a dry pond having no water to quench the thirst of
knowledge and or to get related with each other, no active life will, anyhow, be possible.

The process of expression is basically related to our behavioural life. It may also be treated as a peculiar form of communication (Tolstoy) I communicate my views, feelings and emotions to others. There is, nevertheless, a form of self-expression or self-communication in which I like to apprehend my own heart feelings and emotions before expressing outwardly. The force, the reliance, the use, the applicability of all such expressions remain equally same for all with the difference that a man of prominence in lore and learning can express himself better than an ordinary person. It is because, “Empirical evidence for this difference may be found in the power of the eternal Socratic method, in the ease with which the learned, with their barrage of questions, leave confused and a gape the uninformed who likewise start off by making sense but who, on running the risk during the little knowledge in their possession, have no other recourse than to retreat their own shell, declaring that they are not fond of “Subtleties”10b In expressive signs Stainslaw Ossowski contends that the role of Psyche in functioning of expression is important one because we have the experiences of life in the form of Psychic phenomenon, which are expressed as psychic disposition and are really speaking the expressive signs to which Ossowski claims that “the domain of such expressive signs is primarily the human body and, subsequently, human work”. As such the expression of Psychic dispositions and experiences has been explained under three heads of expression: 1-Naturally direct expression in which facial expressions have been exemplified as “We may deduce from facial expressions the intensity of feeling, possibly the type of feeling (pleasant or unpleasant, anger, fear, despair or elation) but the content of the experiences remains a secret for us if we do not have the aid of some indication of another kind.”11. Secondly, it is also stated that the organic expressions are plausible in respect to the expressive changes brought about due to the function of psychic phenomenon. “Expressive changes in the appearance of the organism make it possible to draw conclusions not only about the experiences but also regarding this psychic dispositions, his character”.12 Thus the first group of psychic expression is natural which is directly related to bodily changes. It may be called an organic theory of expression, named so by me. The second group of expression is related to those phenomena, which are conventional signs. The conclusions regarding the experiences of man and his psychic disposition can be drawn by connecting the existing connection between the experience and the sign and it is for the purpose of communication: To connect a sign with a thought and to admire an actor or a speaker or a dancer or a singer by hand clapping; the hand clapping is the sign of expressing delight of the spectator. It can also be expressed through linguistic systems because language falls under the special system of conventional signs. But in the third group of expressive phenomena purposive actions (psycho-physical) have been assigned to the work to express the Psychic dispositions and experiences of life of both artist and the spectator. However, the function of expression has been related to human body and human work (bodily changes are expressive of psychic disposition and experience which are communicated to the audience through the work of art).13 However, I do not agree with Ossowski’s conclusion in which he says, “It is for these reasons that the
expression of the human body is of special significance in aesthetics. My argument against this notion runs to saying that the human body is not of valuable significance in aesthetics because it is a narrow thesis and inexplicable philosophy of aesthetic significance as related to the meaning of expression. Certain expressions do not require bodily change or bodily phenomenon. Croce can expediently be illustrated in this recourse who proclaims that expression is mental or intuitive and nothing more but nothing less than expression.

As a living being when I laugh, I say that I express my joy and if the manner of expression in my laughing happens to somewhat changed, naturally the meaning of such expression will stand radically changed. As such, the laughing may express my feeling or my attitude, different, say to ridicule to someone, whom I think stupid. Moreover, suppose there is an example of weeping, the tears may express a feeling of pain and grief either caused by some physical phenomenon or that by certain mental phenomenon. In other cases the tears may express the sad moments of the departure or separation of one’s beloved or the joyous moments of a friend’s meeting after a long interval. This will be the expression of love associated with a number of other feelings. Anyhow, a particular expression involves a particular meaning and a specific expression to a specific sense and meaning but it is also true that the same expression may have different meanings for different persons of distinct calibers and civilizations. Suppose, for instance, if I happen to narrate a story in the impression that I would convince you of the story’s main theme as entirely a representation of a fiction, while the episodes in the story indicate truth; the narration of the story will be a means through which I intend to express my attitude in the context of what I like to communicate my feelings pertaining to the story. Henceforth a large number of feelings of pleasure and pains, emotions of love and hatred, experiences of separation and meeting, different ideas and various thoughts, glamouring looks of nature and worthy expressions of each other dominate our minds, absolutely or partially; these are all related to various forms of expressions involving different meanings and different techniques as well. We can plausibly say that the role of expression is significant without which our total life begins to appear like a jejune because we will not have the other alternate through which we may get related our feelings, emotions, ideas and attitudes etc to the other fellow brothers or sisters, and also nor can they feel associated to me or to others. But all these are not artistic explanations of expressions as expression in art is quite different and basically related to emotions only. Moreover, the expression is not needed to be directly executed; the feelings or the emotions or the attitudes may mostly be expressed indirectly by using signs, symbols alliterations, assonations, rhetoricism (in poetic lines), streaks, colours (in painting), tunes, echo’s (in music), emotional ges and gestures etc (in drama) and so on. It is true that the total human life is revolving around expression; it stands like a pivot holding a paramount significance, value and use in all our cognitive, emotive and conative life. The entire working of life runs straightly and properly without rest like inertia in physics because the function of inertia is as important in physics as the process of expression in our lives. I like to mention that what I conceive, or what I hold as an idea in my mind, or what I think, or what attitudes I retain in myself, and also what I profoundly see and view a particular object or person, ascertains nothing more than the act of
expression in a quite simple and plausible way; unless expressive activity springs and flourishes in a mind, the knowledge of all such inner and outer facts and figures or phenomena, involving emotive, conative and cognitive, cannot find its way to existence in the life of man. Suppose for example I have a pleasant view of a fragrant flower in the nature or I have a scene of a cloudy sky or I happen to have a vision of a full moon along with an unsymmetrical order of mountains, disorderly extended green forests and a zigzag or a serpentine like view of rivers; consequently and naturally I will feel happy and delighted and may also utter eloquently that I have a profound experience of the beauty of nature. All these experiences will mean that I express my feelings and emotions aroused by all such objects of nature. But some other may feel otherwise and may express her anguish for the reason known or unknown to her.

Hence, the discursive nature of expression paves the way for noting its various meanings, interpretations and reinterpretations. J.W. Manns conceive of expression as liberally as specifically as used is characterization of gestures, looks and manners but claims that there is a subjective meaning of expression, which is entirely distinct from its objective meaning. He argues that significance of expression in art is related to subjective meaning. In recent theories of art expressionism is a typical school of art, which comprises such a subjectivity. Over and above the subjective and objective forms of meanings there is, however, a conventional form of the meaning of expression; it is immutable (likely to be explained in connotative meaning of expression, provided such a possibility is found). It is worthy to note that there are as many as meanings of expression as are there kinds of expression, but not all forms of expression can be stamped as artistic. Scrupulously, expression is the core of art; it is not disputed; if it is disputed, it is least disputed.

It is very difficult to ascertain what actually and universally accorded meaning can be allocated to the term 'expression'; it is an ambiguous word having various meanings and usages. Intimating its discursive nature and estimating conclusions, which may arise and stand as a puzzling problem for the thinkers of the different ages. I can aptly say that expression is such a term, the definite and universally accepted meaning of which can never be obtained. Torny's declaration seems to be most consistent when we says that expressive is to be systematically ambiguous. The word 'systematically' is considerable to which mans explains as "expressive" at time leading us to infer some state behind the expressive phenomena—sadness behind the face and expresses sadness—and at times carrying no much inferential over, tones—the 'cruel' face unhappy possessed by the nicest of individuals. The later face possess what Torny call the "expressive property cruelty." Torny means by expressive is basically related to the activity involved; the activity as such works as a distinguishing property of the expression at different times on different occasions. But the way or manner of expression, viz. facial expression in the matters of sadness and cruelty, renders the same position on the ambiguity of the term expression. Karl Archenbrenner says that expression is actually very difficult term, "Since the term has been used in such varieties of ways. We now ask what they are." He inspires profound enquiry into the variety, nature, sense and purport of such a highly disputed term.
Psychologically facial expressions are easy to be studied and interpreted, so also some of the expressions related to bodily gestures and actions. The expression of anger involves quite distinctively the lines, figures and colour of the face from the expression of wonder or melancholy or joy, and may be well interpreted by one who has been in the situation of these forms of emotions. Experience is important one. Everybody interprets the facial expressions according to her or his life experiences. But it is once again not certain that in all-facial and bodily actions one my necessarily apprehend to what the emotions are there. Expressed through such facial and bodily changes, e.g. changes in facial colour, rimples or disordered lines and a long peculiar shape of the mouth.

As already noted that there is a large galaxy of expression involving a large number of distinct meanings. As such there are: Direct and Indirect, Immediate and Delayed, Complete and Incomplete, Natural and Artificial, Spiritual or Mental and Physical, tender and callous, sudden and preplanned, conscious or aware and unconscious or unaware, pleasant and clumsy, and a few other not so important in this class. Apart from all these there may be enumerated a few more forms of expressions, viz. moral, political, socialistic, economic, psychological, scientific, artistic and so on.

An eye-bird view is intended here on all these forms of expression: -

**Direct and Indirect**

An emotion evoked by any object (mental idea physical-objects outward) may seek its expression directly; no via media as such will be required. For example, an emotion of love may be required expressed directly to the beloved without any hesitation, without rhetoricism, but if the expression implying emotion displayed through signs, becks, symbols, signals employing ambiguity in the words and sentences the expression will be indirect. The following stanza from Browning’s popular poem ‘The last Rude together’ is a nice and expedient illustration for direct expression of love and fulfill of lovers intense desire to ride with his beloved at least once more in his life.

```
I said - Then, dearest, since 'tis so,
Since now at length my fate I know,
Since nothing all my love avails,
Since all, my life seemed meant for; fails,
Since this was written and needs must be -
My whole heart rises up to bliss
Your names in pride and thankfulness!
Take back the hope you gave, - I claim
Only a memory of the same,
And this beside, if you will not blame.
Your leave for one more last ride with me.
```

The following two more lines in Urdu poetry are marvelous in this course: -
TUJHE MAIN KYA BATAOON. KYON MUJHE TUJH SE MOHABBAT HAI.

MERE DIL KI TU MALKA HAI MERE KHWABON KI JANNAT HAI. (Unknown)

These lines reveal the love emotion of the poet as clear as possible. No complicated metaphors have been used. In plain and simple language the poet has beautifully expressed the emotion of love. His imaginations to characterize his beloved’s beauty surpass to call beauty in the world. Even though poet in his beloved as God’s paradise. To the poets mind his beloved is the only paradise for him. No other existence can be presumed.

2. Immediate and Delayed: -

Emotions or feelings are always generated from within; the evoking object may stand outside. But the expression of emotion if happens at once, a sense of happiness or a sense of pathos, as the case may be, is created and experienced. As such the poets generally compose poems even long poems on account of immediate expressions; delayed expression causes trouble and often it is observed that the genuine expression of an emotion can hardly be obtained by the expressing person in delayed process of expression. The meaning of the emotion in expressing technique in most of the delayed expression stand somewhat or slightly mutable. Harmony and compatibility in such expression in such expression is also affected.

3. Complete and Incomplete: -

If an emotion in all its inherences comes out without leaving behind any of its ingredients, it will be a complete and successful expression of the emotion and will be named as an artistic or beautiful expression. But any emotion that confronts with this outstanding position due to any known or unknown reasons, will naturally be tilted as an incomplete or unsuccessful expression; such expression are pseudo and or ugly in Croce’s view.

4. Natural and Artificial: -

in expressing emotion one can feel or experience or relish beauty of the expression as real as natural or as ought to be, but the dramists, actors and playmakers commonly demonstrate the expression of emotions artificially. Their purpose remains to impress the audience by their skillful movements of hands, necks, heads, twists, gestures and so on. If the audiences are conscious of the actor’s mimetic actions, the audience will not be affected but if they are not conscious, they
will find themselves in the same position, as is the position of the actor expressing the emotion.

**Spiritual, Mental and Physical:**

Croce accords mere spiritual or mental expressions to be the genuine. Accordingly, an emotion expressed mentally or intuitively in its complete form is successful and beautiful; it is treated to be a good art; it is spiritual because all phenomena depend on self experience which is spiritual, intuitive, really artistic and excellently beautiful. Physical expression of the emotion may very well be observed in the expression of anger, wonder and fear. We express our resentment through crying, loudly speaking, unmannerly dealing, hands waving and so on.

A mental or spiritual is limited to self-experience while a physical or bodily expression is seen by others, it may also stimulate others.

**Tender and Callous:**

Certain expressions are simple, tender and easy in spirit. The emotions related to them seek expressiveness in a quite gentle and easy way. No connivance can be observed on any stage in these expressions. But there is a form of callous expressions in which hurdles, unexpected and undue, stand on the way making the expressions difficult and painful. Tender expressions are pleasant and plausible while callous expressions are strictly unpleasant and likely incompatible.

**Sudden and Pre-Planned:**

Sudden expressions are those, which come out abruptly, no awareness prior to their happenings. We are probably and even oftenly have no knowledge, no intention as such to make our certain emotions explicit, yet they come out suddenly (It may be noted that sudden expressions may be grouped under the unconscious expressions as the psycho-analysts excessively lay emphasis on the role of unconscious phase of human mind. Dr.Freud, the founder of the psychoanalysis school of thought contends excellently that in the totality of human life, directly or indirectly, the expression of unconscious mind can be observed- named as Id or Libido. In Pre-planned expressions we just think over certain things, situations, aims and objects and then chalk out a plan to relate a particular kind of emotion to them. There after the expression of such a pre determined emotion is carried out. Novels, dramas, stories and all forms of literature come under this category; it is related to creativity in art and science. It is seen on certain occasions, consciously or unconsciously that we express our feelings without caring for social taboos because it is comfortable to us. But we are also bound- care for taboos where we are not allowed to express desires, feelings, emotions and experiences of life as freely as we like which is a kind of confinement and so we do not feel at home. As such no
comfortable situation is likely seen in our social life. Hence the desires in this way are suppressed or obsessed; such obsessions seek expression unconsciously in dreams, in slip of tongue, in omissions and spelling mistakes, in day dreaming and so on. (Freud)

Pleasant and Clumsy:

There are pleasant expressions aroused by certain glorious situations. Gratification of a desire is pleasant which can be observed by one’s face reading. Sometimes we utter certain words or utterances expressing our happenings. A departed is met; the expression will accompany an acme of joy. It is pleasant expression, a beautiful one. But there is, however, a kind of clumsy expressions also which are expressed by the expressive mind in a quite coarse and inadequate manner. The doggerel poems are good examples of the clumsy expressions.

In Indian aesthetics the expression in poetry has been emphasized. Accordingly, the aesthetic expression involves necessarily the power of suggestion (Dhvani) and propriety (auchitya) but these are the two phases of one phenomenon, not distinct elements of expression. Dandin tell us two cordial forms of expression. These are Natural and specific (Vakrokti), the two forms in which Abhinav Gupta, Jagannath, and Kuntak adopt the second form and explain in their slightly different ways. Abhinavgupt puts up his theory of Transcendentalism. He observes ‘Vakrokti’ as that form of poetic expression, which is apparently transcendental in nature. Vakrokti for Abhinav Gupta, is an elevated form in which expression obtains its highest point; it is actually a vision, which puts up things in real sense of their existence. It is adequately a poetic expression or poetic vision and is not an ordinary one. But Brahma uses the specific form of expression, as a synonym of ‘Alankar’ and rejects ‘hetu’, ‘suksma’ and ‘lesa’ from the regime of Alankar; this act of rejection is based on the absentia of Vakrokti, i.e. if no Vakrokti, no Alankar; the ‘hetu’, ‘suksma’ and ‘lesa’ loose their utility and value without Vakrokti. Kuntak also fathoms into nature of poetic expression by adopting ‘Vakrokti’ as a considerable concept. He thinks that ‘Vakrokti’ is a specific expression, which stimulates a highest or transcendental experience. The Transcendental experience as such, according to Prof.P.S Shastri, is different from a scientific or a historical experience and is therefore called ‘vicitra’ and Visista. However Vakrokti is a mode of expression, which stands on the genuine, and skill of the poet. But Jagannath interprets specific expression as ‘Lokottaratva’; it is really speaking disinterested and objective explanation of Vakrokti, which comes no more than to mere a reference in my thesis.

Other forms of expression may be there but not possible to enumerate all of them. However some expressions pertaining to other fields of life are also there, viz. Moral which is related to the expression of our feelings of good and bad, Economic to the expression of our financial activities, Socialistic to the expression of our social life, Psychological to the expression of our natural behaviour, Scientific to the expression of the desires to know, to analyse and to describe the physical
phenomena. The artistic or aesthetic to the expression of emotions and representation is artistic creation.

No heiracy, no order and no complete galaxy of expression can be prepared and produced. Every kind of expression is unique in its nature and meaning. Different meanings of one kind of expression may be taken; it depends subjectively on moods, situations and genius of the individuals. But expression in art has its own distinct status. Now, the description of various kinds of expressions paved the way to undertake discussion on the different meanings of expression.

**Different meanings Of Expression**

To commence, we have to put down the view of Carrit first. He distinguishes the term expression from symptom or sign, 'symbol' and 'stimulus' or Argument. He says, “The repugnance for the term has been due to the confusion of expression with three other things: Symptom or sign, symbol, and stimulus or argument.”23 Thus variety of meaning in expression differ from one individual to other; no consensus can likely be established in this regard, i.e. in the meaning and sense of expression and aesthetic expressiveness. “Perhaps even a single experience, if sufficiently poignant, may make some sensible appearance expressive for one individual though not for another or only in a different way.”24

The word symptom or sign, symbol and stimulus or argument are obviously distinct from the term expression in nature, in form and in meaning scrupulously, but it is not correct to think that the words symptoms or signs etc are devoid of the act of expressiveness or fake in meaning or blank in significance. All these terms necessarily imply this or that meaning which is made explicit through the process of expression. The explanation produced by Carrit falls down on the basis of subjectivity. He argues that symptom or sign may have different meanings for different persons, as the black spot may be the sign of revenge or a falling glass is of rain and sweating is a symptom of pain, but all is not expression.25 These very meanings are mere presuppositions, not real and authentic. Likewise symbol is different from expression because it may be supposed to be related to intellection-sign, while symptom to physical signs. But it is not tenable explanation or that of stimulus or argument because Carrit, as I think, confuses the word stimulus with argument. These two words are distinct from each other in their nature and in their meaning, and are commonly as well as specifically used in the senses of excitement and reasoning respectively, instead of expression as expression in real sense and meaning. However, each of the words, viz. symptom or sign, symbol and stimulus or argument (the two terms stimulus or argument are treated to be distinct) must have expressiveness in them without which no plausible meaning can either be taken out or be apprehended. Example thus cited by Carrit also stands as a sound evince to this fact. Symptom of ‘curl’ expresses negation; ‘horse shoe’ is expressive of hypothetical proposition and ‘V’ of disjunction and so on. Symptom is very much expressive of the causes of diseases; in Homeopathy propounded by Dr. Haenaimen, the word symptom is rudiment of cures, as it is symptom, the expression of which enables the doctor to detect and know the causes of the nature of diseases on the
basis of which he easily administers medicines to cure the troubles felt by the patients. As such the Stimulus is expressive of feelings and emotions and argument of reasoning. Symptom as expression I think, can properly been described as uttering, "To the question what is expression and how many it or does it contribute to the way in which the picture or any other art work "hangs together"? Since the term has been used in such variety of ways we now ask what they are." Continuing discussion again, "Expression is notoriously difficult notion, but when that is fairly indispensable in talking about the arts... we may treat expression under several heads: as intention or as symptom, and as vehicle or embodiment. These are only some of the most prominent examples of the term." Now the ambiguity of the term expression and its meaning as expression as symptom is obvious.

Albeit it is correct that the kind of symptom may involve meanings, but I think the expression in all symptoms, or in all signs or symbols or in all stimulative situations and in all argumentations must necessarily follow its articulate meaning because in all the above noted cases it is expression that awards meaning to them. He (Carritt) devoted as many as eight complete pages for denoting the ambiguity of the term expression but could not reach a final decision except to introduce meaning of expression as Significance, significance as the meaning of beauty and beauty as the meaning of aesthetic experience. However, he esteemingly made it clear that the meaning or experience of any feeling or emotion in expression or in expressiveness is evidently subjective.

As clearly disclosed and especially demonstrated, the 'Expression' involves a large number of meanings-connotative and denotative are the principal one. Any word or term may either be a general or individual. 'Man', for example, is a general term while the nouns Ram, Sita, Geeta, Neha and so on are used in the capacity of an individual as denoted by the term 'Man', Man being a general term. General terms are applicable to more than one thing, or applicable to all the members of that class. In reasoning it is the definition of a general or universal that is considered to be of great value because, "to explain the meaning of a term is to give the definition to it." Definition of a term may be carried our either by connotative meaning or by denotative meaning; some other meanings and senses may also be considered for this purpose with more or less or with equal importance. (Certain techniques of definitions are also there.)

The word 'meaning' can also be used in different 'senses', as literal or descriptive meaning of a term is distinct from its expressive meaning. The literal meaning of the word ‘diamond’ is colourless precious stone; but if used as ‘diamond jubilee’ or ‘diamond year’ then the sense will stand radically changed and the word so used will express the importance and value of the object denoted, not the colourless precious stone. In aesthetics, art and literature the term expression too holds the same position; it involves more meanings, more senses and more usages, and arises more confusions than that of the so discussed and so exemplified term ‘diamond’. Expression in its literal or descriptive meaning has as much importance and significance as it has in its connotative or intensional, denotative or extensional meanings. A profound enquiry into this matter is intended to be managed from an etymological point of view in the succeeding pages of my thesis. But where as the meaning of a term can articulately by determined by its definition, it will, therefore,
be a wise step to consider the techniques of formation and variety of definitions before proceeding to the different meanings of expression.

**Definition and Technique:**

What is definition? It is a question related to logic. Certain rules have also been put forward in this course, which are not needed to be produced here. What is necessary to justify a definition is concerned to the technique of definitions. Compendiously I lay down here all such techniques employing, which the definition of a term like Expression and other, can be obtained.

**Techniques:**

There are five to seven techniques through which a term can excellently be defined:

1. **Stipulative** - It is also called as nominal or verbal definition and can be obtained by deliberately assigning a meaning to a symbol. Definitions of this nature are mostly constructed in science and philosophy.

2. **Lexical** - It is lexicographically set of definition, which can be obtained by eliminating the ambiguity of the term. It may either be true or be false as against the Stipulative definition, which is neither correct nor incorrect.

3. **Precising** - It is exactly set definition, which can be formed in the same criteria of the lexical definition because the purpose remains to eliminate the ambiguity.

4. **Theoretical or Scientifically set Definition** - A theoretical definition of a term is a definition that attempts to formulate a theoretically adequate or scientifically description of the objects to the term applied. Hence the theoretically adequate or scientifically useful description of the object is meaningful. Its purpose is to obtain an articulate meaning, where options are opened in greater number.

5. **Persuasive or Winning set Definition** - This is a peculiar form of definition in which disputes are pervasively resolved by steering the feelings and emotions of audience or recipients. The informative and expressive functions of a language are treated here to be of great value.

Apart from these five techniques there are two more, which are thought to be the most important. I will also choose anyone to define the term 'Expression'.

**Definition by Intension (Connotative Definitions):**

Intension or Connotation as already explained comprises of those attributes or characteristics, which are equally shared by all the objects denoted by the term in that class. But connotation is a word; itself is seen confounding in its use. Sometimes, it refers to descriptive as well as emotive meanings. Hence, there are three different senses in which the word connotation can be used-1. Subjective,
Objective and 3. Conventional. Meaning of a term in subjective sense varies from person to person; one person believes in one kind of set of attributes possessed by all such objects denoted by the term but the other person disbelieves in that set and thinks of another kind of the set of attributes possessed by all such objects under that head. In objective sense of connotation or intension of a word all the objects falling under the extension of that word commonly share all the attributes. In conventional sense of connotation we have just only the stable meanings of a term, which are neither subjective nor objective but are commonly used and understood from generation to generation. Subjective sense of connotation is inadequate for a definition. The subjective sense also does not serve the purpose because none can have omniscience of all the characteristics shared by all the objects denoted. The conventional sense of intension or connotation remains to be considered for an appropriate definition because the conventional meaning of a term is not private property; it is rather a public apprehension. Such a connotation is publically available and we can plainly communicate with one another without hiccup.

In conventional sense of connotation or conventional meaning of intension we can excellently define a term by adopting certain techniques-

1. Words in dictionary conveying same meaning such are called synonymous definitions, as Marathi words 'Ghaslate' and 'Maao' are defined in English as 'Kerosene' and 'Cat' respectively. This method of definitions is not comprehensive.

2. Operational method in which the operational definition of a term clearly shows that the term so defined is correctly applied to a matter of investigation if the performance of specified operations in that matter yields a specified result. In the field of psychology the abstract definition of 'sensation' and 'mind' have been replaced by operational definitions.

3. Technique of Genus and Differentia- It is called definition by division or definition by analysis or definition by connotation (conventional meaning) objects sharing the common properties may have certain complex properties under big class, called Genus. The complexity of attribute denoted by a term may be analysed into two or more such attributes, which stand as two or more such sub class in the same genus, called species. Limitations are there, e.g. (1) Simple attributes cannot be divided. (2) Universally accepted word like Existence, Entity, cannot be defined by this technique.

**Extension and Denotative Definitions:**

Connotative definitions are based on the implying properties of all objects sharing commonly denoted by a term. But denotative definitions employ the criteria of enumerations of the objects denoted by a term. Extension of the general term is the best technique to enumerate the objects eloquently, but not possibly all the objects, rather some of the objects. Hence the definition by denotation in extensional panorama is restricted and we exemplify the objects existing in one code of conduct upto a maximum possibility because a complete enumeration of the objects denoted is not possible in all such cases. For example- Ram as a man has many, many
characteristics and so Ram is included without hesitation in the extensions of ‘many, many’ different general terms and therefore in a denotative definition of anyone of many, many general terms we can put man Ram in the examples of ‘man’ as animal, as mammal, as philosopher, as idealist, as husband, as poet and so on. The difficulty remains because a few of many examples do not facilitate the distinguishing phenomenon between the meanings of these terms.

However, an ostensive or demonstrative kind of definition is there in which the terms to be defined are demonstrated by gestures instead of naming, classifying and sub classifying the objects –The word ‘house’ means ‘This’ or ‘That’, just pointing to a house.

Ostensive definitions also have certain limitations viz. geographically, we can point to an object, which is present before us, but we cannot to an invisible thing.

There is, however, another quasi-ostensive definition particularly mentioned Copi and Nagel in which we add some descriptive phrase to the terms defined-so the word ‘house’ means this or that piece of ‘architecture’ accompanied by an appropriate gesture.

But any form of this exemplificatory definition in the relief of extension of a term is not genuine; there are difficulties in large number in all such kinds of definitions. This brief description of nature and formation of definitions and their kinds is not superfluous or absurd in the reference of various meanings of the term expression, but it is needed genuinely as the connotative, denotative and other meanings of expression can very well be ascertained through the logical explanation of the techniques of definitions and their applicability in claiming various meanings. Hence, before defining the term expression it is better to discuss different meanings of expression here and now.

**Different meanings:**

Having in view of the term expression as an ambiguous, the meanings in large number may very well be assigned to the term in the following manner:

**The Literal Meaning-**

‘Expression’ has its genesis from a Latin word, which stands for “pressing outward”. It is just like squeezing of juice from the grapes. But J.W.Manns tried to analyse the word expression as ‘ex’ and ‘press’. He thinks that the term in question has two of its principal components as stated before which means to ‘squeeze out’. Both the components are set off from each other. Explaining his analysis of the term expression he writes, “To express is to squeeze out, a simple description that carries heavy implications. For whatever gets squeezed out must therefore have been; in some sense, in; thus embedded in the term itself there exist a distinction between the inner and the outer, a distinction that, specially is the early
flowering of expressionism, was laden with metaphysical implications. This inner something was taken to be inner not in any physical sense (as one's elementary functions, for example, take place inside one's body) but in a metaphysical sense (Aesthetics inside one's body) but in metaphysical sense. Here, wisely the problem of 'in' and 'out' has been raised in which it is clearly said that expression is nothing more than an activity which is related chiefly to the process of bringing about something from the inner self. It is just to say, 'What is inner?' is to bring to light or to make outward. But what is that which is to be brought outward, is a matter of profound consideration. If we mean expression as a process of squeezing something from our inner self then it will compatibly mean that we have certain urges or feelings or emotions or ideas or thoughts or attitudes or on the whole the experiences of life which are to be made outward in the form of expression. In the specific manner of annotation the term expression will cover a vast range of its action. The meaning of expression in this literal sense is not the only meaning; other meanings are also there which invite attention to discuss profoundly and articulately. Further more, J.W.Manns holds the view that expression in not an embodied or physical phenomenon and nor can sensed as physical; rather it is used in metaphysical sense and the outward and inward states of expression are related to realization of an inward and spiritual state in the process of expression in which the inner is taken outward. The inward something is made outward; 'That something' is emotion or feeling which comes outward in this process and continues a perceivable phenomenon in the artwork. It is, therefore, art that is claimed to be the real abode of perceivable outwardness of all 'that something', which remains inward before the activation of expression. Thus expression in this sense is not sheer mimetic in art; it is rather some mental or spiritual activity making art genuine and trust worthy.

The breaking up the term expression in two components as 'ex' and 'press' or 'presso' is not plausible and not very sound analysis. If the meaning of the term as pressing outward, asserted then the placidity of expression will go to darkness because in expression no such activity is likely to happen which may be called pressing; it is simple and gentle activity which occurs as softly as a springing flower. There is no hard doing or stony activity in a nature of expression. If pressing outward is assumed for any reason then it will mean has no coercive nature. Therefore, it is wrong to say that it is related to some inner pressure as we draw juice from squeezing the grape means of an squeezer machine. The expressionists executing the right of freedom under the influence of romanticism advocate that all expression is mental not outward [Croce and Collingwood]. Therefore it is inconsistent to analyse the term on the one hand and ascribe it the meanings of pressing outward.

The dictionary meaning of the term expression also more or less the same as the meaning discussed above. The new dictionary thought by a Cyclopedia of Quotations puts down the meaning of expression as 'Face' and 'as language' and thus Emerson goes on explaining face as "There are faces so flied with expression, so flushed and rippled by the play of thought, that we can hardly find what the mere features really are-when the delicious beauty has appeared that in interior and durable from ahb been disclosed." The second sense of Expression an language remained in explained in the Dictionary. Language as expression or expression as
language is keenly related to art. In art the expression of beauty means the expression through language, in broader sense of it. If is for, “The work of art is a kind of language or vehicle for the artist to use to express some disembodiment thought or conception. In the other, some conception is thought to be embodiment of the material frame of the artwork. The two are somewhat complementary to one another.” The artist in her work hence, utilizes the material sometimes as conception, sometimes as thought, sometimes as idea, sometimes as feeling, sometimes as emotion and other like phenomena to make expression excellent, articulate expedient and comprehensive.

The variety of the meaning of expression can never be ignored. If we can consider the genesis of expression, we will find it flourishing from time to time and from ages ceaselessly. The compact edition of the Oxford English Dictionary Vol I A-O speaks of, expression as term which has been meant, sensed and interpreted differently in different periods. In 1594 Plat Fewell meant by expression a “kind of triangle” 1626 Bacon Sylva & 633 meant “making d4rink by expression.” In 1725 Bradly FAM Dict.S.V. Plague took it as a “separating the vinegar from the herbs, the way of strong expression. Imison Sc Art II 129 allocated the meaning to expression a many vegetables afford essential oil or distillation. In 1859b Tannet Ceylon 11 IX VI-542 relates the meaning to the “Crushing of coconut for the expression of oil.” B concr means “something pressed or squeezed out, an expressed drink, juice, liquors etc.” 1686 W. Harris took it “express through a Lenin cloth…. and let the expression settle. But it also meant as representation and manifestation. Clarifying this notion it is said that the action of expressing or representing is a meaning and a thought state of things in words or symbols. It is also an utterance of feelings, intentions and explicitation or mention or description of something. Expression is an action or process of manifesting qualities or feelings by action, by appearance or by other means and manners. But in fine arts, particularly in painting and in sculpture the expression stands as a fact of a way, which brings about the character the sentiment and the actions, etc. the expression of feeling has also been taken to be plausible meaning of expression in this sense “the manner of performance (with respect e.g. to degree of loudness and softness) suited to bring out the feeling of a musical passage. Expression is wanting, without which music is languid and intimate. Moreover, Expression is also taken to be the “Mark” (Music) science of word indicative of the desired kind of expression, expression-stop in Harmonium, stop by which the performer is enabled to vary the pressure of air and this produce expression. Further more “expression stop in used by which the air reservoir is cut off and the pressure made to depend entirely upon the management of the bellow’s (934,447) In other meanings the expression may be taken to be as decoration, as mystifying, as in carnation at an early or later style of an art work but in the sense of feeble or eloquent speaking it can be considered as the embodiment or expression is as harmless enough manner of speaking but it, along with the form contents is as insidiously misleading that deserves to be virtually expunged from our way of talking about art. Rather, we should look to the natural means for order in art works in all the richness of their dimensions.

In “Compton’s Pictured encyclopedia And fact-Index”, the word ‘Express’ has been dealt with as a Camel Express, Air Express, long Express and
also, “Express as it is known today- a company in business...” But there is no mention of the term ‘Expression’. Moreover, the Encyclopedia of Britanica- and Encyclopedia of western philosophy and philosophers, no such term as ‘Expression’ has been considered: astonishing. The Oxford English Dictionary claims the meaning of expression as “the act of representing, declaration, took peculiar manner of utterance.” In these senses the expression is an activity through which something is represented; it is resemblance with the meaning put down by J.W.Manns and Noel Carroll who think of the expression as a process of inward and outward, the two stages of some phenomenon. Another meaning has been disclosed in Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics-It relates the term with “a person’s manner of speaking or reading aloud.” It means expression literally means elocution or style manner of speaking and reciting Tolstoy means by expression as communications he contends that we express ourselves means we communicate our feelings to others but all communication is not art. “With art, an inner emotional state is externalized; it is brought out into the open and transmitted to viewers, readers and listeners.” It has been articulated by exemplifying “the artist expresses her gloominess here means that she conveys to or instills in her audience by drawing in a certain manner.” But all these meanings are confounded and are denoting senses of rhetoricism, which are not much importance in the case of art and beauty. However, the literal meanings of the term may be asserted for defining a term; if no alternative is in hand on the postulates of the differences of the meaning and senses of the word expression and various schools of art have been established by different thinkers of world (to be discussed later on).

**Connotative Meaning of Expression:**

The literal meaning of connotation implies a meaning; it is also taken for addition and inference (Oxford University Dictionary). But in philosophy, particularly in logic, the definition of the term is obtained from its essential meaning (also on other grounds); essence of the term displays its characteristics, which are included in the definition. The definition of a term articulates the essential meaning of that term. For example, Aristotle, who found rationality as an essential quality of man, and so distinguished ‘man’ from all other animals in the animal kingdom, has defined ‘Man’ as a ‘Rational Animal’. In the same way the Connotative meaning of expression meets the challenges of those persons who think that the term expression has no connotative meaning. That is why they failed to define it in its proper sense and use. Logically Connotation of the term means its intension and likewise denotation is taken for extension. Where as the definition of a term or a subject Plausibly states its meaning but meaning itself involves different senses, as already explained, so the connotative or intensive and denotative are extensive meanings of the general terms are very important. But the literal meaning ‘pressing outward’ or ‘squeezing outward’ or ‘face’ or ‘language’ or ‘the act of representing’ or declaration or ‘look’ or ‘peculiar manner of utterance’ or ‘a person’s manner of speaking or reading aloud’ or ‘communication’ are in large number along with all other meanings on the surface, these meanings are simply descriptive or translativ
informing nothing new about the object. It is very difficult to shift out such a meaning, which may be claimed as the essence of expression, the job is hard and difficult but not impossible. It is logically true that the term expression is simple and its analysis by Manns is coarse and hypothetical, incompatible and inconsistent. Its definition grounded on its connotative meaning is really a creditable business but difficult too. To my mind the essential meaning of the term expression is confined to the process of implicit and explicit; the ‘ins’ and ‘outs’ as meanings of the term coincide with ‘implicit’ and ‘explicit’ respectively and assumed as the two genuine characteristics on the basis of which the definition of the term can be constructed. But the sense of expression as ‘inward’ and ‘outward’ or ‘ins’ and ‘outs’ stands eloquent in relation to activity occurring in such a way as to make a term meaningful and articulate literally, but not implicatively, which is required for a certain and universally accorded definition. The implication of the term denotes its intensive or connotative meaning and is important one. Hence, in the case of ‘inward’ or ‘outward’ or ‘ins’ or ‘outs’ or ‘implicit’ or ‘explicit’ it is obviously true to claim that all these senses or meanings of the term expression are descriptive, instead of self expressive and are basically reporting words of ‘something’ that come outward under the process of expression. The ‘ins’ and ‘outs’ etc do not stand as the property of the term. But what is ‘something’ in the reference is a matter of sincere inquiry.

The meaning of a general term can be known properly, if knowledge of all the members falling under a general class is obtained. As such, it will be an extension of the general term or in other words an acquaintance with all the objects denoted by the general term will come under the umbrella of a term denotation or extension. But whereas all the objects with in the extension must have some common characteristics so as to enable us to know and use the same term to denote all of the objects of the class, therefore, it is necessary to know the common attributes or characteristics of such a general term prior to its denotation or extensive meaning. Intensive or connotation meaning of a term is essentially needed to be acquainted with, not with the extensive or denotative. Cohen and Nagel write “Therefore we may know the meaning of a term without knowing its extension. It is intensional or connotative meaning of the term is taken as the term as a criterion for deciding what the term verily denotes. Hence Cohen and Nagel give the definition of ‘intension’ or ‘connotation’, which is conclusive. They write as such “The set of attributes shared by all and only those objects to which the term refers is called the ‘intension’ or ‘connotation’ of that term.”

Every general term or general class term involves both connotative or intensive and extensive or denotative meanings. The connotative or intensive meaning of the term ‘man’ comprises of rationality, as its peculiar as well as common property or characteristic, which is not needed to be known for being acquainted with ‘man’ as an individual, viz. Plato, Aristotle, Ram and Sita as denoted by the term may be known to most of us, or man as a living creature different from horse or kid or sheep or camel as quadruped living creatures, may certainly be known to all human beings without knowing rationality as an essential characteristic of man. It is therefore, conclusively true that the intension or connotation of a term determine its extension or denotation but not vice-versa. Moreover, intension of a term increases when additional attributes are opted. In the
example of man when we say, “a good man”, “a philanthropist man” or ‘genius man’, the added attributes good, philanthropist and genius expand the intensive meaning of man as ‘a rational animal’. Consequently, to identify the extension of man as ‘good’ or ‘as philanthropist’ or as ‘genius’ as the terms which leave the intension of the class uncertain. Hence, “... intension is not determined by extension. But intension must determine extension.” For this very reason the terms with different denotative meanings can not have the same connotative meaning but connotation as having different meanings may have the same denotative meaning, or in other words the term involves different intension with the same extension, but not vice-versa. Discussion on these lines shall continue under denotative meaning and the term expression will be attempted to be defined convincingly. Howbeit, the literal meaning of the term as investigated in the form of implicit and explicit does not suffice to define it (expression) articulately and convincingly. Attempt will be made after discussing all such meanings, which are possible in the course to define the term possibly on other grounds-literal or descriptive and expressive or denotative meanings and senses provided that no connotative meaning of expression is ascertained.

**Denotative Meaning**:–

Again, an impressive and precise definition of a term can be obtained by its connotation provided such a meaning is undisputed and universally approved and implicated by the term defined. Moreover, there are various techniques of definitions as discussed previously and anyone may be adopted. But if a term by nature does not yield such a meaning that can be said to be universal and undisputed, then still the term can not be left undefined because it is definition of the term that determines the meaning. Where connotation is mute, the definition by denotation or by other technique can be given. What is denotation? It is a matter of consideration. In the proceeding pages my attempt will articulate the meaning and applicability of denotation.

The essential characteristics of a term are those, which a term implies necessarily; all or a few deserving attributes may be chosen for the purpose of definition. This is connotation but the extension of the attributes or added attributes to the connotation expands its scope and thus all the things coming under the realm of the term denoted will form the denotative or extensional meaning of such a term defined. Hence, the denotation covers all those meanings, which are over and above the connotative meanings and the term used differently in different senses and usages may be seen and inquired for the purpose of its denotation. Connotation and denotation have close vicinity with extension and extension being probably two synonymous words and their meanings of intension and extension. In connotation we go deeper and deeper in the depth of a term to find out its essential property or properties and to found the definition on the postulates of such properties. The intension of the term meaning is, more or less, the same as the meaning in essence in connotation. Extension of a term is asserted as its external or physical expansion, viz. ‘Philosopher’ is a term having ‘lover of wisdom’ as its intensional or connotative
meaning but its denotation may be 'Realist', 'Idealist', 'Empiricist', and 'Pragmatist' and so forth, every of these species may further be classified as Plato (Idealist), B.Russell (Realist), Locke (Empiricist), Dewey (Pragmatist) and so forth. But the properties, which are related to Idealism and Empiricism etc., form the classes from upward to downward and are treated as extension of the terms or the denotative meanings of the terms as well. Citing the example of the term 'Man' we can depict a diagram for clearer understanding of the relationship between Intension and connotations, or Extension and Denotation. Aristotle defined the term 'Man' as 'rational animal'. Rationality being connotative meaning, or to say intensional meaning of man is such a differentia on account of which man can easily be separated from other kinds of animals in the Animal kingdom, the genus. 'Man' is species of 'Animal'. But if 'Man' is further classified as philosopher, scientist and artist then 'Man' is asserted as genus or big class and its sub species are philosophers and artists etc. If philosopher is chosen to go ahead then philosopher itself is a big class of which Idealist, Realist, Materialist and pragmatist are sub species having their different and particular meanings from each other. The classification may be taken to individual classes of which no further division will be possible. Hence each big class in the series will have some peculiar properties to which no other class implies.

Example:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Animal Kingdom (Different from Matter)} \\
\text{MAN} \\
\text{(Different from Cow, Horse etc. rationality being differentia)} \\
\text{Extension} \\
\text{Philosopher} \quad \text{Scientist} \quad \text{Artist} \\
\text{(Skilled in reasoning)} \quad \text{(Skilled in discoveries And inventions)} \quad \text{(Skilled in art work)} \\
\text{Or} \quad \text{Or} \\
\text{(Lover of wisdom)} \quad \text{(Lover of reality)} \quad \text{(Lover of beauty)} \\
\text{Intensional Meaning} \\
\text{Philosopher's Extension} \\
\text{Idealist} \quad \text{Realist} \quad \text{Pragmatist} \quad \text{Positivist} \\
\text{Plato} \quad \text{Hegel Hasserl} \quad \text{Minong} \quad \text{James} \quad \text{Dewey} \quad \text{Russell Witgenstein}
\end{array}
\]
Extension of man ends on individual members in the class. But every term in extension denotes certain new distinct meaning in the tree depicted under animal kingdom.

Now the question pertaining to expression strikes the mind: what is denotative meaning of expression? The answer can be given by casting light on the nature of denotation or extension. Copi and Cohen define denotative or extensional meaning of a term as, "A general term, or class term, denotes the several objects to which it may be correctly be applied. The collection of these objects constitutes the extension or denotation of the term." As such, the denotative meaning of expression may cover a large number of such meanings which are used for the purpose of communication of ideas, thoughts, emotions and feelings etc. it may cover all those literal or descriptive meanings, which are consciously, or sub consciously used for denoting matters involving distinctively apprehended senses. In this reference the general meaning and other possibly relevant meaning will now be ideal with as genuinely as needed.

Different Meanings:

It is already disclosed and demonstrated that the term expression involves a large number of meanings- connotative and denotative are the principal one. I would like to commence my inquiry from its etymological meaning.

1) General Meaning:

Expression as a word has been used for long. Rhetoricism has always been related to elocution. Poetic beauty is there where an emotion of the poet succeeds to get expression completely. Language plays important role in this pantomimic nature of expression. It is Customary to exchange ideas in the society with others. Language is the only means of communication of ideas or views. If the language is vivid, self-expressive and unambiguous, not vague, the communication of thoughts or view points will stand clear and meaningful in its aim and objective, then, naturally, we say that we have expressed ourselves is a quite satisfactory way, and if the words of the sentences or the sentences or the language as a whole stand inadequate, we fail to make explained to others in our views and ideologies that are wanted to be inculcated. Moreover, in practical life expression can be expressed everywhere, in all aspects of our life viz. cognitive, affective and conative. In all these aspects expression is required without which we fail to utilize our cognitive, affective and conative values of life. Expression is treated to be valuable for all categories of the human beings, no matter one is lay or learned, but the difference lies in the ways of expression. A layman has a higher level of power in him to communicate his ideas as beautifully and impressively as a learned can do. There is another difference in the expression of a common man, and one who knows the actual meaning of expression. A common man, not knowing what is actuality or inactuality implied in the word expression, can use, generally, such a language which we say inarticulate. This
inarticulation hinders the layman to impress others on the one hand and to make them fully explained what he wants to say. It may be called an inefficiency of the person because of his ignorance towards the art of rhetoricism. But a learned scholar whether one is a philosopher or artist or scientist or, on the whole, one is literary man, is such who can express himself in a quite satisfactory way pursuing a language, which may be remarkable, operative, exhaustive and of great value.

(2) Technical Meaning: -

Under this head there are a sufficient number of the meanings of expression. I will try to cast light on some of them so as to make the note on this chapter conclusive. When I happen to fathom the vast ocean of the meanings of the term expression, I am attracted to the following meanings.

(A) Aesthetic Meaning: -

As a denotation of Expression under the umbrella of technical meaning, the aesthetic meaning comes first to be explained. In Aesthetics the word expression is meant as beauty. Croce has developed his doctrine on Expression determining it to be a form of beauty. He thinks that expression may be of our perceptions, impressions and emotions and after all, of that entire situation which is of great value for an artist, e.g., poetry requires a situation befitting for its creation. Likewise, in painting the situation is always related to the outward nature and the impressions lying on the painter's mind, which enable him to express his experiences by means of colours, lines, sketches and other material to be used. Moreover, a musician too requires a healthy situation for generating in him the emotions, which the musician expresses through musical instruments. So also the artist in the field of sculpture needs certain stimulus in the situation to respond through his art for making it expressive and also to express those emotions, which he has, and on the basis of which he creates the things of beauty- Taj Mahal is a typical example of beauty in the field of architecture. Those who know the genesis of Taj Mahal, find themselves in the same situation of love in which king Shahjahan and architect Sheeraze were. When they have a single look at Taj, Taj will doubtless express not beauty only but a sense and feeling of profound love which the king Shahjahan had in him for Mumtaz, the Queen. Taj Mahal expresses the emotion of love and appears to be an ideal of beauty.

As for as Croce, Collingwood and other expressionists are concerned they all treat expression as beauty; it is mental and intuitive for Croce, to Hegel it is sensuous; to others, like saints, it is entirely spiritual. In all respects after all "Expression is a key concept in aesthetic theory- especially Romantic theory_ most systematically elaborated by Croce and Collingwood. Where expression is given the chief explanatory role. Artworks do not merely describe or represent emotions, they more directly communicate an artist's moods and feelings, and enable to the appreciater to experience them also." The communication and arousal of emotion are not essential to appreciation. Artwork must be expressive but not of all qualities, may be of a few. Aesthetic meaning of Expression is highlighted in all artistic
creations but apart from this there may be other meanings, which are also technical one. I will throw light in nutshell on some of them as follows-

(B) Poetic Meaning Of Expression:

Rhetoricians has always been closely affiliated to the theory of expression or elocution. Proper arrangement of words expressing emotion is called poetic beauty. The organic unity is an essential feature can be seen in Cicero. Nougerius G. Francastero (1555) developed out a theory of expression during the period of Renaissance, though all poetry is said to be expressive of emotions in real sense. In the 17th century a theory of rhetorical elocution was developed in contrast with that of dialectical theory of logic (Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics) But in the early 18th century Pope proclaimed that “true expression like the unchanging sun clears and improves, whatever it shines upon” (Essay on Criticism 315-16, Quoted in Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics) In the later 18th century Herder and other romantic poets asserted that the true expression can not be isolated from thought, i.e. expression without thought and vice versa are not possible. In 19th century a theory of emotional expression was developed in England. Coleridge emphasized the organic unity of Thought and expression. In 1833, J.S.Mill viewed poetry as the expression of uttering forth of feeling. John Kabel, at about same time (1832-41) put up the Theory of indirect expression of emotion. In 1857 G.Eliot said about the poet that it is always true to his own inward vision within, or to mental state, which occurred as “truth to the vision within.” Walter Peters essay on style (1887) speaks that, “all beauty is in the long run only fineness of truth, or what we call expression the finer accommodation of speech to that vision within.” (Ibid) R.L.Nettleship, an English thinker made the organic unity in poetry much lighter. According to him “the feeling is not truly felt but in different way: - so that it is not strictly correct to call the word expression of what we meant before we found it.” (Remains II, 1327 as quoted in Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics) Eugene Veror in 1870 proclaimed, “Art is the manifestation of emotion obtaining external interpretation known by expressive arrangements of time. Forms of colour now by a series of gestures sounds are words governed by particular rhythmical cadence.” (Trans. P 89, quoted in Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics.)

(C) Scientific Meaning:

As the expression has a wide purview, in science it is of great value. In scientific field the expression is seen in the discoveries and inventions of the scientists. All the scientific laws are but the ideal examples of scientific meaning of expression. A mathematician sees beauty in numbers because numbers put together under a formula express the solution of the problems undertaken by a mathematician. As soon as the problem is solved, the mathematician is seen satisfied because
solution appears beautiful to him. In the same way the atomic structure has a beautiful expression for the scientist who undertakes the job to analyse and know its form and structure. All other scientists, in their different branches, do feel a sense of pleasure when the objects of their discovery stand expressed to the mark, which satisfies to ardent fervour of the scientist in their quest for reality.

(D) Ethical Meaning: -

In ethics, we discover the nature of good and on the basis of which moral judgements are passed on behaviour of the individual. In my view, in Ethics, good expresses such an emotion of life, which leads the man to a right path. The standards of good or of judgements may be different but good as good expresses itself as good. It is always beautiful and liable to be approved as good in the society so as to run the society smoothly and easily.

(3) Psychological Meaning: -

Expression in psychology has been undertaken as a form of pleasure. It is related to the pleasure seeking principle Id. Dr.Freud in his analysis of mind reached the conclusion that there is expression of id in all the aspects of man's life. In dreams, in commitment of mistakes, in slips of tongue, in complexes and in all other forms of abnormalities we find the expression of beauty. It is, according to Freud, an expression of suppressed desires, which can very well be seen in the life. Psychologically, expression is related to pleasure but I think that the pleasure itself is an expression of beauty and expression is pleasure in itself.

(4) Economic Meaning: -

Adam Smith defined Economics as a “Science of Wealth.” The words science of wealth is expressive of the meaning of the term economics. But the on coming economists disagreed with the type of expression in meaning of which economics has been under the process of change till the Marshall who defined economics as a “... a study of man’s action in the ordinary business of life. It enquires how he gets income and how he uses it. Thus, it is on the one side a study of wealth, and on the other and more important side, a part of the study of mind.” In his revised definition Marshall writes, “political Economy or Economics is a study of man kind in the ordinary business of life, it examines that part of individual and social action which is most closely connected with the attainment and with the use of material requisites well-being”. There is a marked difference between the definitions of Adam Smith and Marshall. The economic expression in Adam’s definition is related to the wealth as an end of life. Marshall on the other hand interprets the term economics or political economy as the study of mankind which is expressive of human behaviour-individualistic as well as collective both-it is the
study of wealth on the one hand and on the other a study of mind which is taken to be most important fact of life. Marshall, thus, articulates the expression of the term economics by considering with man’s behaviour in relation to the wealth seeking urge or a perfectly psychological deal.

(5) **Social Meaning:**

In sociology we study individual’s relationship to society. Behaviour of man in solitude is seen quite different from the behaviour in multitude. The relationship as such between individual and other members of the society implies a considerable meaning of the relationship between an individual and the society, of which individual is a member and cannot dare to infringe the rules and regulations laid down by the society. Such a meaning is self-expressive in the field of sociology. So the social meaning of Expression is in relationship between individual and society.

(6) **Recreational Meaning:**

Every one of us likes to live in society, even the hermit too. But he seeks aloofness because he thinks that spiritual ascension can be obtained in solitude, but there is no solitude except in our bare thoughts. Actually in saintly language the solitude by heart is intended, not by action without society. As a living being our lives may not be dull, we require certain means of amusement. Every recreational activity expresses pleasure. So in reality recreational expression is not more than the expression of pleasure. Hence, the expressive meaning of recreation is pleasure. No matter the pleasure can also be obtained through other means. However, the recreational expression can also be treated to be aesthetic in form or as beauty and pleasure.

(7) **Biological Meaning:**

Expression as value may be regarded as having so many meanings in the life of man. In this context it may adequately be said that there are certain values, such which express some advantageous phenomena for our existence on the earth as well as for our lives here after. Hence, it is needed to know what is value? What are its kinds? And which of them implies biological meaning?

According to Parker, "... values belong wholly to the inner world, to the world of mind."

The definition expresses the values in such a way as to make the whole life progressive, beneficial and praiseworthy values have moral meaning or meaning of values as related to our inner selves; In which we are impressed by the expression as good or right but values in their expressive meaning have been categorized differently by different thinkers. Someone says’ the value expresses good as its meaning but some other speak of values as an end in itself. Consequently, Right
divides value in two groups—one, intrinsic value and two, instrumental value. An intrinsic value is of worth on its own account, an instrumental value because of its consequents. Urban classifies values into: organic and hyper organic. Organic values are those, which are related to our biological needs. Organic values have further been divided into economic values, recreational values, sociological values and bodily values. Under hyper organic values there are knowledge, beauty and good; these are spiritual values and higher than organic values. In all these kinds of values there is expression of there is expression of meanings but all such meanings are in some or the other way, directly or indirectly, coincide with the expression of beauty in art and aesthetics.

**Revelation, Flash, Rapture and Ecstasy:**

Expression is also related to manifestation, revelation, flashes, raptures and ecstasy. Manifestations are treated to be divine expressions. The nature is a manifestation of God. Revelations are also extra ordinary expressions—Vedas are said to be revealed books on the Aryan mind. But flashes may appear on the heart or mind of an ordinary person, on the basis of which he or she may predict any event which occurs true in future though the causes remain absent in the present; expression is an offspring divine manifestation; divinity manifests, individually expresses. Ecstasy in lexicographical meaning is used as singular the ecstasies is its plural, ‘German ecstasies’, ‘Latin ecstasies’ and also another foreign word. ‘Exestanai’, expresses the meaning as ‘put out of place’ or ‘out of’ and instanai, set up and stand. But the explanation pertains to a state of intense, over powering emotion, a state of exhaustation or mental rapture induced by beauty, music or artistic creations; rapturous-delight, a transport or rapture from the contemplation of divine things; the frenzy of poetic inspiration. Moreover the term ecstasy is also characterized as rapturous one to subject to fits of ecstasy and so on. The word-meaning of Ecstasy provides opportunity to interpret it in the spirit of spirituality and thus to say that ecstasy is a mystical such condition or state in which the complete forgetfulness of one’s self comes out as annihilation of ‘self’ (Buddhism), or a state of ‘Fana’ in Sufism. This annihilation dominates through out, until the mystic revives his consciousness of the self. As such there are three distinct aspects in which the ecstatic state of a mystic may adequately be studied and explained (A) Physical aspect, (B) Psychological aspect, (C) Mystical aspect. Mystical aspect is most perfect form of ecstatic state where subject-object duality ends and one reality, the reality of God prevails. In this context mystical aspect of this state reveals, “Therefore, complete forgetfulness, While in its physical side ecstasy in an entertainment, but on its mental side it is a complete unification of consciousness, and on its mystical side it is an exalted act of perception. It represents the greatest possible extension of the spiritual consciousness in the direction of Pure Being: “the blind intent strenthing here receives its reward in a profound experience of Eternal life. However, in ecstasy truly speaking the mystic perceives divinity by his eyes of his inner consciousness developed and obtained in the process of spiritual journey, not by any other eye. Dualism of all kinds ends here and one reality remains visa-vis. An other
interpretation of rapture is associated with ecstasy can be traced out of Nietzsche's lectures in which Hiedeggar, an existentialist, holds the view that, "... this intanglement of love and respect, 'rapture'; in thinking this intanglement he uses Rilke's first 'Dvino Elegy' as his guide: 'For the beautiful is nothing but barely the terrible, a beginning we but barely endure: (N, 116). The intanglement of love and respect called rapture is related to the creator and the created, the artist and the artwork, the producer and the spectator and ultimately disintanglement concerns itself to the lover and beloved-this relationship is on the empirical level but on the transcendental level the intanglement of love and respect permeates the higher possibility of expressing the relationship between a devotee and the devoted. But the empirical state of rapture, as I think, will necessarily lead to a lover of beauty to the transcendental beauty or sublime where the subject-object finalizes as one or oneness, leaving no room for 'I' and 'you'. Hence, there is no logic to believe that beauty is the beginning of terrible.

Raptures and Ecstasy are those states of mind in which spiritual experiences are obtained. There is an expression of God in these states and only the saints and seers can obtain them. The saints or all those who have realization of divinity are seen dancing and singing. The mystics are said to be the true lovers of God. Whenever they happen to get divine expression, they forget themselves. It may be called a state of self-annihilation or rapture or ecstasy, which induces a specifically spiritual experience pertaining to sublime beauty, good and truth as well. The mystics ascend from an ordinary or empirical level of existence to an extra ordinary or transcendental level.

Croce in the field of Aesthetics and Dr. Freud in the field of psychology are the two prominent thinkers whose achievements in their respective fields are conspicuous and praise worthy.

Croce was an Italian idealist who attempted to explain and expound the nature of beauty in aesthetics or fine arts. He was an aesthetician philosopher instead of an artist philosopher (Collingwood differentiates between aesthetician philosopher and artist philosopher). Croce availed the opportunity to contemplate, utilize and explain the term 'Expression' in its real spirit. No doubt, expression has commonly been in vogue in all the circles of the lore and learning on the one hand on the other, it has been of much value and use for every human being, irrespective of his or her status in the society. But the term under discussion is ambiguous in its meaning and exposition. The mission of Croce, in this respect, was to cast sufficient light on the nature of expression and interpret it in the light of intuition and spirituality as he says, "To intuite is to express, (nothing more, but nothing less) than to express."

Expression as an indefinable term (in my opinion) has been indistinct seeking annotation and clarification from the 'lovers of wisdom' from the times incommensurable. It is a very important and valuable term, remarkable and glamouring concept in aesthetics and psychology to which Croce and Freud paid equal regard. In philosophy and science and almost in all the fields of life, we find expression of ideas and expression of essential qualities and characteristics inherent in the nature. Every such expression in my view is either pleasure or beauty and if it is a hindered or an unsuccessful, it is painful or ugly. In Croce, it is interpreted aesthetically while Freud's approach is psychological in which he proclaims art s
“Collective neurosis”. I do not agree with him, but in the last resort both culminate in the kingdom of beauty and ugly. In aesthetics the standard of judgement is normative while in psychology it is factual which is not so much important as is the basic meaning of expression in psychology and aesthetic both.

Apart from all this, Croce and Freud both have devoted due time to studying, understanding and explaining to the term expression. They succeeded too much in their endeavor to make the term clear, transparent, impressive, enchanting and comprehensive in its essence, sense, value and use there of. But Croce’s expression is mental Freud’s behavioural and say adequately sexual. In both it is egocentric, so far as I interprate.

Fathoming the history of aesthetics or art and literature we can say that expression has been a word of discussion from the fourteenth century or so because of its use in different senses by different thinkers of the world. A higher degree of indistinctness in its explicity has been found involved. I think, Croce was the first among his contemporaries as well as predecessors who diverted his attention towards aesthetic value of expression and invested ample amount of energy in studying and investigating the springing prospects of expression in respect of solving the problems of beauty and ugly, meaning and sense of the term comprehensively and logically, clearly and affectively as needed in his doctrine, the science of expression.

**Definition of the term ‘Expression’:**

The term ‘Expression’ in my view is a simple term. Thinkers in different times made efforts to explain the meaning of the term but all such explanations given by them have been sufficient, the word, as I think, requires deep study and proper attention for its meaning. It will not be unjust to quote the version of G.E. Moore who states that good is indefinable. He puts up his ethical theory in which good has been a term of much discussion. Moore goes on to prove his statement by saying that good is simple and unanalysable, so it is not definable. As he interrogates what, then, is good? How is good to be defined? He answers, “Now, it may be thought that this is a verbal question. A definition does not indeed often mean the expressing of one word’s meaning in other words. But this is not sort of definition I am asking for such a definition can never be ultimate importance in any study except lexicography.” Keeping in view of the Moore’s version we can not allocate any such word or words to the definition of the term expression which are valuable only in the work of lexicography. Logical definition of a term is intrinsically related to the connotation of the term, which is not apparently possible for a simple and unanalysable word like good and expression. Moore, however in this panorama again questions, “If I am asked ‘What is good?’ my answer is that good is good, and that is the end of the matter. Or If I am asked ‘How is good to be defined?’ my answer is that it cannot be defined, and that is all I have to say about it...” That propositions about the good are all them synthetic and never analytic, and that is plainly no trivial matter. And the same thing may be expressed more popularly by saying that, If I am right, then nobody can foist upon us such an axiom as that ‘pleasure is the only good’ or that
'The good is the desired' on the pretence that this is the very meaning of word." Moore I, believe, intended plausibly to prove the placidity and simplicity of good and also in close relationship with pleasure, as I say that pleasure and beauty coincide together and if good being an ethical term stands unanalysable and indefinable as well, then there is no risk to claim the same characteristics for an aesthetic term 'Expression'. For maintaining this position, i.e. indefinable nature of good Moore argues, "Let us, then, consider this position. My point is a simple notion; just as 'yellow' is a simple notion; that just as you can not, by nay manner of means, explain to anyone who does not know it, what yellow, "What yellow is, so you cannot explain what good is." Consequently, if someone is not acquainted with the very meaning of 'Expression' then it is very difficult, or if not impossible, to explain him, what Expression is. Although philosophers in the field of ethics have defined good by adopting different views as Kant defines good as good will. He says, "There is nothing in this world or even out of it that can be called good without qualification except a good will." He further states, "It is a jwell which shines itself." He again articulates the meaning of good by saying that, it is an end in itself." But in this respect Moore does not agree with them and as a logical positivist, he treats 'good' as indefinable. For him all moral judgements are emotive expressions. Moore's notion of good becomes highly considerable when he utters, 'good'; then, if we mean by it that quality which we assert to belong to a thing, when we say that the thing is good, is incapable of any definition states what are the parts which invariably compose a certain whole, and in this sense 'good' has no definition because it is simple and has no parts." Moore's eventual judgement in the case of 'good' may also be expediently allocated to the term expression. To stick his position and to prove his statement that good is indefinable, Moore has cited a number of such examples of horses, lions, and other animals which are understood by means of their bodily structures and or alluded properties but as good can not be characterized as any of the embodiments, therefore good cannot be defined. Expression; as a simple term, has no such properties as to enable anyone to define it convincingly. However, the footprints of G.E.Moore I, as, research scholar in aesthetics, may put up my own view here that the term expression is indefinable because it is simple and its analysis cannot be done. The aestheticians in different periods, no doubt, have made strenuous efforts to explain the term but not to define it. That is why various explanations are found and only a few may be taken for granted. But in this panorama and in the purview of aesthetics it is great responsibility of the aesthetician, particularly of those who are interested in Croce's theory of expression, to define and determine the meaning of expression as clearly as possible. I may hold the responsibility and define the term as follows: "Expression may best be defined as a process of making explicit to all that which is implicit". Somebody may object on this definition because once I proclaim that the term expression is simple and is indefinable and thereafter in the same context I have made an attempt to have been grounded on the connotative meaning of the term, but as the term expression has no such properties or essential characteristics on the basis of which the might have been made possible then how such a definition has been formed and brought about? The answer is easy and the objection stand baseless if I claim once again that the definition under question is as simple and as unanalysable
as the term expression itself. But seemingly, I hold the view that the definition is no more simple term to say it is complex, no matter if the definition contains two major terms in their close vicinity, which are ‘Explicit and Implicit’. But these two terms are not treated to be fundamentally different from each. Rather the words ‘Explicit and Implicit’ indicate the nature of process through which something hidden or alluded comes to light, it is analogous to squeezing of the juice from the grapes: The grapes inhere the juice which may easily be obtained by means of the squeezing process of activity: ‘Grape’, is a term, has as much simplicity as the term ‘Expression’ but it (Grape) is meant for a delicious juice that can be obtained by squeezing process. Moreover, if the term ‘Expression’ is assumed as a combination of the two words, viz. ‘Ex’ and ‘Press’ which mean (1) to come out or to squeeze out and (2) to press outward respectively. Then the meaning of expression will not be plausible, as expression, although it has two components as etymologically as worked out by some thinkers. But expression is a simple, easy, placed and pleasant activity or process in which the inherit something is made externalized. Pressing outward means hard without which desired result is not possible. The meaning of the component ‘press’, as much, is not expedient in respect of aesthetic expression. Pressing outward will, then, naturally mean blast or explosion in which the implied explosive matter bursts forth like a rocket devasting life and nature both. An other significant distinction between expression and explosion may be made on the postulates of the nature of expression; expression is a delicate and beautiful process while explosion is hard and ugly process in its nature. However, J.W.Manns has claimed the squeezing process as simple in other matters but is not as convincing as is needed. He says, “To express is to squeeze out, a simple description that carries heavy implications. For whatever get squeezed out must therefore have been, in between the inner and the outer, a distinction that, especially un the early between the inner and the outer, a distinction that especially in the early flowering of expressionism, was laden with metaphysical implications. The inner something was taken to be inner not in any physical sense (as ones alimentary functions for example take place inside one's body) but in a metaphysical sense..” Alan Tormey’s view may eloquently be alluded here for a more articulated meaning of the states as ‘ins’ and as ‘outs’ of the term expression for a better understanding and accomplishment. According to him, feeling or emotional response is the necessary condition that makes the expression articulated, i.e. Alan Tormey seems to have had the expression fettered by feelings or emotional responses in prima facie. But the actual position is distinct. Expression as impounded by feelings, but not the expression, as a concept itself. In his words, “The concept of expression is associated in a primitive way with the image of ‘pressing out’”. There is something, adds he, “inside” which is expressed, forced out, and which in turn reveals what remains inside...Thus an expression points simultaneously toward the object.”

The presence of object in immediacy or observably is not needed for the inside and outside of the process. But the meaning of expression denoted by Alan Tormey may be viewed as a supporting paradigm in respect of the definition given by me precedently. Physical and mental expressions or instinctual and intellectual expressions, or intended and non-indented, or creative and non-creative and like other forms of expressions if taken for granted there comes a long galaxy of
expressions but all kinds of expressions are not artistic, although all varieties of them must have been woven with the so called process of ‘inwardness’ and ‘outwardness’ or as in accordance to my definition, with ‘implication’ and ‘explicitation’ of the inner states of mind. In art expression involves creativity; the artwork is the result or effect of the artist’s creativity in which imaginations play conspicuous role and emotions find their way out to unladen the expressing mind. This view is not admissible to Alan Tormey. He writes, “The artist is not expressing something which is then infused into the work by alchemical transformation; he is making an expressive object. What he does to accomplish this remains of course, as complex and mystifying as before, and I have nothing to add to the numerous attempts to explain the “creative process” except to argue that, whatever it may be, it is not identical with some act or process of expression.”\(^{64}\) Clarifying the distinction between the artist’s activity and that of others Tormey emphatically says, “...art is an expression of a state of mind or character of the artist does not establish a relevant distinction between art and any other form of human activity, and the attempt to utilize the concept of expression to distinguish artistic or creative activity from more mundane affairs leads only to incoherence and absurdity.”\(^{65}\) It means the artistic expression as an artist’s activity, related to the expression of her state of mind or character is not sufficient criteria for working out the distinction between her activity as an artist and the activity of a common man, say to non-artist. But it is not logically plausible. I do not agree with him because creativity in art and creativity in other affairs of life differ at least, in degree. However, Tormey allocates the expressive qualities to art.\(^{66}\) For expressive qualities he advocates for the qualities in the object itself.

To elucidate at the crucial point the definition of expression, it is a lovely matter if I take the privilege to put down the concept of ‘Abstraction’ and explain it in terms of what I say “something implied” in the definition of expression given by me. When I say that expression is a result of that dynamic process which all abstractions concrete because the implication in the process is not visible unless it is expressed or say, made explicit. Or we can say the inner feelings or emotions or all that which is possible in abstraction is brought to light through art or dialogue, language plays best and important role in this behalf. Croce after De Sanctis in solution of the problem of form and content speaks of form as not abstracted something from the content. Rather it is transformation of any emotional state or in other words of content into an object of contemplation or to artistic vision.\(^{67}\) It clears the point that the concept of abstraction involves to all that which is inner, invisible and clear even to the person running under such a set of mind. It is not an extract of inner feelings but abstraction, i.e. the implied etc to which Croce calls content and are transformed to form. Or I say, “all that which was implicit is made explicit in the dynamic process of expression. However, in aesthetics Croce following Vee-Hegelian goes on discussing the problem of form and content interpreting them not to be the opposites. “But as distincts, is as much as the emotional content of a work of art has an abstract status only when viewed aesthetically, but certainly not when viewed emotionally.”\(^{68}\)

For this very reason I once again confirm my definition of expression and say that in the process of expression not only the inner feelings and emotions but also
all our thoughts, notions and ideas, attitudes and interests, purposes and motivations are to light in the form as ‘expression’ by the artist through her art: the poems, the music, the painting, and the sculpture, and put them to the audience for contemplation.

Kant in discussing the subjective criteria of beauty concludes his theory of subjectivity in the words of Mothersill, “Kant however, who investigated the nature of beauty through the mental conditions necessary for its experience, concluded that there can be no principles of beauty, yet reasoned and judgements of beauty are universal (1987). The conclusion by Kant is seemingly contradictory but as I think there was no way out except making such a paradoxical statement. Likewise in the field of Ethics Kant’s notion of categorical imperative is seemed paradoxical because Kant exclusively states that there is no place of feelings of any sort in moral judgements and he says that the categorical imperative ought to be respected and followed. The feeling of respect has been recognized for categorical imperative while Kant once again disfavours the role of feelings in moral affairs. Another example of such paradoxical statements may be cited from Sidgewick’s moral philosophy. He contends that there is a paradox of practical reason, which cannot be poised with on any account in the field of moral judgements. He thinks that the human nature being selfish can how be directed to generously or benevolence? But he answers that he rational authority motivates to be philanthropist on the cast of egoistic interest. Hegel’s Absolute Idealism may also be exemplified in this context. The absolute is contradictory in itself as it inheres the two opposing phenomena viz, mind and matter, being and not being, self and not self, consciousness and unconsciousness and so on and so forth. But such a contradictory natured Absolute also has the reconciling characteristic. But after all Hegel has no excuse to form such a reality which is together full of contradictory or opposing phenomena or principles.

Moreover, Shankar in Indian philosophy had the same problem before him because once he thinks of Brahma as Nirguna and twice he brings down His position at the empirical level as he thinks that Brahma limited by Maya is Ishwar or Saguna. His philosophy appears paradoxical because he thought that without assuming Maya, the self opted veil by Nirguna Brahma, the falsity of the world cannot be proved logically, and the Advaita nature of Brahma also cannot be established.

Despite of claiming that ‘good’ is simple, unanalysable and indefinable term in moral philosophy by Moore, Baruch Spinzoa had attempted to define good as, “By good I understand that which we certainly know is useful to us.” Though the definition given Baruch Spinzoa is not very sound and does not clarify the very meaning of good still it has been an effort to define it.

The definition of Expression given by me is not based on the connotation of the term because expression is such a term, which has a number of different, meanings and no one or few can be allocated or ascribed to expression. If there is paradox in my statement that the term expression is indefinable because it is simple having no components or parts, yet I define the term does not mean that I had any fanciful thought which compelled me to just produce a definition of such a term which has no definition. It is not nightmare or false idea or a whim of vanity; it is rather a fact that the definition of the term Expression is meaningful, excellent,
befitting and convincing. Criticism is the essence of wisdom without which what is right and wrong, what is true and false and what is fanciful and real? Cannot be ascertaining. This is so much and so that in favour of my statement that expression is such a term, which is simple, and indefinable, yet it is definable.

**Elaboration of the definition:**

Certain questions—

1. What is made explicit?
2. For whom it is brought to light?
3. Who works it out?
4. Finally what is its result?

The definition of Expression given by me, may be analysed in; process, explicit, implicit and making to all that. The definition vividly speaks that expression is a process. What is this process? is considerable. The answer to this question may be related to Croce’s theory of Expressionism in which he says that the expression is an intuitive or spiritual activity. As he says, “To intuit is to express, and nothing else (nothing more, but nothing less) than to express”

Croce does not recognize content and form as separate from each other. He holds the view that concretization of abstract phenomenon at the initial level as merely content, might have its reality based on spiritual activity. Intuition is spiritual and whatever is spiritual is thus expression.

The process of bringing something to light is spiritual activity rather than physical. It is metaphysical, not material; it is mental, not elemental. Etymological meaning of the term expression clarifies this process by squeezing the juice out of the grapes. It is merely an analogy for making the point clear.

In the course of analysis of the definition the second considerable question is, what is the relation between explicity and implicitly in this process? To answer this question is to make the point clear that the process itself is a relative term in which something implicit is made explicit; ‘implicit and explicit are the two relative terms, they akin, not far off. Explicitization is of implicitization, i.e. ‘something’ is ‘in’ which is to be made ‘out’ or in other words ‘in’ is to bring to light as ‘out’. Implication means something hidden or ‘in’ and explicit means ‘that something’ is to be brought to light or hidden something is made disclosed or ‘in’ became ‘out’. Actually the relationship between implicit and explicit is perfectly compatible to the process of expression because expression in its true sense is no more than the process of internalization or today more adequately concretization of something which before hand remains hidden or implied consequently the process in terms of ‘implicit’ and implicit plays double degree role; the existence of one procures the existence of the other necessarily.

Tolstoy, a Russian thinker, means by expression as a form of ‘communication’. He says that when I express myself to you or else you express yourself to me or another expresses herself or himself to you or to me, means that I communicate to you or you communicate to me or any other communicates to you or to me. But all types of communications are not related to art, only the
communication of feelings or emotions are meant for an artistic communication "With art, an inner emotional state in externalized; it is brought out into the open and transmitted to viewers, readers and listeners." The problem of transmission is also attractive and momentous. The theory of expression conveys the meaning of transmission as transfer of emotions, which an artist stands to make explicit or to make open. She wants to communicate such an idea or feeling or emotion to the recipients. If she succeeds in her intention, then the communication or the transmission is perfect and the artist is satisfied otherwise not; all this she does through her artwork. Croce calls the successful expression of emotion as a good art and apart from this, the artist fails in her aim of communication then it is no0 more than a pseudo art. N.Carroll eloquently exemplifies this matter, "According to the expression theorist, what is transferred is an emotion. An artist looks at a landscape and feels gloomy. Then she draws the landscape in such a way that the viewer experiences the same sense of gloominess. "The artist expresses her gloominess" here means that she has a feeling of gloominess which she conveys to or instills in her audience by drawing in a certain manner." Tormey repudiates Tolstoy's expression. According to him expression is the sense of communication is illusory, not an articulated meaning. In his words, "Expression is not communication; nor does it require communication to occur successfully. I may intend or hope to communicate something by saying (or doing) what I do, but it is not a condition of expression that this should be so, or I should succeed." But to what extend the view of Tormey is correct is a matter of debate which is not intended here.

The discussion in short or in a little long result is making a problem of explicit and implicit as clear and plausible as possible. It is, really speaking, a problem of inner and other states of mind. The artist aims at expressing herself to the recipients, no matter if one (recipient) is sympathetic or arrogant; she, the artist, always has a significant urge within herself which persuades her to communicate her feelings or emotions to the recipients through her artwork, "The act of expression from this perspective is one of clarification and unencumement, in which some gnawing emotion is brought to light and its pernicious hold on the artist is there by dissipated. "Ex-pression", after all, merely makes mention of the squeezing out of something; it tells nothing of the fate of that something once it has been externalized." Hence, the expression at mental level of an artist is not sufficient to be called an artistic expression, unless it is communicated through artwork. N.Carroll, in this context, writes, "Needless to say, an artist might clarify her feelings by just focusing on them mentally. That is, it is at least, conceivable that one could get clear on one's emotional state simply by thinking about it. The emotion, then, would be clarified but not externalized. Yet could an artwork exist entirely, so to speak, inside someone's head? This would appear to violate our ordinary understanding of art, which regards an artwork as a public affair. It would also seem inconsistent with the notion of expression, which fundamentally rests on the idea of something 'inside' being brought "out-side". Thus, in order to block cases of completely mental artworks, the expression theorists should add that the process of the clarification and transmission of emotions be secured by means of lines, shapes, colours, sounds, actions and or words. This guarantees that an artwork is, at least in principle, publicly accessible medium.
Expression at the mental level is no doubt beautiful and unless it is externalized through some artwork, it cannot be classed into art proper.

Having the discussion on the nature of process and purport of the terms explicit and implicit the third question pertaining to the definition comes out as, what is 'all that' which is made explicit? The answer to this question is easy because it is feeling or emotion or idea or experience or thought which gets outwardness in the process of expression the emotions and feeling etc are implications of heavy results. The artwork not only the experiences of the nature but also manners of impression which he obtains according to her bent of mind. The emotions as such take rise in her and seek their outward existence. In this respect James W. Manns articulately contends that "What gets expressed: a thought, an idea, an attitude, or an emotion? We can be said to express our views on world peace, democracy, the value of a sound education, voter fraud, lawn care, or cheese soufflés, and we can also express how we feel toward any such notions, institutions, phenomena, or entities." The artist cannot grow her emotions or any account; it is because every such emotion has a powerful urge in itself that powerful urge makes the artist uneasy and unless she expressed herself through her art work, she cannot live placid. The expression of emotion is intentionally done as writers. Noell Carroll, "When an artist expresses her feelings, she does it intentionally that is her aim. She wants to get her feelings out in the open where everyone, including herself, can contemplate them. Something is an art work only if it is an intended transmission to an audience of the self-same emotion that the artist experienced."

The connotative meaning of the expression belongs to its essential qualities and characteristics. When the essence to which a thing or thought implies, happen to come out or the implied. Characteristics are made explicit absolutely and clearly through any mental or non-mental process, we say that the process as such in an act of expression. This is an actual expression which is brought to being as beauty in aesthetics and pleasure in science and psychology, may it be some material or some spiritual or intuitive or mental phenomena indented to be expressed externally or internally.

Croce's mental expression and Freud's external-expression of id in our outward activities viz. committing mistakes in spelling, pronunciation and so on. In other words, when the essential qualities or salient features of a phenomena, or something else is brought to light to be known and also be explained in the knowledge of others, then we say in this panorama, that the process of expression happened in actuality or potentiality is made actuality by the thinking mind. The expression may either be subjective or objective or may be both-subjective and objective.

Unless the expression in proper sense of explicit and implicit is conciliated, the meaning and the implied characteristics of a phenomenon can, on no account be followed and apprehended. Hence, the definition given by me as above vividly shows the very nature of the expression. Any quality or characteristic or thing or an idea, if made clear and convincing, we are bound to believe that which is primarily implicit has now been secondarily explicit. In this panorama the doctrines of Croce and Freud are valuable who interpret expression as beauty and pleasure respectively. It is mental and intuitive as well as physical, physical and para physical.
In fine arts-poetry, painting, music and sculpture- I think, the expression covers all such fields in which mental and physical and all other types of expressions may be perceived and realised.

The process of ‘implicit and explicit’-requires the medium of language which provides opportunity to think and thought, feelings and emotion to come into existence having the essence of beauty and pleasure. To cite the examples of poetry, painting, music and architecture etc. is to say that if they have the power and efficiency of expressing an idea or an emotion or something else, we can say that the essential qualities inherent in all such phenomena have been made clear and the indented expression has been successful. A successful expression is a ‘good art’ otherwise it is pseudo as Croce claims it is because a successful expression belongs to beauty and pleasure while a hindered or incomplete expression is always ugly and painful. A competent artist crates beauty a pleasure or pathos by his creations. The spectator or the audience may have the same taste, realization and experience, provide he or she has the art experience. Such persons will very well apprehend the meaning, aim and objectives of the artist who tries to express his experiences of life and nature through his paintings, music and poems etc. utilizing material of such creations-words, gestures, lines, colours, musical tones etc.

For example, I come across a person who is unfortunately grotesque; the first look at him will impress upon me his ugliness. I would not like to see his face again because his grotesque features will have the expression of only those qualities, which cannot be treated to be in conformity with the norms of beauty. But objective expression is there which may be painted successful by a painter may have the beauty of expression but not beauty in reality, rather ugliness is made explicit, not the beauty. However, the relation between the states as implicit and explicit continues in all such expressions as ugly or as beauty. I may have the opportunity to illustrate Newton’s law of gravitation as discovered and produced by him. He was perhaps, sitting beneath an apple tree and had a sight on falling apple. Newton was anxious to explore the reality; it was a puzzling problem in his mind. He began to contemplate on the problem and sooner or later the solution of the problem was lying latent in Newton’s mind, which came out as the law of gravitation. It means the implicit became explicit or an unexpressed solution of the problem expressed as law of gravitation. It brought an aesthetic beauty and psychological pleasure to Newton.

The meaning of expression according to F. Sparshott is not betraying, enouncing or otherwise giving signs or indications of mental states, even in dictionary emotion, feeling, mood and all classical line of expression in real sense. But Expressiveness or say expressive line as intuition, which is full of cognitive, effective and conative meanings in the real expression in real form. It means expression on the traditional lines or postulates has been banished from being expression as expression by F. Sparshott as he thinks of new lines of expressiveness in his theory of expression. The expressive line emphasized as intuition comprehensively treated to be the real essence of expression. It also a fact that expression may either be natural or aesthetic in which ‘expressiveness’ may eloquently be an attribute of all forms of expressions. “A gesture is a natural expression of some feelings if it is a symptom of that feeling and a symptom need not be expressive. ‘Expressiveness’ has to do with impact: an expressive gesture is a
revealing or eloquent gesture. Expression becomes expressiveness only when it is in some sense successful, and the concept of success has no clear application to the notion of a symptom. On the other hand, it does have ready application to language, where a man can be more or less successful in conveying what he means.\textsuperscript{89}

By Expression Tolstoy, means communication, Carrit means 'significance' and F. Sparshott means 'Expressiveness' and others mean others but I mean 'Expiutionization' by the term Expression, seems to be articulate meaning of Expression.

In context to the definition as detailed in the preceding pages of the thesis it is fortunately necessary to make the definition articulate and expedient. There are three such questions, the answers of which will be serve this purpose. First of all I would like to know who or what makes the emotions explicit, secondly for whom is it done so thirdly what means are adopted for such expression? But ultimately a subsidiary question is likely to be dealt with in the last.

The first question is related to the artist herself. It is artist who plays important role in making the process of expression possible. Whatever and whatever way the artist is impressed by her experiences of life, feelings and emotions, she likes to make them explicit and give form of an artwork. But there are thinkers who content that it is the art itself, which makes the activity of expression possible. These are the two extreme theories in this context but actually a reconciliation between the tow can be established on the ground that the process of expression is akin a much as to the artist so much is also akin to the artwork. James W. Manns writes, “Here the schools divide into two principal camps. One holds that it is the artist who is said to express emotion through the work of art...the other principal approach contends that it is the work of itself that should be said to express that or that feeling.”\textsuperscript{90} Unless the activity expression is brought outward (if the expression is confine to the mental level only), such activity or process cannot be treated art. Expression means something outward and the outward form of the process will necessarily confound to some sort of artistic creation.

The second question is confounded to the audience or viewers or listeners. The every expression is done by the artist but for the recipient. It is from Beethoven’s work Missa Solemins the title page of which mentions commendably, “From the heart, may it go to the heart?” Beethoven’s aim was to made the point clear that the expression of emotion is connected to the both artist and the recipient. The emotion coming from the artist heart goes to the recipient’s heart. It means for all artistic creation the artist and the recipients are the two necessary conditions without which no expression of emotion can be get related to rat proper.

The answer to this question may be given by making an eloquent statement in which it is that the thoughts, ideas, experiences, feelings and emotions can be expressed through the means of 'signs' and 'symbols'. In all artistic works the artist uses certain signs and symbols denoting their meaning or purport with a view to make her creation plausible and articulate. Every such sign or symbol like lines, contours, strokes of brush, words as metaphors etc expresses the implied meaning to all those recipients who are interested in such creation. But all sorts of symbolic creations cannot be accounted for art proper only those symbolic forms of artistic creation will be claimed to be a good art or in the words of Collingwood an art
proper which are liable to express articulately, successfully and perfectly all those emotions which an artist intended to express. The subsidiary question is associated with transmission or communication of the emotions expressed through the act of such an expression. Beethoven in this context claims the transmission of the emotion through the expression in the heart of the perceiver, audience and listener (recipient). Tolstoy has produced his theory of art in which he repudiates the idea of comprehension without communication. He contends that the communication is to be essentially done through the artistic creation; the recipient must have in her mind the complete expression of the emotion indented by the artist. The artist aims at bringing the recipient in the same situation in which she finds herself at the time of expressing an emotion. The transmission of emotion through representation comes to light when the recipient feels as what the artist feels himself before activating such an urge to come out in the form of expression. Tolstoy in this respect introduces an energetic idea of infection which is most important a key note in his theory as he writes, "one indubitable sign distinguishing real art from its counterfeit" gives rise to a feeling, this feeling again arises an other feeling, namely, "that feeling,... of joy and of spiritual union another (the author) and with others (those who are infected by it). It is the recipient who is infected by such feelings of artists. Thus for Tolstoy, communication is the ultimate aim of art, with end of communication itself being something akin to universal brotherhood in which art is "a means of union among men joining them together in same feelings." Tolstoy shows degree of infectiousness of art which depends on three conditions- (1) on the greater or lesser individuality of the feeling transmitted; (2) on the greater or lesser clearness with which the feeling is transmitted (3) on the sincerity of the artist, that is on the greater or lesser force with which the artist himself feels the emotion he transmits.

This is all stated and explained in reference to the question what communication or transmission means in art and in this recourse a great authentically; it is intended to articulately explain my definition of expression put up for a sympathetic consideration.

Summarization:

It is nice to say, concluding the chapter, that the expression is the essential need of human life; even the animals do indicate though their signs and gestures what they want from their masters, a psychologist may very well follow the signs and motions of the beasts and all other savage animals, if he had studied animal behaviour. The child-behaviour is followed by the mother and all the members of the family because of the close contact with the child's behaviour, acted and interacted perpetually with the parents and others in the family. Dr. Freud's notion of expression is commendable in this recourse. Alan Tormey opines that expression is a mental state expressed in behaviour but every sort of behaviour or act is not expression; only that state of the person which is mental if expresses itself properly, is expression in true sense of the term. In his words, "we express, both in our speech and our nonlinguistic behaviour, a prodigious variety of things, from beliefs and attitudes to moods, intentions, and emotions, from hope, hostility, and anger to pity,
doubt, and elation. It is clear however, that neither behaviour nor language is expressive of everything that could be said to be a state of a person. He distinguishes between the expressing subject and the expression objectified and also between expressive and expressiveness. There is also a difference between a sincere and an insincere expression but the proper sense of expression Alan Tormey connects to the mental state as expressed in the behaviour and character. His distinction between the expressive properties and non-expressive properties is remarkable expressive properties are those properties of art works (or natural objects).

The fulcrum of all human life is expression, the language, in broader sense of the term, is the essential need without which the expression purport culminates into nothingness. Hence, it is plausible to that Expression, the vehicle; language, the fuel, Imagination, the steering; Artist; the mover; Audience; the respondent traveler when form a coherence, the art is true sense of art comes out as a genuine art. It is not a jumble of the variety of part takers rather in a coalescence of harmonious entities of animate and inanimate, visible and invisible. Ultimately the life is an expression of the two ingredients that are matter and spirit, combined together in a proportion expedient and adequate in an artistic manner or, if I am not wrong in a scientific method of combination; the art expresses nothing but the feelings generated by this whole in relation to the existing environment. It is the expression, is not manufactured phenomenon rather it is an inborn idea in human mind: God reveals Himself as Divine and expresses Himself as creator of the world, is an in born idea, not acquired by non. However, expression is the core of art, it is not disputed; if it is disputed, it is less disputed.
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