

From Plato to Tolstoi art has been accused of exciting our emotions and thus of disturbing the order and harmony of our moral life. "Poetical imagination, according to Plato, waters our experience of lust and anger, of desire and pain, and makes them grow when they ought to starve with drought. "Tolstoi sees in art a source of infection. "Not only in infection," he says, "a sign of art, but the degree of infectiousness is also the sole measure of excellence in art." But the flaw in this theory is obvious. Tolstoi suppresses a fundamental moment of art, the moment of form. The aesthetic experience – the experience of contemplation – is a different state of mind from the coolness of our theoretical and the sobriety of our moral judgment. It is filled with the liveliest energies of passion, but passion itself is here transformed both in its nature and in its meaning. Wordsworth defines poetry as "emotion recollected in tranquility". But the tranquility we feel in great poetry is not that of recollection. The emotions aroused by the poet do not belong to a remote past. They are "here"-alive and immediate. We are aware of their full strength, but this strength tends in a new direction. It is rather seen than immediately felt. Our passions are no longer dark and impenetrable powers; they become, as it were, transparent. Shakespeare never gives us an aesthetic theory. He does not speculate about the nature of art. Yet in the only passage in which he speaks of the character and function of dramatic art the whole stress is laid upon this point. "The purpose of playing," as Hamlet explains, "both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as, twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure." But the image of a passion is not the passion itself. The poet who represents a passion does not infect us with this passion. At a Shakespeare play we are

Page 1 of 2

### **ENGLISH (Precis & Composition)**

not infected with the ambition of Macbeth, with the cruelty of Richard III, or with the jealousy of Othello. We are not at the mercy of these emotions; we look through them; we seem to penetrate into their very nature and essence. In this respect Shakespeare's theory of dramatic art, if he had such a theory, is in complete agreement with the conception of the fine arts of the great painters and sculptors.

# CSS 2009

Art has been made responsible for igniting emotions and bringing disorder in one's life. Plato considers poetry as enriching the experiences of one's emotions. According to Tolstoy art should have widespread influence on everyone which indicates its effectiveness. But the theory has a drawback as it ignores the aesthetic nature of art which is the basic element. For Wordsworth poetry is "emotions recollected in tranquillity". ~~But~~ The effects of the great poetry is not merely recollection of emotions in past but it has its influence in present moment. Shakespeare did not contribute in aesthetic theory and did not discuss the nature of art. He discussed the dramatic art nature that play should reflect nature, can assess itself and can be applicable at every age and time. The displayed image has not have much emotional influence than poetry, because content can be easily observed.

Title: Art in View of Great Intellectuals

Total Words: 419

Required Words: 139

Words in Summary: 140