EXISTENTIAL APPROACH TO ART
Art has always been a mysterious phenomena, interpreted in different ways throughout the history of human civilization. Artistic activity is as old as human existence itself. Archeologists have discovered a number of pictures created by predecessors of modern human species. Man has always been interested in depicting, through different art forms, his observations and impressions of the nature. He is distinguished from all other beings because of his creative power i.e. representation or recreation of his perception of nature and all the phenomena that constitute the physical world. He has been always striving to discover the hidden meaning or mystery of the world, with which he has to cope. The primitive man, belonging to any period of the developmental stage of human species, has been interested in expressing himself through different media which constitute the essential forms of different fine arts like dance, music, poetry, sculpture, architecture and painting. This urge reflects man's urge to recreate
and represent the realities, which he encounters in his daily life, in one form or the other. Different fine arts are expressions of the same urge.

The nature which man had to confront, and has to confront even today, seems to be in a chaotic form. The universe, as a whole, from existential point of view is absurd, which implies that it has no order, no plan, no discipline, no purpose. It is human existence (Dasein or Being-for-itself) which gives meaning and direction to all that exists in the universe. All such attempts found expression in the works of art with a view to unveil the mystery of being, the hidden meaning behind phenomenal world. Art is actually an odyssey through unknown worlds that manifests man's quest to unfold and capture the mystery of being. From this point of view, all the works of art are attempts to transcend the appearances and the absurd. Right from pre-Socratic philosophers till our age, artistic experience, its process and its products attracted the attention of thinkers who examined and interpreted them in different ways. In order to evaluate their relevance to existentialist interpretation of art, it is essential to give a brief but critical account of some extant theories of art. For such a critical survey one has to assess these interpretations of art in a broader perspective relating them to the totality of existence.
Imitation theory of art is as old as the human civilization itself. Before Plato could reshape it, it had considerably been developed by his predecessors. The principle of imitation, prior to Plato, had been employed by the artists and litterateurs to the extent of attaining such a high degree of excellence that sometimes the artistic creations of antiquity were taken as real by the spectators.

The two prevalent theories of art in Greece viz. 'The Theory of Imitation' and the 'Hedonistic theory', were rejected by Plato on metaphysical, ethical and aesthetic grounds. The entire world of nature, according to his metaphysics, is just an imitation, a reflection, an imperfect copy of the world of Ideas. According to him if a work of art is simply an
imitation of the material objects of the senses, it is an imperfect copy of the already imperfect copy of an Idea; it is a shadow of a shadow, a reflection of a reflection; hence far removed from the reality. Therefore, to imitate is to waste human energy unnecessarily, for what the work of an artist aims at is already done much better by nature.

It was this metaphysical standpoint which compelled Plato to exclude the artist from his ideal Republic. He had, in fact, a fine aesthetic sense. That is why he himself declared in his Republic that he would have been very glad to justify art, to prove its rationality and to give it a place in the ideal Republic if someone could tell how art could be assigned a useful function in human society.

On a closer analysis of Plato's philosophy, we can say that Plato was actually dealing with the epistemological problem viz; the cognitive value of the products of art. Therefore, he could not pay much attention to the intrinsic character of things, the intrinsic value of mental activity which happens to be the cardio-vascular feature of a work of art. That also seems to be the reason why Plato failed to recognize the value of art. His lack of interest in the mental processes other than pure thought forced him to discourage artist and debar him from entering his ideal Republic.

Plato rejected the hedonistic theory of art, propounded by Socrates, as it was in conflict with his ethical theory.
He rejected the imitation theory of art, for it did not fit in his metaphysical view of the reality. He was inclined to accept the Sophist's view that art created illusions. It was, however, Aristotle who improved Plato's theory of art, pin-pointing some vital drawbacks in the metaphysical theory of his teacher. Aristotle objected that if ideas were really transcendent, if they existed beyond the world of stars, how could the ideas act upon matter in such a way that the objective world came into being. As one of the biggest exponents of Idealism, Aristotle brings the Ideas from the transcendental world to earth. Ideas, according to him, are not transcendent but immanent; they make things what they are; they are progressively realised in matter. Our world, according to Aristotle, is not a shadow but a real world of form and matter in union.

On the basis of this ontological theory, Aristotle improves upon the conception of Plato's meaning of imitation. The external world, for Plato, was merely irrational matter on which form was somehow imperfectly impressed, while for Aristotle the objective world was a synthesis of idea and matter. Idea is, to Aristotle, the soul, the essence, the motive force which determines the direction of the growth, evolution and development of matter. It was not beyond the reach of creative Artist. Art for Aristotle had either the moral or the intellectual purpose. It is creative activity under intellectual direction. If the artist concerns with the realm of senses only and ignores the idea completely,
he is not an artist at all. For Aristotle imitation is idealisation, the presentation of things, not as they are but as they should be; not as they are known to senses, not as they exist in the external world but as they are to be under the controlling force of ideas. Therefore, imitation is not merely production of a thing but of things, better or worse than they are found in the external world.
An abundant contribution has been made by the recent discoveries of psychoanalysis and analytical schools of psychology to a sound and profound interpretation of art. What is of interest to a psychologist in a work of art?, according to one of the leading psychoanalyst, Wilhelm Stekel is to investigate the impulse which drives people to create. A psychologist is mainly concerned with such deepest impulses and instincts of an artist which force him to create a work of art. He is not going to place a judgement of aesthetic value but rather tries to study the psychological processes underlying and accompanying the aesthetic activity.

There are divergent opinions regarding the nature of these impulses and instincts of which art is an expression. Credit goes to S. Freud, who, for the first time, brought
this subject under the purview of scientific research and tried to correlate the two branches of human knowledge science and art.

According to the psycho-analysis of Freud, art is an activity, aim of which is to assuage unappeased wishes. At the bottom of every artistic work there are certain instinctual forces compelling the artist to create. If not expressed, in their suppressed state, such intra-psychic conflicts can drive the artist to neurosis. It is this fundamental opposition of these psychic forces within an artist that are responsible for the creation of a work of art. Anything which is the product of opposite psychic forces must be having the character of suppressed or unful-filled wish of an artist which is the dynamic force at the root of a work of art. Just like dreams and fantasies, a work of art represents this wish as fulfilled. But how?

Freud lays enormous importance to the gratification which the individual obtains through fantasies and day-dreams. Everyone has day-dreams, which according to modern researches reveal that to some extent every individual has some abnormal tendencies. Whether there is anyone who is absolutely normal is yet to be established and can perhaps be never established.

In a day-dream one imagines his desires and wishes fulfilled, which are, according to Freud, mostly erotic and
egotistic in nature. If the gratification or the ability to obtain gratification, in the world of reality, is not great or not very great, an individual develops the tendencies of day-dreaming and phantasies. Freud says:

"Unsatisfied wishes are the driving power behind phantasies; every separate phantasy contains the fulfillment of a wish, and improves an unsatisfactory reality. The impelling wishes vary according to sex, character and circumstances of the creator."¹

Sex, character and circumstances constitute the psycho-social make up of an artist and it exclusively depends on the fulfillment of his urges (basically sexual), that is, on the quantity of suppressed libidonal energy, whether an individual develops a neurosis or not.

When the instinctual urges become powerful and individual is incapable of attaining their gratification, these energies turn and flow backwards along with course of the libido-development of those early stages at which they were once able to obtain full satisfaction. If they become more powerful they break through into consciousness inspite of moral, economic and social restraints and obtain satisfaction in the form of substitute gratifications and actions. Freud maintains that it is at this stage that libido regresses into infantile position, a process which the ego is not going to tolerate. When the
psychic conditions of such an individual are unable to discharge his libidonal energy through proper channels of satisfaction by real desired objects he gains and tries to gain gratification through phantasy, a condition which Jung calls 'Introversion'.

Being an introvert, the artist is unable to satisfy his overpowering instinctual needs in the world of reality; he turns away from the real world to that of phantasy. Although it is a way which could lead him to neurosis, through the discharge of instinctual energy and the satisfaction one gains from creating the work of art, which concretizes one's unfulfilled wishes in the socially acceptable forms of creative activity. One saves oneself from neuroses and regains contact with reality. Through the creations of art an artist obtains gratification of his intense childhood wishes which he represents as fulfilled in his creation. It is by this analysis that Freud has tried to prove the presence of infantile wishes in the work of art. He quotes the example of Sophocles 'Tragedy of Oedipus'.

"It may be that we were all destined to direct our first sexual impulses towards our mothers, and our first impulses of hatred and violence towards our fathers; our dreams convince us that we were King Oedipus, who slew his father Laius and wedded his mother
Jocasta, is nothing more or less than a wish-fulfilment—the fulfilment of the wish of our childhood... As the poet brings to guilt Oedipus to light by his investigation, he forces us to become aware of our inner selves, in which the same impulses are still extant, even though they are suppressed.²

Freud also states that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is rooted in the same soil as *Oedipus Rex*. Therefore, Freud's main thesis is that unfilled wishes, originating in the unconscious, are satisfied in the work of art, and if possible, we can discover these unfilled wishes by minute observation and analysis of facts and furthermore, these wishes are basically infantile wishes.

**Jung's Criticism of Freud's Analysis of Art:***

In the scheme of Freudian psychoanalysis, art has double purpose. Not only does it fulfill the wishes of the repressed libido but it also satisfies man's longing for perfection and recognition in the real world. The unconscious longing is to satisfy sexual desires, the conscious longing is to have social recognition and status. While unconscious longing of the human psyche may be called its weakness, the conscious longing may be called its strength.

It was however, Jung who rejected Freud's interpretation of unconscious mind. For Jung art is an expression which
arises from the stratum that exists universally in the mind of human race. He names it as the 'collective unconscious'. As a part of human psyche, it cannot be said to exist in itself; it is a possibility of everything but nothing in reality. It comes from time immemorial. The unconscious for Jung is not only "...receptacle of all unclean spirits and other odious legacies of opinion of dead situations, such as the store publique, for example, which constitutes Freud's super-ego, but it is in particular the one ever living seed-ground which manifests itself through ancient symbolical images, yet by means of these images points to a renewal of the spirit."^3

The core of Jung's psychoanalysis is his conception of archetypes or symbolic constants that are the common heritage of mankind. Jung says that "the essence of art does not consist in the fact that it is charged with personal peculiarities", as Freud had called it, "but that it rises above the personal and speaks out of the heart and mind and for the heart and mind of the humanity."^4

It is by this point of view that Jung rejects Freud's theory of art as wishfulfilment and propounds that art being distinctive and autonomous cannot be wholly explained by psychoanalysis.
The fundamental thesis of intuitionists is that art is intuition. It will not concern us here to show whether these philosophers are anti-intellectuals or less intellectuals or whether these philosophers tend to give metaphysical import to art, and are completely lacking in analytical or linguistic analysis. It is also irrelevant to our present study as to whether there is any disagreement among these philosophers with regard to their approaches to pose rationalism against empiricism or to hold idealism as opposed to materialism. We mean here simply to explain the views of some leading philosophers who maintain that "Art is Intuition".

Just as rationalists emphasize reason, empiricists emphasize experience, linguistic philosophers emphasize language; Intuitionists emphasize Intuition within their whole thought system that include the sphere of art as well.
Unlike rationalists or empiricists, whatever intuitionists conceive is absolutely particular and has no trace of universal concepts; whatever qualities they ascribe to the objects are those that make them unique in the realm of nature. They do not portray at all the general characteristics. In this respect they come very close to existentialists if they are not recognized as identical to them.

We will focus our attention mainly on the most famous Italian philosopher of our century, B. Croce (1866 - 1952), because he has been very influential proponent of the intuitional interpretation of art. But before going in the details of Croce's philosophy, some light is also required to be thrown on H. Bergson's philosophy because his system of thought also culminates into a kind of intuitionism.

(a). H. Bergson (1859 - 1941): furnishes a very sharp contrast between intuition and intellect and identifies art with the former. For him, the prime reality is movement or change. It is only by movement i.e. change, that life has appeared. The most useful means of survival and progress is provided by intellect. Intellect not only serves for the survival but its most important function is to establish the most satisfactory reactions to environment. Bergson maintains that man's intellect has changed reality for man's convenience from a perpetual happening to a patterned immobility. Intellect or reasoning power can understand the patterned and the
Immobile. Life and movement, however, are neither patterned nor immobile but a moving complex in which no one element is separable from the rest, and is, in consequence, quite beyond the power and scope of intelligence. Hence, so far as our minds are controlled and led by intellect, we will be unable to grasp the real nature of life and movement. Some psychologists have, however, pointed out that just as animals, particularly insects, man has a very rich instinctive power by which he works. Bergson, though accepting the instinctual power of man, does not accept that this power could furnish us the knowledge of the real nature of things. Instinctual knowledge can provide us with practical knowledge but since it works unconsciously, it becomes somewhat useless for a philosopher. Bergson however, maintains that between these two mental powers or faculties viz. intellect and instinct, there is another faculty, which, while giving the immediate knowledge of life-in-action possessed by instinct, gives to consciousness the more impersonal and remote objects of intellect. This faculty is termed by him as Intuition. He claims that it is only through this faculty, that man can comprehend the very movement of life itself and could free himself from the irreducible contradictions in reality created by intellect. Hence it is intuition only by which one can attain the true nature of reality.

As compared to the scientific or philosophic genius, he recognises artist's gifts to be perfectly intuited. He says; 'By intuition is meant the kind of intellectual sympathy
by which one places oneself within an object in order to coincide with what is unique in it and consequently inexpressible. Since intellect cannot go much deep, therefore, the uniqueness and consequently the inexpressibility of an object, can be explained by the artists only, who work by intuition alone. Intuition is a direct vision which the artist is unusually gifted with. Most works of art are the products of intuition that alone can penetrate into reality and grasp its dynamic character and its unique qualities. In a work of art reality is captured with its dynamic character.

Intuition is comparable to mystic or existential experience. Iqbal, whose philosophy is very close to Bergsonian notions of intuition and creative evolution, defines the religious experience as immediate, unanalysable, synthetic in character and incommunicable. He qualifies further the prophetic experience as capable of communicating the incommunicable. In Iqbal's view, a poet's job is similar to mission of a prophet. The prophetic character of art has, therefore, its origin in intuition.

Besides Bergson and Iqbal, usually most of the artists and poets have been always defining their creative process in terms of intuition.

(b). B. Croce (1866 - 1952) was a Hegelian who evolved his theory of art on the basis of a critical appraisal of...
Hegel. According to Hegel, Reality is unity which includes in it all multiplicity and opposition without compromising and disturbing its basic oneness. The opposites are opposites only to each other but not to the Absolute; the supreme unity is not static but dynamic. As for the problem of opposites, Hegel furnishes his famous dialectical method of triadic form, viz; thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis. Hegel held that, of the two terms involved in opposition, the second is the negation of the first, but the third term in which both of them are synthesised, is the negation of negation. This process gives rise to an evolutionary course that is explained by him in other terms, i.e. Being, Not-Being and Becoming. Croce rejects this triadic theory of opposites and furnishes his own diadic theory of distincts. The main point of Croce for this rejection of Hegelian triadic method is that the philosophic thought is not only the synthesis of opposites but that of the distincts also. In other words, though Croce accepts the Hegelian concept of opposites he recognizes some such concepts which are not opposites but distincts. As the two terms themselves suggest opposite concepts are quite different from the distinct concepts. Croce maintains that while two distinct concepts can unite, opposite concepts cannot. It was mainly on the basis of this logical error, Croce observes, that Hegel considers intuition as thesis, representation as anti-thesis and philosophy as synthesis.
For Croce, religion cannot be the opposite of art, i.e. to consider religion as the negation of art is as impossible as to consider their truth to be possessed by the third, viz. philosophy. Had Hegel identified the difference between the opposites and distincts, he would have perhaps been able to recognize the truth of aesthetic activity, i.e. art.

From above it can be maintained that as a follower of Hegel, Croce accepts his concrete monism but as a critic he rejects his triadic theory of opposites. He accepts Hegel's view that Reality is unity in multiplicity, but deviates from him when he holds that it is not abstract. No doubt, Reality is of the nature of thought but it manifests itself in multiplicity of forms that are concrete. As an intuitive aesthetician, his fundamental thesis is that art is intuition and intuition, in the philosophy of spirit, is the first original form of spirit. He does not differ from Hegel in respect of the conception of spirit; he rather differs from him in respect of the forms of spirit. While according to Hegel, spirit manifests itself into a triad, viz. the critical spirit, practical spirit and Absolute spirit, Croce holds that the spirit manifests itself into two forms only, nevertheless, he retains the terms employed by Hegel, i.e. theoretical spirit and practical spirit. Theoretical spirit manifests itself into intuition and concept, and practical
spirit in the economic will and ethical will.

So intuition is the first of the eternal forms of spirit and it is, according to Croce, the sphere of Art. Since art is intuition, therefore, as a form of spirit, it is also eternal. It is not universal but individual and has not conceptual unit. He says:

"We deny that it has the character of conceptual knowledge. Conceptual knowledge, in its true form, which is philosophical, is always realistic, aiming at establishing reality against unreality... But intuition means, precisely, indistinction of reality and unreality, the image with its value as mere image, the pure ideality of the image..."\(^6\)

Croce further holds that art is not a moral act; it is beyond good and evil. It does not arise as an act of will which presupposes the moral obligations and the criteria of good or evil, 'praiseworthy or blameworthy. "Not only is there no penal code that can condemn an image to prison or to death, but no moral judgement, uttered by a rational person, can make of its object..."\(^7\)

Rejecting the famous saying that 'intuition is blind, and intellect lends her eyes' Croce says that "intuition is perfectly independent of intellect. It is not blind but is self-shining, it 'does not need to borrow the eyes of others, for she has excellent eyes of her own"\(^8\) ...the total effect
of the work of art is an intuition; and notwithstanding all
those intuitions, the total effect of the philosophical
dissertation is a concept." While differentiating between
an intellectual fact and an intuitive fact, Croce holds:

"The difference between a scientific
work and a work of art, that is,
between an intellectual fact and an
intuitive fact, lies in the difference
of the total effect aimed at by their
respective authors." 

Croce also does not allow space and time to be attributed
to intuition. For him, artistic intuition is free from spatial
and temporal relations. For him the intuition which is free
from spatial and temporal relations is the only true intuition.
"We have intuitions with space and time, the colour of a
feeling, a cry of a pain and an effort of will, objectified
in consciousness; these are intuitions which we possess, and
with their making space and time have nothing to do." Croce
asks: "Who is conscious of temporal sequence while listening
to a story or a piece of music without breaking into it with
a similar act of reflection? What intuition reveals in a work
of art is not space and time, but character, individual
physiognomy." 

So far Croce has maintained that intuition is the first
of the eternal forms of spirit which is the sphere of art and
is accordingly eternal. Intuition cannot be conceptualized.
No moral or penal code can be ascribed to it. It is exclusively independent of intellect. It is free from spatial and temporal relation. But then what intuition is?

Croce maintains that intuition is expression. Sometimes, intuition has been confused with simple sensation. Sensations, according to him, are intuitions only when they are formed synthesised and expressed. "Every true intuition or representation is also an expression. That which does not objectify itself in expression is not intuition or representation, but sensation and mere natural fact. The spirit only intuits in making, forming and expressing. He who separates intuition from expression never succeeds in reuniting them." 13

As a spiritual manifestation of an artist, intuition is not only sensation but expression which distinguishes it from mere mechanical and passive sensation. It brings the impressions or feelings from the obscure region of mere sensation to the region of spiritual activity. It is the illumination of the inner self of the artist. It is a very complicated and difficult job, hence achieved by a genius only, because it is the expression of a complex state of soul. 14 That is why the ninth symphony could not be created by any except Beethoven, the 'Hamlet' except by Shakespeare, 'Mona Lisa' by Leonardo da Vinci. We may draw a parallel between Croce's theory of intuition as expression and Iqbal's prophetic experience explained as communication of the incommunicable. Iqbal says:
It is in this perspective that Croce holds: "That which does not objectify itself in expression is not intuition. Intuitive activity possesses intuition to the extent that it expresses them" and "to intuite is to express, and nothing else more, but nothing else less than to express."
"To evoke in oneself a feeling one has once experienced and having evoked it in oneself then by means of movements, lines and colours, sounds or forms expressed in words, so to transmit that feeling that others experience the same feeling this the activity of art." (Leo Tolstoy)

Eugene Veron, Yejo Hirn, Roger Fry, Leo Tolstoy, are some of the famous exponents of the emotional theory of art. Though they differ in detail but what is common among them and where they converge to agree, is that the function of art is to express the whole gamut of human emotions and not merely to create beauty or to provide pleasure to an individual, whether artist or the reader or spectator. We are not here concerned with finding out what are the differences among these philosophers; we will rather focus our attention on one of the most famous exponents of this view of art, viz. Leo
Art, according to Tolstoy, is not a mere means of pleasure, but one of the essential needs of human life. "...By words a man transmits his thoughts to another, by art he transmits his feelings..." From this point of view art becomes one of the means of intercourse between man and man. Just as speech serves as a vehicle for transmitting our thoughts and experiences, in a similar way, art serves the purpose of transmitting the feelings and emotions between an artist and his addressee. The capacity of a man to receive another man's expressions of feelings and to experience those feelings himself is the main factor on which the whole gamut of artistic activity is based. If a boy, Tolstoy holds, having experienced, say, fear, on encountering a wolf, relates that encounter in such a way that he again experiences the feelings he had lived through and infects the hearer with what he had experienced, is art. Similarly, if a man having experienced the feelings of suffering, or enjoyment or delight, sorrow, courage etc. (whether in reality or in imagination) communicates these feelings in an effective way to others who are infected by them, he enters in the domain of artistic creativity. Notwithstanding any prejudice for or against any medium, (it can be through words, colours, lines, sounds, forms etc.), it is the expression of emotions only, which could evoke an equivalent degree and similar kind of emotions in...
others. The main characteristic that makes an expression artistic is its ability to unite emotionally the recipient with the artist in such a way that he feels as if the work were his own, as if the work were one which he had for long wished to express. Tolstoy, in other words, wants to abolish the phychic-distance between the work of art and the reader or spectator; it is a complete unity of the artist and the art's recipient. Any work which abolishes the phychic-distance and invokes this union is, according to Tolstoy, a work of art.

Art is not only what we see in the theatres, concerts and exhibitions. "All this is but the smallest part of the art which we communicate with each other... All human life is filled with works of art of every kind"\(^1\), from cradle song to the monotonous sound of grave digging. But not that, Tolstoy warns us, everything that we do in everyday life is art; it is rather that part, which we, for some reasons, select from life to which we attach special attention. A work of art by which we can communicate our feelings and emotions to others must, however, be individual, have clearness of expression and above all must be authentic, i.e. be true to the artist's self. The absence of any one of these three conditions excludes any work from the domain of art.

Finally Tolstoy rejects the metaphysical, psychological, hedonistic and even intuitionistic interpretations of art.
He holds:

(1) Art is not, as metaphysicians say, the manifestation of some mysterious idea of beauty or God.
(2) Art is not, as some psychologists hold, a game in which man lets off his excess of stored up energy.
(3) Art is not simply the expression of man's emotions by external signs.
(4) Art is not the production of pleasing objects;
(5) Art is not wish-fulfillment.

In his view art is fundamentally the expression of our feelings and emotions and serves the purpose of the emotional union and integration of the entire humanity.

All the different theories of art emphasize a particular aspect of art, subordinating other aspects of it or, in some cases, ignoring certain aspects totally. It may be said that though these theories help us to understand art partially, there is a need of an integrated approach to art. Art has various dimensions and the best way for appreciating, understanding and evaluating art may be provided by a multidimensional approach to art. Sartre's existential theory of art, which we propose to deal with in detail in the next chapter, because of its emphasis on the expression of totality of human existence, will provide a comparatively comprehensive view of art. But for the comprehensive study of Sartre's existential theory of art, an analysis of 'Existential Interpretation of Art' seems obligatory in the topic that follows now.
Human thirst for knowledge is as old as the human existence itself. Using the scientific as well as existential experiences, man envisages a situation, foresees the course of events, projects a desirable outcome before mind's eye and devices means which cause events to take a certain course. Though modern psychologists consider man as simply a mass of conditioned reflexes, he is still the lord of his creation, a position which he obtained through his consistent efforts. His desire for understanding all the facets of perceptual world is so strong and persistent that it seems to be his essential nature.

Not being content with the simple sights and sounds, which are the basis of perceptual knowledge, we instinctively strive, by coordinating them, to locate their origin in the material world. Even if we identify some traces of its
origin in the material world, we go further to discover all the links of causal chain. When we fail to understand its origin in the material world we try to locate it in other spheres, for example, the metaphysical, the aesthetical or ethical. It can be maintained that since we want to understand and interpret each and every phenomenon as a part of the whole, we are not satisfied with the bare perceptual impressions because they do not lead us too far.

Scientific explanation attempt at explaining and interpreting the data received through perception or through the most sophisticated scientific instruments. Nearly all the human responses are tried to be explained and interpreted in scientific terms but there are some human responses such as aesthetical, ethical, religious or metaphysical responses of man with which science seems unable to deal with. Since we have an aesthetic sense, an ethical sense, a religious sense and a metaphysical sense, which evidently constitute some basic and indispensible responses of man, and with which science is unable to deal with, it can be presumed that man cannot live by a scientific explanation alone.

There are some such internal urges within our own being which are not satisfied by the how and why interpretation of science. No doubt science tries to explain the universe as a whole but man has an urge to know the hidden meaning of the universe, its mystery, as a whole and aspires to relate
himself to it existentially. Scientific interpretation tries to explain the outer structure of different phenomena but does not and cannot say how to relate ourselves with those phenomena. Besides, there are also some features of the universe which are not dealt with by science at all; these are, for example, pain and suffering, hope and joy, love and hate, harmony and beauty of nature, ruthless life and death struggle for survival, decay, death etc. etc., as inevitable manifestations which life has to undergo.

Such responses of man are very acute and intricate. We often try to explain them and offer an interpretation. But the moment one offers some explanation or interpretation of such responses, he automatically falls back on experience. If we, however, judge any such interpretation from a broader perspective it can arbitrarily be called an existential interpretation. But it is not and cannot be a universal law in the sense in which a scientific interpretation is said to be. "It is mainly because a scientific interpretation not only makes use of universals but it also uses such a universal language which is intelligible and applicable to all. An existential interpretation, on the other hand, though also using universals as well as universal language, says different things to different men with a corresponding difference of appeal. A scientific interpretation uses a comparatively cold language about the nature of things as they might be when all the human interests, preferences and insights
are suppressed—it is rather a dehumanization. An existential interpretation uses a warmer language which is more subjective and humanized."20 It is however, because man's nature, from existential point of view, is never fixed once for all; his nature is essentially and continuously modified by the culture and time he lives in. Dilthy Ortegaay Garret has rightly observed that 'man has no nature, he has only a history'. J.P.Sartre observes that "there is no human nature because there is no God to have a conception of it."21 Man, according to Sartre, simply is; he is not what he conceives to be; but he is what he wills. Being-for-itself, in the philosophy of Sartre, is man which is full of negation. Being not what he is, man is not subjected to the principle of identity. Therefore, when such a transcendental being, as existentialists call him, and conditioned being, as psychologists call him, is defined, all the interpretations become arbitrary and inadequate and ignore the following factors:

a). The influences he has in his conscious or subconscious mind.

b). Historicity of human existence.

c). Some goal he seeks to achieve in future.

If we look at human being in this perspective, there is a dialectical relationship between the existential interpretation and personality orientation. It is because of this personality orientation that different existential
interpretations suggest different ways of treating the universe or relating oneself to it. For example, some say 'Life is a garden of flowers', some say 'Life is full of thorns' and still others say, 'Life has no meaning at all' and so on and so forth. Likewise if we turn the pages of the history of art, we find that art has been interpreted in many ways. These interpretations are so varied and different from one another that they, on the whole, cover almost the whole gamut of life from cradle - song to grave digging. Some say art is imitation, others say, it is only emotional expression, for others, it is beauty, and still for others it is intuition or sublimation of suppressed sexual urges.

These are all existential interpretations which are neither hypothesis nor partly justifiable postulates; these are rather motivational reinforcers that integrate the individual thoughts, feelings, emotions and aspirations for a stable way of life and the mode of treating the universe or any particular aspect of it on aesthetic plane.

An existential interpretation of art can be compared with dream interpretation, notwithstanding Freudian interpretation of dreams. The object of a dream interpretation is self understanding and that of an existential interpretation, the person's stable adjustment or orientation to the universe as a whole or to some significant aspect of it. One may for
example, interpret art as beauty, another may call it as wishfulfilment, for others it may be intuition. All such interpretations try to give meaning and direction to life on aesthetical plane. Their primary function is as much aesthetic as orientative. An existential interpretation is in fact a deeply inward response to the mystery of being and to the mystery of Cosmos. It is no doubt, a totally subjective response or interpretation but not in the sense in which one's preference for this necktie or that necktie is subjective. But in the sense in which one's basic moral or human values are subjective without ignoring the universally accepted norms.

An existential interpretation can neither be substituted by nor compared to a scientific interpretation. It is mainly because a scientific interpretation deals with the outer core only, while an existential interpretation, besides explaining the inner core also performs mostly the directive function. It can accordingly be maintained that while an existential interpretation always has an aesthetical as well as ethical function, in some cases it can also stimulate scientific research.

An existential interpretation of art takes into account not merely particular facts and elements in a work of art, but the full range of different features of the universe without supressing any feature. An artist must therefore
necessarily be aware of the evolutionary features of life, though the knowledge of factual detail is not called for. Again, he must be aware not only of the beauty and harmony and happiness in the universe. Above all he must have some existential experiences; for example, he must have experienced 'freedom' within himself; he must have experienced at least some moments of subjectivity to the extent as Kierkegaard realised it; he must be aware of the dread which Heidegger interprets as the essential mode of human existence; he must be fully aware of the feelings of alienation, anguish and historicity of his being; he must know the meaning of silence and above all he should be able to translate the communicative role of silence implying that every significant work of art leaves certain things unsaid. Historicity for a contemporary artist means existential awareness of the impact of technology on the process of dehumanization in modern society and politics.

However, existential interpretation of art is not necessarily at variance with other approaches, which claim to be scientific to art. Existential approach to art takes into consideration all the different theories with regard to nature of art and creative process but accepts only those interpretations which give due importance to existential experience, which if not similar, are at least, closer to
the experience of creative artist because creative experience is actually existential experience that may be summed up as the experience of unfragmented human existence.

Almost all the theories of art emphasise only one aspect of creative experience and ignore certain other aspects. That is why no theory of art is adequate enough to interpret artistic experience and its product. Among the major theories of art, the Formalist theory of Bell and Fry states that any thing which is art is an instance of significant form and anything which is not art has no form. In opposition to this theory, Emotionalists reply that Formalists have ignored the truely essential property of art; for emotionalists (Tolstoy) art is not significant form but rather the expression of emotion in some senseous medium. Institutionists reject both the formalistic as well as emotionalistic theories and maintain that art cannot be identified with any physical object; art is some such creative and cognitive process which is spiritual in nature without any scientific or moral content. Likewise, art from psycho-analytic view point of Freud and his followers is an activity whose aim is to assuage unappeased wishes which are erotic in nature. In opposition to Freud, Jung holds that art is an expression which arises from the stratum that exists universally in the mind of human race (archetypes of collective unconscious). M. Wietz holds that to define art is to close the concept when its very use reveals and demands its openness; hence art cannot be defined.
This approach is logical outcome of G.E. Moore's theory of undefinability of value. In addition to these schools of thought there are a number of particular aestheticians and litterateurs who interpret art from different points of view. Some say, for example, art is an emotion, some say it is only form, some emphasize only content and others emphasize expression.

These interpretations though in themselves expressive and significant about a work of art, emphasize only a partial view of art. Can we say that Beethoven's 9th Symphony had only rhythm and no content or Leonardo's Mona Lisa had only form and no emotion. None of the above quoted theories of art are able to offer satisfactory answer to such questions. Although Wittgenstien's analysis of the basic elements of a work of art could help us to remove the basic prima-facie discord between different interpretations of art, as shown by M. Weitz in his article "Theory of Aesthetics", but it cannot help us much because it lacks Existential import.

An existential interpretation will not only take into consideration all the aspects which are indispensable parts of a work of art but it will be an existential elucidation of a work of art i.e. it will illuminate the depths of one's hidden attitudes, choices and responses. It cannot ignore any aspect of life, no matter how distinct or remote. An interpretation which unveils the extreme depths of human
existence, keeping in view, the total perspective of the Cosmos, is an existential interpretation of art. The total perspective of Cosmos includes basic features of human experience, cosmic law and order, the mysteries of birth growth, decay and death; the beauty as well as the fury of the nature, good and evil, tragedy and joy.
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