

## A TREND IN ENGLISH ART CRITICISM

—From John Ruskin to Herbert Read—

Yoshimasa YOKOGAWA

Since the publication of *The Stones of Venice*, every English art-critic has, to some extent, been influenced by John Ruskin (1819–1900), whether significantly or not. Nobody will doubt that he is the first Englishman to fashion art criticism into great English prose; at the same time he is one of the first to see industrialization in terms of the malady it inflicts on art and creative activity. Significantly, Ruskin put art in the central position of civilization by grasping the nature of organic art and its role in society. He appealed to the public to develop the 'innocence of the eye'<sup>1)</sup> to revitalize their creative freedom, which had been reduced to a condition of slavery in industrial society, by making a grievous outcry; 'It is not, truly speaking, the labour that is divided; but the men—Divided into mere segments of men—broken into small fragments and crumbs of life;'<sup>2)</sup>

In spite of many of the Victorian prophet's displeasing features, that is, the moralistic eloquency, and the capricious whimsicality which must repel us, Ruskin himself remains something of a touchstone for those who have engaged in literary-art criticism, by virtue of passages filled with wonderful sensitivity, deep feeling and genuinely profound insight into life and things. Ruskin's immediate English and American followers like William Morris, who did restore beauty to English craft and book production, or Frank Lloyd Wright, whose constant idea of architecture was accompanied by that of an organic society, are absolutely unthinkable without his inspiration. As Kenneth Clark points out, 'standard writers of art criticism—Aristotle, Longinus and Horace—all described art as something imposed, so to speak, from without.' Until the age of Romantic movements began with Ruskin's circle, 'the idea of style as something organically connected with society, something which springs inevitably from a way of life, does not occur.'<sup>3)</sup>

Here, my proposition is that one of his less obvious but most versatile descendants is Herbert Read (1893–1968). It is not only because Read's efforts to consolidate English art criticism attempt to relate Ruskin's principles of aesthetics to modern consciousness in a more progressive way; Read is also an inheritor of the romantic tradition handed down from Ruskin and Morris with regard to ideas of art in general. However, Read is often critical of Ruskin's generally ethical, backward reference to Medievalism and of his favorite phrases like 'organic', 'goodness' and 'sublime' which tend to be open to charges of obscurity. But Read in reality appreciates Ruskin's unsystematic but persistent practice and study drawn from his enthusiastic attitude toward art. At least, Read is far from reluctant to admire the greatness of Ruskin, 'who first got under the stones and revealed the spirit of Gothic through its theoretical and historical interpretation.'<sup>4)</sup> Perhaps there would be no test of the genuineness of art other than that

suggested by Ruskin—the sense of ‘getting at the root’ and ‘holding this by the heart’ which Read often mentions in his books.<sup>5)</sup> The standpoint Read and Ruskin shared with each other was the position of the creating artist *ab intra*, not that of the spectator *ab extra*. ‘If we ever recover,’ Read continues, ‘our sense of these values (Ruskin’s love and understanding of art) — and we must recover them if we are to produce another great style — we shall return to Ruskin for inspiration and guidance.’<sup>6)</sup> For Read, Ruskin was the only critic of art other than Baudelaire whom he could at once read and respect. Particularly the chapter of ‘The Nature of Gothic’ in *The Stones of Venice*\* had a strong influence on him and we can easily imagine that he was moved by it no less deeply than had been an faithful follower of Ruskin, William Morris. ‘In these years we have not advanced on Ruskin’s love and understanding of art which, for two or three brief centuries, was the supreme expression of the transcendental value of the northern races’.<sup>7)</sup> In passing, Read’s emphasis is evidently on the evaluation of Gothic art as a northern art, and necessarily Ruskin’s theories of it should find fulfillment, not only in the art of the nineteenth century, but also in the creation of twentieth-century Expressionism. Though Ruskin did not use the word ‘Expressionism’, which might be roughly included in ‘Imagination’, no one has more precisely or more eloquently formulated this theory.<sup>8)</sup>

Here, I might stress that the aim of this essay is to follow a parallel based on my own deduction, not to propose a direct connection between Ruskin and Read. For they lived according to different principles in two different cultural environments, which require us to assess their achievements individually. However, what I can say about their fundamental view of art is that Ruskin firmly believed ‘the art of any country is the exponent of its social and political virtues’,<sup>9)</sup> while Read insists that ‘art must be treated not as a detached activity, subject to its own laws—but as a form of expression which takes on its characteristics and ultimately its value from the general content of the environment within which it appears’.<sup>10)</sup>

In 1920, two decades after Ruskin’s death, in a letter to an American novelist, Edward Dahlberg, Read tells of his definite resolution to become the art-critic of his age. In spite of many poor conditions compared with the situation of Ruskin, ‘who was lucky in having a great artist Turner—to write about and a great deal of wealth and leisure’, his decision was confirmed, especially by the death of T. E. Hulme. ‘I found myself in a situation (in this country) where I was the only person with necessary energy and will to take on the defence of modern art. I would willingly have stood down and left the field to some other critic, but I belong to a generation that was determined by war and people who might have done this necessary task—men like T. E. Hulme—were killed in that war and I found myself a solitary survivor in this field.’<sup>11)</sup>

It is true that Read was then living in a peculiar time of war and in the place where the criticism of art has been relatively neglected since the time of Ruskin, but

\* *The Stones of Venice* was published during Morris’s first year at Oxford and that event determined the rest of his life.

there was a more serious circumstance for artists, that is, the alienation of sensibility that is the inevitable consequence of mechanization. Read is not only the child from Muscoates in Yorkshire but also the disciple of Ruskin and Morris who emerged in the lament for the passing of the wild flowers.

We have lost touch with things, lost the physical experience that comes from a direct contact with the organic processes of nature. The man who followed the plough felt a tremor conducted from the shining thrust of the coulter in the earth along his arms and into his heart ..... There has never been and never can be a civilization that is not rooted in such organic processes.<sup>12)</sup>

On his way to the conclusion that a vital relationship between art and society is essential for social health, Read had to accept the influence of Ruskin and Morris, with both of whom he shared a social idealism that rejected capitalistic economics as well as the authoritarian political structures of modern society. Read admired Morris as a whole man and as a 'practical genius, carrying things into action, embodying beauty in things of use giving organization to opinion.'<sup>13)</sup> What matters crucially is that the relationship between harmony in art and harmony in society was more than analogical; it is organic.

Ruskin's greatness has been considered to be twofold: one is that he insisted on a definition of philosophical terms like 'truth' 'beauty' 'colour' and so on, which had been given merely mechanical definitions in the classical age; the other is that he related aesthetic activity to life as a whole. These two attitudes are complementary and intrinsic to the felicitous achievement of his essential vision of beauty in the *organic* world. As for the definitions of philosophical terms like *Typical Beauty* and *Vital Beauty*, they may have been criticised because of their lack of the relevance to the modern situation. However, it might be correct to say that our primary concern with Ruskin's works should be not to examine his present relevance as a critic of art or society, but to see his writings in order to understand our own situation.

By the term Beauty, then properly are signified two things. First, that external quality of bodies already so often spoken, and which, whether it occur in a stone, flower, beast, or in man, is absolutely identical, which, as I have already asserted, may be shown to be in some sort typical of the Divine attribute, and which therefore I shall, for distinction's sake? call Typical Beauty: and; secondarily, the appearance of felicitous fulfillment of function in living things, more especially of the joyful and right exertion of perfect life in man; this kind of beauty I shall call Vital Beauty.<sup>14)</sup>

The transition from literary-art criticism to social criticism was quite natural for Ruskin, within his form of thinking and necessitated by the changes of the meaning of *culture*. Admittedly, we can easily see that his conception of Beauty was directed to

his social thinking. The artist's standard was 'Typical Beauty', but, extending beyond the sphere of art, was the other category which is 'Vital Beauty'. In deepening the meaning of art Ruskin investigated not only its source in imagination and its object in natural laws, but its social and economic condition. The linking of art with the general state of culture may seem to be now unfashionable as a theme, but it is still significant.

One of the most important alternatives that Ruskin is asking us to choose between in 'The Nature of Gothic' concerns the problem of function of the artist in society: that is, the choice between 'an animated tool' and 'a thinking being', or between 'a man of design' and 'a man of fact',<sup>15)</sup> in Ruskin's words, 'to choose whether you will pay for the lovely form or the perfect finish, and choose at the same moment whether you will make the worker a man or a grind stone.'<sup>16)</sup> Apparently, what Ruskin implies here by the alternative of designer or craftman is not the evaluation of the quality of works, but the possibility of workers in various social degrees corresponding to their functions so as to achieve the integrity and the wholeness of man's life and society. The idea of 'function' at the root of all his thinking might suggest an image of society which must regulate itself by means of a rigid class-structure, but Ruskin's constant ideal of society is to be realized by seeking for an organic wholeness of individual within his social responsibility, not any kind of totalitarian unity of men with society. Probably, most of the philosophical and social confusions of the past has come from the unreasonable desire to establish unity or totalitarian unity. What Read learned as one of the precepts in 'The Nature of Gothic' was, I believe, as follows;

But man is diverse, culture is diverse, art is diverse. Mankind (though we may doubt it sometimes) is one species, but that unity is, as the derivative word rightly indicates, specious. The reality is the diversity, the multi-formity, and art should cultivate these subtle values.<sup>17)</sup>

Again, Ruskin regarded art and society as an integral part of any healthy communal life, not as a redundant luxury of civilization. It is impossible, finally, for the artist to be good if society is corrupt. 'The art or general productive and formative energy of an century is an exact exponent of its ethical life.'<sup>18)</sup> This view was developed in a more practical way and on a wider social and economic level by his disciple, William Morris. Though Ruskin did sometimes apply his doctrines in an eccentric and evocative way, Morris's primary purpose was rather to show how art actively entered into the life of every man, not in a merely passive or receptive way. Consequently, what Morris found most significant in 'The Nature of Gothic' was the urgency of the reconstruction of society founded on art as 'the expression of man's pleasure and labour.'<sup>19)</sup> He did not believe that industrial design or any kind of artistic activity could be transformed without a reformation of society. Whatever appreciation may be given to Morris as a practical artist, his success was generally attributed to the ability to relate his sense of past to the problem of the modern, in other words, to his sense of tradition, which he would have defined as an organic continuity in the methods of work. Of course, the

idealization of the past and the affection for *Nature*, which might be considered a characteristic of the romantic temperament, would be realized only in revitalizing social reality by constant contact with Nature, not imitating it nor escaping into nostalgic sentimentalism.

Besides the problem of the social function of art, what matters gravely with Ruskin as well as Morris was the poignant condition of working alienated from thinking; that is to say, the division of man rather than of labour. Necessarily, the division of man has brought the dissociation of the sense of tradition, which is the search for the wholeness of man in time and space, for the organic interrelation between mind and body, man and nature in a dynamic context. This is one of the reasons why Ruskin must still be read if the tradition is to be understood, and why his works must now be taken as a whole.

Significantly enough, Ruskin was one of the keen witnesses of the process of disintegration of man in the middle of nineteenth century, when social revolution had established the division of labour as a necessary price to pay for industrial expansion. It was quite natural for a society to become sectional and vocational, its ideal of humanism and its disinterestedness gradually lost; one form of its structure was for the worker, another for the thinker. In our own time that divisive process has been elaborated and legalized into a rigid vocational structure. Our civilization is no longer primarily manual or even human: mechanization has taken command and the human being inevitably becomes a component of the machine. Such a devastating situation for artists is far from being overcome; on the contrary, the disintegration of man has become worse than ever with the development of industrialization. Irrevocably, a technological civilization has come to stay and what is now urgent is to prevent it from destroying itself through lack of a controlling vision. Science and technology pride themselves on being impersonal in pursuing aims that are strictly rational and utilitarianism. Presumably, the exigent task of creative visual forms imposed on the artist can only be fulfilled when he recovers from this alienated condition, and the designer of the modern age is significant in so far as his design links the products of machine with the products of nature. Without the recovery of the organic tradition, there can be no general achievement of style in its true sense.

The word *organic* is always subject to ambiguous usage. Perhaps few English words are more difficult than this word which has a vast and complicated semantic history. The Greek ὄργανον first meant 'tool' or 'instrument', and ὀργανισμός was equivalent to our 'mechanical'. In English, 'mechanical' and 'organical' are synonymous in the sixteenth century, but in the eighteenth century the physical and biological references begin to predominate. And by the middle of the nineteenth century 'organic' and 'organized', which were once used as synonyms, are commonly opposed as 'natural' versus 'planned'. According to the notes on *organic* by Raymond Williams, there were five apparent reasons why 'organic' —to mean 'natural'— became popular;

to stress an idea of 'wholeness' in society; to stress 'natural growth' as in 'cul-

ture', with particular reference to slow change and adaptation; to reject 'mechanists' and 'materialist' versions of society; to criticize industrialism, in favour of a society in close touch with natural process' (ie-agriculture).<sup>20)</sup>

At least, this complication of the word 'organic', prevents our using the word without deliberate definition. To make its meaning clear, I believe, there would be no more useful example than the function of architecture, which is precisely the link between Ruskin's aesthetics and his social theories. Architecture, in particular, Gothic architecture, imposes on man a biological relation with his natural and social environment and with the practical necessity of his breathing, eating, sleeping — all the activities of his bodily organs. When used of design, *organic* implies that the designer should keep his senses in constant contact with nature and engage his sensibility in a constant creative effort; that is to say, the artist should attempt to revive the sensibility that has coursed along the nerves and veins of countless generations of artists.

Now let us turn to the Romantic qualities inherited from Ruskin to Read. The psychological basis of art for them both was instinctive or visionary; the great emphasis is on the instinctive origin of art. This intuitional ability cannot be taught nor learned as a set of rules or logic underlying all intellectual concern with art. Ruskin says that 'there is the strong instinct in me which I cannot analyse, to draw and describe the things I love.'<sup>21)</sup> Art must exist first as feeling and appetite. And then the unknown emotions in flux are ultimately brought to a spiritual beholding or a vision through the most important instrument for the artist; the eye. The virtue of the visual artists is their adherence to the vision. Of course, the artist not only sees accurately the particular object he sees, but discerns the relative values in what he sees. The quality of seeing, and the special quality of apprehension of essential form; these are the particular faculties through which the artist reveals the essential truth of things. But, when he tries to communicate, he depends on the same qualities in others, that is to say, on their active presence in society. Seeing is creating, and creation is communication; objective realities come into existence only in the act of creation as a biological necessity in society. Here is a main line from Ruskin to Read's radical criticism of nineteenth century society as infected by an imposed mechanical habit of apprehension. In *Icon and Idea*, Read argues that the attempt to comprehend the world visually is basic. And the tendency of dereliction in modern art is a result of the fact that art has become separated from people, and also has lost some kind of visual contact with Nature. In such a situation it is not the art that should be reformed, but the people that should be given the eyes to see.

Since the time of the Renaissance we have been building our practice on mathematical reason and accumulations of positive fact. This has induced in all aspects of our life efficient, competitive and strong qualities, but on the other hand it has robbed us of feeling and 'The Innocent Eye'. Consequently, 'what we have gained in utility and efficiency we have lost in sublimity or grandeur,'<sup>22)</sup> in Read's words, 'A sense of Glory.'<sup>23)</sup> This explains why Ruskin rejected any sort of mechanization of society in defence of beauty, while Read warned of our fatal loss of the innocent eye and our distrust of in-

tuition. In other terms, after all, both of them led to the acknowledgement of the vital difference—in terms of understanding the process of artistic creation—between the concept of *humanistic* art and that of *abstract* art; one is concerned with the expression in plastic form of human ideals or emotions, and the other is non-figurative art, which has no concern beyond making objects whose plastic form appeals to the aesthetic sensibility.

Read, unlike Ruskin, however, does not deny the future of a mechanized world at all, and he made a tremendous effort to preserve the organic tradition in an age of automation. But, however generous Read might be to the impersonal rational utilitarianism of the modern world whose aim is efficiency for efficiency's sake, there was one thing which he couldn't observe as a mere onlooker. That is the functional thinking of a human being when it is the product of a brain that operates like a machine tool, cold, precise, imageless, repetitive, bloodless, and dead.

The alternative that Read presents between functional thinking and imaginative thinking, a will to power and a creative mind, is precisely the counterpart of Ruskin's distinction between making 'a tool of the creature' and 'a man of him', a distinction which has remained unresolved ever since. We may admit that in these oppositions there is no easy compromise, as Ruskin foretold: 'you cannot make both.'<sup>24)</sup> One is based on the principle of causality and accumulation of abstract knowledge, the other is creative and a sort of manifestation of the logically inexpressible, of the irrational. Strangely enough, we are sometimes told that all would be well if science and technology would take a supplementary course in the human arts; then the two cultures should become one culture, a fused culture. But I believe that this is a delusive confusion. 'We must realize that between functional thinking and imaginative thinking, there can be no compromise. The lines of these two modes of communication do not ever cross: they are parallel and can never be met,' rightly said Read.<sup>25)</sup>

Any way, what is important is not to continue passively deploring this miserable, fatal division of human ability, but to seek actively for a mode of envisaging the individual's perception of some aspect of universal truth, or a form of unknown thing emerging from the dynamic process between man and nature. Read asserts without reservation that it was Ruskin who proved that 'the greatest work of art is that which holds in perfect balance two opposite principles'; man and tool.<sup>26)</sup> Rightly at this point did Read's task begin as an art critic who found the modern significance in Ruskin's works.

To the question 'Can the machine produce a work of art?', Read finally found an answer in this subtle canon of art formulated by Ruskin; 'All beautiful lines are drawn under mathematical laws organically transgressed.'<sup>27)</sup> And Read himself presents his agreement with Ruskin's precept in almost identical terminology; 'if we are conscious of a law of proportion, and then slightly deviate from it, to avoid its precision, we shall produce a more beautiful effect.'<sup>28)</sup> In his only novel, *The Green Child*, Read tells of it in a more deliberate way; aesthetic pleasure was a perception of the degree of transgression between the artificial form and its natural prototype.<sup>29)</sup> Although Ruskin's rejection to any kind of mechanical ornamentation does not need any more explanation, the penetrative imagination which he regarded as derived from an excellent seeing capacity

makes the impressions from Nature expressible in geometrical terms or abstract relations. 'The Romanesque arch is beautiful as an abstract line. The cylindrical pillar is always beautiful, for God has so moulded the stem of every tree that is pleasant to the eyes.'<sup>30)</sup> From these illustrations we might be able to admit that an abstract element can be some sort of tonic in the organic structure like a vegetative pattern which sometimes reduces itself to self-indulgence in order to attain a subtle balance between formal beauty and vital images. As for any good Romantic, the lack of some dynamic feeling for beauty is the absolute lack. It was true that Read had been greatly influenced by Ruskin, and especially by Morris, who rejected any kind of capitalistic economy. But Read says that 'we must not scrap our machinery, but perfect and control it; we must not assume that art and machinery are mutually exclusive.'<sup>31)</sup> This is the main theme Read developed in *Art and Industry* where he sought for a *new* art which would reconcile the opposition of organic vitality to mathematical law dialectically.

As I have already argued, art is a biological, spontaneous activity accompanied by joy and satisfaction, deriving energy from nature, so that we can neither prevent it from developing according to its inner coherence, nor impose from without any discipline like a classical ideal of perfection. In 'The Nature of Gothic' Ruskin attacked the character of classical architecture in the Renaissance period because it demanded that everything should follow a rigid predetermined law. He condemns such a demand for any kind of perfection, which he sees as the restless requirement for preciseness and as a sign of a misunderstanding of the end of art which has persisted since the age of the Renaissance. 'To banish imperfection is to destroy expression, to check exertion and to paralyze the vitality of imagination.'<sup>32)</sup> Of course, there is no hope of any creative style. Read often refers to the process of the development of Gothic style in architecture as a typical one to illustrate the process of the integration of cultures, borrowing the passages of Ruth Benedict.

The process of its integration is instinctive and can be described only by using animistic forms of expression as if there were choice and purpose in the growth of their great art-form. But this is due to the difficulty in our language-forms. There was no conscious choice, and no purpose.<sup>33)</sup>

As the plant needs the properly balanced elements of nature, the environment of art also needs the organic diversity, multiformity and imperfection which alone cultivate the subtle values produced in the moment of dialectical synthesis of varieties. The artist and nature correspond to 'the husk and the seed, the shell and the kernel.'<sup>34)</sup> It is an unconscious growth, and is killed by rationalization. The forms of art are only significant in so far as they are transformed by the sensibility of the artist whose mind is free and whose vision emerges according to the formal necessity within his own psyche identified with natural prototype. There is a principle of life, of creation, of liberation, and that is the romantic spirit. Read often uses the metaphor of the tree to illustrate the genuine relationship between the artist and the nature. The artist is regarded as the

trunk of the tree, gathering vitality from the soil, from the depths, and transmitting it to the crown of the tree, which is beauty. This is why Read calls an artistic activity 'biological necessity' or 'teleological',<sup>35)</sup> and its purpose is to determine the nature of the process of life and the place of our human existence in that total process. As Ruskin's success in *Modern Painters* was exclusively attributed to the existence of a genius, J. M. W. Turner, Read owes the formulation of his theories of modern art to the sculptures by Henry Moore whose eye has been directed to a moment of achieved equilibrium between artist and nature, between his mind or psyche and the external world. His sculpture is associational to nature in its purpose and content, by which he implies that its form is determined by the archetypal images evolved through human history. Only in this sense, is he worthy to be described as visionary and symbolical.

Ruskin's definitions of the spirit of Gothic art are filled with contradictions and alternatives which should ultimately be attributed to the greatness of his work. It is because, like a growing plant, Ruskin's theory develops in relation to certain discernible axes which seem unsystematic or illogical, but are always persistent and living. This is why we should take him as a whole. For example, 'the best architecture should be the expression of the mind of manhood by the hand of child. To attain the level of transparent monotony, he claims that 'the subtle true relation of monotony and changefulness whose disease, love of change, destroys the healthy of architecture' is needed. Here is another passage to describe the paradoxical truth of *changefulness*. The work of Gothic 'must pass on, sleeplessly, until its love of change shall be pacified for ever in the change that must come alike on them that awake and them that sleep.' To appreciate the unique quality of Gothic art, that is, *savageness*, 'the richness of Gothic should come from the rudeness and at the same time from refinement.' 'The best Gothic building is not that which is most Gothic.'<sup>36)</sup> The last one sounds enigmatic, or even ironical. However, these paradoxical elements of Gothic art are nothing but the proof that the art is alive in its essence. Presumably, the characterization of *Naturalists* who embody the spirit of Gothic art is the ideal embodiment of all kinds of the creative synthesis of two opposites like *Sensualists* and *Purists*. The most symbolic meaning of *Naturalists* is to be found in the expression of the vegetative life of living foliage, which, subject to the rule of universal phenomena, never loses its inspiration and energy for fresh liberty. All these references to 'The Nature of Gothic' look like a sort of word-play in rather simple terms and above all account for the eclectic origin of Ruskin's theories, but if we try to survey the whole trace of evolution of his ideas, we find that they rightly indicate the essential nature of Gothic art, which should be found in its capacity to create a synthetic and self-consistent world—in Read's words, 'a world which is neither the world of practical needs and desires, nor the world of dreams and fantasy, but a world compounded of these contradictions : a convincing representation of the totality of experience.'<sup>37)</sup>

In a sense, the energy of Gothic art may be a sort of liberty under a control which makes the existence of the artist impersonal so that he may be a channel or medium to nature. Now it can be said that we have come to the very creed of romantic organ-

icism; that is, the paradox of a subjective world, the content of which might be held to have an objectivity as aesthetic value. The images which the artist creates out of the subjective experiences may in their effect be objective and represent the values that are impersonal or absolute. Any kind of impersonal art implies a surrender of personality and all desires which seek for the aggrandisement of the self and emotion. The artist himself is there not to express his idea about the universe, nor to record his wayward emotion, but rather to embody a universal or archetypal image. The pattern of foliage in Gothic art is an good example of the paradoxical expression of vitality. Its impersonal features are exact in retaining an impersonal sublimity, while the figures are infused with vitality and express a certain sense of movement. Read points out that the draperies are formal, but serve to emphasize this sense of vigour. 'The foliage form itself is a kind of liberty of the press.'<sup>38)</sup>

As I already mentioned, Read re-evaluated the nature of the geometrical abstraction in Gothic art, which is indispensable as a proper control of rude emotion just to animate the art, as long as the forms do not fall into too rational and spiritless abstraction. But this does not mean that Read is indifferent to the organic form of nature. Contrarily, he thinks that the new art should always draw its inspiration from the direct observation of nature so as to reserve energy for the fresh sentiment of an age, while the close observation of naturalistic motives should be combined with a formal conception of design.

The practice of art enables us to establish an active and pragmatic relationship between the self and the external world. This is also a movement from separation to sharedness. In the words of Joanna Field, who describes the progress to wholeness found in a creative activity is described as follows:

To be able to break down the barrier of space between self and other, yet at the same time to be able to maintain it, this seems to be the paradox of creativity.<sup>39)</sup>

Art has its necessary connections with all kinds of social factors at any period, and at the same time it contributes in its own right to the process of the integration of personality. At first, art begins as a solitary activity of one artist, but in so far as the artist recognizes and absorbs the experiences with society where he is living, his art is woven into the social fabric. The individual does not work in a vacuum. Actually, in the very step of achieving the integration of the personality, I believe, we should at the same time solve the problem of our social integration. The true values of culture will depend on the delicacy with which the relationship between the artist and the society is adjusted. It is like a spark springing, at the right moment, between the two opposite poles, one of which is the individual, the other the society. Herein lies one of the basic paradoxes of human existence; art is the pattern evolved in a complex interplay of personal and societal processes of adjustment. And the whole complexity of our problem arises from the fact that the artist is dependent on the community not only in the obvious economic sense, but in a sense that is far subtler and waiting for psycholo-

logical analysis. A society in which every man would be an artist of some sort with the responsibility for the creation of art would necessarily be a society associated in a single creative enterprise, because, in such a society, the arts are good and living.

Notes :

Notes on Ruskin's works consisting of volume and page numbers refer to *The Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and A. Wedderburn (Library Edition, 39 Vols., London, George Allen, 1903-12).

- 1) *The Works of Ruskin*, V. XV, p. 27.
- 2) *Ibid.*, V. X, p. 196.
- 3) Clark, Kenneth, *The Gothic Revival*, (John Murray, 1975), p. 139.
- 4) Read, Herbert, *Annals of Innocence and Experience*, (London, Faber & Faber, 1946), p. 213.
- 5) ——— *The Philosophy of Modern Art*, (London, Faber & Faber, 1977), p. 87.
- 6) ——— *Annals of Innocence and Experience*, p. 213.
- 7) *Loc. cit.*
- 8) Read, Herbert, *The Philosophy of Modern Art*, p. 81.
- 9) *The Works of Ruskin*, V. XX, p. 39.
- 10) Read, Herbert, *English Stained Glass*, (London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926), p. 14.
- 11) *Herbert Read: A Memorial Symposium*, ed. Robin Skelton (London, Methuen & Co Ltd, 1970), p. 117.
- 12) Read, Herbert, *The Contrary Experience*, (London, Faber & Faber, 1963), p. 342.
- 13) ——— *Art and Industry*, (London, Faber & Faber, 1966), p. 47.
- 14) *The Works of Ruskin*, V. IV, p. 64.
- 15) ——— V. X, p. 192.
- 16) *Ibid.*, p. 200.
- 17) Read, Herbert, *Art and Industry*, p. 15.
- 18) *The Works of Ruskin*, V. XX, p. 39.
- 19) ——— V. X, p. 460.
- 20) Williams, Raymond, *Culture and Society 1780-1950*, (Penguin Books, 1977), p. 256.
- 21) Cook, E. T. *The Life of John Ruskin*, Vol. 1 (London, George Allen & Co., 1911), p. 263.
- 22) Read, Herbert, *Art and Industry*, p. 12.
- 23) ——— *The Contrary Experience*, p. 348.
- 24) *The Works of Ruskin*, V. X, p. 192.
- 25) Read, Herbert, *Art and Industry*, p. 15.
- 26) *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- 27) *Ibid.*, p. 36.
- 28) *Loc. cit.*
- 29) Read, Herbert, *The Green Child*, (London, Grey Walls Press, 1945), p. 173.
- 30) *The Works of Ruskin*, V. VIII, p. 140.
- 31) Read, Herbert, *Annals of Innocence and Experience*, p. 214.
- 32) *The Works of Ruskin*, V. X, pp. 203-4.
- 33) Benedict, Ruth, *Patterns of Culture*, (Sentry Edition, 1959), pp. 47-8.
- 34) Read, Herbert, *The Philosophy of Modern Art*, p. 108.
- 35) ——— *Art and Industry*, p. 30.
- 36) *The Works of Ruskin*, V. X, pp. 180-242.
- 37) Read, Herbert, *Art and Society*, p. 2.
- 38) ——— *English Stained Glass*, p. 27.

39) Field, Joanna, *On Not Being Able To Paint*, (London, Heinemann, 1950), p. 165.

(本稿は、科学研究費補助金（一般研究B）による研究分担の成果の一部とする。)