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1. Prospect of John Ruskin’s Radical Color Theory

Color is single, not as a lifeless thing and a rigid individuality but as a winged creature that flits from one form to the next. Children make soap bubbles. Similarly, games with painted sticks, sewing kits, decals, parlor games, even pull-out picture books, and to a lesser extent, making objects by folding paper – all involve this view of color. (Walter Benjamin. “A Child’s View of Color,” 1914-5.) [1]

British art critic John Ruskin, who had an enduring impact on his contemporary artists and intellectuals, was among the earliest critics to anticipate Walter Benjamin’s claim that color should be thought of as a living thing, not a mere pigment. Ruskin’s claim that a painter must commit his life to the practice of coloring – cited below from his The Elements of Drawing in 1857 – indicates one of the core issues concerning the function of color at stake in the modern art world. Ruskin states:

You ought to love colour, and to think nothing quite beautiful or perfect without it; and if you really do love it, for its own sake, and are not merely desirous to colour because you think painting a finer thing than drawing, there is some chance you may colour well. [...] You may, in the time which other vocations leave at your disposal, produce finished, beautiful, and masterly drawings in light and shade. But to colour well, requires your life. It can not be done cheaper. The difficulty of doing right is increased – not twofold nor threefold, but a thousandfold, and more – by the addition of colour to your work. [...] the difficulty is strangely increased, – and multiplied almost to infinity by this great fact, that, which form is absolute, so that you can say at the moment you draw any line that it is either right or wrong, colour is wholly relative. [...] so that every touch must be laid, not with a view to its effect at the time, but with a view to its effect in futurity, the result upon it of all that is afterwards to be done being previously considered. You may easily understand that, this being so, nothing but the devotion of life, and great genius besides, can make a colourist. [2] [emphasis in original]

This passionate statement warns painters or “colourists” to be prepared for the complexities that the process of coloring will present. Painters should have thorough comprehension and sufficient foresight to anticipate and embrace relativity, multiplicity, complexity, subtness, and all aspects that accompany the application of color in creating a work of art. To fulfill this overwhelming duty, according to Ruskin, painters were to devote their lives to this process.

Although, or rather because, the word “life” in this context could be extremely multivalent, Ruskin’s argument illuminates a domain that transcended the conventional sphere of artistic practices during the nineteenth century, which included artists’ participation in salons, academies, exhibitions, political
propaganda, and so forth. He directly addresses the broader realm of the artists’ personal maxim through the discourse of color, characterized by its transgressive nature. The “life” associated with the characteristics of color – mentioned above as noted by Ruskin – is a place that is relative, borderless, nebulious, and complex, that is always connected to something else. To be true “colourists,” painters ought to give their full consideration to all the possible aspects associated with color across the boundaries of art and “non”-art. Accordingly, various conventional distinctions – between art and life, perception and action, aesthetics and ethics, subject and object, reason and sensibility – are overcome in terms of the discourse of color. Such discourse transformed the aesthetics of color into that of coloring – in other words, aesthetic discourse became focused on the practice (or enacting) of color, as well as the end result.

I would like to call this transgressive nature of color “cross-media,” and call your attention to this special nature intrinsic to color. In fact, color experience infiltrates the boundaries of all fields of life that bridge the gap between perception and action. For instance, we can see typical examples in the history of action paintings [Figure 1 & 2]. Figure 1 is Jackson Pollock’s painting action, which was photographed by Hans Namuth in 1950. The performative act of coloring plays a critical role in this artwork, and color perception and coloring action are intermingled each other. Moreover, in this action, at least four senses, i.e. vision, touch, smell, and hearing (dripping sounds of paints and the brush) are involved. Figure 2, the notorious work by Yves Klein, called “Anthropometry Performance,” probably embraced even the fifth sense, “taste,” as the female performers must have been forced to taste the canvas and pigments. The important point here is that color as media affiliates with various different senses at once, much as Ruskin indicated when he stated that a painter dealing with color should devote his or her “life” to it.

This as-it-were multisensory nature of color can be confirmed in the phenomena of synesthesia, which began to catch people’s attention in mid-nineteenth century Europe through the works of psychologists including George Field (1835), Gustav Theodor Fechner (1876-1877), and Francis Galton (1883)[3]. These books largely focus on the phenomena called “color hearing” and “grapheme-color synesthesia.” “Color hearing” is a phenomenon in which a particular musical or spoken sound evokes a particular color. “Grapheme-color synesthesia” [Figure 3] is the sort in which a particular letter or number evokes a certain color. For example, Figure 3 shows a case in which one sees green with “S” and “4.” Purportedly, the French poet Arthur Rimbaud and the Russian composer Aleksandr Scriabin possessed this color-oriented synesthesia [4]. This claim is supported by their works, including as Rimbaud’s sonnet “Vowels” (1871)[5] and Scriabin’s “Prometheus: The Poem of Fire” (1910) [6]. Although I cannot delve into the details of these works now, I mention these facts to support the claim that color plays a fundamental role in bridging different senses.

The third example in which color bridges perception and action is the critical role that color plays in consumer society. As anthropologist David Howes points out, late capitalism is the age of “hyperesthesia,” in which people make full use of the five senses [7]. As we know, color infiltrates our shopping experiences everyday [Figure 4]. A large number of fashion brands such as “Franco Franc,” “Benetton,” and “UNIQLO,” sell their products by gradation of color. We see a variety of products, including furniture, clothes, cell phones, iPods, perfumes, and candies being offered according to color.
gradations. When we choose and shop for them, we look, touch, smell, hear, and sometimes taste them. Color always permeates such sensory experiences in consumer society.

Of course, color has always been with us, probably since the birth of our vision: however, I argue that the significance of color as “cross-media” has come to be even greater in modern and late modern age. This paper focuses on a point in history when the understanding of color may have started to embrace a field beyond mere visual perception – namely, Europe in the mid- and late nineteenth century, when Ruskin’s *Element of Drawing* was actually published.

2. Color “Crosses” Perception and Action: The Neo-Impressionist Case

Since this paper started with the passionate statement of John Ruskin, we have to check in on how the statement has actually evolves into the above-mentioned twentieth- and twenty-first-century situation where color has a connotation of multivalent life. Ruskin had an enduring impact on the artists now called “Neo-Impressionists,” whose technique is known for pointillism or dotted color dabs. One of the leading painters of the group, Paul Signac, designated Ruskin as “the greatest aesthetician of the century” [9]. I will quickly introduce the relationship between Ruskin’s aesthetics and Neo-Impressionist activities as a case study of the value of multivalent color. Although Ruskin’s impact on the Neo-Impressionist group must have been various to mention – which, for example, could be the initiation of pointillist technique and the synthesis of art and daily life – the transgressive nature of color experience that Ruskin emphasized above can surely be seen in the Neo-Impressionist understanding of color [10].

Georges Seurat – recognized as the founder of the Neo-Impressionist movement for his sensational large painting “Sunday Afternoon on the Island of Grande Jatte” of 1886 – emphasized the importance of the viewer’s durational retinal activity stimulated by colored dots. In his “Letter to Maurice Beaubourg, August 28, 1890,” Seurat described how the viewer could respond to a Neo-Impressionist dotted work:

> Given the phenomena of the duration of a light impression on the retina synthesis is the unavoidable result. The means of expression is the optical mixture of tonal values and colors (both local color and the color of the light source, be it sun, oil lamp, gas, etc.), that is to say, the optical mixture of lights and of their reactions (shadows) in accordance with the laws of contrast, gradation, and irradiation [11].

This text implies that the viewer’s durational perception was regarded as the key to appreciating the various effects of contrast, gradation, and irradiation that the dotted work offers. Without such a temporal experience, the work of art could not be fully synthesized as initially intended by the painter.

However, more significantly, this durational experience does not mean a simple extension of time in appreciation, but it brings about a fundamental topological shift of the place in which the artwork could function. Without the viewer’s mental activity, the work would not be complete. The critical *place* of work exists not only in the individual creation of the work of art itself but also in the viewer’s mental activity as we accomplish the work of perception. A boundary between perception and action blurs in this way of engagement, which establishes a new relation between the viewer and the painting. Importantly,
it is color experience that bridges perception and action.

Arguably, Seurat’s proposed way of looking at a painting is indicative of his own way of painting. As previous studies have demonstrated, to complete one oil painting, Seurat habitually made a large number of studies. For example, it is well known that at least twenty-eight drawings, twenty-eight panels, and three canvases – variously focused and arranged – were created for the “Grande Jatte” from 1883 to 1885 [12] [Figure 5]. Since each sketch shows totally different figures piece by piece, one could argue that Seurat designed each figure independently like puzzle pieces to be assembled into the final work. In other words, “Grande Jatte” may be understood as a product of extensive interactions or communications between the painter and each individual figure over time, and does not attempt to embody a representation of a single frozen moment.

In fact, as is often pointed out, Seurat’s painting shows a strange spatial inconsistency in the depiction of figural groupings relative to each other, and this discrepancy causes a certain difficulty for viewers as they mentally synthesize multiple objects in the painting [13]. As a result of Seurat’s lengthy and fragmented working process, the viewer is led to communicate back and forth with each element of painting, and this lively manner of interaction has become itself a significant part of the work [14]. This also brings to mind the fact that Seurat priced his painting in a wage-like manner. When the Belgian critic Octave Maus asked the price of Seurat’s work “Poseuses” (1888) [Figure 6], the painter calculated it as being equivalent to a year’s salary at seven francs a day [15]. Painting action and appreciation or perception of a painting, in this way, were incorporated together into the wholeness of “life,” to use Ruskin’s term. Considering the Western history of art, this is totally different from the previous avant-gardists such as Realists and Impressionists who painted and represented “frozen” moment of life.


Significant to this discussion are the questions: how were color temporality and viewers’ participation suddenly introduced into the world of painting, and what was the significance of their introduction? Among various factors [16], I will focus on the impact of neuro-psychological discourse. In order to examine the temporality and active perception associated with Neo-Impressionist painting, it is critical to analyze the critic Félix Fénéon’s earliest writings on Neo-Impressionism from 1886 to 1891, because they were among the first and most well propagated theoretical explanations of Neo-Impressionist color techniques, and it is Fénéon who christened the name of “néo-impressionnism” [17]. Regarding the temporality of perception, Fénéon’s analysis is more pointed and detailed than Seurat’s “Letter to Maurice Beaubourg” (1890). In “VIIIe Exposition Impressionniste” (1886), Fénéon analyzes the various durational color effects of Neo-Impressionist painting:

These color reactions, these sudden perceptions of complementaries, this Japanese vision, could not be expressed by means of shadowy sauces concocted on the palette: these painters thus made separate notations, letting the colors arise, vibrate in abrupt contacts, and recompose themselves at a distance. [...] Messieurs Georges Seurat, Camille and Lucien Pissarro, Dubois-Pillet, and Paul Signac divide the tone in a conscious and scientific manner. This evolution dates from 1884, 1885, 1886. [18]
Here Fénéon recognizes the importance of the viewer’s mental activities – reaction, recomposition, and decompositions of vibrant colors – to the success of the Neo-Impressionists’ new approach to the use of color. Moreover, he perceives clearly how this suspended perception of color induces an active physical engagement with the work, requiring the viewer to move back (at a distance) and forth (in abrupt contacts) in front of the painting.

Although rarely pointed out, it is notable that Fénéon exclusively referred to the texts of the color theorist Ogden Rood and his associates, such as Hermann von Helmholtz, James Clark Maxwell, Wilhelm Dove, and Charles Henry, whereas the names of the chemist Eugène Chevreul and the art theorist Charles Blanc are strangely absent from his writing between 1886 and 1891. Significantly, Rood and his associates founded their research on a neuro-psychological explanation of color perception, while Chevreul and Blanc did not necessarily rely on that body of knowledge. [19] Ogden Rood, the most cited theorist in Fénéon’s writing, designates color generation as a function of the three optical nerves, i.e. RGB (red, green, and blue), following Thomas Young’s hypothesis. [20] On the basis of this neurological standardization of color vision, Rood believes that complementary afterimages are generated as a result of fatigue caused by the labor of the nerves. Rood connects afterimages with nervous system reactions that struggle for equilibrium among the three optical nerves:

According to our theory, the green light from the little square of paper, acting on the eye, fatigues to some extent the green nerves of the retina, the red and violet nerves meanwhile not being much affected. When the green paper is suddenly jerked away by the string, grey light is presented to the fatigued retina, and this grey light may be considered to consist, as far as we are concerned, of red, green, and violet light. [...] The fatigue of the optic nerve, mentioned here does not differ essentially from that which it undergoes constantly, even under the conditions of ordinary use, where the waste is continually made good by the blood circulating in the retina, and by the little intervals of rest frequently occurring. [21]

Color mixture is no longer located physically in external objects, but optically within the retinal nervous function. The topological shift of color experience embraced by Neo-Impressionist aesthetics is most clearly realized here. Color vision is identified with the labor of the three nerves, and what is primarily measured in this experiment is not a ratio of pigments but that of the nervous labor.

Neuro-psychological discourse – which emerged gradually in the mid-eighteenth century, specifically along with Julien Offray de La Mettrie’s notion of the “man-machine” – came to designate the human being as a conglomeration of nerves. [22] This new understanding of human beings was based on an autonomic and circular model of the world, which departed radically from the traditional system of metaphysical philosophy and religion. In opposition to conventional religious authorities, La Mettrie in 1748 declared that “only by nature can we discover the meaning of the words of the Gospel,” and that “the excellence of reason does not depend on its immateriality, a big word empty of meaning.” [23] Machine discourse, which was largely based on the neuro-psychological notion of the human organism, refuted the Cartesian dichotomy of matter and mind with its monistic worldview. As the cultural historian Allison Muri points out:
The immaterial and immortal soul – which long proceeded Descartes – remained a tradition in metaphysical or literary discourses, but in terms of physiology and medical sciences it receded in relevance. The medical and technological intervention in the workings of human bodies that creates cyborgs is not a legacy of Cartesian dualism, but an emphatically monistic one where human identity is profoundly physical and embodied. [24]

A characteristic feature of the neuro-psychological model for the human organism is its closed and circular system. William James drew a scheme in 1890 that typically describes a nerve system in which sensory and motor nerves are continuous and homogeneous in quality [Figure 7]. Once a sensory organ captures a certain stimulus, the nerve transmits it as a signal, and the motor nerve moves the muscle according to that signal. This transmission system does not require any external reason and power, for nerve communication is a completely circular and autonomous system. This understanding of the human organism rejects metaphysical social conventions, as Christoph Asendorf demonstrates, and can only be compared with the capitalistic economic system, which is governed by a monistic monetary circulation [25]. The neuro-psychological understanding of color goes along with this monistic worldview. These monistic but still multivalent features of life are strangely consistent with Ruskin’s idea of color and life. It is important that both discourses happened to grow from the nineteenth-century on.

Neo-Impressionist and its neuro-psychological discourse of color are part of such onset of multivalent life of color. However, as I mentioned at the beginning of this article, the history of art and consumer society prove the existence of multivalent life of color. The twentieth century philosopher Emanuel Levinas stated that “one does not conceive the sensible qualities, but one lives these qualities: green of these leaves, and red of this sun-set” [26]. In short, we do not perceive but live colors. Once we have overcome the conventional dichotomy between subject and object, the holistic worldview is prepared in front of us. Is this mere monistic tautology or real enrichment of life? This is a fitting question for us who live in the society of late capitalism and hyperaesthesia. Although it is impossible to give a single answer to this question, at least we can confirm that we are living in such a monolithic world that annuls various dichotomies as well as embraces multifarious senses. Color definitely plays a critical role in such a new world.
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Jackson Pollock, photographed by Hans Namuth, 1950 (Copyright is owned by the Hans Namuth Estate).

Figure 2

Grapheme-color synesthesia

(Source: http://blog.lib.umn.edu/nich0185/myblog/2011/10/synesthesia.html
[the blog for the Fall 2011 offering of PSY1001, Section 23])

FrancFranc Shop, Sendai, Japan
(from http://sendai.keizai.biz/headline/347/)
Figure 5


Figure 6

Georges Seurat. “Poseuses,” 1887-88, oil and gesso on canvas, 200 x 250 cm, The Barnes Foundation, Merion, Pennsylvania
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