Following Hobbes and Locke, Addison described Imagination as applied to the perception of visible objects, giving pleasures of two types i.e. primary pleasures of imagination which entirely proceed from such objects as are before our eyes, and secondary pleasures of imagination which flow from the ideas of visible objects, when the objects are not actually before the eyes but are called upon into our memories or formed into agreeable visions of things that are either absent or fictitious.

We have also taken note of his description of the mental representation of ideas derived from those original perceptions which he confounds with the objective representation of these ideas in work of art. The pleasures of imagination from derived ideas or derived after primary act of perception of the objects present before eyes, he explains, arise from the two fold satisfaction of comparing a copy with the original and from the variety and added liveliness which we experience from the manifold combinations of ideas which are not found thus combined in nature.

We have taken note of some of the issues raised by Burke and shall now turn to another viz. G.E. Lessing, a poet, a dramatist, a journalist, a student of classics and an omnivorous reader of modern literature including English who published his
According to Lessing, Art has been allotted a very wide sphere. "Its limitations, it is said, extend over the whole of visible nature, of which the beautiful is but a small part: truth and expression is its first law, and as nature itself is ever ready to sacrifice beauty to higher aims, so likewise the artist must render it, subordinate to his general design, and not pursue it further than truth and expression permit. Enough that, through these two, what is most ugly in nature has been changed into a beauty of art".

Does medium set a limit to the activity of an Artist?

The question discussed in common parlance was to discover values of art in terms of emotional experience and some were disposed to think that the painter, the sculptor, the poet and the philosopher as well as historian, all of them were engaged on one common task of expressing universal truth, even at the expense of beauty. Some, on the other, were of the opinion that the work of a sculptor, the painter, the poet, the philosopher, the historian was different from the other, that a sculptor represented something different from that of a poet, a painter, a philosopher.

Lessing wants to show that there are certain limits to expression which are thrust upon the artist by the nature of his medium. He also wanted to distinguish the arts by the specific effect which is capable of producing.
Since the days of Plato, or even earlier, the common elements of one art and another and most common amongst them all were traced and it was contended that all of them can be put under a common term of denomination i.e. Fine Arts. The common property which unites all the arts was named once and for all by Plato—was that they are all modes of imitation. Critics, then had no difficulty in recognizing certain principles which were said to enter into every work of art; it was an imitation or representation of reality in various media i.e. words, musical sounds, visible shapes drawn, painted or chiselled in such a way as to create an illusion of reality and produce an effect of pleasure or satisfaction in accordance with the universal laws of beauty. Aristotle laid down certain principles common to all works of art.

Comparison of one art with another gives critics some of the delights of artistic creation. Ben Jonson repeating a quotation from Plutarch, "Poetry is a speaking picture, and picture a mute poesy" declared that it was excellently said.

Even Croce in our own times comes near to obliterating all distinctions between one art and another, says Miss A.E. Powell in her very able account of Croce's Aesthetics.

**Difference rather than Resemblance important**

Differing sharply from the above traditional common trend, Lessing says "The difference, in effect, between poetry and
painting is more important for criticism than the resemblance between them. And he was not first to say so, for even Burke had taken some pains to assert that words are not pictorial substitutes for the visible world. The difference between poetry and painting, he says, is a basic difference, that between a medium of time and a medium of space. A medium of space can present corporeal objects directly and vividly. Conversely, a medium of time can present actions directly and vividly, but can present bodies only indirectly and through actions. Poetry ought to describe not objects as such but objects in action.

Lessing attempted to show that "bodies with their visible properties are the peculiar subjects of painting ... actions are the peculiar subjects of poetry" and this because painting can only represent a single moment of time, while poetry, in describing bodies, must give in temporal sequence what has been received as a single impression. According to Lessing poetry tolerates and will only tolerate certain modes of expression, painting and sculpture and others. That is to say, poetry is not a speaking picture, painting is not mute poetry. Lessing is here dealing with a practical artistic issue and not with a problem in the philosophy of Aesthetics.

Lessing, we may say, takes it for granted as an axiom that a work of art is designed to produce an effect. A picture
is made to be looked at, a poem is made to be read. It is by
the effect it produces on us that we judge it, and it is this effect
which the artist seeks to produce. Lessing's point is, not that
certain desired effects are utterly denied, but that they will be
attained by quite different means.

Lessing was right when he showed why the laws of
poetry are not the laws of painting. It may be that the separate
province of each cannot be defined in terms of feeling or intuition.
It can be defined in terms of expression. A practitioner of one
art may doubtless borrow much that belongs more obviously to another,
but he cannot borrow its medium. By the medium he uses, he
is bound.

Lessing's theory all too clearly leans toward vividness
or illusionism. The fact that he actually countenanced this aesthetic
norm while perhaps believing that he was severe upon it, is suggested
in Laozoon. He was a pioneer German dramatic critic and a rebel
against French neo-classicism. When we think in terms of new-
classicism, we must bear in mind the distinction between what goes
under the term classic and what is indicated by the term romantic.
Longinus among the old is considered "the first Romantic critic"
for he preferred to speak of the emotions which great literature
stirred, the passions it called forth and the transport or ecstasy
to which it led. A rapture is induced by a kind of madness or
divine influence and the Artist flows forth in phrases that are
inspired, the reason is completely set aside. The literature inspired by sublimity born out of profound contemplation rather than barren speculation reaches a peak in the domain of creative art which transport and lifts us out of ourselves by a power which confounds the judgement, eclipses mere reason and illumines the subject with the vividness of lightning. What is known as Renaissance marks the end of the period of classicism which prescribed limits everywhere, the limits born out of cool rational manipulation.

The old landmarks were thrown overboard. In few decades, the appearance, thought, sentiment and literature of the Europe were radically transformed. It had its global impact but gradual. The demand for overall change, on one hand, assumed the form of French Revolution. In another sphere, not quite so quickly but more permanently, it assumed the form of industrial and scientific revolution. Its influence on mass consciousness of nations is manifested in flamboyant forms of altruism, humanitarianism and egalitarianism. In literature it assumed the form of artistic revolution known as the Romantic movement which changed everything including the language, thought, approach to problems, the jargon of philosophy, criticism, politics, society - all have undergone a radical change and we have been lifted as by a magic into the modern world.

The pioneer of this Romantic movement, we may say, was Jean-Jacques Rousseau who challenged the society, not the
literature in all its aspects - government as it was constituted, law as it was administered, religion as it was imposed by the hierarchy, customs and conventions as maintained in the interests of the status quo. Against the old Gods of custom and privilege, he set up the claims of Reason, the rights of Man, the freedom of the individual to remake society in the light of his ideals. The French Revolution and the literary Romantic movement were products of the same intellectual ferment.

Rise of forces of Rapid Change & Individual Initiative

It was a period of turbulent change which touched off and transformed almost all aspects of social life. Things which had existed through the centuries began to disappear. The Kings, the aristocrat, the plutocrat and the privileged person one after another became targets of criticism. The means of production changed, the factory system supplanted cottage industries and along with it the social superstructure raised on class-exploitation crumbled. A world in which things went on as they had always gone on, under an authority which claimed divine sanction, was replaced by a world of perpetual change in which individual initiative and enterprise received unbounded admiration, recognition and encouragement.

It was irony of fate that the classics which were summoned to the service of those who rebelled against medieval repression of the church were afterwards successfully used to crush the
rebels. They were actually enlisted on the side of aristocratic authority, Pedantic restraint and critical convention. Renaissance was again followed by Romanticism led by Rousseau.

Distinct Characteristics of Classicism & Romanticism

In a nutshell if we are to distinguish classicism and Romanticism, we can say that it is Form, outward form which is the first distinctive element in classicism and on this beauty of outward appearance, with its attributes of symmetry, balance, order, proportion, reserve etc., it takes its stand. As contrasted with this, the romantic tends to emphasize the spirit which lies behind form - not the formless, but the freedom which is not content with any one form, but experiments and expresses itself now in this, now in that way, as the spirit dictates. The first tends always to emphasize the "this-wordliness" of the beauty that we know, the second, its "other-wordliness". For the first, "the proper study of mankind is man, whilst the second, in its pursuit of the soul, looks for it in strange and unknown places and in the wilder scenes of Nature".

The one seeks always a mean, the other an extremity. Repose satisfies the classic., adventure attracts the Romantic. The one appeals to tradition, the other demands the novel. On the one side we may range the virtues and defects which go with the notions of fitness, propriety, measure, restraint, conservatism,
authority, calm, experience comliness; on the other, those which are suggested by excitement, energy, restlessness, spirituality, curiosity, troublousness, progress, liberty, experiment, provocativeness.

The need of the hour was, a study of classics in the romantic spirit of re-discovery and curiosity which the scholars of Renaissance failed to exhibit because they had the slender basis of native culture and were amazed at the treasure-trove of the finished classical literature which lay before them. They could not learn more than its simplest and most rudimentary lessons and began to rebuke the boistrous innovators of Romantic movement as did Jonson who advocated restraint and classical rule.

**Synthesis of the Classic and the Romantic**

The task of the study of the classic in the spirit of the Romantic or in other words the synthesis of the classic and the Romantic was accomplished by the German artist and art critic Winckelmann. He protested against obscurantism and favoured sanity and comliness which he rediscovered in his long study of Greek painting and sculpture.

At the time when the new spirit of exploration and romance was awakening in the younger minds of Germany, Joachim Winckelmann was already devoting his life to the re-discovery of
Greek culture. He was passionately devoted, in his efforts at searching for "the form of real beauty". His search is no doubt for the form of the beauty but beauty of a different order; the real beauty, not the real in beauty. The form in Art matters supremely for art is form and can only present itself through a medium that is objective, external and discernible through the senses. He says the very language of art is changing. He as a classicist is only able to be so superb a critic of the order of classicism because he had already in him imbibed some spirit from the early Romantic movement so that he is able to bring to the study of the Greeks the spiritual curiosity which they themselves possessed abundantly.

Art a matter of Spirit

Art, according to him, was a matter of spirit revealed as form in which the artist submits himself to the conditions which his medium required. He did not closely distinguish, as Lessing did between the different methods of approach and treatment imposed upon the poet and the sculptor by reason of the difference of their media. But he did exactly study the demands of the artist's medium, because it was through a given medium that the artist sought to arouse a beautiful emotion. He says, "the more tranquillity reigns in a body, the fitter it is to draw the true character of the soul, which, in every excessive gesture, seems to rush from her proper centre, and being hurried away by extremes becomes unnatural".
The critic of the classics is still concerned with the forms of expression, but only because they are expressive and convey spiritual emotion. It is not a narrow field of emotion to which he would ask the artist to confine himself, but rather he asks that in revealing it, he should never squander his power in showing more than an object, which never changes. There may be moments of joy, sorrow, terror, surprise but these emotions of a moment cannot spend all their force in a beautiful object which is to remain beautiful for ever.

Winckelmann, says Scott-James, rescued classicism from the pedants. They in their academic way, had seized upon the formal rules, and so had lost the formal values. He restored the Greek spirit of ideal beauty which is a healing harmony of the mind, a tranquillity which makes ecstacy complete. This harmony of the mind the sculptor sought to express in harmony of body, the poet in harmony of verse, the dramatist in harmony of action. For him the problem of art was the problem of form, resting upon the prime conception that the body is nothing without the spirit and the spirit nothing without body.

**Romantic classicism or Classical Romanticism**

It was in Germany that the intellectual revolution was consciously realized and fought out systematically between Romanticists
who asserted the supremacy and freedom of the individual spirit and those who, following in the steps of Winckelmann tried to restate in more modern terms, the claims of classicism. German Romantic Criticism gave currency to the Nineteenth Century tradition of a poetry which combined within itself inspiration and intuition - inspiration, in that it drew its force from some mightier cosmic force beyond itself of which it was only a vehicle - intuition, in that the poet gazed into life and by direct vision saw life in its true forms and re-created it thus. The view of poetry as inspired was already there throughout ages if we look closely for it was present in Homeric songs, as ecstasy or divine madness in Plato, as sublime thought illuminating an entire subject "with the vividness of a lightning flash" in Longinus.

The poet as an inspired prophet once again became a matter of passionate belief based upon passionate experience with the romantists and once this view got into the air and became part of current thought, it was sure to be subsumed under philosophy in an intellectual age; they gave "inspiration" view, a philosophical sanction and turned it into a main driving force behind new philosophical systems. The Romantists launched upon the world a man of Genius, the artist divinely inspired who spoke with the voice of God. The romantists faced the world confident that they were in possession of a faculty which was neither sense-perception nor reason. It was variously called a vision beatific, an intuition,
an imagination, a reason in her most exalted mood based upon inspiration, intimation, illumination, rapture and ecstasy. It was a faculty of perceiving truth immediately through the mind, which made them look at the world and saw the world revealed as truth or fundamental essence of things radiantly revealed. Their faculty of imagination was the power which represented the world of nature and material things read and transfigured by the spirit. It was a vision whose authenticity was attested by inner conviction, by the ecstasy or illumination which was the mark of genius and the guarantee of truth.

For such inspired men, poetry and art were their proper sphere for it was only in the forms of art that truth could be presented immediately, authentically without the interposition of logical method. It was only through these forms that the same guarantee of truth - the emotion which arises from the sight of the beautiful - could be conveyed from the artist to those who contemplate his work. As nature itself was the expression of the artistry of God for those who had the eye to see, so the picture or a poem directly conveyed the conceptions of its author, the composer, the poet, the artist.

The Romantic movement inspired by Rousseau had the effect of clearing the encumbrances thrust upon free flow of human spirit by the advocates of the ancients, the alien tradition - not
based upon its own literature, but on Roman-Greek literature, once for all and ever. It did not kill the classical spirit but it freed it from all its artificiality and standards of criticism based on a tradition which had no roots of its own, in its own soil. Romantic movement in literature was only one aspect of the revolution which swept across the Europe violently changing the life of men. The social and intellectual change which had its first epoch at the Renaissance, reached its second climax and appeared in the growth of science, the application of science to industry the transfer of population from the country to the towns, the accumulation of fortunes in the hands of a few, the breakdown of caste system, the emergence of new classes, the development of new studies, the appearance of new philosophy and the new literature. The external changes following one upon another with amazing rapidity stirred the mind and the imagination and generated intellectual and spiritual unrest and fervour. Rousseau expressed the social and democratic impulse of freedom equality and fraternity. In philosophy Kant declared that the mind is no more dependent, no more passive on objects and knowledge was no more confined to mere impressions. Mind being a part of nature, actively participates in supplying forms or concepts to the raw material supplied by nature through senses, on which knowledge is based. The barren forms supplied by mind are required to be mediated through intuition with sense-material to give rise to knowledge proper.
The literary critic stands in between the two - the pure intellectual element or the philosophical accounts of the world given by the thinkers on one hand, and the patent realities of life in the form of changing social patterns of life - these two influences combine to determine his perceptions and conceptions at every stage of his awareness of contemporary life in proportion as he really belongs to the age in which he lives.
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