

**Fluorescent Paper trail:
Dan Flavin's Diagrams**

Georgina Ruff

Abstract:

This research into Dan Flavin's drawings suggests that rather than mere preliminary sketches or documentation of installations, his rich oeuvre of "diagrams" function concomitantly with his well-known fluorescent fixtures. The graph paper diagrams offer a map, perhaps an outline, of the phenomena that his well-known fluorescent fixtures present. Whereas the lights themselves obscure and illuminate space, the diagrams measure and quantify, and correspond to the final installation only in the most liminal manner. The more intimate drawings on looseleaf paper offer a uniquely expressionistic insight into a canonical Minimalist oeuvre. These note card diagrams record influences, changes, dedications, and intentions; Flavin underscored their importance by having selections printed in lithographic and intaglio form. Displayed separately from the fluorescent fixtures, the drawings authenticated Flavin's traditional artistic practice in a period (the early 1970's) when such an admission was unfashionable. Ultimately, Flavin's diagrams and drawings serve to humanize and map the fluorescents, offering the viewer a concrete point of entry to the phenomenological experience.

Keywords

Dan Flavin, drawings, Minimalism, light installations

It is generally acknowledged, by those who care to know, that in 1963 Dan Flavin broke with his past practice. With a single fluorescent fixture placed at a 45° diagonal on his studio wall he determined *the diagonal of personal ecstasy*, among other things, and secured both his medium for the next 40 years and his place in the art historical canon.¹ In his writing about *the diagonal*, Flavin mentions a prior “diagram,” yet places his emphasis on the action of placement rather than the planning. It was obvious that fluorescent light had been on his artistic mind for some time: his series of *Icons* from the early 1960s had included the use of fluorescent fixtures, and his departure from a gallery guard position at the American Museum of Natural History had occurred in part because he had “crammed [his] uniform pockets with notes for an electric light art.”² Four months after *the diagonal of personal ecstasy* was realized, Flavin produced a drawing titled *the gold diagonal (completed)*, in which a simple diagonal of grease pencil on a 3 x 5 inch note card serves to commemorate the momentous event.

In retrospect, with Flavin’s entire oeuvre at one’s disposal, the question of where Flavin’s numerous drawings, sketches and diagrams fit with this work becomes problematic. The topic has been addressed by several notable scholars, Briony Fer and Tiffany Bell among them, and it is a daunting discussion considering the sheer volume of literature surrounding Flavin’s lights. These works on paper, however, remain a significant part of Flavin’s production: they are meticulously labeled and dated, some etched and printed, some made as certification of works, some gifted to museums, and many displayed concurrently with exhibitions of the fluorescents. To file these as preparatory or to dismiss them as documentation would be both inaccurate and irresponsible. It is obvious that to Flavin some of these “so personal memos of mine” were more than notes to self, carefully saved, but rather functioned in a binary manner with the lights themselves. In structuralist terms, the lights and the works on paper could not exist without each other. In the post-structuralist terms of Derrida, one is privileged over the other; in this case, the physical fluorescent installations constitute most of the discussion and exhibition of Flavin’s oeuvre.

This privileging of the lights over the works on paper is evident in the statistical breakdown of Flavin's show in the early 1970s: between 1969 and 1976, Flavin had 49 exhibitions of lights, only 12 of which also displayed (or in one case primarily displayed) his diagrams or sketches.³ This 1976 show "Dan Flavin: drawings, diagrams and prints 1972-1975" was divided into two distinct parts, that of the works on paper and that of the installed lights. Many of the works on paper referred to the installations and were shown in the accepted museological manner: matted and framed, hung on white walls with labels and appropriate lighting. A 1969 show in Ottawa included not only drawings and diagrams but also early painted and collaged works. Fer posits that Flavin's desire to have both aspects of his work displayed helps to "dramatize the disproportion between affect and effacement that Flavin's work depends on."⁴ The inescapability of the lights which permeate, reflect, burn and ultimately alter vision is the polar opposite of the effects of the reserved drawings and diagrams, which require close scrutiny due to both their scale and technique. Fer argues that it is the function of the works on paper to "stage" the lights, to demonstrate Flavin's working process and ideological evolution.⁵

Within the works on paper, there are four distinct typologies: the "diagrams" on both graph paper and 3 by 5 inch note card, the figurative sketches of friends, strangers and seascapes, and the later abstractions. Between the diagrams and the lights there exists another sort of break, between the overwhelming affective independent phenomena of the light installations and the reserved referentiality and purposiveness of the works on paper. Rather than merely staging the lights, the paper works, as the necessary binary to the lights themselves, to physically and temporally chart both Flavin's history and forward progression.

The term "diagrams" has been systematically adopted to refer to a broad collection of Flavin's works on paper, however within this medium there is a crucial bifurcation between those diagrams that act as certificates of authenticity for editioned lights and those that do not. The certificates on graph paper were initiated by Flavin and his wife Sonja in 1970, and are easily recognizable by the phrase "This is a certificate only" both typed and handwritten, with an edition number usually present.⁶ Meant to accompany works rather than exist autonomously, the

certificates changed subtly throughout Flavin's career and serve as a (mostly) comprehensive history of the fabricated lights.

The remaining "diagrams" occupy a more fluid space in relation to Flavin's oeuvre and exist in two typologies: those renderings by someone other than Flavin on uniform graph paper, and those sketched by Flavin personally in his 3 by 5 inch looseleaf notebook. In 1972 Flavin described the diagrams as a "minimal, graphic rendering of the equipment in locale."⁷ His idea of the diagrams as specific to a space is interesting although misleading, as it becomes quickly evident that with the exception of corner versus wall, the diagrams give no specificities regarding location. "Minimal" in this context is intentionally written with a lowercase "m," for although Flavin's fluorescent installations were quickly identified with the Minimalist movement of the 1960s, the diagrams are unlike Minimalist drawings in several ways.

Sol LeWit's wall drawings are perhaps the best-known Minimalist drawings. Created directly on the painted wall, the drawings were the result of an explicit set of instructions, carried out by a team of trained studio assistants. Stylistically closer to Flavin's drawings were those of close friend Donald Judd, for whose 1968 Whitney Museum of American Art exhibition Flavin both composed a catalog foreword and lent a work on paper.⁸ Judd's drawings are more mechanical than Flavin's and their purpose is more immediately recognizable as instructions for fabrication. The iterations of Judd's shapes appear similar in manner to those of Flavin, although the serial nature of forms in Judd's works necessitated such fabrication instructions. Interestingly, Judd usually produced perspectival renderings of his forms, whereas the graph paper diagrams of Flavin's that are most similar remain strictly two dimensional. Judd, however, was "antagonistic" to drawing, using the medium specifically to communicate with fabricators; he certainly did not lobby for the inclusion of these works in gallery shows.⁹ Flavin drew throughout his career, keeping his 3 by 5 inch notebook in his pocket and producing diagrams for every edition of a work.

The Graph Paper Diagrams

Temporally, these diagrams may have been created before or after the installation of a fluorescent piece. Sometimes the drawing is evidence of the permutations of possible fixture

arrangements, as seen in *untitled (to Barnett Newman) Pairings*, dated February 28, 1971 and initialed by Sonja. On this single piece of horizontal graph paper appear four precise and almost identical diagrams. Each has a dotted central line, indicating that the final piece is to be located in the corner of a room, with the ceiling and floor joints also noted by dotted lines that splay at 30° away from the center toward the corners of the paper. Placed symmetrically over these axes is a vertical rectangle outlined by thin rectangular boxes. The outlines of the top and bottom strips are carefully coloured yellow in each of the renderings, while each vertical side of the rectangle, composed of a single strip surrounded by blue and two shorter strips surrounded by red, alter in position in each permutation of the diagram. In the first, the red strips are on the left side of the blue ones; in the second, they are on the right, then outside, and finally inside. Under each diagram there is a number-- "1," "3," "2," and "4" respectively-- and the handwritten title reads "(to Barnett Newman) Pairings, 1971 for Dwan Gallery NYC March 1971, SF 2/28/71" with Flavin's signature beneath.

The four works referred to in this diagram were constructed for the March 6 – 31, 1971 show at the Dwan Gallery. Only *two* and *four* were ever constructed again. Comparing the diagrams to photographs of the installation of *untitled (to Barnett Newman) two* makes the correspondence between the two seem incidental. In the gallery, the corners disappear, washed out by the powerful blue light of *two* in a "stable illusion" that Rosalind Krauss attributes to the graphic power of the fluorescent fixture.¹⁰ This illusion, stable or not, cannot be summoned from the diagrams, since the play of light in the given space is not and cannot be fully specified by pencil and paper. Similarly, the reflection of yellow light from the floor and the odd shadows cast by the intersections of the lights at the corners are not noted in the diagrams. These diagrams are the most minimal part of Flavin's practice, simply maps of technological installations.

Fer also believes that the term "diagram" is loaded:

The word *diagram* entered Flavin's vocabulary with his fluorescents – mainly, to start with, I think, as a way of saying what the drawings were not. They were not preparatory "sketches" in the art sense. Rather, they were like a paper pattern or template

that could be used more than once. Yet they were not “designs” either – although he sometimes called them proposals or plans. Perhaps he preferred the word *diagram* because it did not have the connotations of preparatory work but implied the kind of working drawing that could be reused.¹¹

This process of elimination never successfully proves what the diagrams are, but rather what they are not. However, based on their meticulous nature, the graph paper diagrams can be seen in the context of a map, navigating the phenomenological fluorescent installations in concrete format. It is true that one cannot experience the glow of Flavin’s lights based on the diagrams, nor can the layperson even truly conjecture how the final result will appear. Just as a topographical map offers the reader only the mathematical constructs of the land it renders, Flavin’s diagrams provide only measurement and colour, necessitating the visual appreciation of the work diagrammed to appreciate the phenomenological experience of “being there.” What can be gleaned from these precise renderings is Flavin’s methodology, or perhaps what Fer refers to as his “template.”

The act of mapping is temporally unspecific, and can occur before or after an event, or without any event at all. Authors have made maps of imaginary lands, astronomers have conjectured maps of the universe; Flavin’s 2004 traveling retrospective had a map. Using this particular term releases Flavin from direct authorship of the graph paper diagrams/maps: throughout his career, first Sonja, then studio assistants and finally his son Stephen were responsible for their creation. Using the term also allows the viewer to read the diagram/map as a signifier rather than an independent sign; by adding this structure to Flavin’s oeuvre, the relation between the lights and the graph paper diagrams becomes codified.

The pieces of graph paper are generally uniform in size—approximately 17 by 22 inches—although they do differ slightly during the three decades of their production. Using the squares as a measuring tool, similar to the scale on a map, the viewer can calculate the physical dimensions of the installations. *Installation Plan for the Art Institute Exhibit* (1977) uses the familiar convention of the corner/floor/ceiling axis, informing the viewer immediately that this piece must be placed across a corner of the room. The uniformity of conventions across the diagrams

facilitates easy translation on the part of the viewer, similar to the ease with which one reads a road map from a familiar atlas. The horizontal red lights face the viewer, while the short blue and green vertical lights on the left side of the work face the wall. The center two feet of the red horizontals are outlined in yellow, indicating the presence of a yellow bulb behind the red also facing the wall. But reading the diagram in this cartographic manner does not make it possible to imagine the interplay of these coloured lights. Constructed for the 1977 Chicago installation of the “Dan Flavin: drawings, diagrams and prints 1972-1975” exhibition, *untitled (in honor of Harold Joachim)* has never again been physically manifested. In this manner the diagram/map can be thought of as a historical artifact—a bit of a romantic notion, but one that fits nicely with Flavin’s interest in the Hudson Valley School of painting and with his self-professed romantic streak.¹²

As a process of constant refinement, mapping also fits Flavin’s working technique of altering the titles and dates of the diagrams. Since many of the works were editioned, a graph paper diagram and certificate of authenticity would accompany each purchased work. Whereas the certificate served several functional purposes, not only as an authentication but also as a warranty for repair should a fixture break, the graph paper diagrams served to provide a two-dimensional skeletal map of the installed lights and often Flavin’s handwritten personal dedication. In the case of the work at the Art Institute of Chicago, this inscription appears underneath the formal title in Flavin’s hand: “Harold! for you with fondest admiration, Dan.” Reminiscent of the markings on a map of a favorite route or stop or restaurant, these personal notations retrieve the diagram from the formal functions of the certificate and remind the viewer that this is a map of a work of art created by an individual.

Determining when many of the diagrams were committed to paper is also difficult: some were made significantly before the construction of the lights, whereas others, such as *Installation Plan*, are dated to 11 days before the opening of the show.¹³ The title of *Installation Plan* is also unusual, as most of the diagrams/maps are labeled with the title of the work described; given the singular nature of the work dedicated to Harold Joachim perhaps this anomaly is not surprising. The catalog of the “Dan Flavin: drawings, diagrams and prints 1972 – 1975” show enumerates several examples of the graph paper

diagrams, easily discernable even in the text listing as they are the only works on white rag vellum graph paper. The descriptions are all similar—“colored pencil, pen and ink...17 x 22” inscribed: ____”—yet on at least one work, the last note reads:

exhibitions Basel #131, This diagram was
redone by Sonja Flavin on 2/4/75
from a work of March 1, 1974.¹⁴

As a signifier of the related work, the date of the diagrams is of less importance than the installation of the lights themselves, yet it is interesting to realize that the mapping of the lights throughout Flavin’s career is endless.

The Note Card Diagrams

Rapidly sketched in the looseleaf notebook that he habitually carried, it would be easy to categorize Flavin’s note card diagrams as preparatory sketches, suitable for supporting material in an exhibition catalog, although sparingly displayed. Instead, like those on graph paper, the note card diagrams occupy a more dynamic role within Flavin’s oeuvre, not only due to his insistence that they be prolifically displayed in early exhibitions, but also due to his decision to make artistic prints, both intaglio and lithographic, of them.

Writing in the 1976 catalog for “Dan Flavin: drawings, diagrams and prints 1972 – 1975,” curator Jay Belloli postulates that these drawings function reciprocally with the installation works.¹⁵

The variety of Flavin’s fluorescent installations obviously increased because of the greater realization of projects envisioned in his drawings. While several years earlier the always numerous and rapidly completed drawings were permanent manifestations of projects that could not be realized either because of the lack of opportunity to construct them or because of the financial impossibility of having them built, in the last several years, as demand for his work has increased, the drawings have become less speculative, fewer in

number and created more in response to already proposed jobs.¹⁶

Yet it is in these “last several years” that Flavin chose to concretize the artistic value of his sketches by committing them to the printing press.

Belloli’s argument seems to imply that the earlier sketches, plans for works that might or might not be realized due to financial constraints, should be considered as final art works; whereas the later sketches, made for planned installations, can only exist as “preparatory notes” for the lights themselves. This logic is questionable when compared to Belloli’s later statement concerning the reciprocal nature of the two mediums for Flavin. Perhaps positioning the note card diagrams as independent works was what motivated Flavin to make prints from the sketches in several notebooks.

As an artist who always sketched prolifically, the importance of the transition from sketchbook to notebook cannot be underestimated for Flavin. Occurring shortly after his decision to move his artistic practice from a loft studio to an office space in 1965, Flavin’s adoption of the notebooks also provided a more practical alternative to traditional artistic practice. In all this practicality, the office, the notebook, the commercially available “off the shelf” fluorescent fixtures that he insisted upon using, the diagrams are also the trace of the artist that Flavin insisted on retaining with his drawing practice in both the notebook and the exhibitions. Fer puts it this way: “If the lights eschewed the handmade, his drawings brought the hand back.”¹⁷ Flavin constantly advanced this play between the (distant) ready-made nature of the fixtures and the (close) individual phenomenological experience of the viewer. It is recapitulated in these very (close) personal, hand-drawn notes to self on note cards which are then treated as (distant) art objects in their own right, matted, framed and lit.

In stark contrast to Belloli’s review of the 1976 show, artist and critic Peter Plagens questioned the necessity of the inclusion of Flavin’s drawings in the 1973 St. Louis exhibition “drawings and diagrams from Dan Flavin 1963 – 1972; corners, barriers and corridors in fluorescent light from Dan Flavin”:

The question is: are these semiprecious liberal art jewels [the drawings and diagrams] necessary? For

the understanding of the specific fluorescent light pieces in the exhibition, no. For the understanding that Flavin is not a holdover of 60's cool technology dispassionately expanding the mechanical boundaries of art in the greater art world game, yes.¹⁸

For Plagens, the drawings, inept as they are, demonstrate the earnest nature of Flavin's installations. Although this comment sounds antithetical to the praise of Belloli, it echoes the idea of the personal involvement of the artist; the authenticity of the light installations relies on Flavin's ability to prove that he engaged in the traditional artistic practice of drawing to arrive at the precise arrangement of the fixtures. Yet what Plagens does not account for, and Belloli does, is that the note card diagrams are only sometimes site- or installation-specific. More often than not, the sketches are a rough approximation of the final product, produced sometimes months or years before its fabrication and sometimes after.¹⁹ So, the note card diagrams reference a work that might or might not be fabricated, in a form similar to, or vastly different from, the sketch.

What can be said definitively about the note card diagrams is that their omnipresence throughout Flavin's career denotes a desire and need to maintain a traditional practice of drawing. As installation sketches, memos of ideas for possible installations, or as a visual list of the permutations of a given fluorescent arrangement, the note card diagrams acted in the manner of a conventional sketch book within Flavin's practice. This begs the question of why Flavin chose to make the note card diagrams into prints. Flavin makes a passing reference to printmaking in a 1982 interview with Tiffany Bell, but in this instance he shows her an etching that he quickly made of a family friend. Although it does not pertain to the lights per se, Flavin's interest in the "elegantly stroked lines" that "printed fairly well" speaks to his continued interest in drawing as more than simply a recording methodology for his larger fluorescent project.²⁰

Beginning with etchings and drypoints in 1973, Flavin's prints correlate directly with the 3 by 5 inch loose leaf notebook sheet format. The "holes" are embossed into the heavy printing paper, and the plate itself is cut to mimic the rounded corners of Flavin's notebook. Working most often in drypoint, with burrs

visible on many of the prints, Flavin sketched layouts of fluorescent fixtures directly onto the metal (usually copper) plates. What is missing, especially in the earliest intaglio works, are the inscriptions, the writing, the measurements that have become commonplace on the note card diagrams. Instead, Flavin seems to explore space "...the way he delineates a wall, or lets the entire plate represent the walls and the floor, a variety of spatial qualities are achieved."²¹ In comparison to the very personal, but also very practical, notebook that actually remained in his pocket, the prints, completely impractical really, demonstrate the desire of an artist involved in a very impersonal and removed art to partake in a very tactile and direct artistic process. If the graph paper diagrams serve as maps of Flavin's works, then the printed note card diagrams are the personal snapshots from the journey taken using that map.

In the catalog of the 1976 Fort Worth show, Emily S. Rauh waxes poetic about Flavin's use of line in both the intaglio and lithographic prints. Noting his rapid working process (so similar to making a note), Rauh describes the "sweep and bravura" of the lithographic crayon, the "rich blurry lines" raised by the copper burr.²² This is not the language of Minimalism, whose precise and impersonal renderings are intended to provide a set of directions to a fabricator, as with Judd's *Drawing for Untitled*, or to demonstrate the logical conclusion of a set of written instructions, as with LeWitt's wall drawings. These rich sweeping lines speak to Flavin's early dialogue with abstract expressionism, to his interest in Robert Motherwell and Franz Kline, and to the works of his early career which he included in the 1969 Ottawa show "fluorescent light, etc. from Dan Flavin."

By 1975 the prints assumed a form more akin to the graph paper diagrams than the loose leaf notebook. Printed in direct scale on enormous sheets of paper measuring 17 by 30 inches, prints from 1975 again bear Flavin's handwritten inscriptions such as that on a print in the collection of the Art Institute of Chicago (1997.75):

for circular fluorescent light h.c. Dan Flavin 1975
presented in honor of Harold Joachim
affectionately, by Larry Scholder and me,
Dan Flavin

Although the lines depicting the fixtures and the architecture retain their sensual quality, by formally inscribing the work Flavin

anchors it firmly within his oeuvre as a reference to either a built or conceptualized fluorescent installation. The explanation also serves to distance the viewer from the appreciation of the line and composition of the works. By giving a title to the work depicted, Flavin bursts the metaphorical bubble of the romantic snapshot of parts unknown, and replaces it with a record of his working drawing practice, the purpose of which is designing the installation of the fluorescents.

Finally

One of Flavin's first series of fluorescent pieces was the series of monuments to Vladimir Tatlin. Started in 1964, not even a year after *the diagonal of personal ecstasy*, the series eventually encompassed 10 total arrangements of cool white fluorescent lights, each permutation being offered in an edition of 5. The number of these pieces attests to the growing popularity of Flavin's work; the 1973 review by Plagens, while disparaging Flavin's drawings, ends with the statement: "Dan Flavin is the American artist who at the moment really deserves the tired adjective 'important,' for he is liberating art from its objects, its elitism, and its hermeticism."²³

Tatlin was one of Flavin's connections to the Russian Constructivist tradition, an artist who had also started out thinking of painting icons (Flavin produced a series of electronic *Icons* in the early 1960s just before *the diagonal* of 1963). As Fer notes, Tatlin's corner reliefs divide space in a manner similar to Flavin's corner pieces, and the Russian's reliance on drawing as a primary medium spoke to Flavin's habitual practice.²⁴ Most of Tatlin's drawings were practical in a manner that Flavin's were not: for an artist in the early days of the communist experiment, drawings were often the only practical artwork to produce. In a use of materials similar to Flavin, Tatlin and his comrades produced linear diagrams on graph paper which they referred to as "laboratory research," often with no hope of ever continuing the experiment in three dimensions.

For Flavin, early days of financial insecurity aside, the diagrams cannot be read in such a limited manner. Although Belloli entertains the romantic notion that we must consider the note card works as independent of the fluorescent installations, I maintain that without their reciprocal (to borrow Belloli's term)

relationship with the lights themselves, many of the diagrams are incapable of attaining an independent meaning beyond that of a map. For a small moment in the early 1970s, when Flavin chose to reunite his interest in expressionism with the drawings surrounding his fluorescent practice, creating sets of intaglio and lithographic images without external reference, the diagrams break from their role as binary. However, this moment is short-lived. As a map might be appreciable for its clarity, organization, or skill, it is ultimately referential to a topography—a landscape or geometry to which the reader/viewer mentally refers. In this manner, Flavin's diagrams and drawings refer to the lights themselves: despite their paper and pen media, for the viewer, they are truly of fluorescence.

I am not minimizing the importance of Flavin's drawings, but rather agreeing with Briony Fer that they recapitulate the element of the personal in the dialogue of Flavin's lights—personal in the sense of the overt hand of the artist in the note card diagrams, and personal in the ideation of the existence of the fixtures depicted in diagrammed works on graph paper. In each case, there is the incommunicable element of the light that is innately missed. One finds that when viewing the diagrams, both on graph paper and note card, one instinctively attempts to translate the experience into an encounter with the fixtures themselves, much in the same way that one objectively reads a map and finds oneself remembering one's travels from here to there rather than admiring the width of the line that demarcates them.

Georgina Ruff is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Illinois in Chicago. Her dissertation questions the role of the apparatus in immersive light environments, and her research interests include mid-century suburban housing, rock and roll light shows, ephemeral art/objects, and light bulbs of all shapes and sizes. She currently teaches at UIC and the School of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Endnotes

¹ I say “among other things” because the title of this work, as many of Flavin’s pieces, is subject to change. Other iterations of this seminal piece are titled *the diagonal of May 25, 1963*, *the diagonal of May 25, 1963 (to Robert Rosenblum)* and *the diagonal of May 25, 1963 (to Constantin Brancusi)*

² Dan Flavin, “...In Daylight or Cool White,” *Artforum* 4, no. 4 (1965). 24.

³ Michael Govan et al., *Dan Flavin: The Complete Lights, 1961-1996* (New York: Dia Art Foundation, 2004). 146-149.

⁴ Briony Fer in Jeffrey Weiss, ed. *Dan Flavin: New Light* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006). 40.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Michael Govan et al., *The Complete Lights*. 123.

⁷ Dan Flavin interviewed by Phyllis Tuchman, 1972 previously unpublished until Govan, *Dan Flavin: The Complete Lights*. 194.

⁸ Donald Judd, William C. Agee, and Dan Flavin, *Don Judd* (New York: Publishers Printing-Admiral Press, 1968).

⁹ Fer in Weiss, ed. *Dan Flavin: New Light*. 27.

¹⁰ Rosalind Krauss, “New York,” *Artforum* 7, no. 5 (January 1969). 53.

¹¹ Briony Fer in Weiss, ed. *Dan Flavin: New Light*. 37.

¹² Dan Flavin interviewed by Tiffany Bell in Govan et al., *Dan Flavin: The Complete Lights, 1961-1996*. 198.

¹³ The inscription on *Installation Plan for the Art Insitute* gives the date as 4/1/77, and is initialed H.G. for Helene Geary, his partner and office manager from the mid-1970s to early 1980s.

¹⁴ Jay Belloli and Emily S. Rauh, “Dan Flavin: Drawings, Diagrams and Prints 1972-1975,” ed. The Fort Worth Art Museum (Fort Worth: The Fort Worth Art Museum, 1977). 58.

¹⁵ Dan Flavin, Jay Belloli, and Emily S. Rauh, *Dan Flavin: Drawings, Diagrams and Prints, 1972-1975* (Fort Worth: Fort Worth Art Museum, 1977). 31.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 28.

¹⁷ Fer in Weiss, ed. *Dan Flavin: New Light*. 36.

¹⁸ Peter Plagens, “Rays of Hope, Particles of Doubt,” *Artforum* 11, no. 10 (1973). 35.

¹⁹ *Untitled (to a man, George McGovern) 1*, 1972 was installed in the Leo Castelli Gallery in 1972 and the Fort Worth Art Museum in 1976. The two installations differed in their placement of the triangles on adjacent walls (Castelli) or the same wall (Fort Worth). Flavin’s diagrams show a single conception of the work, which was then translated to two iterations of installation. The Fort Worth installation not only oriented the work differently in respect to the corner, but also used a different number of bulbs.

²⁰ Bell in Govan et al., *Dan Flavin: The Complete Lights, 1961-1996*. 199.

²¹ Emily Rauh in Belloli and Rauh, "Dan Flavin: Drawings, Diagrams and Prints 1972-1975." 11.

²² Ibid. 14.

²³ Plagens, "Rays of Hope, Particles of Doubt." 35.

²⁴ Fer in Weiss, ed. *Dan Flavin: New Light*. 36.

Bibliography

Belloli, Jay, and Emily S. Rauh. "Dan Flavin: Drawings, Diagrams and Prints 1972-1975." edited by The Fort Worth Art Museum. Fort Worth: The Fort Worth Art Museum, 1977.

Flavin, Dan. "...In Daylight or Cool White." *Artforum* 4, no. 4 (1965): 20-24.

Flavin, Dan, Jay Belloli, and Emily S. Rauh. *Dan Flavin: Drawings, Diagrams and Prints, 1972-1975*. Fort Worth: Fort Worth Art Museum, 1977.

Govan, Michael, Dan Flavin, Tiffany Bell, Brydon Smith, and David Gray. *Dan Flavin: The Complete Lights, 1961-1996*. New York: Dia Art Foundation, 2004.

Judd, Donald, William C. Agee, and Dan Flavin. *Don Judd*. New York: Publishers Printing-Admiral Press, 1968.

Krauss, Rosalind. "New York." *Artforum* 7, no. 5 (January 1969): 53-54.

Plagens, Peter. "Rays of Hope, Particles of Doubt." *Artforum* 11, no. 10 (1973): 32-35.

Weiss, Jeffrey, ed. *Dan Flavin: New Light*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.