


STELLA KRAMRISCH, SANSKRIT TEXTS AND THE TRANSCULTURAL PROJECT OF INDIC 'NATURALISM'

Parul Dave Mukherji 

21: INQUIRIES INTO ART, HISTORY, AND THE VISUAL
4-2024, pp. 901-924

<https://doi.org/10.11588/xxi.2024.4.107513>



ABSTRACT

Stella Kramrisch's 1924 English translation of the first printed Sanskrit text of the *Citrasūtra* (from *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, 5th–9th century CE) made its mark on the nascent stage of art history and high nationalism in India. While translating this ancient treatise on Indian painting, she laid open a possibility of theorizing around Indic naturalism. Her ethics of listening to the text and its mimetic terminology is heroic at a time when her contemporary art historian, A. K. Coomaraswamy, had taken pains to expunge naturalism from Indian art history as an alien framework. Revisiting Kramrisch's translation today from the lens of transculturalism reveals her model of comparativism between western and Indian naturalism. It is particularly legible where Kramrisch confronted the most corrupt part of the text. My essay examines Kramrisch's 'cultural unconscious' via these 'mistranslations' while exploring how her keen ethics of listening complicate the recent move towards decolonizing Indian art history.

KEYWORDS

Stella Kramrisch; Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy; Indic naturalism; Mimesis; Indian art history; Decolonization.

Stella Kramrisch's (1896–1993) pioneering work on the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* is as much a work in language translation as it is in cultural translation. Written in Sanskrit, it was an encyclopaedic Hindu text from between the 5th and 9th centuries CE that contains the *Citrasūtra*, one of the earliest known texts on Indian painting. Given the status of Kramrisch's work as the first English translation, it left an enormous mark on the nascent field of art history in India. In fact, it would not be an exaggeration to claim that Kramrisch's own theorization about Indian art, in which 'naturalism' was central, was to a large extent shaped by her early exposure to the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, of which the section on painting or the *Citrasūtra* will be the focal point in this paper.¹

This paper revisits the moment in the 1920s when Kramrisch set upon translating this text from Sanskrit into English and explores her engagement with Indic 'naturalism' from a transcultural perspective. Kramrisch's quest for native meaning in this early text posits a paradox for decolonizing art history, a project that usually invokes the work of Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy (1877–1947), another seminal art historian of South Asian art who was contemporary to Kramrisch.² Their contrarian stance on 'naturalism' – Kramrisch's acceptance and Coomaraswamy's denial – poses a historiographical dilemma that surfaces in the interpretation of this text. The paper will also explore how Kramrisch, as a pioneering translator of the text, negotiates with some errors found in the first printed edition.³ Her solutions to the hermeneutic challenges presented by the corrupted source text lead us into Kramrisch's 'cultural unconscious', or her expectations as translator that underlie her transcultural interpretation of this native text.

The key concern through which I enter Kramrisch's translation of the *Citrasūtra* is 'naturalism'. 'Naturalism', a fraught concept, had a certain currency in Kramrisch's comprehension of Indian art. I accept 'naturalism' as a 'concept metaphor' in the sense given by Gayatri Spivak.⁴ This term also draws from cognitive linguistics,

1

See Stella Kramrisch, *Indian Sculpture*, Calcutta/London/New York 1933, as well as ead., *The Art of India. Traditions of Indian Sculpture, Painting, and Architecture*, London 1954.

2

Monica Juneja, Crafts and the Spiritual. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, in: Beate Söntgen and Julia Voss (eds.), *Why Art Criticism? A Reader*, Berlin 2021, 52–61, here 54–55.

3

In 1912, Venkateswar Press in Bombay published the first printed edition, later followed by Kramrisch. See *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, Bombay 1912 (henceforth referred to as V). It could not be regarded as a critical edition, as it was based on two unreliable manuscripts. Eventually, more dependable manuscripts came to light, which helped to place the text on a sounder foundation. In fact, the first critical edition of this text, produced by the Sanskritist Priyabala Shah, was only published as late as 1958. See Priyabala Shah, *The Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa. Text, Critical Notes, Etc.*, Baroda 1958; and ead., *The Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa. Translation of the Third Khanda*, Baroda 1961. Both volumes were published in the Gaekwad Oriental Series as numbers 130 and 137, respectively.

4

Gayatri Spivak on concept metaphor: "Whatever the identitarian ethnicist claims of native or fundamental origin [nationhood, constitutionality, citizenship, democracy, even cultur-

which refers to the understanding of one idea, or a conceptual domain, in terms of another, enabling comparisons across cultures. Just as the notions of “nationhood, constitutionality, citizenship, democracy, even culturalism” do not have exact parallels in the Indian context, neither does the concept of ‘naturalism’.⁵ The construct of ‘naturalism’ that Kramrisch deployed drew considerably from what was familiar to her in European art history. In fact, her teacher, Max Dvořák had written an influential book titled *Idealism and Naturalism in Gothic Sculpture and Painting* between 1915 and 1917 when Kramrisch was his student in Vienna.⁶ Her familiarity with the debates on western naturalism never deterred her from paying close attention to the endorsement of ‘naturalism’ in a culturally disparate text such as the *Citrasūtra*. Rather, ‘naturalism’ was a heuristic for Kramrisch to explore the gaps between western naturalism and its formulations.

It is in this discourse around ‘naturalism’ and her use of the comparative mode that Kramrisch’s model of transculturalism comes to the fore. I take transculturalism to refer not only to the transfer of ideas from one cultural context to another but also to how an art historian trained in western art history like Kramrisch interprets art and ideas of another culture. Her theorization of Indic ‘naturalism’ is punctuated by frequent invocations of the naturalism of Greek, Italian Renaissance and Dutch art. What makes her embrace of naturalism remarkable is that during the time she was engaging with the *Citrasūtra*, the young discipline of Indian art history was deeply driven by cultural nationalism of the kind pioneered by Coomaraswamy. At the forefront of the defence of Indian art against disparaging colonial views about Indian art, Coomaraswamy had embraced the view that Indian art is essentially transcendental, a view that led him to reject naturalism per se. In fact, this conviction deeply conditioned his own interpretation of the *Citrasūtra*, which entailed a radically deliberate reinterpretation of even the most mimetic terminology found in the text. On the other hand, given Kramrisch’s early exposure to the *Citrasūtra*, it

alism] [...] what is being effectively reclaimed is a series of regulative political concepts, the supposedly authoritative narrative of whose production was written elsewhere, in the social formations of Western Europe. They’re being reclaimed, indeed claimed, as concept metaphors for which no historically adequate referent may be advanced from postcolonial space, yet that does not make the claims less important.” Gayatri Spivak, Poststructuralism, Marginality, Postcoloniality, and Value, in: Peter Collier and Helga Geyer-Ryan (eds.), *Literary Theory Today*, Ithaca, NY 1990, 219–244, here 225.

5

I use ‘naturalism’ within quotes when it is evoked as a ‘concept metaphor’ to distinguish it from the more entrenched understanding of European naturalism.

6

As reported by Barbara Stoler Miller, Stella Kramrisch. A Biographical Sketch, in ead., *Exploring India’s Sacred Art. Selected Writings of Stella Kramrisch*, New Delhi 1994, 8. Dvořák’s text was first published in 1918: Max Dvořák, *Idealismus und Naturalismus in der gotischen Skulptur und Malerei*, Munich 1918.

prepared her to remain open to the possibility of an Indian naturalism.⁷

Coomaraswamy was intensely invested in a nationalist defence of 'oriental' art against what was perceived as colonial misrepresentation, which entailed a strident rejection of naturalism per se on the one hand and almost a reverential espousal of transcendentalism on the other – a development that Kramrisch was witness to but remained more cautious about.⁸ Today, when we revisit Kramrisch's translation of a text like the *Citrasūtra*, her decision to 'listen' to this early Sanskrit text on Indian art, which in fact, illuminated theories that were out of step with current nationalistic expectations from the past, is striking. It was clear that her goal was to grasp this text on its own terms, which prepared her to explore a possible Indic 'naturalism'.

Cultural difference featured prominently in her project to grasp Indic 'naturalism' by comparing it with European modes of naturalism. By the late 19th century, race entered the discourses around aesthetics, urbanism and art history. In colonial India, the plurality of races, which sometimes got reduced to the binary of just Aryan and Dravidian cultures, allowed them to be connected differently with those outside India. Quite early on, race had been a major concern for Kramrisch. This is not surprising given her art historical training by Josef Strzygowski, her teacher in Vienna, who had framed the history of art in explicitly racial terms.⁹ In fact, as late as 1924 she published an essay titled "The Influence of Race on Early Indian Art".¹⁰ For her, however, race resonated more with different ethnic traits she associated with North India and South India than with the late 19th-century discourse imbricated in the context of imperialism. More relevant to our discussion on naturalism is the take on race by John Ruskin, an influential English art critic and writer. He had, in fact, proposed a race-oriented model of art history with naturalism as a key demarcation of cultural difference between the colonizers and the colonized, encapsulated in his *The Two Paths* – the correct path that embraced naturalism in art exemplified by Greek art, and the false path that ended up in creating monstrous anatomies as in the art of the colonies.¹¹

7

For Coomaraswamy's transcendentalist interpretation of Indian art, see Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy, *The Transformation of Nature in Art*, Cambridge, MA 1934.

8

It must have been a challenge for Kramrisch to think against the grain. On rare occasions, when she would confront a tricky reading in the text, she would fall back on the Coomaraswamian model and its claim of high morality for the traditional Indian artist/artisan.

9

In fact, Kramrisch had translated Strzygowski's article in the first issue of the *Journal of Indian Society of Oriental Art*. See Miller, Stella Kramrisch, 16.

10

Stella Kramrisch, 'The Influence of Race on Early Indian Art', in: *Rupam* 18, April 1924, 73–76.

11

John Ruskin, *The Two Paths*, London 1907.

Both Kramrisch and Coomaraswamy, who had laid the foundation of art history in India, had to grapple with such problematic binaries but sought to question them in different ways. While Coomaraswamy rejected naturalism on the grounds that it was essentially a European phenomenon, Kramrisch, with her early exposure to the *Citrasūtra* and her ethics of listening to a text that was culturally alien, embraced it via transcultural relativism. For her, every culture could have its own culturally specific ways of representing nature whether it is Chinese, Indic or European.

Despite Kramrisch's best intentions to uncover Indic 'naturalism', the corrupt sections of the text often posed enormous challenges.¹² Now that more dependable editions of the same text are available, it is possible to revisit Kramrisch's 'mistranslations' to inquire into the model of Indic 'naturalism' that she had proposed. I will argue that it is in the most difficult sections of this Sanskrit text that Kramrisch's imagination about the Indic past, which shaped her cultural unconscious, comes into play.

This paper is broadly divided into two parts: the first part closely delves into Kramrisch's key readings and compares them with the current critical edition of the *Citrasūtra* in order to shed light on the model of Indic 'naturalism' that she was proposing; the second part engages with her theorization of such a model which had to a large extent resisted the dominant transcendentalist model for understanding Indian art.¹³

I. Kramrisch's "Discovery" and Strategies of Interpretation of the *Citrasūtra*

After obtaining her doctorate in 1919 from the University of Vienna, Kramrisch went to England. She had to wait for her visa that arrived in 1921 after which she set out for India. It was in 1924 that she began working on translating what proved to be a seminal text on pre-modern Indian art. That Kramrisch was already interested in the question of 'naturalism' in Indian art prior to her translation project is confirmed by an article she published in 1921 titled "The Representation of Nature in Early Buddhist Sculpture".¹⁴ It was Aksaya Kumar Maitreya, the Bengali ideologue and the Director of the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi (in present-day Bangladesh), who drew Kramrisch's attention to the salience of the third

¹²

Kramrisch's first edition is: A Treatise on Indian Painting, in: *The Calcutta Review* 2, February 1924, 331–386. This edition – which she considered "unscholarly", as pointed out by her biographer (Miller, Stella Kramrisch, 14) – was followed four years later by a revised and enlarged edition, titled *The Vishnudharmottara (Part III). A Treatise on Indian Painting and Image-Making*, Calcutta 1928. In this article, I follow the latter.

¹³

For the latest critical edition, see Parul Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra of the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, New Delhi 2001.

¹⁴

Stella Kramrisch, The Representation of Nature in Early Buddhist Sculpture (Bharhut-Sanchi), in: *Rupam* 8, October 1921, 7–10.

part of the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* for Indian art history.¹⁵ This text, composed sometime between the 5th and 9th centuries CE, unfolds in the form of a dialogue between king Vajra and sage Mar-kandeya. The text is encyclopaedic in scope, dealing with a vast variety of topics ranging from astronomy, astrology and medicine, to grammar, metrics, lexicography, rhetoric, dramaturgy, dance, vocal and instrumental music, and the arts. However, it is the *Citra-sūtra* section from chapter 35 to 43, with its focus on painting, that received fuller attention from Kramrisch and also formed the basis of my critical edition.

Not being an expert in Sanskrit, Kramrisch had to rely on the expertise of Devadatta Ramakrishna Bhandarkar (1875–1950), an archaeologist and epigraphist who worked with the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) from 1917 until 1937. In the early 20th century, the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* circulated within a small group of Indian scholars steeped in traditional scholarship in the form of a printed text, published in 1912 by the Venkateswar Press and compiled by two Sanskrit scholars, Pandits Madhusudana and Madhavaprasad Sarma (this text will henceforth be referred to as V). It may be noted in passing that none of the Indian scholars who were aware of the existence of this text attempted to translate it into English. Maitreya, who had informed Kramrisch about the significance of the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, was an historian who often used Sanskrit references in his writing on the history of Bengal. Kramrisch's doctorate on Indian art had largely relied on photographs taken by Victor Goloubew.¹⁶ When in India, she not only wanted to see the actual artefacts but also appears to have been committed to grasping the emic perspective, and what better way to do so than by translating a traditional *śilpāsāstra* or art treatise.¹⁷ It was her English translation that brought this text into the disciplinary space of art history and made it difficult for any subsequent art historian of South Asian art to overlook this text. If Coomaraswamy singled out chapter 41 of the same text for his translation and critical annotation, C. Sivaramamurti successively revisited the text to argue for the existence of an Indian naturalism.¹⁸

15

A. K. Maitra also ran the *Journal of the Varendra Research Society* with the aim of discovering the history of Bengal. Kramrisch acknowledges Maitra in her work on the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* and in fact dedicates it to Abanindranath Tagore.

16

Miller, Stella Kramrisch, 7.

17

I draw the terms etic and emic from linguistics. They were coined by the linguist Kenneth Pike in 1954 and later entered the field of cultural anthropology. They are useful in understanding Kramrisch's keenness to grasp the 'native' meaning in her translation project.

18

See Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy, *Viṣṇudharmottara*, Chapter XLI, in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 52, 1932, 13–21; as well as C. Sivaramamurti, *Chitrasutra of the Vishnudharmottara*, New Delhi 1978. For the cultural politics surrounding the interpretation of the *Citrasūtra*, see my article, 'The Citrasūtra and the Politics of Authenticity', in: Kalyan Kumar Chakravarty (ed.), *Tattvabodha. Essays from the Lecture Series of the National Mission for the Manuscripts*, vol. 2, New Delhi 2008, 125–140.

Unfortunately the first critical edition of the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* appeared more than three decades after Kramrisch's translation of the text. It was Priyabala Shah, a Sanskritist, who had embarked upon this task and published her edition in 1958. Being the first critical edition, it incorporated readings from four new manuscripts, making it a vast improvement over the Venkateswar printed edition of 1912 that Kramrisch was to follow. Nevertheless, when it came to deciphering the difficult sections of the text in which even the new evidence lacked clarity, Shah tended to gravitate towards Kramrisch's interpretations. Such was the authoritative stature of the first English translation of the *Citrasūtra* by Kramrisch.

What facilitated my work on a critical edition was my access to two more manuscripts, one in Nepal (N) and the other in Bangladesh (D), that Shah could not lay her hands on. Bringing out the critical edition of the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* was part of my PhD in Oxford (1986–1991). It was my adviser, Alexis Sanderson, who urged me to work on this text, as according to him, even Shah's edition was unreliable given the fact that it had not consulted the two manuscripts mentioned above.

As its critical editor, my task was to create a stemma to understand the interrelationship among all the available manuscripts and figure out how they were related with the archetype or the perfect original whose hypothetical existence must be assumed.¹⁹ These two new manuscripts, N in Newari script and D in Bengali script, happen to relate to the archetype independently, which implied that they did not share the errors found in the remaining manuscripts. Apart from emending the primary text based on the new evidence, my task also included a close attention to historiography, which involved engaging with how each of the previous editors starting from Kramrisch, Coomaraswamy, Shah, to Sivaramamurti, had interpreted the different editions of the text across decades.

As a pioneer, Kramrisch had the most daunting task cut out for her: how to coherently translate an early Sanskrit art treatise into English when the primary text itself was on shaky ground. Equally challenging was how to engage with naturalism in colonial times when cognate ideas like realism and verisimilitude were often deployed to set apart the art of the colonized from that of the colonizer on the grounds of racial difference.²⁰ I have identified her departures from the current edition through the following lenses:

- i. *Moral*, to understand how a misreading leads Kramrisch to regard traditional artists as ethical beings.

¹⁹

See my edition for a diagram of the stemma: Parul Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra*, XXX.

²⁰

In fact, within Britain itself, the treatment of artistic naturalism as an index of racial superiority had attracted a backlash from the ideologues of the Arts and Crafts movement in the late 19th century and subsequently from modern art with its turn to abstraction in the early 20th century.

- ii. *Contradictory*, to underline the role of some errors that clash not only with the norms of visual representation accepted by the text but also with the artistic practice found in Ajanta paintings, understood by Kramrisch as being coeval with the *Citra-sūtra*.
- iii. *Metaphorical* refers to the fraught concerns around 'naturalism' in which the literal and the metaphorical meanings of terms get blurred, as for example, in the depiction of body hair.
- iv. *Imaginative* suggests the most corrupt parts of the text that lead Kramrisch to conjure up a fantastical universe.

Out of the nine chapters that constitute the manual on painting from chapter 35 to 43, it is the last three chapters, from 41 to 43, that shine light on Indic 'naturalism', Kramrisch's central concern. At a time when the nationalist defence of Indian art had left little scope for naturalism to stay relevant, Kramrisch remained committed to the project of deciphering 'native' mimesis.²¹

I.1 Moral

Chapter 41 discusses four types of paintings – *Satya*, *Vaiṇika*, and *Miśra*. It is the first kind, translated by Kramrisch as "true to life", which has a direct bearing on Indic 'naturalism'.

Markandeya said: Painting is said to be of four kinds: (1) 'true to life' (*Satya*), (2) 'of the lute player' (*Vaiṇika*), (3) 'of the city' or 'of common man' (*Nāgara*) and (4) 'mixed' (*Miśra*). I am going to speak about their characteristics (now). Whatever painting bears a resemblance to this earth, with proper proportion, tall in height, with a nice body, round and beautiful is called 'true to life'.²²

Kramrisch's fidelity to the text is remarkable in comparison to Coomaraswamy's strenuous reinterpretation of this chapter. If Kramrisch translates *Satya* as "true to life", Coomaraswamy radically overhauls its semantics to interpret the same as "*Pure and Sacred*" (my italics) to align it with his transcendentalist framework. The transcendentalist framework assumes that traditional Indian artists deliberately closed their eyes to the observation of the external world and sought artistic inspiration from within. It also claimed

²¹

In my own work on Sanskrit aesthetics, I have used mimesis as a cognate term of 'naturalism' to shed light on an overlooked theory of *Anukṛtivāda* or performative mimesis, a theory which was much in circulation between the 9th and 10th centuries CE. See Parul Dave Mukherji, Who Is Afraid of Mimesis? Contesting the Common Sense of Indian Aesthetics through the Theory of 'Mimesis' or Anukaraṇa Vāda, in: Arindam Chakrabarti (ed.), *The Bloomsbury Research Handbook of Indian Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art*, London/Oxford 2016, 71–92.

²²

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 51.

that artists were deeply religious beings who dedicated their artistic labour not for profit but as service to the divine.²³

However, despite Kramrisch's best intentions to remain close to the text, an unreliable reading could nudge her towards the transcendentalist framework – possibly a default position in this case. At this point, the text lists a number of causes that may spoil a painting while it is getting executed. Kramrisch translates:

Bad seat, thirst, inattentiveness, and *bad conduct* are the root evils (in the painter) that destroy painting.²⁴

It is Kramrisch's emendation of V's reading of *durānītan* to *duranītim* which turns "bad posture", involving artist's crouching uncomfortably over a painting, into "bad conduct" and introduces a moral sense when the text was only listing certain practical reasons that may lead to an unsuccessful execution of a painting.²⁵ Coomaraswamy follows Kramrisch's interpretation in his article on this chapter and expands on the moral stature of a traditional artist:

Durānītam, possibly for *durānatam*, 'lack of patience or humility', must refer in any case to some moral defect in the painter; there are innumerable texts in which it is insisted that the *Śilpin* must be of good moral character, and even require from him particular abstinences as a preparation for his work.²⁶

My edition, on the other hand, accepts *durālīnam*, which refers to the awkward way of crouching by the artist as one of the factors that can mar a painting.²⁷ Morality has little place in this verse, which is interested in underlining certain basic pragmatic conditions for a successful completion of a painting.

23

See Coomaraswamy, *Viṣṇudharmottara*, Chapter XLI, 13; ead., *The Transformation of Nature in Art*, 8, 25, 31, 80, 120. Also see Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra and the Politics of Authenticity*.

24

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 52. My italics.

25

Ibid.

26

Coomaraswamy, *Viṣṇudharmottara*, Chapter XLI, 21. Coomaraswamy translates this verse as: "An uncomfortable seat, bad conduct (?) (*durānītam*), thirst and absent mindedness are regarded as the causes of failure in painting." See *ibid.*, 14.

27

In my edition, I have discussed my reliance on MS D, which retained "*durālītam*" which I have emended to "*durālīnam*". Following are the reasons why a painting may suffer from bad execution: "uncomfortable posture, *awkward crouching*, thirst and lack of concentration". My italics. Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra*, 183.

I.2 Contradictory Readings

In the same chapter, the text produces a list of faults that no longer pertain to the artist but now refer to the formal features in a painting that artists should avoid. By no means should the painter employ lines that are too weak or thick, or make paintings that lack variety (*avibhaktatvam*), show faces with oversized eyes, lips, and cheeks²⁸ (*bṛhadgaṇḍoṣṭhanetratvam*), depict inconsistency (*samvirudhatvam*) or distort correct measurements/proportions (*mānavikāratā*).²⁹

In place of the last fault or “*mānav i kāratā*” or “distortion of proportion”, V reads “*mānav ā karatā*” or “human shape”, a reading followed by Kramrisch.³⁰ In a text which concentrates on the human figure in all the chapters, it is unlikely that human form or shape is to be counted as a fault. In my edition, the emendation of “*mānavak ā ratā*” to “*manav i kāratā*” restores consistency and yields the meaning “deviations from [the rules of] proportions” which fits in as one of the faults in a painting.³¹

Another example of inconsistency in translating the text concerns the last chapter. After listing auspicious themes like the depiction of treasures, celestial musicians, sages, the mythical bird *Garuda* and the monkeys, the text goes on to warn against a specific type of painting associated with “self” or *atman* about which there arises glaring variations in translation. Kramrisch translates:

(oh) king in one’s own house the *work of painting* should not be done by *oneself*.³²

This reading contradicts a cross reference that Kramrisch herself provides to the *Kāmasūtra*, the 5th–6th-century CE text on the art of the erotic, about the role of painting in the life of the refined connoisseur of art, *nāgaraka*:

That every cultured man had in his house a drawing board, and a vessel for holding brushes and other requisites of

28

The Venkatesvara edition that Kramrisch was following had a misreading of *aṇḍa* in place of *gaṇḍa* which led her to read “testicles” in the place of “cheeks”.

29

Chapter 41, verses 7–8.

30

Note that I have used italicized text to highlight what looks like a minor variation but hugely impacts the meaning.

31

Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra*, 161.

32

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 61. My italics. Kramrisch follows V’s reading *ātmanā* (by one’s own self) in place of *ātmanah* (of one’s own self). Note how influential Kramrisch’s interpretation was considering that Shah, who had access to MSS BCD’s better reading “*ātmanah*”, continued to follow V’s reading. Cited in Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra*, 262. In fact, N’s “*ātmana prakṛtim grhe*” is clearly an interpolation that resonates with common Sanskrit phrase “*ātmapratikṛti*” or “*ātmanah pratikṛti*” to mean self-portrait.

painting is evident from Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*. *But one should not have a painting by one's own hand in one's house, says the Vishnudharmottara.*³³

In fact, it is a sound reading from N that clarifies that there is no ban on the making of a painting by oneself but on paintings made of oneself (*ātmanaḥ citrakarma*) and it is their display on the wall of one's home that is proscribed.³⁴ This interpretation is in tune with the *Kāmasūtra*, according to which every cultured *nāgaraka* or a refined/cultured city dweller must display objects associated with painting in his living quarters, perhaps to flaunt his proficiency in painting.³⁵

A further contradictory reading ensues from Kramrisch's mis-translation of *kumudānām* (of many water lilies) in the singular:

That the moon is shining should be shown by the kumuda flower in full bloom.³⁶

If she discerns in the *Citrasūtra* a proclivity of Indic mimesis for symbolism, then this reading – in which a single blooming lily signifies moonlight – can be seen as paradigmatic. It is the same reading that underlies her observation that “a single object elliptically conveys a more complex natural phenomenon”, to be reiterated in her Introduction:

Yet we are told that moonshine should be shown by a Kumuda flower in full bloom, and sunshine by drawing creatures suffering from heat. In one instance, atmospheric effects are observed, while in the other, the behaviour of one object or the other, reacting to the atmospheric change is represented suggestively.³⁷

Her stress on the singular forms emerges as a way to underline the cultural specificity of Indic ‘naturalism’:

³³

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 7. My italics.

³⁴

It is on the basis of N's reading *ātmana pakṛti* (*atman* in the instrumental sense rather than *ātmanaḥ* as a genitive) that I have emended the text.

³⁵

There is, however, no reason given by the *Citrasūtra* about why there is a ban on self-portrait (and its display) in one's own home; but given the fact that this discussion happens in the context of the auspicious and inauspicious themes, it appears that self-portraits bore association with magic.

³⁶

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 58.

³⁷

Ibid., 10.

That seas should have water depicted instead of a halo, or that an artist should show a pitcher to suggest a tank, a conch shell in representing a conch shell, and a lotus flower in representing a lotus flower, once more points to a matter of absorbing interest namely, the single form of nature exercised on the mind of the artist.³⁸

Here is the case not of an unreliable reading derailing Kramrisch's translation but her cultural unconscious guiding her preference for the singular over the plural.³⁹ In fact, prior to her translation project, Kramrisch had been struck by what she understood as Buddhist art's predilection for the singular in such a way that a part can stand for the whole:

One tree, one flower, is sufficient to express and to contain the whole nature. [...] One house or citadel represents similarly a town.⁴⁰

However, the fact that the *Citrasūtra* devoted a full chapter to the laws of foreshortening (*kṣayavṛddhi*) created a dilemma for Kramrisch about reconciling the "naturalistic" and "symbolic" aspects in visual representation, best resolved in terms of a paradoxical 'naturalism':

Once more, one notices the same counteraction of abstraction and observation as in the case of landscape painting. A logical employment of *kṣaya* and *vṛddhi* would have implied oversecting. But the Indian artist cherishes every single form as a whole, as containing all he has to express and as containing the whole of nature. So he cannot bring himself to cover and hide one of its parts.⁴¹

I.3 Metaphorical

Although metaphors abound in texts like the *Citrasūtra*, they are slippery with regard to the question of naturalism in the text. Common stock metaphors compare human body parts to that of the world of flora and fauna as when human eyes are compared with lotus petals, fish's belly, cowrie shells and so on. If there is a culturally specific idea germane to 'naturalism', it is captured in the term *ānulomyam*, which is hard to translate in a single word. The closest

³⁸

Ibid., 11.

³⁹

Indeed, *kumudānām*, or the flower in the plural genitive, is found in all the manuscripts.

⁴⁰

Kramrisch, *The Representation of Nature*, 9.

⁴¹

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 15.

is “along ‘natural’ hair growth”. Idiomatically, it means ‘to go with the flow’. Here, the ‘natural’ hair growth on the human body and its predilection to grow in a particular direction is invoked metaphorically to stand in for normativity.

The text associates *ānulomyam* or the hair trope in opposition to the term discussed above: *sammukhatvam*, which refers to unnatural or stylized depiction of human postures and literally means “pure profiles facing each other”.⁴² Just as there is a natural direction to hair growth, so is there a natural vision in which pure profiles facing each other is considered unnatural in the world where bodies relate with one another at varying angles. Elsewhere, the strictly ordered juxtaposition of profiles facing each other is associated by the text with crude aesthetics commonly found in untutored village art (*grāmyasansthitam*) and therefore lacking in [visual] interest (*virasa*). Rasa here does not refer to the 8–9 aesthetic rasas related with different emotional states but simply to whatever holds our interest. *Virasa* would mean simply ‘uninteresting’. In chapter 39, on foreshortening, perfect symmetry where faces confront one another in pure profile is referred to as *ardhārdhagatasārupyam*. Quarter-based symmetry is considered lacking in interest (*virasa*) and vulgar (literally associated with village arts or *grāmyasansthitam*).⁴³ Note that the term *ānulomyam* appears in the context of demand for naturalism in the representation of human bodies such that the artist must be able to draw a sleeping, breathing body as distinct from a dead body.⁴⁴ And such a skilful artist must have the dexterity to depict waves, flames, smoke, flags and garments etc. with the speed of wind (*vāyugatyā*).⁴⁵

However, there is another facet to the hair metaphor, which is deeply imbricated in political/cultural hierarchies. Chapter 42 begins with rules of depicting members of a royal court starting with the kings who head the hierarchy. They, like the gods, are to be shown as the tallest whereas the ministers, priests, astrologers and others are to be shown relatively shorter; the shortest body type is reserved for the common folk. The hair metaphor needs to be placed in this context of political hierarchy across class and caste. However, V’s incorrect reading ‘*rupake*’ (in a painting) in place of

42

Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra*, 251.

43

Ibid., 88–89.

44

The verse 43.30 reads: *eteṣāṃ khalu sarveṣāṃ ānulomyam praśasyate sammukhatvam tathā teṣāṃ, chitre yatnād vivarjayet*. My translation: In all these cases, conformity with the natural order (*ānulomyam*) is recommended. The placement of figures facing one another [in strict profile] should be carefully avoided. Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra*, 250–251.

45

Ibid. Note that this verse on artist’s skill to depict objects caught in the wind (Vishnudharmottara, Ch. 43, V. 28) is selected by Kramrisch as one of the opening quotes to her introduction to the translation: “He who paints waves, flames, smoke and streamers fluttering in the air, according to the movement of the wind, should be considered a great painter.” Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 2.

'*kupake*' (in the body pore from which hair grows) leads Kramrisch to the following translation:

A king (ruler of the earth) is to be depicted just like a god. In the case of kings (however), the hair on the body should be drawn one by one.⁴⁶

This injunction to the artist is less about the literal depiction of body hair than a reminder to conform to social hierarchy while representing different characters in a painting. As mentioned, at the top are the gods and kings who are not only to be shown in the *Haṃsa* mode of proportion with a height of 108 *aṅgulas* (the highest) but there should be only *one* hair sprouting from each pore on their bodies. Here, body hair is a marker of differentiation – the higher the hierarchy, the fewer number of hairs grow from the body pores.

My edition follows N's '*kūpake*' (in the pore for the body hair) in place of '*rūpake*' (in a painting). This reading clarifies that in the case of depicting kings, the artist is not expected to paint body hair one by one, as assumed by Kramrisch, but that there should not be more than a single hair in each pore (*kūpake*).⁴⁷ The fewer number of hairs sprouting from hair follicles implies more power, as the energy does not get split into many points on the body. Such details had less to do with visual representation than with political hierarchy and prognostication.

I.4 Imaginative

Often, the biggest challenge posed to a translator is a text that has undergone serious scribal mistranscriptions. At such times, the translator either acknowledges this fact and refrains from translating it, or wrestles hard with the given reading to draw out a plausible sense. Kramrisch, being the very first translator, may have felt a greater sense of responsibility to make the text fully comprehensible and went for the second option. The concluding chapter of the *Citrasūtra*, apart from stressing the skill of the artist to depict naturalism, makes a distinction between auspicious and inauspicious themes of painting. While the auspicious themes may be shown anywhere including in one's home and public places like temples and royal assembly halls, the latter are strictly forbidden in private spaces and living quarters. At this point, the text elaborates on negative/inauspicious subject matter, which the painter must refrain from painting by all means. Kramrisch translates:

⁴⁶

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 53.

⁴⁷

That the *Vishnudharmottara* drew from the text on astronomy, the *Bṛhatsamhitā*, was known by Kramrisch as she cites from the latter in chapter 35 while dealing with five male prototypes; these have direct parallels in the text on astronomy. It is *Bṛhatsamhitā*'s commentator, Bhaṭṭa Utpala, who explains that kings have only one hair in the pore: *romaika kūpake parthivānam* (cited from *Bṛhatsamhitā*, 67.5). See Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra*, 42.

Except in assembly halls of kings and in temples, the inauspicious, (as for instance) *bulls with horns (immersed) in the sea, and men with their horns (sticking out of) the sea (whilst their) body (is) bent (under water)*, men with ugly features, or those inflicted by sorrow due to death and pity, war and the burning ground, should never be depicted.⁴⁸

It may be noted that none of the manuscripts preserves a reliable reading and the problematic part of the verse shows:

Nidhiṣṅgān vṛṣānnājannidhihastān matengajān
*Treasure horns bull treasure hands xxx*⁴⁹

Guided by the context and the rules of *anuṣṭubh* meter of eight syllables in which all the verses in the text are composed, I have made the following emendation, which involved minimal intervention:

Niḥṣṅgānśca vṛṣānrājan nirhastān sca mataṅgajān

Since this line is about the list of inauspicious themes or motifs, which are forbidden from being painted in one's own home, the emended text means:

Images of bulls without horns and elephants without trunks
 [are considered inauspicious themes for painting]⁵⁰

What makes these depictions objectionable is the incompleteness caused by the absence of the most characteristic features of creatures by which they are recognized: absence of horns in bulls and trunks in elephants, for example, deprive them of their recognizability, aesthetics and therefore auspiciousness.

It is the point at which the text is at its most garbled that the translator's compulsion to make sense of it takes over and gives free rein to her cultural unconscious. In fact, it is to solve the riddle posed by the slippery text that Kramrisch falls back upon the familiar terrain of comparativism with European art history in which "men with horns" supply the iconography of satyrs common in Greek and Renaissance art.

⁴⁸

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 60. Cf. Dave Mukherji's text and translation, *The Citrasūtra*, 244–245.

⁴⁹

"xxx" stands for an indecipherably corrupt section of the manuscript.

⁵⁰

These inauspicious themes are listed with other inauspicious themes like battles, funeral grounds, etc., in the next line.

II. Theorizing Indic 'Naturalism'

Since 'naturalism' as a concept metaphor offered her minimum common ground to make sense of a culturally alien text, it seems that comparativism was built into Kramrisch's project as an inevitable condition. As a pioneer, Kramrisch faced many challenges while translating the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*. This task not only involved exploring a new cultural terrain but also cultivating an ethics of listening. In fact, if there is an overarching framework that she constructs on the basis of her translation of this text, it is clearly that of theorizing what can be termed as Indic 'naturalism'. The translation project involved a complex negotiation between her European scholarship and non-European object of study. This particularly comes to the fore in the previous reference to the figure of the satyr; as she struggles to glean meaning from the most 'corrupt' parts of the text, the familiar frame of reference from European art looms in her conceptual horizon.

There is nothing reproachable about the exigency of making sense of the culturally unfamiliar through the familiar; it in fact informs any transcultural negotiation of meaning making. Despite Kramrisch's deep commitment to listen to the text, V's unreliable readings introduced a hermeneutic barrier, so to speak, steering her towards certain postulates such as the 'paradoxical' nature of 'naturalism'.

On the lookout for emic terms in order to capture Indic 'naturalism' as oscillating across the poles of naturalism and abstraction, she turns her attention to another key term: *dṛṣṭa* or "visible". While this term acts as a direct correlate to naturalism, she needed another that could correspond with abstraction and therefore coined "*adrṣṭa*". While the text clearly articulates the first category, she in fact deduces the latter as the logical opposite of *dṛṣṭa*. This is a rare example of Kramrisch making the text echo her assumptions:

The *Viṣṇudharmottara* clearly distinguishes between *dṛṣṭa* and *adrṣṭa*, the latter comprising things invisible or rarely to be seen.⁵¹

To Kramrisch, *dṛṣṭa* offers itself as one of the several native categories for naturalism, which is explained via a comparative naturalism connecting the Indian and the Dutch modes:

The *dṛṣṭa*, things that are seen easily by ordinary mortals, excel in what we call landscape-painting. The hours of day and night, the seasons are described (Ch. 42). There we find a close connection of mood and time, which reached its height in the Rāgmala pictures, where season, hour, emotion and music became fused as painting. At the same time

⁵¹

Kramrisch, *The Viṣṇudharmottara*, 10. My italics.

details are observed with such sincerity as we find in the pictures of Dutch masters, for instance, in the description of the drinking place. The light effects sought to be produced show a very sensitive reaction to optic effects as the faded light of the candle in the morning dawn.⁵²

It is with the help of the *dr̥ṣṭa* and *adr̥ṣṭa* dyad that she proceeds to theorize a ‘paradoxical naturalism’:

The *dr̥ṣṭa* and *adr̥ṣṭa* hold their sway; symbol and illustration are amalgamated into an expressive language, keenly alive to all those visual impressions that are on a small scale, obtrusively finite, and seem to carry their meaning expanded within their outlines, as local colour.⁵³

Thus, ironically in her quest for emic meanings of representation, Kramrisch ends up operating in an etic framework based on a dichotomy between abstraction and naturalism. Take, for example, the representation of the sky. Following V’s reading, she assumes that sky must be shown without any colour (*vivar̥ṇa*) but signified by birds. The colour of the sky as proposed by V is *vivar̥ṇa* or colourless, against *svavar̥ṇa* or “its own colour” found in the rest of the manuscripts. Her reliance on the corrupt passage in V would impact Kramrisch’s formulation.⁵⁴

But this ambiguity of the colour in its suggestive and descriptive faculty was clearly kept apart. Taken in a naturalistic and descriptive sense, the sky or the atmosphere has to be painted as almost without any special colour. The sky, on the other hand, is of the colour of the blue lotus and wears a garment of that colour, if represented as a statue, when it should carry the sun and the moon in its hands.⁵⁵

While Kramrisch’s observation about the coexistence of the naturalistic and the allegorical is confirmed by the text, her understanding of the “symbolic” nature of representation in Indic ‘naturalism’ does not find adequate support from the same. Take, for instance, the question of the placement of figures which centrally addresses naturalism and is captured by the technical term *sammukhatvam*, which literally means the state of figures facing each other in strict profile

⁵²

Ibid.

⁵³

Ibid., 18.

⁵⁴

See my translation of the verse: *ākāśam darśayed vidvān /vivar̥ṇam/ svavar̥ṇam khagamākulam*. The learned painter must show the sky without any colour/with its own colour, full of birds. Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra*, 206–207.

⁵⁵

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 18.

– an arrangement strictly disallowed for its unnatural representation.⁵⁶ However, Kramrisch translates it as:

In painting (one) should carefully avoid, in the case of all these, placing one (figure) in front of another.⁵⁷

Such a translation of *sammukhatvam* would not only contradict the Ajanta murals [Fig. 1], where no such prohibition is followed, but also Kramrisch's own active use of the *Citrasūtra* to explain the painterly traditions of ancient India.⁵⁸ If this way of arranging figures is disallowed by the text, this prohibition counters the kind of figure grouping that is commonly seen on Ajanta murals, which she had already accepted as being contemporary to the *Citrasūtra*.⁵⁹ This proscription not only accords with figural placement on the walls of Ajanta caves where most figures are shown in three-quarters. More seriously, this misreading of *sammukhatvam* also impinged upon Kramrisch's understanding of the laws of foreshortening (*kṣayavṛddhi*), which can only work if the figures are allowed to overlap with each other.

No wonder Kramrisch is perplexed by the meaning conveyed by her translation as it would, in her own words, "counter the basis of foreshortening in which figures are to be shown from varying angles". Hence, the paradox that Kramrisch notes between naturalism conveyed by the stress on foreshortening and the misleading prohibition of overlapping figures is best captured by her use of 'Yet':

How much observation and technical experience is needed to state their results in such clear terms will be understood. Yet 'whatever the artist represents he should avoid placing one figure in front of another' (Ch. 43).⁶⁰

According full visibility to Indic 'naturalism' and assigning it a symbolic function not only rests on mistranslation but also underlies Kramrisch's ascription of different temporalities to its inner and

⁵⁶

Dave Mukherji, *The Citrasūtra*, 251. My translation reads: "In all these cases, conformity with the natural order (*ānulomyam*) is recommended. The placement of figures facing each other [in a strict profile] should be carefully avoided."

⁵⁷

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 62.

⁵⁸

For instance, this translation contradicts the very basis of laws of foreshortening (*kṣayavṛddhi*) to which a full chapter (39) of the *Citrasūtra* is devoted.

⁵⁹

"The chapters of the *Vishnudharmottara* dealing with painting must have been compiled in the seventh century, contemporary with the latest paintings of Ajantā". Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 5.

⁶⁰

Ibid., 15.



[Fig. 1]
Unnamed Artists, A painted mural scene from the 'Mahajanaka Jataka' showing King Janaka and his wife Sivali, circa 5th century CE, Fresco at Cave 1, Ajanta caves, Maharashtra, Western India © Y. S. Alone.

outer levels, or to an unchanging inner core and its time-bound surface:

The abstract and the realistic vision, which, as a rule, we [my italics] hold apart as poles in the evolution of art, isolated from one another by gradual steps of development or by the sudden gap of reaction, are but the two sides of Indian art, contemporary and organic, for the obverse is turned towards that which lies outside, changeable, alluring in its variety and provoking observation, whilst the reverse faces the within, essentially unchangeable, because continually stirred up by emotions, of which *chetana*, the life-movement, is the common source. To do justice to them a language of symbols comprises colours and measurements in solemn hierarchy.⁶¹

However, it is in a section of the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* outside of the *Citrasūtra* that her openness to naturalism in a non-western art context expresses itself most compellingly. It is in the dialogue between the King and the Sage on the use of colour in painting that captures her attention:

Vajra said: my curiosity (runs) high, and I wish to hear (more) about the true and untrue colours of water, mentioned by you.

Markandeya replied: The untrue colour of water resembles that of lapis lazuli. It is the effect of the reflexion of the sky in water. But the natural colour of water is seen in the falling down of water-falls; it resembles moonlight.⁶²

This remarkable exchange invokes the *Satya* type of painting discussed in chapter 41, over which Kramrisch and Coomaraswamy offered conflicting interpretations. On the one hand, Kramrisch – whose main agenda as the first translator was to hear the text closely – interprets *Satya* or “truthful” along the register of visual verisimilitude. On the other hand, Coomaraswamy, under his cultural-nationalistic compulsions, accepts “truth” as a moral category in which artistic practice bypasses any engagement with the world of visual perception. Markandeya’s reply to Vajra’s query about the colour of water definitely validates Kramrisch’s model of “visual truth”.⁶³

61

Ibid., 20. This polarization between outer changeable naturalism and inner changeless abstraction invokes her famous binary between ageless and timed variations of terracotta. See her *Indian Terracottas*, in: *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art* 7, 1939, 89–110.

62

Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, Chapter 52, verses 10–12, as quoted by Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 19.

63

Kramrisch gleans from this dialogue that: “The expressionism of colours visualizes a temperamental attitude and is concerned with the wide range of emotions. Yet side by side with it, colour in its descriptive quality was made use of to a large extent. It was not only

Despite the fact that there is not a single Sanskrit word which can translate naturalism, its sense remains scattered across a variety of terms such as *Satya* (true to life), *Ānulomyam* (along the direction of hair growth), *Kṣayavṛddhi* (laws of foreshortening), *Sādrśya* (resemblance) and *cetanā* (consciousness). It is Kramrisch's take on Indic 'naturalism' that oriented me eventually to explore this aspect of visual representation further in the theory of *Anukṛtivāda*, an overlooked discourse on visual representation, preserved in the 10th-century commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* by a Kashmiri aesthete, *Abhinavabhāratī*.

Almost half a century following her translation project, Kramrisch grew sceptical about the text's claim of naturalism, as becomes evident in her foreword to her student Calambur Sivaramamurti's commentary on the *Citrasūtra*.

The realism is in the eye of the beholder and pious stories told, though not in the Citrasūtra...⁶⁴

The U-turn in her position on Indic 'naturalism' during postcolonial times is quite perplexing considering that her "naturalistic" reading of the *Citrasūtra* arose during the era of colonialism at a time when nationalistic art history had programmatically rejected naturalism in Indian art.

It is Kramrisch's against-the-grain reclamation of 'naturalism' as a frame for exploring Indian art that opens up a productive terrain for future research. I conclude by invoking ethics of listening as a way to compare different engagement with the same text by Coomaraswamy and Kramrisch. While Coomaraswamy was more of a South Asian than Kramrisch in his Eurasian racial identity, it was Kramrisch, the European Jew, who 'heard' and paid heed to 'another naturalism' despite the daunting task of navigating the error-ridden first printed edition of the text. It is Kramrisch who opens the way further pursued by Sivaramamurti, who was to bring out an annotated translation of the *Citrasūtra* in 1978.

Almost a century after Kramrisch's first English translation of the *Citrasūtra*, today there is a growing recognition that the 'naturalism' that the *Citrasūtra* had professed was not one of its kind but a part of a larger discourse of *Anukṛtivāda* or performative mimesis [Fig. 2].⁶⁵ In this respect, Kramrisch enables another take on 'naturalism' in line with decolonizing art history. Here decolonizing art history hardly implies returning to some golden authentic past

known as local colour, distinctive of, and unchanging with, the various objects, but also its modifications due to light and surroundings were considered." Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 19.

64

Calambur Sivaramamurti, *Chitrasutra of the Vishnudharmottara*, New Delhi 1978, p. X.

65

For 'performative mimesis' or mimesis in a performative sense, see Parul Dave Mukherji, *Who Is Afraid of Mimesis?*, 77; and also for discussion on *sādrśya* or resemblance, id., *Life and Afterlife of Sādrśya. Revisiting the Citrasūtra through the Nationalism-Naturalism Debate*, in: *Saivism and the Tantric Traditions. Essays in Honour of Alexis G. J. S. Sanderson*, Leiden/Boston 2020, 569–587.



[Fig. 2]

Unnamed Artists, A cropped detail from the 'Mahajanaka Jataka' story painted on an inner cave wall, circa 5th century CE, Fresco, Cave 1, Ajanta Caves, Maharashtra, Western India © ACSAA.

interpreted by a ‘native’ scholar but a non-Eurocentric rethinking of the very project of representation. Deeply steeped in a comparativist project, Kramrisch’s take on Indic ‘naturalism’ was not only facilitated by a close ‘listening’ to the old Sanskrit text but also by her embrace of modernism.

While Kramrisch’s paradoxical Indic ‘naturalism’ unfolded within a binary framework, her modern, *avant-garde* take on representation also questioned the oppositions between abstraction and observation, and more importantly, between representation and performance. If Ruskin expressed his unabashed contempt for the lack of naturalism in Indian art, Kramrisch emptied naturalism itself of its Victorian prestige of superior cultural power and demoted it to almost a mindless seeing of nature: “This versatility in visualizing abstraction and actual action replaces the mere observation of nature.”⁶⁶ Just as the Cubist *avant-garde* artists overturned the revered conventions of European naturalism by embracing the fragment and the collage, the Indian artists of early times, for Kramrisch, “never took the world at a sweeping glance”.⁶⁷

[Parul Dave Mukherji](#) is professor at the School of Arts and Aesthetics, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India. Her publications span global art history, comparative aesthetics and contemporary Indian art. She is the author of *Ebrahim Alkazi. Directing Art – The Making of a Modern Indian Art World*, Ahmedabad / New Delhi 2016; and *Whither Art History in a Globalizing World*, in: *The Art Bulletin* 96 / 2, 2014, 151–155. Her most recent publications are: *20th Century Indian Art*, co-edited with Partha Mitter and Rakhee Balaram, London 2022; *Decolonizing Art History*, in: Beate Söntgen and Julia Voss (eds.), *Why Art Criticism? A Reader*, Berlin 2022, 97–98; *Artistic Labour in Dance and Painting. Revisiting the Theory-Practice Debate via Mimesis (Anukrti) and the Abject Body*, in: *South Asian History and Culture* 14 / 2, 2023, 140–152; *Aesthetic Repose (Viśrānti), Self and the Emerging Figure of the Rasika in Early Medieval India*, in: Prasanta Chakravarty (ed.), *Assured Self, Restive Self. Encounters with Crisis*, New Delhi / London / Oxford 2023, 67–82.

66

Kramrisch, *The Vishnudharmottara*, 11.

67

Ibid.