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Introduction

‘Mimesis’ is a philosophical term that conveys an extensive and diverge meanings, which includes imitation, representation, mimicry, similarity, and resemblance. Mimesis, the principle theory of art was established by Plato and Aristotle later advanced by Philip Sidney, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Sigmund Freud, Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, Erich Auerbach, Luce Irigaray, Rene Girard, Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe, Michael Taussig, Merlin Donald, Paul Ricoeur, and Homi Bhabha.

Both Plato and Aristotle found in mimesis the representation of nature. Ion and The Republic (Books II, III and X) are the main texts of Plato inscribing the theory of mimesis. Similar to Plato’s views on mimesis, Aristotle also defined mimesis as the perfection and imitation of nature. This study considers the Plato’s principal philosophical theory, ‘mimesis’ and its varying major notions exposed throughout the history of the art world. These basic issues exercised from the ancient philosophical hint are continuing in the contemporary philosophy of art.

Again the study takes into an account of the modern Indian paintings, the examples of art fit into the visual class that are frequently and, reasonably appreciated in terms of their ability to represent ‘Nature’, and precisely what is implicated in the pictorial representation of the visible world, or the pictorial imitation of the world. In the ‘Republic’, Plato made an enquiry into the nature of pictorial representation and he provides an undeniable sign for that the artist that holds a mirror up to reality in effect. However, the import derived as imitation, representation in image making option in Indian art particularly in the
modern instance, the western pressure set the artists of the time. The route from the early period to modern times, the concept of Indian art has been limited by the artist’s perceptions of reality and it is realised that the representation of mere nature is devoid of content, which restricts his sphere of art sublimity.

Therefore, many of them resist describe contemplation of an object in order to elucidate its significance in the representation. Modern Indian artists are exposed to an innovative retort for it from the extreme south to the extreme north. The resistance they have formed by elucidation of reality and the degree of the reality they have interpreted through their paintings to prove the artistic precision, an advanced consistency in the issue of art is a rationalization of aesthetic delight. A few artists have been able to reveal the representation of a scenery alongwith the furtive human feeling. The passionate objectivity allows their feeling for the land and people, which is the evolving thread of the modern Indian painter’s artistic wisdom and philosophy.

A retort against the label of Indian modern art being derivative has set in, and the realisation that an Indian identity must be recreated, capable of absorbing the modern trend and emerging with ‘new’, had become the motivating principle of the artists of the beginning period. Later they focused on the erotic idiom structured around the human, animal-vegetation continuum merged with the rural and urban, the human and animal, the male and female. On the other hand, a sincere conceptual and rigorous reinforcement has been evident in the work of many of the Indian artists of the era, through a variety of styles and graces. The balance and dilemma between the traditional and modern, the philosophical and artistic, absorbed a new energy in the later period, and
provided the contemporary art a coincidental to create an original but abstract idiom on the concept of Indianness.

**Statement of problem**

Modern Indian painting presents problematized versions of the world that includes self, nature, society and reality as such. The aesthetic philosophy latent in it is normally against sheer reproduction, imitation, and unproblematized perception of the tradition and a blind acceptance of it. In modern Indian painting, tradition is re-created, contemporaneity is reflected, deeper aspirations of human life are imaged, and failures and successes are projected for further transcendence. From this point of view, it occupies a central place in the cultural life of people in defiance of the mimetic concept of art. Even the realistic trends in Indian art do not reflect any primacy of mimesis in terms of one-to-one correspondence within what is ‘imaged’ and ‘real’.

The concept of *mimesis* owes primarily to Plato and Greek thought. This is an important but at the same time an elusive concept for its association with some other concepts. First, it has a broad sense. In its broad sense, it is associated with the concepts like *methexis* (participation), *homoisois* (likeness) and *paraplesia* (likeness/ half- striking). All such terms speak of a relation of correspondence between an image and its archetype. The word *mimesis* and its adjective *mimetic* are used in our context in their narrow and stringent sense. It means sheer reproduction, copy, and imitation alone. It is in consonance with photographic realism. The value of imitation or *mimetic* approach to art, however, cannot be altogether denied. What is questioned is the aesthetic theory that assigns a primacy to it and does not thereby distinguish between *learning* art
and creating art. In classical Indian aesthetics, *sadrisya* or *semblance* has been considered a major component in art creation. *Sadrisya* speaks of the representative character of painting, but representation does not there mean copying in Plato’s sense, because cultural basis of perception is at the back of any representation in painting. In addition, visual art forms, according to the traditional Indian aesthetic concept of *Rupabheda*, must be distinguished from the forms that are not with life and beauty. According to Abanindranath Tagore, the difference of forms can be known in terms of a deeper insight that is not simply through senses. He says, “The difference that exists between outer forms gives us only the variety, and not the verity which underlies all *rupa*. Only the knowledge of appearances gained through our inner sight will enable us to see and show the real difference of forms.” (Abanindranath Tagore, 1942, “Shadanga or Six Limbs of Painting”, *The Visva-Bharati Quarterly*, Vol: VIII, Part I & II, May-October). Hence, the one-to-one correspondence never dominates any theme of a painting.

If we analyse the concept of representation in the sense of *Sadrisya*, modern Indian painting manifests a tension between representation and abstraction. As Benode Behari Mukherjee says, “No art can be wholly representational, or symbolic. Both these qualities are there in the art of any country. So art can neither be purely formal nor fully imitative of sensory images.” (Benode Behari Mukherjee, 2006, *Chitrakar: The Artist*, translated by K. G. Subramanian, Seagull, Calcutta, p. 121). The nature of representation too has certain ambivalence because in modern Indian painting it is never representation ‘*per se*’ that is important. In realistic paintings, it may at the most be representation based on some interpretation of the real. Hence, a re-
understanding of the concept of *mimesis* even in the sense of representation in the context of modern Indian painting is necessary, both by taking the writings and by works of some selected artists and art critics and in terms of a theoretical explication of and comparison between the concepts of *mimesis* and *sadrisya*. The philosophy dominant in modern Indian art is dialogical in terms of human-world, human-human, and human-society relationships.

**Objective**

History of modern Indian visual art is often based upon rise and decline of schools. The present proposal points to a thematic unity among the modern Indian artists. Conceptually, the theme is negative in the sense it speaks more of what modern Indian art is not. However, at the same time a transition from pre-modern naturalistic trend in art production in India that comes in little proximal terms with mimetic notion of art to the problem of abstraction-representation balance and also the unfolding of a deeper reality parallel to the existing world of facts and events will also be shown with illustrations. In the latter aspect, modern Indian art is close to the notion of art as dialogue where an interpretative understanding of the reality and reality as imaged in visual arts plays a major role.

**Survey of literature**

The survey of literature shows a proclivity towards understanding Indian art based on art movements, progress, and decline of art school. However, an interpretative and thematic mode of understanding too is available in some of the publications mentioned here. Besides the written documents, an extensive
survey of the works of some major artists has been carried out. Details of those catalogues and publications are mentioned below:


   The author is not an art historian but an artist. In his book, Kandinsky has methodically discussed spirituality through act and feelings in art and has constructed an absolute diverse philosophical theory on art, which was provoked by the artist’s for their advanced thought for creating ‘new’ in art later throughout the world. “….. (The artist’s) actions and thoughts and feelings, like those of every human being, constitute the spiritual atmosphere, in such a way that they purify or infect the spiritual air” (page. 213).


   The writer has made a new series which offers up-to-date authoritative aspects of the Indian history of art from the early period to the twenty-first century. Using a contextual approach, the book considers the meaning of art in the Indian cultural background, the relationship among art, traditions and modern artistic development during pre and post-colonial period. He has highlighted, how the new aesthetic delight was projected in art after Independence. “A European presence became increasingly apparent from the seventeenth century until, finally the subcontinent became a British possession. .....and painting produced into the mid- twentieth century reveal the growing impact of Western taste. Today, after fifty years of independence, a new
aesthetic is apparent in the subcontinent as artists respond to two equally vital stimulants: the need to reclaim a neglected and dormant artistic heritage, and the desire to establish itself as modern culture. Today’s art does not make a sharp break with the past; rather, the past is reinterpreted and reinvented in unique and innovative ways” (Page, No. 4).


The book is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the life and works of Plato and also the theory of knowledge, doctrine of forms, psychology, moral theory of State, physics and art. The second section contains selections from the ‘Republic’. Plato’s theory of art, discussion is on origin of art and its natural instinct of expression and the metaphysical aspect of imitation. “Plato suggests that the origin of art is to be sought in the natural instinct of expression. In its metaphysical aspect or its essence, art is imitation. The form is exemplary, archetypal. Plato, who was above all things interested in truth, was young to depreciate art, however much he might feel the beauty and charm of statues, painting or literature. …..Plato’s theory of art was doubtless sketchy and unsatisfactory, but one can hardly be justified in asserting that he had no theory at all” (Page. No 64- 66).

4. The Publication Division (Author and Publisher), Ministry of Information band Broadcasting, Govt. of India, ‘Indian art’ through the Ages, 1951, Chapter, II , ‘Modern’.
This catalogue talks on new trends of Indian art from Raja Ravi Varma, Bengal school and other developments. ‘New Beginnings’. “The nineteenth century....... One important personality stands out, belonging to this transient phase. This is Raja Ravi Varma. He was not popular with the revivalists of Bengal because of his westernization and he is not popular with the radicals of today with their orientation towards to expressionism”. (Page, no 39- 48)


In this article, Tapati Guha Thakurta’s subject matter and methodology is gained from studies in modern Indian history and more specifically critical studies in Indian nationalism in the growing condition of making a new art. It has been her task to see how the Indian intellects from the later nineteenth century, including the self-conscious category of artists, provoked by the colonial and embarrassing forms of empowerment that changed beyond the question of originality. The new approach is teases the imagination of those engaged in art practise then and now; meanwhile she has raised the question of taste and value, which constructed the high art in modern time. In This journal she has commented that, “This constructed lineage of modern Indian art, thrown up by the histories and powerfully reinforced through museum displays such as……., also remains in the background...a particular historical option of negotiating the double demands of ‘modernity’ and ‘Indianness’ and of reconstituting the very implication of these terms... each of these options and
projects as having ideological resonances that go well beyond the immediate period or the individual style” (Page- 9-39).


This book is not only an open window between Ramkinkar and us but also truly a multi-layered and rich deposits of human excellence. It is also a story of how Ramkinkar and other’s sensitive souls sorted through the human legacy of truth and beauty and how they shaped their forms of art. Ram Kinkar Baij says; “The Canvas not painted by brush; colour was applied with spatula. The technique itself brings about some distortion. The same happens with the use of the palette knife...Even quicker methods are followed now- nature, volume, space- all are painted in variegated shades and certain details are later highlighted with a few brush strokes”.


A notable characteristic of modernism is self- consciousness, which has often led to experiments with form, alongwith the use of techniques that draw attention to the processes and materials used in creating a painting. Modernism has explicitly rejected the ideology of realism and makes use of feelings integrated by form and subject-matter. In this book, she has described that, “Once you answer the question ‘what does art create?’ all the further questions of why and how, of personality, of talent and genius etc.... seem to emerge in a new light from this central thesis’.... Feeling and form are not opposed. Feelings may be objectively symbolized in certain forms, which then are capable of being
abstracted in experience. Hence ‘art works contain feelings, but do not feel them....Since ‘significant form’ is the essence of art, art is defined as ‘the creation of forms symbolic of human feeling’” (page no- 10, 22, 40).


The author describes the Aristotelian view that: “He sometimes employs the language of ‘Likeness’ to cover all mimesis, and a sentence in politics 8.5 tell us that ‘habituation to feeling pain and pleasure in the case of likeness (that is, works of art) is close to being so disposed towards the truth. The poetics repeatedly insists on this point by its use of criteria of ‘necessity and/ or probability’ (the latter being the dominant consideration), criteria which call both for ‘internal’ consistency in the terms of an artistic representation, and for an underlying connection between these terms and the broad beliefs which people hold about reality. (Poetics 1, 2, 8, 25).... Form and content are there for intertwined in Aristotle’s account of aesthetic objects; and his conception of aesthetic experience possesses matching features. Poetics 4 and Rhetoric I.II give an essentially cognitive explanation of the pleasure which arises from contemplation of mimetic works (we ‘understand and infer each element’ in the works)” (page, 487- 510). The focus of this book is to develop an aesthetically reconstruction of important problems in the development of Aristotle’s mimesis theory. The fact that mimesis cannot be represented without the use of mimetic processes poses the fundamental problem of theory formation with reference to the object. The moot questions are: What is the relation between the representational and the represented world? Is the representation structurally equivalent to simple? The author hopes to get answer to these.

Regarding Rabindranath Tagore and his creative urge on painting, the author says: “Though, as an artist, he knows the passion ‘to make objectively real that which is inwardly real to us, he does not look upon the art object as an object among other objects’” (page-57).


This book contains the relationships on art as objects and the artist’s expression on art. It is strictly a philosophical text, however, a significant effort in the history of ideas, even of social relations of art and objects to show how these relations are progressed in the direction of more naturalistic and democratic forms of representation in art. He argues that, “The first view is that works of art are expressive because they have been produced in a certain state of mind or feeling on the part of the artist: and to this the rider is often attached, that it is this mental or emotional condition that they express” (page no- 22-23).


In this book, Parimoo focuses on historical perspectives on modern Indian art and its trends along with aesthetic introspection, relatively as a socially progressive trend of thought that affirms the power of human beings to create, improve and reshape their art with the aid of practical experimentation,
scientific knowledge, from Ravi Varma to post-Independence era. “Indeed, it is my contention that Indian art activity came under the orbit of Western sphere of influence from the moment Ravi Varma began his adaptation of the European neo-classical style to paint Indian mythological pictures. At this point, the questions arise: how individual an Indian artist can be if he is conditioned by the inevitability of ‘syntheses? How can he escape ‘syntheses? Will he be able to transcend being only a follower of some indigenous mode or some latest western innovation? Is he doomed to be an eclastic? Of course the view that individualism in India is an anathema is only untenable” (page no. 1-13).


This book contains aesthetics theories of Tagore on art and truth. He says that the concept of aesthetic truth requires a personal awareness of the impersonal reality and it does not remain static or sterile in a limited frame-work of modernity in terms of sheer conflicts but found its route through such conflicts towards an infinity of the aesthetic consciousness of man. He has expanded the idea of Indian modernism in art, and posits that: “The modernism is freedom of mind, not slavery of taste. It is independence of thought and action, not tutelage under European school masters. It is science but not its wrong application to life”.

The reason for the existence of art was sought by Tagore in man’s creative impulse to move further than what is given in one’s freedom or creative impulse, what he calls the ‘surplus in man’. The works of art are the signs of this surplus which permits man to move from quantity to quality, fact to truth and utility to beauty. The author has in his view that, Tagore’s thoughts and paintings are of the same intention. “Rabindranath Tagore had rightly recognized the surplus energy that the creators of objects, performers of events and conjures of myths expend, to give to them some extra validity, as the basic input of the arts”.


The author tells the story of Indian art during the ‘Raj’ period, set contrary to the interplay of colonialism and nationalism. The work speaks of the tensions and contradictions that show up with the advent of European naturalism in India, as part of the imperial scheme for the Westernization of the elite, and traces the artistic progression from unquestioning westernization to the construction of Indian national identity. It seeks out to go beyond both conventional art history, which portrays the western influences on Indian art in terms of a greater culture controlling a passive one, and the alternative view that condemns Western cultural dominance but fails to allow any form of indigenous expression. In chapter 10,‘The passing of the age of oriental art’, he says about Amrita that, “The death knell of oriental art was sounded by Amrita Sher-Gil, the first Paris- trained Indian artist…….This gifted artist offered in her paintings a personal, melancholic vision of ‘true’ India, a talent cut short at
twenty-eight. These developments brought to an end oriental art as a movement, leading to the rise of individual artists. They signaled future developments, but a future built on the foundations of the first art movement and its concern with cultural identity, a concern that still dominates Indian art” (page no.380).


This article is focused on the matter of definition of art and its technical hitches. It also includes sections that stress conceptual and theoretical issues. The author has deliberately adopted an approach which is both flexible and pluralistic. This takes as its subject not only the visual arts as typically conceived as painting sculpture but also the activities behind the processes. He says, ‘Some other way of becoming a work of art would be required to block the regress, and the only plausible way would be that the regress blocking work or works came into being as a result of an artefact being created….and which may be called ‘resemblance art’ and what may be called ‘artefactual art’ ( page 58-78).


Throughout the book, the author stresses the analogy between pictorial representation and verbal description because it seems to be both corrective and suggestive. Reference to an object is a necessary condition for description or depiction, but no degree of resemblance is a necessary or sufficient condition for either. Both these participate in the formation and characterisation of the world, and they interact with each other and with perception and knowledge. He says, “The imitation view of representation, then, is that it is a necessary condition for
one item to represent another that the first be an imitation of the second in the
specified sense. A variety of objections....some thinkers have argued that the
sheer imitation of things in the real world is literally impossible... though much
more radical, objection; that the very demand to copy an object the way it is
incoherent, for the object before me is a man, a swarm of atoms, a complex of
cells, a fiddler, a friend, a fool, and much else’ (page-6).

17. K.G. Subramanian, (Trans) “Binodebehari Mukherjee, Chitrakar:
The Artist, Segal, Calcutta, 2006.

This book is a translation (from Bengali) of Binodebehari and his art
experiences, through the legacy of truth and beauty to shape into forms of art.
The key objective of this translation is to propagate a wider range of the great
artist whom we have only partly recognised or hardly published. His views on
art- image, representation and aesthetics are also incorporated in the text. He
says, “No art can be wholly representational, or symbolic. Both these qualities
are there in the art of any country. So art can neither be purely formal nor fully
imitative of sensory images.”

His book ‘The Creative Circuit’, Seagull booms, Calcutta, 1992,
Lecture –I, ‘Models of modern art’, revolves around certain issues relating to
modern Indian art. His attempt is to open up the issues in a broader perspective
and will enlarge our understanding of the modern art situation. In the last
hundred year art history has been interpreted differently. The views of artists
have, tended to be personal and restricted, as they are deeply involved in their
individual creative interests. Subramanian opines thus: ‘Artists, as everyone
knows, are find of models, whether they are of flesh and blood or abstract and
incorporeal; they seek a tangible image of whatever is in question. ...for models offer them the hypothetical structures or pre- concepts or projections that back up their enquiries or action... So an understanding of models and their use or misuse is highly significant in our understanding of nature and validity of any human activity. Terms like ‘art’ and ‘modern’ have been construed differ- lesser degree and its mass and force is phenomenal. (Page. No.3).


This book continues the project initiated in art, criticism and the theory to explore the possibilities of writing art. This second issue is dedicated to translating seeing into telling, to finding the words before the image. Juliet says, ‘Words take from the image, the origin, threaten to obliterate it and yet they turn to awaken it. Words befall the image to reveal what is at once knowledge and other than knowledge’ (Page, no .6).


After the introduction of English education in India, in art education also there developed a tendency to be western, as perfect and naturally imitable. The artists almost fell delighted with the Victorian ideas of art, which set a new trend in visual arts in India. The establishment of art schools in major cities of India was a phase in the direction of familiarising the India artists with the representational techniques. The author has expressed his view in the Chapter vii, Epilogue- Modern Indian art, “Thereafter .......European painting was now
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taught in the government schools of arts, generally providing an aversion against occidental “Materialistic Art’ (page nos. 235-241).


The forms of art are only significant in so far as they are archetypal, and in that sense predetermined, and only vital in so far as they are transformed by the sensibility of the artist and in that sense free. The artists releases these dynamic energies within his own psyche, and his peculiarity, his virtue, is that he can direct such forces into matter, can realize them as forms of objects in the art works. He explains that, “Form is the most difficult of the four elements which go to the making of a work of art in painting: it involves questions of metaphysical nature. Plato, for example, distinguishes between relative and absolute form…..By relative form Plato meant form whose ratio or beauty was inherent in the nature of living things and in imitations of living things” (in Q 26 d, page no-61).


Jogen spell out his experiences in art making process related to elemental and formalistic principles such as line, colour, space and composition and he says, “A certain tension is most essential in art work which is the result of the total effect of composition, colour and rhythm or sensitive lines…I do not agree that it is only ‘speed’ which creates such tension (Ramkinkar’s view), but it is ‘stillness’ which can be create even greater tension in a work of art…Aesthetic tension in an art work is very different from an ‘expression of
speed’. Speed is not necessarily important for a painting, or an art form, but tension is important”.


Modern aesthetics is characterised by the attempt to define the nature of aesthetic experience in itself. In this period, this ‘modern’, conception is joined with a revolutionary commitment to endless experiment and innovation in artistic form, images and materials. He says, “Artists in course of their creative journey experiment with new images and new materials. There is nothing wrong in it- as long as it is done with a deeper purpose. Modern developments offer ample scope for artists to use new materials for their creative activities”.


The idea that the concept of expression or feeling might be central to a philosophical understanding of the nature of art derives much of its contemporary force from the influence of an ‘expression’ theory. This book summarises the essence of that theory, outlines the major criticisms that have been levelled and it addresses the question of cognition. In his version of thoughts, its reason, and feeling are pragmatic conception of a person, which is evolved individually from the understanding of the object he perceives. “Cognition takes place with a different subject, -- a second person; it refers to the sympathy or feeling of the first person and therefore it is freed from the mundanely situated object/event/state-of-affairs. Understanding such emotion is
for eternity and a matter of bliss contrasting emotions in real life that are pleasing or painful depending upon the way such emotion are empirically related to the individual”.


The author shows in her book, a dimension of the contemporary art in India especially in Bengal school art movement and its expansion. One of the artists was Rabindranath Tagore and his views, and works, motivated the contemporary Indian artists. Geeti Sen says, “Gurudev’s influence on the following generation of artists in Bengal has been considerable. His approach to art was significant in liberating contemporary modes in India from being descriptive or narrative, from bearing messages, or from imitating either ‘nature’ or ‘reality’.


This essay precipitates the question of modernism and the process of the history of modern movement in India by presenting art practice and subjectivity. It provides a criticism of representational development of modern art. It also attempts to provide an uneven history to modern form from its steady move into a presumed global art. She says that, “Modernisation in India is a real if incomplete historical process...It is no wonder, then, That modernism, or the specifically aesthetic aspect of the modern, even as it manifests itself in
Indian national culture, is still ideologically speaking, a vexed site. It is possible to argue that Indian artists have scarcely yet internationalised modernism; that they have moved on from a pre or antimodern position” (Page- 105- 126).


In this book, aesthetics is used in the broader sense of philosophy of art. The wide range covered by the articles of this book are with cross-references related to theories of art. All of these topics are the concepts of aesthetics dealing with the choice of philosophers and other writers covered more or less on the core issues of aesthetics. ‘Plato’, and his dialogues are arguably the most influential philosophical works, containing many of the central issues of metaphysics, ethics, politics and art. The author says that Plato is the only great moral questioner of art and aesthetic experience who can also be regarded as a profound lover of art and his aesthetics is embodied in the entirety of his philosophical creativity. Some of the rare reference of Plato’s views are placed here in the book, “If, however, poets do not know how or what they create, their status as guides to life” (cf. Lysis, 214a1-2) must be suspect, and the powerful emotions which they undoubtly evoke (Ion 535) may be psychologically dangerous. The pleasure of art stands in an uneasy relation to ethical alms” (Gorgias 501-2).

Yet Plato was also able to allow for ‘internal’ aesthetic principles, such as those of form, organization and coherence (for example, Phaedrus 268- 9; Republic 4.420c- d)”. “The strands of thought so far mentioned are variously elaborated throughout Plato’s ‘middle’ period, which culminates in the
Republic. But the later..... A turning point seems to have been the Cratylus, where for the first time Plato focuses his questions about art on the concept of mimesis(whose Greek senses include ‘imitation’, ‘representation’ and dramatic ‘enactment’). Part of the importance of this new angle is that poetry, the visual arts and even music can now be treated as analogous in their representational relation to the world. In Cratylus itself artistic mimesis is cited chiefly as a reference point for complex arguments about linguistic signification. But in the Republic we are given two major discussions of the mimetic dimensions of poetry and arts themselves’ (page no, 327- 330).


This book presents a whole new way of looking at art. It exposes art-historical classifications by brilliant examples of all periods, schools, visions and techniques. The book presents a fresh and original approach to elements of art and fundamental theories from formal to modern, loaded by aesthetical interpretations. About the form, significant form and its relation to the visual image or representation, author articulates that, “Works of art were items that displayed ‘significant form’, combinations of plastic elements (lines, masses, colours) that move us aesthetically. .....Art transports us from the world of man’s activity to a world of aesthetic exaltation.... Representation is bad in itself; a realistic form may be as significant, in its place as part of a design, as an abstract. But if a representative form has value, it is as form, not as representation” (page. No. 27).

This book is an interpretation of a chapter from ‘Vishnudharmottara’, an ancient treatise. ‘Sadrisya’ or resemblance, one of the elements in visual art, is descriptively explained in that, nothing would seem more obvious than the idea that painting of a natural object represents the same to our mind. The problem of the relationship between the physical object, which was the painting and its perceptual features of the painting out of which the image was made. He says “Sadrisya or resemblance is to be understood in this sense from contemporary as well as classical Indian standpoint. This resemblance, which is not of the nature of direct copying, is necessary for inter-subjective communicability of art experience”.


This article is also an interpretation of ‘Vishnudharmottara Purana’. From one of the chapters, ‘Chitrasutra’, the author has established on several aspects of painting. One of the major issues discussed here is the basic elements of art—Form, Scale, Expression, Beauty, Similarity and Colour, and their use and application in painting. He has explained the ‘form’ as, “The difference that exists between outer forms gives us only the variety, and not the verity which underlies all rupa. Only the knowledge of appearances gained through our inner sight will enable us to see and show the real difference of forms.

In considering the relevance of *rasa* theory to Indian art that the author discusses in this book, particularly interesting for its classicism and ‘*rasa*’. A revision of his comments reveal his enormous scholarship and comparative technique in the arts in general, his acute sense of history and his ability to collate all the variegated elements into a plausible synthetic whole. In the 213 pages of text, a highly documented history of art in South and Southeast Asia and rasa. “*The Visnudharmottaram distinguishes the kinds of painting appropriate to temples, palaces and private houses; and applies the theory of rasa to painting. Paintings are there classified as satya, vainika, nagara and misra*”.

All these books, journals and articles cited, explain generally ‘art’, an ‘open’ subject of study, and aesthetics, which is based on the language and logic of evaluation about beauty and taste. Besides, the features such as image, representation and resemblance in art are discussed in detail from early to modern period. Through Plato and Aristotle, artistic activity is located and appreciated. Among practices meant to promote goals of cognition and conduct, art is situated in a special ‘world’, both philosophical and ordinary of its own as a notion of modern construction. In spite of these, some references show that in India, with the rise of new developments in art practices, artists are under pressure and there is resistance from all the corners as to the construction of an aesthetic meaning. These problems are discussed in these reviews of books and articles.
Hypothesis

History of art in general can be written with reference to particular themes. The thematic in art creations gradually reveals a thematic-problematic tension in moments of creation and art appreciation. Creativity is thus essentially different from imitation in the sense of copying. Modern Indian art exemplifies this philosophy.

Data and Methodology

The methodological part of the work will consist of analysis, interpretation and consultation of libraries and archives. Catalogues of the artists discussed here will be part in the form of plates.