

Why Art is Not Nature

Why is art not nature? According to Professor Sevreryn T. Bruyn on his critique about art and aesthetics, the meaning of art has puzzled many thinkers for many centuries whether it be nature or not. Starting from the ancient Greeks, Plato said that art makes a copy of nature. He argued that a “copy” can mean a “re-presentation” of nature or an interpretation of nature. The philosopher believed that artists make copies of nature. Therefore, he strongly believes that art is not specifically nature but a replica or a copy of nature.

Art comes in many forms such as subject art in which paintings, photographs, and 3D arts are involved. Paintings and photographs visualize or capture a concept in real life as well as to nature. Subjects on these artforms include landscapes of sceneries, portraits, and many more. 3D art on the other hand, can be in a form of sculptures. These works of art can be found anywhere in the world and they all look fascinating. Sculptures are done especially by carving stone or wood or by casting metal or plaster. They are commonly tall, but they all vary from shapes and sizes. Most subjects include a people, animals, and many more.

In my own understanding, art is not nature in direct but merely mirror to nature. What artists make in their artwork correlate to what nature is. Especially on paintings and photographs, what the artist see on their surroundings is what they capture and place it in their artwork.