CONCLUSION

In the foregoing chapters, the solutions offered are by no means final or exhaustive. They are such as have been suggested in the process of explanation and analysis. Let us attempt to summarize briefly the main conclusions that emerge.

1. In the first place it is acknowledged that there is such a thing as a distinct and unique kind of experience known as the aesthetic experience. The distinction, however, does not categorize the aesthetic into an isolated realm of its own, making it a peculiar branch of knowledge and experience, but into a higher mode of being and awareness, a level which the individual attains through his own innate capacities.

2. This mode of being and awareness is the outcome of a special mental attitude which permits the observer to disengage himself from the irrelevant and existential properties of the object of perception and to identify himself, to the exclusion of all else, with its intrinsic properties. This process of a simultaneous withdrawal and identification leads to a total experience wherein the object of perception is known directly.

3. A further characteristic of the aesthetic lies in its capacity not only to bring about at certain
times art experiences, but also in its transcendence at all times of phenomenal attitudes. Through this transcendence, experiences marked by the duality of a subject-object reference, gain a unitive character. The scholar, the saint and the man of action need the aesthetic attitude as much as the artist, in order to lead a full and integrated life. In the ultimate analysis beauty, truth and goodness are three aspects of the same thing.

4. Therefore, in order to bring about an aesthetic experience, which is the same as acquiring a deeper and broader perception, a transformation is required not only of the aesthetic object during the process of art creation, but equally of the perceiving subject. The Indian theory of art, in contrast to modern theories lays as much emphasis on the cultivation of the artist's or aesthete's personality as on the mastery of the external laws of art creation. A true aesthetic experience involves a metamorphosis of the entire personality; consequently it is akin to a religious experience.

5. It follows from this, that art which is an externalization of the aesthetic attitude is a total human activity engaging every aspect of life, and is not only confined to the making of specific objects.
Broadly defined it is the employment of energy, towards the achievement of a disciplined and organized result. As such the art of the shoe maker is equivalent to the art of the painter or musician. An individual does not become an artist because of the trade he pursues, but by virtue of the method he employs.

6. The emphasis on inner phenomena for the aesthetic attitude and creative process, gives no doubt the traditional Indian theory a metaphysical and idealistic basis. But at the same time Indian aesthetics is not antagonistic to a realistic and naturalistic explanation. The concept of *rasa* for instance which signifies not only the essence of the aesthetic experience, but also that the principle in art works which distinguishes them from other objects, permits fully of a natural explanation. It is the term used for that quality which emerges from the organic structure of the work of art, that is from the physical elements related to each other in a certain way. It is the unexpected and sudden appearance of *rasa* as an overpowering perceptual illusion which tends to give it a transcendental basis and make it appear disconnected with the tangible elements of the work of art. The sudden emergence of *rasa*, however is in conformity with psychological
causation and has some similarity with Gestalt of modern psychology. Similarly the term dhvani which explains the nature of poetic meaning by suggesting that it lies essentially in the overtones and resonances rather than in the literal meanings of the words, is not opposed to a naturalistic conception.

7. Nonetheless if the overall aim of Indian art and aesthetics is considered to be predominantly religious, it is due to the emphasis laid on the development of inner attitudes and mental processes and to the artists final aim to lead the mind of the spectator away from the superficial, particular and transitory aspects of the work of art, towards its deeper intrinsic and universal qualities. Traditional Indian artists always sought through the expression of a universal symbolism, to achieve inner peace, serenity and oneness with nature; this is in contrast to the generally accepted secular aim of modern art wherein the artist feels he is nearer to truth by expressing his own personality, with all its moods of frustration, anxiety, discontent, mockery, rejection, and resentment or by presenting purely sensuous or formal values of the art work without leading on to its deeper spiritual values. Indian art, however, is not religious in the abstract sense of being ascetic, world-negating or purely formal. It incorporates fully
all the sensuousness, romance, fervour, vitality and dynamism of the phenomenal world. Its aim and function is not to reject these, but through a process of transformation, to bring them to a fuller plane of enjoyment. In this sense it has a greater pragmatic value than present day art and aesthetics. Also by aiming basically at the cultivation and improvement of the human personality it performs a valuable social function, making art an integral part of life and the social order.