

# The Influence of Transcendentalism on American Organic Architectural Theory

SCOTT GARTNER  
Virginia Tech

## THE ORGANIC IDEAL

The term 'organic architecture' is most frequently associated with the theory and work of Louis I. Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright. In organic architecture, as understood by them, the outward, visible form of a building must be the *expression* of an inner generative principle. It is this principle that gives the building its formal coherence and its harmony with the natural and social environment s.

As a critical theory, the concept of organic expression opposes 'organic' to 'mechanic' form. In Samuel Taylor Coleridge's influential definition,

The form is mechanic, when on any given material we impress a pre-determined form, not necessarily arising out of the properties of the material;— as when to a mass of wet clay we give whatever shape we wish it to retain when hardened. The organic form, on the other hand, is innate; it shapes, as it developes, itself from within, and the fulness of its development is one and the same with the perfection of its outward form. Such as the life is, such is the form.<sup>1</sup>

In the theory of Sullivan and Wright, the organic principle supported their argument for greater attention to the particularities of function, material, and site in the design of buildings. Sullivan's famous dictum, "form follows function," is, at one level, a formulation of a functional and structural rationalism, and so takes its place with similar tendencies in early modern architecture. For both Wright and Sullivan, however, organic architecture embodied a more profound interrelationship between the works of man and the whole of nature. There is, operating within nature and the human soul, a vital governing spirit. The goal of organic

architecture—its higher function, so to speak—is to bring building, and the human life it shelters, into harmony with the *spirit* of nature. As one part of a vital organic whole, such works are conceived, in some sense, to be alive. Writing in *Kindergarten Chats* (1918), Louis Sullivan stated that a great work of art "must be an organism—that is, possessed of a life of its own . . . which finds its variations in expression in the variations of its main function, and in the consequent, continuous, systematic variations in form, as the organic complexity of expression unfolds." This idea was the antithesis of any notion of art as "the mere setting together of ready-made fragments, parts, or features, the setting together of ready-made ideas, of conventional assumptions."<sup>2</sup> Wright defined organic architecture, in terms that directly recall those of Coleridge, as "an architecture that *develops* from within outward in harmony with the conditions of its being, as distinguished from one that is *applied* from without."<sup>3</sup>

Other writings by the two architects emphasized the coherence and order of their architecture by comparing it to organization of living things. Certain of their statements indicate that at least one aspect of their notion of life was that of something emergent from the special organization of matter. Wright stressed the organizational aspects of living things when he declared that

We cannot conceive life, we do not know what it is, but we can perceive the nature of its consequences and effects. . . . The word [organic] applies to 'living' structure—a structure or concept wherein features or parts are so organized in form and substance as to be, applied to purpose, *integral*. Everything that 'lives' is therefore organic. The inorganic—the 'unorganized'—cannot *live*.<sup>4</sup>

Sullivan wrote in *Kindergarten Chats* that the term organic implies "organism, structure, function, growth, development, form."<sup>5</sup> A little later in the same discussion, Sullivan refines the statement just quoted by claiming that the special organization of living things implies "the initiating pressure of a living force and a resultant structure or mechanism whereby such invisible force is made manifest and operative. The pressure, we call Function: the resultant, Form. Hence the law of function and form discernible throughout nature."<sup>6</sup> It may be thought that this "invisible force" is only a metaphorical manner of describing what is better understood as the complex of environmental forces operating on the development of living forms. There is, however, in their discussions of architecture, the pervasive implication that some unifying and vitalizing force or spirit animates all living things. As Sullivan declared,

behind every form we see there is a vital something or other which we do not see, yet which makes itself visible to us in that very form. In other words, in a state of nature the form exists *because* of the function, and this something behind the form is neither more nor less than a manifestation of what you call the infinite creative spirit, and what I call God.<sup>7</sup>

Sullivan's formulation of the principle of organic architecture, "form follows function," must be understood in the light of the belief that all of nature is unified by an innate spiritual source, which he identified as the "the Function of all functions."<sup>8</sup>

Both architects indicate their belief that the same spirit that animates nature and directs its evolution is also working through the creative processes of the architect. The architect should not only emulate the purposive unity found in organisms, but develop such a unity by merging his creative imagination with the living spirit which is the ultimate source of all natural forms. Sullivan declared that works of art must be "animate with a soul, must have been breathed upon by the spirit and must breathe in turn that spirit." For any work to do so, it must

stand for the actual, vital first-hand experiences of the one who made it, and must represent his deep-down impression not only of physical nature but more especially and necessarily his understanding of the out-working of that *Great Spirit* which makes nature so intelligible to us that it ceases to be a phantasm and becomes a sweet, a superb, a convincing *Reality*.<sup>9</sup>

Wright also emphasized his belief that the life-principle expressed in the growth of organic forms was equally at work in the growth of the human spirit: "A seed in the earth responds to light in expanding to realization of the life-principle, so we respond to this life-light which is within us and gives birth to 'Forms.' The growth of the Seed is a primitive symbol of our own growth, if we say Truth is Light or Love. Man makes a symbol of this light and calls it God."<sup>10</sup>

### ORGANIC EXPRESSION AND ITS CRITICS

When Sigfried Giedion, in *Space, Time and Architecture* (1941), discussed what he called "the urge toward the organic" in modern architecture, he remarked on what he believed to be Wright's inability to explain the term "organic," pointing out that while the concept of an organic architecture was the focus of Wright's entire life's work, his efforts to clarify what he meant by the term were, as he put it, "futile." It is evident, concluded Giedion, that "no explanation was possible in words, that what he meant by organic architecture could be revealed only in his work."<sup>11</sup> The tendency of Giedion and many other twentieth-century critics who followed was to supply that explanation themselves, and sometimes in direct contradiction to what Sullivan and Wright actually wrote in explanation of their organic theory.

For Giedion, the organic was simply the opposing trend to the rational and geometrical in architecture. Organic architecture, in contrast with rational, is unplanned — it grows in a manner analogous to trees. As such, it is one of two chief contrasting approaches to the making of architecture that has been present from earliest times. From this point of view, the concept of an organic architecture, because it lacks definition beyond a vague "trend," has neither history nor theory. Giedion's treatment of Sullivan and Wright's organicism is confined to a discussion of the traits of personality that led them to adopt this approach.

Other critics saw organicism as identical with functionalism. For example, Edward Robert De Zurko advanced a functionalist interpretation of organicism in his *Origins of Functionalist Theory*, published in 1957, the year of Wright's death. Starting with Sullivan's "form follows function" as the basic premise of functionalism, he went on to define functionalist theories as "those which make strict adaptation of form to purpose the basic guiding principle of design and the principal yardstick by which to measure the excellence or the beauty of architecture."<sup>12</sup> De Zurko concluded that the terms organic and functional are synonymous. The use of

“organic” to describe functional buildings is then only a poetic metaphor or analogy, suggested by the adaptation of form to functions present in organisms.

Even some of those more sympathetic to Sullivan’s and Wright’s architecture sometimes failed to understand certain key ideas at the heart of their organicism. The most enthusiastic advocate of organic architecture in Europe after World War II was the Italian historian, Bruno Zevi. His book, *Towards an Organic Architecture* (1950), made a determined effort to establish the architecture of Wright as the central expression of modernism in architecture. Zevi, however, agreed with Giedion in characterizing organicism as more a tendency discoverable in the work of certain architects than a theory or program. In Zevi’s view, organic architecture is ideally void of style and external associations. He warns architects against what he calls the “biological fallacy,” which he dismissed as a metaphorical misreading of architectural forms.<sup>13</sup> Such fallacious thinking, he believed, leads to “expressionism” in architecture, which is, he thought, “a phenomenon of decadence.”<sup>14</sup>

In fact, as has been shown, the organicism of Wright and Sullivan is fundamentally an expressive theory. As summarized by M. H. Abrams in *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (1953), expressive theories are those in which:

A work of art is essentially the internal made external, resulting from a creative process operating under the impulse of feeling, and embodying the combined product of the poet’s perceptions, thoughts, and feelings. The primary source and subject matter of a poem, therefore, are the attributes and actions of the poet’s own mind; or if aspects of the external world, then these only as they are converted from fact to poetry by the feelings and operations of the poet’s mind.<sup>15</sup>

The organic theory of architecture, as developed by Sullivan and Wright, was not a metaphor for functionalism, but an internally consistent set of ideas developed from a well-defined theory of poetic expression. Wright commented, in a review of Hugh Morrison’s *Louis Sullivan: Prophet of Modern Architecture* (1935), that his mentor was “essentially a lyric poet-philosopher interested in the sensuous experience of expressing inner rhythms, evolving a language of his own—his ornament—in which to utter himself: unique among mankind.”<sup>16</sup> It must be remembered that both architects thought of themselves as ‘poets’. Sullivan made this clear for himself when he declared in *Kindergarten Chats* that “the real architect is first, last and all time . . . a poet who uses not words but building materials as

*medium of expression.*”<sup>17</sup> As he wrote in *Kindergarten Chats*:

Seek toward this end: That architecture, its organic forms, its inorganic materials, may respond to your will, to your persuasion, and become the plastic medium whereby you shall express not word-thoughts but building thoughts, and the function then will flow to the minutest details of form in orderly sequence . . . .<sup>18</sup>

## AMERICAN TRANSCENDENTALISM

In 1887, a young Louis Sullivan wrote to Walt Whitman assuring him that he was understood “as you wish to be understood.” Sullivan enclosed a copy of his essay on “Inspiration,” asking the poet for “sympathetic surgery.” In this essay, read before the Western Association of Architects Convention in Chicago the previous year, Sullivan had declared the “vital purpose and significance of art” to be the “attuning” of the form or “rhythmic song” of art to “the rhythms of nature as interpreted by the sympathetic soul.” At its highest, such art reveals a harmonious concurrence of nature and humanity, “sustained and permeated” by a power that manifests itself in the rhythms of life. The hidden workings of this power are not perceptible to the mind, but to the soul by means of a “vital sympathy.”<sup>19</sup>

Statements such as this are evidence of the profound and pervasive influence of American Transcendentalism on Sullivan’s thought. The Transcendentalists drew on a wide variety of contemporary and past sources for many of their most characteristic ideas. They read the poetry and literary criticism of the English and German romantics with great enthusiasm. In addition to contemporary British, French and German scientific and philosophical writers, they also studied the ancient philosophy of Plato, the Stoics, and the Neoplatonists. Many of them developed a keen interest in Indian religion. They were steeped in the heritage of Christian theology and mysticism, and many of their ideas are anticipated by thinkers such as Plotinus, St. Augustine, the Pseudo-Dionysius, John Scotus Erigena, Meister Eckhart, Jacob Böhme, George Fox, Gerrard Winstanley, Emmanuel Swedenborg, Shaftesbury, Henry More and Ralph Cudworth. This venerable tradition of spiritual thought underlies what the American Transcendentalists regarded as their ‘new views’.

The widespread awakening of the intellect that Van Wyck Brooks called the “Flowering of New England,” of which Emerson and the Transcendentalists were the fruit, had been initiated by their father’s generation.

Emerson, the grandson and son of ministers, inherited a humane and liberal religious culture that nourished a life of the mind. Historically, Boston Unitarians saw themselves as the culmination of the great religious and political movement begun by the Protestant Reformation. They saw this movement as the progressive triumph of liberalism and rationality in both secular and religious matters, and with it, the rejection of all irrational elements. When he considered the history of the Reformation, Emerson saw another story: the ongoing struggle to assert the fullness and depth of human spiritual being. "Everywhere the history of religion betrays a tendency to enthusiasm," he wrote, upholding the original meaning of enthusiasm as, literally, the indwelling of a divine spirit. "The rapture of the Moravian and Quietist; the opening of the internal sense of the Word, in the language of the New Jerusalem Church [of the Swedenborgians]; the *revival* of the Calvinistic churches; the *experiences* of the Methodists."<sup>20</sup> To these examples, he added the trances of Socrates, the mystical union of Plotinus with The One, the blinding illumination accompanying the conversion of St. Paul, the theosophical visions of Jacob Böhme, and the 'openings' of George Fox. All are "varying forms of that shudder of awe and delight with which the individual soul always mingles with the universal soul."<sup>21</sup> In his lecture on Martin Luther in 1835, Emerson compared the great reformer and "preacher of Faith" to the religious enthusiasts that he admired, Swedenborg, Madame Guyon, Fox, Böhme. "Each owes all," he wrote, "to the discovery that God must be sought within, not without."<sup>22</sup>

When Emerson published a short essay on "Transcendentalism" in *The Dial* (January 1842), he defiantly acknowledged that Transcendentalism was enthusiastic. In a direct challenge to the Unitarian establishment, which prided itself as the guardian of 'liberal' Christianity, he declared enthusiasm to be truly "the liberal thought of all men of a religious and contemplative habit in other times and countries."<sup>23</sup> Enthusiasm is liberal because it frees the individual soul into awareness of its own essential nature. Present within each individual is a spirit common to all, called by Emerson the *Over-Soul*. Although each of us lives as though we were distinct and separate beings, from each other, and from nature, there is nevertheless within us what Emerson described as the "soul of the whole; the wise silence; the universal beauty, to which every part and particle is equally related; the eternal ONE."<sup>24</sup> Our awakening to the presence of the *Over-Soul* within us, and to the identity of the individual soul with the "soul of the whole," is what has always been called 'revelation'—it is the "influx of the Divine mind into our mind."<sup>25</sup> Such experiences are necessarily accompanied

by enthusiasm, which is the consciousness of the immediate presence of an inner spiritual being. It is this awareness that accounts for the ecstasies of the mystics and the 'inspirations' of the poets: "A certain tendency to insanity has always attended the opening of the religious sense in men, as if they had been 'blasted with the excess of light.'"<sup>26</sup>

The Transcendentalists found many areas in which to contrast their beliefs with those against which they rebelled, but none were more important, or more typical, than their opposition of the spiritually *living* to the spiritually *lifeless*. Emerson's characterization of the religious orthodoxy of his time and place as "the corpse-cold Unitarianism of Brattle Street and Harvard College" was indicative of his disdain for a manner of worship that no longer invited immediate spiritual experience. A drive towards a vital form of spirituality was characteristic of Transcendentalism. The Transcendentalist, declared Emerson, "believes in miracle, in the perpetual openness of the human mind to new influx of light and power; he believes in inspiration, and in ecstasy."<sup>27</sup> In the history of the human mind, such believers are always in rebellion against the orthodoxy of their times. They stand for the liberation of the human spirit. "This way of thinking," wrote Emerson in 1842,

falling on Roman times, made Stoic philosophers; falling on despotic times, made patriot Catos and Brutuses; falling on superstitious times, made prophets and apostles; on popish times, made protestants and ascetic monks, preachers of Faith against the preachers of Works; on prelatical times, made Puritans and Quakers; and falling on Unitarian and commercial times, makes the peculiar shades of Idealism which we know.<sup>28</sup>

#### AMERICAN TRANSCENDENTALISM AND THE ORGANIC IDEAL

As M. H. Abrams observed in his great study of romantic literature and philosophy, *Natural Supernaturalism* (1971), the "high Romantic words" are life, love, liberty, hope, and joy, which appear in their writings whenever they "get down to the first principles of life and art." Life, writes Abrams, is the "ground-concept" of romanticism, "the highest good, the residence and measure of other goods, and the generator of the controlling categories of Romantic thought." It is "premise and paradigm" for two important romantic ideas: *vitalism*, "the celebration of that which lives, moves, and evolves by an internal energy, over whatever is lifeless, inert, and unchanging," and *organicism*, "the metaphorical

translation into the categories and norms of intellection of the attributes of a growing thing, which unfolds its inner form and assimilates to itself alien elements, until it reaches the fullness of its complex, organic unity."<sup>29</sup> When the roots of romantic vitalism and organicism are examined, what appears is a many-stranded and far-reaching tradition of thought about the nature of life and spirit. It reaches back into Renaissance ideas of sympathetic nature which are themselves based on Neoplatonic ideas of an ensouled world, an *anima mundi*. There is also an equally ancient tradition of the ensoulment of the universe traceable through Renaissance and medieval magical and occult thinking back to the Hellenic-Egyptian gnosis attributed to Hermes Trismegistus. All these traditions play a role in understanding the vitalism and organicism of European romanticism and American Transcendentalism. Romanticism is also intimately associated with mysticism and Protestant 'spiritism' or enthusiasm. Radical visionaries of the English Reformation such as Gerrard Winstanley conceived of a redeemed world restored to vitality by the inward transformation of the soul—a paradise of the Inner Light. The English romantic poets who inherited this radical Protestant vision intended the revitalization of their world through a renewal of the poetic imagination. The Protestant emphasis on rebirth by the infusion of spirit also contributed to the formation of romantic vitalism and organicism.

The particular version of organicism that emerges out of Transcendentalism can be outlined around four interconnected ideas, common to all the main exponents of organicism in America after Emerson. First, nature as a whole constitutes a single interrelated and living unity. Second, the organic unity of nature is the expression or visible manifestation of an underlying spiritual unity, conceived as an animating spirit or life force. Third, this unity is perceivable only through a spiritual intuition. Fourth, this capacity for intuition of the unity of the whole implies that the human spirit is not only itself a part of that unity, but stands at its center and point of origin.

When applied to an understanding of artistic production, organicism asserts that the true or ideal work of art is also an organic unity, whose outward expression is the interdependence of the parts within an organized whole. Such a work is understood to be the outgrowth of a spiritual intuition on the part of the artist. The study of natural forms is a crucial part of the artist's education, but it is spiritual insight into the structure and unity of nature that guides the artist in the development of the work. The goal of the artist is to bring into existence works that in their own organic unity participate in the organic unity of nature as a

whole. The organic work of art is, ultimately, an expression of the living spiritual reality that both generates and unifies all nature. The creative activity of the artist is itself the expression of this spiritual life at work.

The topic of discussion for the first meeting of those who were to eventually be called the Transcendentalists (September 20, 1836), was the failure of America to produce great works of art. Emerson, still fresh from his European travels, remarked that "twas pity on this Titanic Continent where Nature is so grand, Genius should be so tame." The fault, he suggested, was that all the productions of American art were "receptive" rather than "creative." Speaking of the works of Washington Allston, at the time the best-known American painter, Emerson declared that they he and other American artists were "vases" that receive their content, or in Emerson's terms, their "character," from without, instead of being like "fountains" that "impart" or express their content from within.

Emerson's basic framework for understanding literature, art, and architecture, was based on this primary distinction between art that receives its form and meanings from without, (in imitation of a received standard of beauty or by an association of its forms with external ideas), and art that derives its form from its own generative processes. It was not enough for Allston to be a great draftsman, there must be a "soul" present and manifesting itself in the work. On the other hand, the real productions of America, those that have grown directly from its heart and energy, the railroads, for example, are "genuine productions of the age but no art." The reason for this split, concluded Emerson, is that works of art are not yet *wanted* by Americans. The builders of the medieval cathedrals, said Emerson, built out of need and manifest purpose. It was "Love and fear laid the stones in their own order." In ancient times, a statue of Jove was made to be worshipped, while a statue of Jove by a modern sculptor is made to be appreciated by a small coterie of admirers. Art in America is "merely ornamental," he concluded, and no such art can be really beautiful:

Whatsoever is beautiful must rest on a basis as broad as man. There can be no handsomeness that is not such of necessity, that does not proceed from the nature of the man that made it. Poetry, Music, Sculpture, painting, architecture, were all enlisted in the service of religion. The gayest petal serves the flower. The finest form in woman is only perfectest health.<sup>30</sup>

Writing in his journal a few days later Emerson returned to this theme of the "necessity" of art and restated it in naturalistic terms. As with the forms of plants and animals, beauty "depends forever on the necessary & the useful. It is the sign of health & of virtue." From this fit between the form of the living organism and its life functions, Emerson derived a general aesthetic principle: "Fitness is so essential to Beauty that it has been taken for it. The most perfect form to answer an end is beautiful. This holds true in all animals. Why not in Architecture?" But Emerson retains a significant distinction between the beauty of essential forms and their utility:

The Temple decorated with sculpture is better for religious worship than one unadorned. . . . A work of art is something which the Reason created in spite of the hands; it was the work of inspired moments & now it is presented to the Reason again for judgment.<sup>31</sup>

Emerson here used terms borrowed from Coleridge. In Coleridge's interpretation of the philosophy of the German Idealists, the Understanding is based on empirical observation, while the Reason is a faculty for innate perception of truth. For both Coleridge and Emerson, beauty is neither made nor perceived by the Understanding, but by the Reason. It is a product and a vision of that highest faculty of the human soul. If the Understanding perceives the dependence of form on its function, the Reason perceives in the beauty of such forms a higher reason and purpose. Because of this, art is necessarily symbolic. A mind alerted to the beauty of nature and art is aware of the "strange sympathies" that bind all things in unity. "Some kindred pleasure does Architecture give," he wrote in September of 1841.

The cobweb, the bird's nest, the silver counterpane of the stonespider, the cocoon, the honeycomb, the beaver dam are the wild notes of nature: the wigwam, the tent, the mound, are the elements of it in man. Rome, Athens, the Coliseum, the Cathedral of Strasburg, the obelisk are the poems which he has allowed his higher thought on the foundation of the Necessary to fulfil its demands to the last hair. Strasburg Cathedral is a material counterpart of the soul of Erwin von Steinbach. The poet is a poem, the shipbuilder a ship. . . . We feel in seeing a noble building which rhymes well, as we do in reading a perfect song that it is "spiritually Organic," that is, had a necessity in nature for being, was one of the possible forms in the divine Mind & is now only discovered & executed by the Artist not arbitrarily composed by him.<sup>32</sup>

Emerson, who had not yet visited Germany, was referring to a famous essay by Goethe on "German Architecture" (1772), his interpretation of the architecture of Strasburg Cathedral. Goethe saw in this work of Erwin von Steinbach's genius a magnificent image of nature itself: "Just as in the eternal works of nature, everything is perfectly formed down to the meanest thread, and all contributing purposefully to the whole." Such art proceeds only from the inner spirit of the artist. The character of such art is the product of the working outward, or expression, of an inner vision and will. Such art is alive, it is organic: "this characteristic art is the only true art. If it becomes active through inner, unified, particular and independent feeling, unadorned by, indeed unaware of, all foreign elements, whether it be born of savagery or of a cultivated sensibility, it is a living whole."<sup>33</sup>

The main ideas of Emerson's organicism recur throughout the organic architectural theory of Sullivan and Wright. As did Emerson, they conceived of nature as a unified whole which manifested the activity of an indwelling spirit. Like him, they believed that this unity was perceived by an intuition that revealed the unity of the individual spirit with that of the whole. Their concept of the architect's creative work grew out of these beliefs. The architect seeks to embody in his own work the creative activity of nature, and to work in such a way that intuitive insight into the spiritual life of human beings and their ends, together with that of nature and its materials, gives rise to essential forms that grow or develop as organisms. Nature and human activity must be brought into participation with one another so that both coexist as a unified organic whole. The essential characteristic of this position is its insistence that both nature and human creativity spring from a single spiritual source.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Lectures and Notes on Shakspeare and Other English Poets*. T. Ashe, ed., reprint (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1972) 229.

<sup>2</sup> Louis Sullivan, *Kindergarten Chats and Other Writings*, reprint (New York: Dover Publications, 1979) 160.

<sup>3</sup> Frank Lloyd Wright, *Collected Writings. Volume 1. 1894-1930*, Bruce Brooks Pfeiffer, ed. (New York: Rizzoli, 1992) 127.

<sup>4</sup> Frank Lloyd Wright, *Collected Writings. Volume 2. 1930-1932*, Bruce Brooks Pfeiffer, ed. (New York: Rizzoli, 1992) 32.

<sup>5</sup> Sullivan, *Kindergarten Chats*, p. 48.

<sup>6</sup> Sullivan, *Kindergarten Chats*, p. 48.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 46.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 99.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 194.

<sup>10</sup> Frank Lloyd Wright, *Collected Writings. Volume 3. 1931-1939*, Bruce Brooks Pfeiffer, ed. (New York: Rizzoli, 1993) 208.

- <sup>11</sup> Sigfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1967) 412.
- <sup>12</sup> Edward Robert De Zurko, *Origins of Functionalist Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957) 4.
- <sup>13</sup> Bruno Zevi, *Towards an Organic Architecture* (London: Faber and Faber, 1950) 73-74.
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* p. 75.
- <sup>15</sup> M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953) 22.
- <sup>16</sup> Wright, *Collected Writings, Volume 3*. pp. 187-188.
- <sup>17</sup> Sullivan, *Kindergarten Chats*, p. 140.
- <sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* p. 55.
- <sup>19</sup> Louis Sullivan, "Essay on Inspiration" in Narcisco G. Menocal, *Architecture as Nature: The Transcendentalist Idea of Louis Sullivan* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin) 166-167.
- <sup>20</sup> Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Essays and Lectures* (New York: Library of America, 1983) 392-394.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* p. 392-394.
- <sup>22</sup> Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Volume 5, Merton M. Sealts, Jr., ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965) 5.
- <sup>23</sup> Emerson, *Essays*, 1196.
- <sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* p. 386.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* p. 392.
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.* p. 392.
- <sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* p. 196.
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* p. 198.
- <sup>29</sup> M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971) 431-432.
- <sup>30</sup> Emerson, *Journals and Misc. Notebooks*, 5, pp. 195-196.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.* p. 206.
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 206-207.
- <sup>33</sup> Johann Wolfgang Goethe, in *Goethe on Art*, John Gage, ed. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980) 108-109.