

Avant-Quotation

Imitation, Conventionalisation and Postmodern Practices of Reference

Elizabeth M. Keslacy

University of Michigan

Abstract

Quotation has often been used to describe design strategies in architecture involving historical references. However, given the linguistic origins of the concept and the difficulty in precisely translating it into visual and formal terms, is it accurate to use quotation in the context of architecture? Considering two forms of late 20th century design that could be described by the term "quotation" - the ironic PoMo of Charles Moore and the straight revivalism of Allan Greenberg - this paper looks to earlier paradigms of visual repetition in search of more accurate models. Specifically, I draw upon the 19th century design-theoretical debates over imitation and conventionalisation to unpack the visual and formal strategies that we today describe as quotation. By interrogating these strategies in terms of authorship and fidelity to the original, the types and specificity of their referents, and the visual coherence of their re-presentation, I will argue that imitation and conventionalisation provide insight into the operations of revivalism and PoMo that quotation does not.

Quotation occupies a strange status in architecture. A wide range of visual and spatial phenomena have been colloquially described as quotation, and quotation is widely understood as a design strategy central to Postmodernism. And yet, few Postmodernists utilised the term to describe their own work, and the most astute architectural critic of that moment - Charles Jencks - did not address the term in his period-defining book, *The Language of Postmodern Architecture* (1977). He certainly could have. Quotation would have been at home alongside other linguistic and literary concepts such as metaphor, words, syntactics and semantics that Jencks argued were the primary mechanisms of Postmodern architectural meaning-making.

On the contrary, quotation is a term that we now project backwards to understand certain historical architectural operations. Quotation is part of a constellation of borrowed terms that we use to understand modes of reference in architecture, including citation, allusion, paraphrase, parody, pastiche, and copy. Each of them describes some way of making connections between the work at hand and something else - a specific text, an author's oeuvre, a style, a genre, a figure, an idea, or simply a general sense of "past-ness". Some of these terms emphasise the *content* that is transferred by bringing *that* into *this*, while others instead foreground the *form* of the connection between original and repetition.

These terms do not come to us from visual or artistic practices, but are rather appropriated from disciplines of natural language, such as linguistics, literary theory and rhetoric. While 'allusion' and 'reference' are softer, more ambiguous modes of connecting one text with another, a quotation is a direct, attributed, repetition of a specific, existing piece of authored text. Of all the devices used to link texts or works together, quotation is the least subtle and the most immediate. Rather than gesture in the general direction of a figure, an idea, or a particular work, quotation wrests a discrete chunk of text from its source to repeat it, unaltered but recontextualised.



Figure 1 (left). Charles Moore and Perez Architects, Piazza d'Italia, New Orleans, LA (1978). Photo by joevare, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/joevare/5731561311>. Licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 2.0. **Figure 2 (right).** Allan Greenberg Architect, Treaty Room, US Department of State, Washington, D.C. (1986). Photography by Richard Cheek, Courtesy of the Diplomatic Reception Rooms, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

There are at least two modes of Postmodern architectural production that have been described by the term 'quotation.' First, it has been used to describe the well-known ironic designs of Charles Moore, whose work utilised both Mannerist strategies of gaming with the classical language alongside the low-brow playfulness of pop art. His Piazza d'Italia in New Orleans (1978) referenced triumphal arches, Roman fountains, and the classical orders, rendering them in neon, stainless steel, and water jets. [Fig. 1] The project included a "sixth order" Moore cheekily termed the "Deli Order". Secondly,

quotation could also aptly describe the classical revivalists of the 1980s, such as the American architect Allan Greenberg. In the Treaty Room of the US Department of State (1986), Greenberg borrowed freely from many classical periods, mixing details from antiquity, the Renaissance, and Neo-Classical architecture. [Fig. 2] He also employed two highly recognisable and specific references. First, the oval plan and paired columns is a clear nod to the Marmorsaal at Sanssouci in Potsdam (designed by Wenzeslaus von Knobelsdorff 1745-1747). Secondly, the Treaty Room's parquet floor repeats Michelangelo's spiraling diamond paving pattern for the Piazza del Campidoglio.

Neither Moore nor Greenberg repeated historical forms with the precision of a textual quotation. However, given the widespread colloquial use of the term, it is important to explore the degree to which we can understand both strategies as forms of quotation. To do so, it is useful to turn to two related models of reference and repetition that, I will argue, shed light on their architectural operations: that is, the nineteenth century concepts of imitation and conventionalisation. These ideas, locked in a design-theoretical debate for over half a century, addressed many of the same questions that plague us regarding quotation: What are the procedures and visual/formal strategies of making reference? What are the proper or acceptable sources for such references? What is the relationship between old and new, or between original and copy, that these strategies construct? Imitation and conventionalisation are useful for this inquiry particularly because they are *visual* or *artistic* modes of repetition, rather than stemming from linguistic or literary origins.

Ultimately, imitation and conventionalisation will explain, by analogy, how we might understand Postmodern irony and earnest revivalism of the 1970s and 1980s as two distinct forms of architectural quotation. Each of them are forms of pastiche, bringing together multiple references or quotations, but they employ different aesthetics to either highlight that assemblage (in the case of PoMo) or to smooth over difference, creating an image of coherence or wholeness (in the case of revivalism). To begin, I will trace the histories of imitation and conventionalisation and articulate the terms of the debate between them as strategies of producing design. Then, I will return to the two modes of postmodern quotation to show how imitation and conventionalisation articulate the operations of revivalism and ironic Postmodernism with a high degree of precision.

Imitation and Conventionalisation

Unlike quotation's straightforward operation of repetition, imitation and conventionalisation provide alternative, more complex, models for the utilisation of historical or natural forms. The nineteenth century debate between them raised a series of questions that mirror some of the issues. These include *ethical* questions about the forms of truth and falsehood they perpetrated, *historical* questions about the authority of tradition, *normative* questions about the propriety of realism and abstraction in various contexts, and *disciplinary* questions about how to weight disciplinary rules and concerns with broader cultural aims for art and architecture.

Imitation in art has been a subject of discussion and debate as far back as antiquity, when debate centered around ethical questions of artistic veracity. In Book X of the *Republic*, Plato disparaged the visual artist as a "craftsman of the image" who bears no deep knowledge of his or her subjects, grasping only appearances and forsaking truth for illusion.¹ Plato dismissed even the skill and taste of the artist employed in producing that illusion, arguing that it was philosophically equivalent to the reflections of a mirror. Not all ancient thinkers shared this attitude. Plotinus, for example, argued that artists do not always imitate appearances but often imitate the ideal form of their subjects, suggesting that artworks maintain a closer relationship to the truth of the real than admitted by Plato.² Further, he argued that it was not the model that determined the representation, but rather the artist's skill and choices, rejecting Plato's equivalence of art and mere reflection in recognition of the artist's agency and creativity.

It was not until Dionysius of Halicarnassus, however, that the debates around imitation shifted from the relationship of art to nature/world to its relationship with other authored works, raising new questions about the authority of tradition. Specifically addressing the realms of poetry and rhetoric, Dionysius (and Quintilian after him) argued for the necessity of imitating great authors and works, particularly in terms of their style and even turns of phrase.³ This version of imitation was less about quoting individual authors, but rather absorbing and repeating the best qualities of many.⁴ While this argument was rooted in a belief in the authority of the canon and a turn to emulation as the best source of instruction for budding authors, it did for the first time acknowledge imitation as an intertextual and discursive practice that establishes relationships between works and one that recognises human production (as opposed to divine) as a legitimate subject of imitation.

The nineteenth century discourse on imitation left Dionysian innovations aside to refocus on art's relationship to world, particularly to nature. Many early nineteenth century design theorists viewed the imitation of nature as art's highest calling, born of emotionally moving impressions of the world and an innate artistic drive to recreate and represent those experiences.⁵ Doctrines of imitation insisted that art reflect reality - this could be an everyday reality, an idealised reality, or even unreal or future-oriented imaginings realistically rendered. Imitation required a continuity between art and reality, and prohibited works that might ultimately challenge the security of the viewer's perception of the world.

Few theorists argued for the mechanical replication of nature. In his 1823 *Essai sur la nature, le but et les moyens de l'imitation dans les beaux-arts* (published in English in 1837 as *An essay on the nature, the end, and the means of imitation in the fine arts*), Quatrèmere de Quincy tried to reconcile ethical considerations with disciplinary ones, balancing the interests of truth with the nature of artistic media. In it, Quatrèmere defined imitation as the production of an artistic image manifesting as close a resemblance to reality as possible while still acknowledging its artifice. Distinguishing imitative art from the mechanical reproduction of self-similar objects, Quatrèmere noted a paradox particular to imitation: while the imitative arts strove to reproduce nature's appearance as closely as possible through the representational means of each particular art form, the pleasure of the imitation rested on the knowledge that a work was indeed a representation rather than the real thing. Imitations thus represented the appearance of the real, relying upon art's "fictitious and conventional nature" to engender the "character of appearance" - a character that was constituted by a degree of incompleteness.⁶ That incompleteness resulted from the inability of any medium to convey all characteristics of a subject in its totality, or from its inability to bear the full "presence" of the original as Richard Shiff has described it, but rather imitated only those characteristics aligned with its representational means.⁷ An imitation was thus not a copy, but a way to experience the 'real' and the 'not-real' simultaneously through artistic practices of image making.⁸

In practical terms, doctrines of imitation demanded real subjects, preferably those found in nature. John Ruskin too was an ardent advocate of imitation as an artistic value. But Ruskin's notion of imitation was one that demanded artistic creativity in both the apprehension of the natural model and in its representation. He rejected the unbiased repetition of nature as a crude form of artistic production, and viewed the pleasure taken in deft imitations as coarse and simplistic.⁹ His view was not unlike that of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who likened nature to water - pure, tasteless and neutral, requiring the artist's imagination and creativity in re-presenting it to give it flavor, character, and meaning.¹⁰ For Ruskin, the proper approach to imitation involved both "the observation of fact" and "the manifesting of human design and authority in the way that fact is told".¹¹ Artists utilised an interpretive faculty, according to Ruskin, in translating their apprehensions of nature into a work of art or design. That faculty was strictly limited, however, to the enterprise of realism or the truthful depiction of nature. The improper exercise of the artist's agency was found in what he termed idealism - a formalism that found visual pleasure in the abstract and sensorial experiences of color and line.¹² In criticising "idealism", Ruskin took aim at a widely utilised design strategy in the nineteenth century: conventionalisation.¹³

Conventionalisation was the process by which a natural model was rendered suitable for reproduction in a given material, technique or useful object by abstracting natural form into a graphic, repeatable pattern or motif utilising color and line but eschewing any depth-producing techniques. Figure 3 illustrates the process of conventionalisation, here of the Cineraria plant. At the top, we see a pictorially rendered specimen flanked by shaded renderings of its leaves and flowers. These are imperfect and happenstance, as the plant would be found in nature. At the bottom of the page, orthographic outlines of the leaves and flowers are arranged into figure-ground or silhouette patterns, with a serial arrangement on the left and a radial arrangement on the right. At the center of the page is a more elaborate radial pattern that utilises outlines of the plant's elements but omits its surface detail in the infill. That natural detail is replaced by diaper or geometric patterns whose tonal differentiation is suggestive of the color palettes that might be applied to it.




Figure 3. “Botanical analysis of the cineraria - a study in conventionalisation. Drawn by Miss Phoebe E. Curtis, a pupil of Mrs. Cory’s ‘School of Industrial Arts for Women.’” The cineraria is shown pictorially (top), conventionalised into a complex radial pattern (centre), and into linear and radial figure-ground patterns (bottom).
From *The Decorator and Furnisher* 1 2 (1882) p. 55.

American educator and activist Marion Foster Washburne described the procedure of conventionalising natural form as one of flattening, simplification and symmetrical arrangement, creating a pattern or field.¹⁴ An unsigned November 1882 article in *The Decorator and Furnisher* echoed Washburne’s sentiment, suggesting that conventionalisation involved the analysis of a natural form and “such a re-arrangement of its various features, as will present it in *flat* form, and thus permit it to be applied to flat ornamentation in a strictly proper and artistic manner”.¹⁵ The visual flatness of the ornament was an important corollary to the actual flatness or smoothness of the textile, paper, object or wall to which it would be applied. To render depth in these instances, whether visually (through shading) or actually (through relief) was considered to be inappropriate and deceitful.

If the classical notion of imitation sought to reveal the truth of nature, then conventionalisation asserted a competing truth value, the truth of the material, fabrication technique, and function of the object that bore the ornament. Indeed, conventionalisation explicitly privileged the ornament’s destination - both the immediate material or object to which it was applied as well as the context of the interior that formed its site - such that some characteristics of the natural model had to be tempered and actively edited to be rendered suitable as decoration.¹⁶

British artist, designer and educator Richard Redgrave pointed out an important part of the process of conventionalisation: the intermediate step between observation and design that he described as ‘analysis’. Figure 4, from Redgrave’s 1876 *Manual of Design*, depicts a *Sonchus* or sow thistle to illustrate the process of analysis as a translation from a pictorial to an idealised rendering. The drawing on the left depicts how a specimen might appear as encountered in nature. The plant is asymmetrical, it is rendered with the shadows of an incident sun, its buds and flowers are all shown at the same early stage of development suggesting that the artist encountered it somewhat early in the growing season, and its leaves are depicted in an oblique perspectival view, disallowing a clear understanding of their morphology. On the right, Redgrave presents an idealised version of the *Sonchus*, one that is not yet distributed into a regular pattern or stylised for a particular material or technical application. This intermediate step in the conventionalisation process, however, accomplishes a number of things: it depicts three stages of the flower’s lifespan, from bud to bloom to fade; the leaves and the buds are rendered orthographically rather than perspectively, presenting a more “objective” view that allows the artist to more accurately articulate the plant’s particular features; finally the symmetrical and shadow-less arrangement communicates that this is not an *actual* plant encountered by the artist, but an idealised version that presents its characteristic forms, relationships between its parts, and internal principles of growth. Charles Alfred Barry conveyed a similar sentiment when he described conventionalisation as the reproduction of “*general forms*”, achieved by omitting “irregularities”.¹⁷




Figure 4. *Sonchus* or sow thistle, show pictorially at left, and in an idealised state on the right. From Richard Redgrave, *Manual of Design*. South Kensington Museum Art Handbooks, No. 6. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong, 1876. pp 166-167.

The British decorative artist and educator Lewis Foreman Day articulated well what was at stake in the debate between imitation and conventionalisation. For him, the “rusticity” of realistic imitation and the “artificiality” of abstraction engendered two representational extremes that ornamentists had to negotiate. On one hand, the artist risked the “literalism” of the copy, which denied the agency of the artist’s imagination, and on the other, she hazarded idiosyncrasy and affectation by venturing too far away from the natural model.¹⁸ The middle road, conventionalisation, allowed for both continuity and surprise, both familiarity and novelty. Against the pictorialism required by imitation, conventionalisation allowed for abstraction and for the development of compositional devices unrelated to subject matter, e.g. diapering, radial and linear patterns, and non-representational elements like borders. Conventionalised ornament thus required its own principles and techniques distinct from those of its natural models, and thus asserted the value of disciplinary knowledge and artistic creativity independent from the source of its motifs.

At root, the debate between imitation and conventionalisation centered on whether art could have interests that were independent and self-reflexive, or whether it must work in the service of a larger cultural or moral aim. John Ruskin, arguing for the latter, asserted that

Wherever art is practiced for its own sake, and the delight of the workman is in what he *does* and *produces*, instead of what he *interprets* or *exhibits*,--there art has an influence of the most fatal kind on brain and heart, and it issues, if long so pursued, in the *destruction both of intellectual power and moral principle*; whereas art, devoted humbly and self-forgetfully to the clear statement and record of the facts of the universe, is always helpful and beneficent to mankind, full of comfort, strength and salvation.¹⁹

For advocates of imitation, then, art was truthful when it supported rather than challenged the viewer's existing visual understanding of the world. Conventionalists, in contrast, viewed nature as an important starting point, as one of many possible sources, and as something whose 'perfection' had to be *constructed* in order to render it suitable for its destination.

Revisiting Postmodern Quotation

To return to our two examples of Postmodern quotation, Greenberg's Treaty Room and Moore's Piazza d'Italia, the question remains whether quotation is indeed the right term to describe them, or whether imitation and conventionalisation don't offer a more carefully calibrated comparison.

Part of the problem lies in the real difficulty of utilising the language-based concept of quotation to describe a visual phenomenon. Although we have models for how to understand the translation of quotation from the linguistic to the architectonic realm, courtesy of Charles Jencks and his contemporaries George Baird, Geoffrey Broadbent and Mario Gandelsonas, these remain metaphorical owing to the real differences between natural and architectural language. Three of these differences are particularly important in understanding the intransigence of quotation: the first has to do with the centrality of the author to quotation; the second can be found in the differing nature of form and content in text and building; and finally, to borrow from Walter Benjamin, they maintain differing loci of authenticity and aura.

To unpack these three differences a bit more, I'll go through them one by one. A quotation, in modern usage, must acknowledge its source, particularly its author. An unattributed quote is, in the journalistic realm, suspect. In the academic realm, an unacknowledged quote is heresy - an instance of plagiarism. Quotes may be attributed to "Anonymous" or even to "Source Unknown", but quotation admits, by its very definition, an origin that is an individual author. The question of authorship is infinitely more complex in architecture, owing to shared styles and codified languages, the proliferation of mass-produced elements, the increased engagement with vernacular forms, understood to be unauthored, and the difficulty in attributing a particular form or detail to an individual architect or built work for all but the connoisseur or specialist. When Moore or Greenberg utilise the Corinthian column, how many can tell which version from history they are using, and which architect designed it? And is that authorial attribution important to its meaning?

Second, with respect to the form/content distinction, the *form* of a textual quotation - i.e. written language - is always perfectly preserved from origin to copy. A quote is the perfect reproduction of pure content, and admits of no deviation. In contrast, form and content is not nearly so neatly separable in architecture and other visuo-formal media. Indeed, the form and the materiality of media are often central to the content that an element or a building can be said to have. To repeat a form in a different material, at a different scale, surrounded by different elements or in a new context is to perform a different act than the exact repetition required by the practice of quotation. In other words, what does it mean to render a Doric column in chrome? What does it mean to repeat Michelangelo's paving pattern for the Campidoglio in the symbolic spaces of American diplomacy?

Finally, the notions of authenticity and the aura taken from the discourse of art reveals incompatibilities between textual and architectural quotation. The authenticity or aura of an aesthetic or literary text does not reside in any original, material substrate, but rather in the unique construction of the phrase, sentence, paragraph, chapter or work by an individual author. Unlike the work of art, whose aura is threatened in the process of mechanical reproduction, no amount of repetition can diminish the value of a text - and might be said even to increase it. Conversely, the scale of architecture is one that resists mechanical reproduction, such that every building seems to maintain its own aura, no matter what its relationship to a previous model or the ubiquity of its elements. Architectural authenticity is not vested in an original produced by the artist's own hand, but rather imbued in a building by virtue of its material reality and the embodied experience it sustains. Ultimately, unlike a text which is pure communication, a work of architecture is both immediate and mediated - it is both real object and representation, both phenomenological and semiotic, both experiential and conceptual. Given this condition, how does one weigh Greenberg's reference to Sansouci against the unusual spatial, visual and acoustic experience of an oval room?

Given the difficulties in translating the concept of quotation from natural language to architectural form, the paradigms of imitation and conventionalisation provide a useful alternative. Just as imitation requires a pictorial and realist rendering of nature, so too does revivalism produce an image of classicism that appears to reproduce it "truthfully". The fact that revivalist design is rendered in different materials, fabrication techniques, contexts and uses than its historical antecedents notwithstanding, the perception and experience of Greenberg's Treaty Room is intended to be visually continuous with previous forms of classicism and appears to follow its rules of proportion, order and ornamentation. Few visitors to the room would recognise its diverse references, and even if they did, there's no clear story being told in their amalgamation. What does one get in combining a reception room from the country retreat of a Prussian King with the Papal commission of a Roman urban design, the paving pattern for which was not actually implemented until 1940 by Mussolini? The only connection seems to be their geometry - the oval. More importantly, the visual coherence of the design does not draw attention to itself as a bearer of multiple references, but rather treats its multiple quotations with the evenhandedness of a single "truth". In other words, these imitations or references are rendered in such a way that does not appear "representational", but rather does so in a manner that corresponds with our existing impressions of classicism, or what I would argue is a high degree of realism or pictoriality. Just as imitation insists on a high degree of fidelity to its source or original, so too does Greenberg provide the *image* of fidelity to the classical tradition even as it assembles the design from multiple unrelated sources.

Moore's Piazza d'Italia, on the other hand, utilises many of the design strategies found in conventionalisation. While it draws upon the same general source as Greenberg - the classical tradition - it does not reproduce that source faithfully, but rather modifies its elements in response to a new context and in new materials. For example, both the Treaty Room and the Piazza employ cable-fluted columns. While Greenberg employs them in their traditional form, and highlights the cables with gold leaf, Moore renders the cables with water jets. Similarly, while Greenberg's Corinthian column capitals are largely orthodox versions, excepting the inclusion of the State Department Seal (which is in keeping with tradition established in the late 17th century), Moore reimagines them in faceted chrome in response to the physical qualities of steel plate. Moore's project also spatialises the classical order in an unorthodox way. While traditionally the orders are combined through stacking, the heavier Doric supporting the lighter Ionic, and so on, Moore layers them radially with the heaviest and least detailed Etruscan (or a version thereof) in the inner-most ring of the plan and with the composite and "Deli" orders at the outermost ring.

While Moore's design does not recall particular precedents with the specificity that Greenberg's Treaty Room does, it is easy to see echoes of Bernard Maybeck's Palace of Fine Arts and the

QUOTATION: What does history have in store for architecture today?

Maritime Theatre at Hadrian's Villa in the Piazza d'Italia's semi-circular colonnades, and of the Trevi Fountain in the arched proscenium-like structure that forms the fountain's visual terminus. In many ways, these references are more congruous with the Piazza's program than are Greenberg's, insofar as they are each fountains or water features in a public or leisure space. But most importantly, through strategies of flattening, outline, and abstraction - those used to conventionalise nature into ornament - the Piazza d'Italia presents itself as both a real thing/place *and* a representation of something else. The graphic, outlined nature of the column bases, the arch and keystone, and even the map of Italy rendered in black and white contours of stone in plan - all of these signal the conscious and intentional connection between Moore's project and its referents, producing a design that owes as much to its sources as it does to Moore's innovations and modifications of those sources.

Both Greenberg's Treaty Room and Moore's Piazza draw upon multiple, unrelated sources, and we have used the term "quotation" loosely to refer to that borrowing. However, what those architects *do* with that source material, how they are assembled and re-presented, is an equally important part of the equation. Imitation and conventionalisation help to distinguish between the revivalist strategy - that suppresses the tactics of pastiche utilised in the design process - and the PoMo strategy - that celebrates and emphasises them.

Endnotes

- ¹ Plato and C. D. C. Reeve, *Republic*, Republic.English (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 2004). 302.
- ² Audrey N. M. Rich, "Plotinus and the Theory of Artistic Imitation", *Mnemosyne* 13, no. 3 (1960). 235.
- ³ K. K. Ruthven, *Critical Assumptions* (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979). 103.
- ⁴ D.A. Russel, "De Imitatione", in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, ed. David West and Tony Woodman (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979). 5.
- ⁵ For example, see Benjamin Robert Haydon, *Lectures on Painting and Design* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1844). 7-8.
- ⁶ Quincy Quatremère de, *An Essay on the Nature, the End, and the Means of Imitation in the Fine Arts*, trans. J. C. Kent (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1837). 22.
- ⁷ Richard Shiff, "Representation, Copying, and the Technique of Originality", *New Literary History* 15, no. 2 (1984). 334.
- ⁸ Nineteenth century design theory was filled with distinctions made between imitations and copies. Thomas Leverton Donaldson voiced a typical formulation: "He, who copies, is bound by the letter of the original. He, who imitates, is bound only by the spirit and essence of the type: for in copying is not the most exact copy the best? but to copy is not to create, and true originality does not consist merely in variation. [...] To copy is the instinct of the mere animal faculty; to imitate is the property of reasoning intelligence". Thomas Leverton Donaldson, *Architectural Maxims and Theorems in Elucidation of Some of the Principles of Design and Construction: And Lecture on the Education and Character of the Architect* (London: Pub. for the author by J. Weale [etc.], 1847). 33-34.
- ⁹ John Ruskin, *Modern Painters* (New York: J. Wiley, 1848). 18-19.
- ¹⁰ Samuel Taylor Coleridge, "On Poesy or Art", in *The Literary Remains* (New York: Harper, 1853). 229.
- ¹¹ John Ruskin, "The Deteriorative Power of Conventional Art over Nations", in *The Two Paths: Being Lectures on Art, and Its Application to Decoration and Manufacture* (New York: Wiley, 1879). 24.
- ¹² "The Unity of Art", in *The Two Paths: Being Lectures on Art, and Its Application to Decoration and Manufacture* (New York: Wiley, 1879). 65.
- ¹³ He viewed conventionalization as unethical in representational art forms and grudgingly necessary in industrial art. For Ruskin, conventionalized ornament and the types of decorative and industrial arts that required it were subordinate both visually and conceptually to the representational fine arts, and permitted only when its objects were not central to an aesthetic experience. In one essay, Ruskin outlined the situations in which conventionalized decoration was permitted: when materials were unable to accommodate accurate depiction, when the viewing conditions did not permit appreciation of fine work, and when decoration was applied to a subordinate element designed to highlight another work that was the primary focus, as in a picture frame. "Modern Manufacture and Design". 85.
- ¹⁴ Marion Foster Washburne, "Conventionalization in Design", *The Decorator and Furnisher* 10, no. 5 (1887). 161.
- ¹⁵ "The Conventional", *The Decorator and Furnisher*, 1, no. 2 (1882).
- ¹⁶ As Washburne notes, "A conventional design is one in which the beautiful forms of natural objects, principally flowers, are utilized, and the relief and natural coloring, which are rarely quiet enough for a wall, left out". "Conventionalization in Design", *The Decorator and Furnisher*, 10, no. 5 (1887). 161.
- ¹⁷ Charles Alfred Barry, *Primer of Design* (Boston, New York: Lee and Shepard; C.T. Dillingham, 1878). 42.
- ¹⁸ Lewis F. Day, *Nature in Ornament*, Text Books of Ornamental Design. (London: B.T. Batsford, 1892). 2-3.
- ¹⁹ Ruskin, "The Deteriorative Power of Conventional Art over Nations". 22-23.