Volume Title: Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art

Volume Author/Editor: David W. Galenson

Volume Publisher: Cambridge University Press

Volume ISBN: 978-0-521-11232-1

Volume URL: http://www.nber.org/books/gale08-1

Publication Date: October 2009

Title: The State of Advanced Art: The Late Twentieth Century and Beyond

Author: David W. Galenson

URL: http://www.nber.org/chapters/c5799

Chapter 16: The State of Advanced Art: The Late Twentieth Century and Beyond

The Balkanization of Advanced Art

> Art used to mean paintings and statues. Now it means practically anything human-made that is unclassifiable otherwise.
>
> Peter Schjeldahl, 2005[1]

Ever since Giorgio Vasari wrote *The Lives of the Artists* in the sixteenth century, a series of art critics and scholars have attempted to produce master narratives that would explain the development of fine art over time. Probably the most prominent of these theories for the modern era was that advanced by the critic Clement Greenberg during the middle decades of the twentieth century. Greenberg contended that from the mid-nineteenth century, all the arts were ruled by Modernism, in which "the unique and proper area of competence of each art coincided with all that was unique in the nature of its medium." As practitioners of each art progressively emphasized the unique qualities of their own art, "Thus would each art be rendered 'pure,' and in its 'purity' find the guarantee of its standards of quality as well as of its independence." For Greenberg, painting was the queen of the visual arts, and over time the greatest painters were those whose work stressed the single defining characteristic of their art: "Because flatness was the only condition painting shared with no other art, Modernist painting oriented itself to flatness as it did to nothing else."[2]

As a normative matter, critics are of course free to offer their personal preferences as to what they consider desirable in art. Yet as a positive theory of the development of advanced art in the modern era, Greenberg's theory was a failure even by the time he proposed it. For Greenberg's theory ignored the fact that a central feature of much of the advanced art of the twentieth century was in fact its violation of the traditional boundaries that defined the individual

arts. This began when Picasso invented the collage in 1912, by violating the flatness of the surface of a painting, and continued throughout the century as dozens of other artists created new hybrid artistic forms that did not conform to the defining characteristics of any of the existing arts that Greenberg recognized as belonging to Modernism.

Recognizing the failure of Greenberg's theory, the scholar Thierry de Duve proposed a new theory that addressed the importance of new art forms in the advanced art of the twentieth century. Thus in 1996 de Duve observed that "From surrealism to conceptual art, half of the avant-garde played a game on the definition of art in general. (The other half, which is often called modernism, apparently played a different game, confining itself within the specific boundaries of painting or sculpture.)" In recognition of the importance of the first of these tendencies, de Duve argued that the twentieth century had witnessed something without precedent in the history of art: "A new 'category' of art appeared – art in general, or art at large – that was no longer absorbed in the traditional disciplines." De Duve credited Marcel Duchamp with creating the new model: "the possibility of making art in general came to be interpreted as if it were a new artistic discipline in its own right, and the paternity for this was attributed to Duchamp." The key innovation was the bottle rack Duchamp offered as a work of art in 1914: "A bottle rack is neither a painting nor a poem nor a piece of music nor even a sculpture; it's art, or else it's nothing."[3]

De Duve's claim that Duchamp and those of his successors who made works of art that did not respect the traditional boundaries of any existing art were making "art in general" is false. In recognition of the fact that manufactured objects did not fall within the boundaries of any previously existing art, Duchamp designated them as examples of a new genre, which he named the readymade. And dozens of artists followed Duchamp not only in creating new hybrid

forms of art, but in giving them names that designated them as specific new genres. De Duve's claim that the readymade and other conceptual hybrids that followed them were art in general thus ignores the express intentions of Duchamp and many of his successors.

It should now be possible to recognize that a central feature of advanced art in the past century was the iconoclastic behavior of conceptual innovators. Picasso violated the traditional boundaries of painting by inventing collage, Duchamp made an even more deliberately provocative violation of traditional practices by inventing the readymade, and scores of conceptual artists followed their lead. Generations of young conceptual innovators appeared to be determined to compete to see who could most conspicuously violate existing artistic conventions, and in the process they created a series of new hybrid forms. These artists had no intention of making art in general, and they signaled this by claiming property rights in their innovations, effectively trademarking them by giving them proper names. As this became recognized as a path to artistic success, the twentieth century witnessed an unprecedented outpouring of new artistic genres.

Many of these genres failed to gain many followers – indeed, a number of them remained the exclusive domain of their inventors. Yet some rose to considerable quantitative importance. One major result of this was that over the course of time the world of advanced art became progressively balkanized. At the beginning of the twentieth century, most fine artists were either painters or sculptors. By the century's end, painters and sculptors had been joined by sizeable numbers of fine artists who devoted themselves to such other genres as collage, installation, photography, and video, with smaller numbers who specialized in more esoteric forms. This balkanization has had profound implications for our perceptions of art and artists: so, for example, it has affected our judgment of the importance of individual artists. This phenomenon,

and its sources, can be explored by examining the most important artists of the late twentieth century.

The State of Advanced Art

> On the morning of Sunday, February 22 with the news that Andy Warhol was dead, I ran to the window expecting to hear seismic noises coming from the city outside, and to witness a transfiguration, I don't know of what … but of something. The shock of so enormous an absence would surely register, it seemed, on reality itself.
>
> Critic Lisa Liebmann, 1987[4]

Who made the most important art of the late twentieth century? As for earlier periods, one way to answer this question is by using narratives of art history. In order to focus not on the greatest artists who were alive late in the century, but rather on who was actually making the most important art in the specific period of interest, in this case textbook illustrations were selected according to when the illustrated works were executed. Therefore, for all available textbooks published in 2000 or later, all illustrations were tabulated that represented works of art made in 1975 or later. Based on this survey, Table 1 presents the ten artists (actually 15, because of ties) who had the most works illustrated in the textbooks. It should be noted that although such major figures as Jasper Johns, Robert Rauschenberg, and Andy Warhol remained active after 1975, they do not appear on the list, because illustrations of works they made prior to 1975 were not counted for this study, and works they made in 1975 and beyond were illustrated less frequently than those of the artists included in Table 1.

The 21 books surveyed included 25 illustrations of photographs by Cindy Sherman. An earlier chapter found that she was the most important woman artist of the twentieth century, and the present one shows that she also has the distinction of being the most important artist overall

in the period from 1975 to the present.[5] In this the textbooks support the recent judgment of Peter Schjeldahl that Sherman is "the era's most original artist."[6]

The ranking of Table 1 strongly underscores the dominance of conceptual art in the late twentieth century and beyond. Of the 15 artists included in the ranking, only one – Richard Serra – was an experimental innovator.[7] And consistent with the trend toward conceptual approaches, it is significant that Serra was the second-oldest of the 15 artists listed.

Table 1 clearly reflects the balkanization of advanced art in the 1970s and beyond. Thus only four of the artists listed – Richter, Kiefer, Basquiat, and Schnabel – were exclusively painters. Six – Koons, Hirst, Whiteread, Serra, and the Chapmans – were primarily sculptors, but several of these, most notably Koons and Hirst, worked with materials, including the vitrines for which both are known, that were not traditionally those used by sculptors. Three of the artists – Sherman, Prince, and Wall – worked exclusively or primarily in photography, while Barney worked primarily in video, and Holzer extensively in installation. It should also be noted that Koons and Hirst are prime examples of conceptual artists who routinely work in a number of different genres.[8]

Table 1 points up several significant trends of the late twentieth century. One is the growing prominence of women artists, as Whiteread and Holzer join Sherman in the ranking.[9] Another is the increasing importance of co-authorship in advanced art, as Jake and Dinos Chapman appear in the ranking.[10] In spite of the progressive globalization of advanced art, a majority – 8 of 15 – of the artists were born in the United States, but the presence of Richter and Kiefer attests to the importance of Düsseldorf in training painters and the success of London in 1990s is reflected in the presence of four of the young British artists – Hirst, Whiteread, and the Chapmans.[11]

The evidence of Table 1 can help us to explain a view that became common among art critics and scholars in the latter decades of the twentieth century, that advanced art was no longer producing individual artists comparable in stature to the greatest artists of earlier periods. So for example the critic Calvin Tomkins declared in 1988 that "The last two decades have produced no artists on the level of Pollock and de Kooning, much less Picasso and Matisse."[12] There has of course long been a tendency to denigrate contemporary artists as inferior to the giants of the past. Beyond this perennial doubt, however, in recent decades the structure of the art world has itself created a new basis for the perception that today's artists do not match the greatness of their predecessors. This view has been related to the characterization of the art world of the 1970s and beyond with the terms "pluralism" and "postmodernism." These labels were effectively observers' way of accounting for their inability to produce coherent master narratives of the art of these decades. Thus one scholar observed that "the Pluralism of the seventies … effectively did away with the idea of dominant styles for at least a decade," and another explained that "Postmodernism is an inclusive aesthetic that cultivates the variety of incoherence."[13] In 2005, the critic Peter Schjeldahl offered an even more despairing overview: "The contemporary art world of the early 1980s blew apart into four main fragments … Eventually, even the fragments disintegrated, becoming the sluggish mishmash that has prevailed in art ever since."[14] Although these analyses were generally focused on the proliferation of styles that began during the 1970s, for present purposes it is important to note that, as the listing of Table 1 demonstrates, this was also a period in which the leading artists were distributed among a larger number of different genres than had ever been true in the past.[15]

The analysis applied throughout the present study suggests a straightforward explanation for the proliferation of both styles and genres that occurred in the late twentieth century. Quite

simply, both appear to have been consequences of the extended dominance of conceptual approaches to art in a time of heightened demand for artistic innovation. Thus a series of young conceptual innovators, including nearly all the artists listed in Table 1, devised radical new approaches to old genres, or effectively transformed old genres into new ones, and in the process divided advanced art into a larger number of nearly unrelated activities than had ever previously been the case.

The question might be raised of why advanced art became so thoroughly balkanized only late in the twentieth century: why did the periods of conceptual dominance earlier in the century not produce a comparable fragmentation? This is effectively a new question in art history, and it deserves careful study. Yet a powerful hypothesis can be suggested, that arises out of the connection, so often neglected by art scholars, between artists and the market. As discussed earlier, Picasso initiated the creation of new genres in 1912, when he invented collage, and a large number of other artists soon followed his lead. The Dada artists were particularly prolific in creating new art forms.[16] Although a number of these innovations diffused rapidly, few of them became economically profitable, for the period that followed included two world wars and a great economic depression. In contrast, the prosperity of the 1960s and after, which allowed a strong demand for innovative art, appears to have provided a basis for the establishment and widespread adoption of new styles and genres that was lacking in most of the period of conceptual artistic innovation earlier in the century.

Whatever the full explanation of why balkanization did not occur earlier, it is clear that during the late twentieth century there was not merely a proliferation of styles, but also of genres. Advanced artists of this period had increasingly diverse interests and objectives. And this meant that the potential sphere of influence of any individual artist became more circumscribed than in

the past. For most of the first seven decades of the twentieth century, important painters worked for an audience that potentially included most, if not all, advanced artists. Andy Warhol may have been a member of the last cohort of artists whose influence could have extended to a sizeable majority of serious artists. By the late 1970s, it appears that this situation had changed in a basic way. Painting no longer dominated the attention of serious artists; many were committed to other activities. Sherman could potentially influence photographers, Richter might influence painters, Koons might influence sculptors, but it was now difficult if not impossible for any one artist to influence all these groups. Since the importance of an artistic innovator depends directly on the extent of his or her influence, one consequence of this balkanization of advanced art was that to many observers, it seemed that there was no artist of a stature comparable to that of the great painters of earlier eras.

Duchamp vs. Picasso

> The greatest idea of the twentieth century was collage. I just see it all like collage.
>
> Damien Hirst, 1994[17]

> Publicly a work becomes not just intention, but the way it is used … You can't control that kind of thing.
>
> Jasper Johns[18]

The development of advanced art in the twentieth century has sometimes been described as a battle between the legacies of Pablo Picasso and Marcel Duchamp. An example of this formulation was given by the painter Robert Motherwell in 1971:

> Picasso, in questioning himself about what art is, immediately thought, "What is not?" … Picasso, as a painter, wanted boundaries. Duchamp, as an anti-painter, did not. From the standpoint of each, the other was involved in a *game*. Taking one side or the other is the history of art since 1914, since the First World War.[19]

From the vantage point of this formulation, Duchamp's key contribution was the readymade, for its rejection of traditional aesthetic and artistic values. Thus for example Thomas McEvilley declared in 2005 that "the Readymade has exerted more influence on the sculpture of the last two generations than all other models and influences put together."[20] Quantitative support for this view was provided by an English survey of 500 artists, curators, critics, and dealers taken in 2004, in which Duchamp's readymade *Fountain* was voted the most influential work of modern art, primarily because of overwhelming support from the artists included among those polled.[21] A commentator on that survey observed that "there is a new generation out there saying, 'Cut the crap – Duchamp opened up modern art,'" supporting Calvin Tomkins' conclusion more than two decades earlier that "by the end of the nineteen sixties Duchamp was widely recognized as the most influential artist of the second half of the twentieth century."[22]

Duchamp served as an inspiration for many younger conceptual artists in the second half of the twentieth century who wanted to break down the barriers between art and everyday reality. A central element of this desire was a rejection of the traditional boundaries that defined the arts, and specifically an attack on painting, the most powerful of the visual arts. A prominent early statement of this agenda was made in 1959 by Robert Rauschenberg, who declared that "Painting relates to both art and life. Neither can be made. (I try to act in that gap between the two.)"[23] In 1997, Arthur Danto recalled that he had been "dazzled by the idea of the 'gap between art and life' as a possible site for artistic activity," and he contended that Rauschenberg had succeeded in defining it in his innovative works of the 1950s: "one gets the sense that the Combines touch both these domains as boundaries, with art symbolized by raw paint, and life by odds and ends of real things with antecedent identities." To Danto, Rauschenberg's combines marked a turning point, by creating a bridge between the art of the past and future, "pointing in one direction back

to the metaphysics of the paint, which defined Abstract Expressionism (and hence art, in Rauschenberg's vocabulary), and, in the other, to the uninflected display of commonplace objects, which in various ways was to define Pop." Danto considered the impact of Rauschenberg's use of common objects to have been so great that he declared that "the artistic mainstream today is very largely Rauschenbergian."[24]

Yet to conclude that Duchamp clearly exerted a greater influence than Picasso on the art of the late twentieth century may ignore the complexity of Picasso's legacy. And this is true not merely because Duchamp's innovation of the readymade may have been a direct response to Picasso's invention of collage.[25] More fundamentally, collage has been recognized by a series of observers as a primary basis for the twentieth-century revolt against the traditional boundaries of the arts, and to have done this precisely by bringing elements of everyday life into art. Thus as early as 1915, the Dada poet Tristan Tzara recorded the "great uproar" caused by an exhibition of collages in Zurich, for the works were "neither art nor painting."[26] Tzara considered the invention of collage "the most revolutionary moment in the evolution of painting," because the new genre incorporated "a piece of everyday reality."[27] Similarly, the Dada poet Richard Huelsenbeck wrote in 1920 of Picasso's invention of "the new medium" of collage: "He began to stick sand, hair, post-office forms and pieces of newspaper onto his pictures, to give them the value of a direct reality, removed from everything traditional." Collage brought a new value to art: "it participates in life itself."[28] This early assessment of the function of collage has equally been shared by later analysts, and has been seen as the source of many of the forms of more recent conceptual innovations. So for example in 1975, the critic Harold Rosenberg declared that "Collage changed the relation between painting and the world outside painting. The combining of formal qualities with crude fact in Cubist collage contained the seeds of anti-art that have

flourished in the half-century that followed."[29] Collage thus was recognized from an early date as the catalyst for the introduction of real objects into fine art, and as the beginning of the attack on painting as the dominant form of fine art.

Collage was chronologically the first of the twentieth century's scores of new artistic genres. In many respects it was also the emblematic new genre of twentieth-century conceptual art. Collage was created by sticking together material elements that had previously been considered unrelated. In this it served directly as a model for a significant number of new genres that followed it, in sticking things together: these include papier collé, papier dechiré, photomontage, merz, and décollage. Even Rauschenberg's combines were genetically related to collage. Like collage, the combines grew directly out of painting. Some combines came to be free-standing, but the earliest combines were made by attaching found objects to painted canvases. And although it was later abbreviated, the name initially given to these works was "combine painting."[30] Even when new genres did not literally involve sticking things together, the metaphor of collage as a combination of unrelated elements remained in artists' minds. Thus for example in 1966 Allan Kaprow defined his own new genre, the Happening, as "a collage of events." In 1958, when Kaprow was first creating this genre, which was intended to unite all the traditional arts, he explained that "this idea of a total art has grown from attempts to extend the possibilities of one of the forms of painting, collage, which has led us unknowingly toward rejecting painting in any form."[31] For Kaprow and others, collage thus became a metaphor for conceptual innovation in general, and Picasso's innovation was seen as the historical point of origin for their later efforts.

An objection might be made to this claim for Picasso's influence, on the grounds that the work of artists like Rauschenberg and Kaprow violated his own intentions. Thus whereas

Duchamp avowedly wanted to change the course of art, and was pleased by the success the readymades had in undermining the importance of painting, Picasso's firm belief in the primacy of painting would certainly have led him to disapprove of the hybrid genres that were inspired by collage. It might be maintained that since this effect of collage violated his intentions, he should receive no credit for this element of his legacy.

This argument can be immediately dismissed, however, for it is based on a misunderstanding of the nature of influence. An example from Picasso's own early work provides a telling demonstration. In 1922, the eminent English critic Clive Bell published a book of essays on modern art titled *Since Cézanne*. Bell defended this title for a book that ranged widely over forms and styles of art on the grounds that "there is hardly one modern artist of importance to whom Cézanne is not father or grandfather." Among his progeny, two were preeminent: "Matisse and Picasso are the two immediate heirs to Cézanne."[32] Cézanne never met either Matisse or Picasso, and he did not see their seminal early contributions. Yet Cézanne's experimental art was based on decades of painstaking efforts to devise better means of recording his visual perceptions, and it is inconceivable that he would have embraced the conceptual devices of either Fauvism or Cubism. Clive Bell recognized the conceptual basis of the art of Matisse and Picasso, observing in *Since Cézanne* that "in the sixteen or seventeen years which have elapsed since the influence of Cézanne became paramount theory has played a part which no critic or historian can overlook." In crediting Cézanne's legacy with this development, it did not bother Bell that Cézanne had been an implacable opponent of theory in painting: so for example among Cézanne's opinions that had been quoted in a celebrated article published by the painter Emile Bernard in 1904 was the view that the artist "must avoid thinking like a writer, which so often distracts the painter from his true goal – the direct study of nature – and causes

him to waste his time in intangible theories."[33] Nor did Cézanne's commitment to an experimental approach prevent either of the younger conceptual innovators, Matisse or Picasso, from declaring their debt to his art.[34] The fact of Cézanne's influence on Matisse and Picasso stands independent of whether he would have approved of the form that influence took. This earlier example of the protean nature of influence clearly demonstrates that an artist's influence does not depend on his goals or intentions, but rather on the value of his innovations for other artists. The use of collage, by Rauschenberg and others, to violate Picasso's goals for art thus does not in any way affect our assessment of the extent of Picasso's influence.

Duchamp's emphasis on highly conceptual approaches to art, and his rejection of painting, made him appear to many younger artists as a patron saint of their activities, whereas Picasso's staunch adherence to the traditional values of painting throughout most of his life led many younger artists to ignore, or reject, him as a model. Yet it appears misguided to describe the art of the late twentieth century as a victory for the legacy of Duchamp over that of Picasso, for two reasons. Perhaps the less important is that Duchamp's key contribution may have been crucially indebted to an innovation of Picasso. More generally, however, it would appear that the radical conceptual innovations of both artists, perhaps no less Picasso's collage than Duchamp's readymade, exerted an enormous influence on the advanced art of the second half of the twentieth century and beyond.

Conceptual Revolutions in Art

> Another important value of the modern artist is that his art is completely free. There are no rules, no hierarchy of privileged qualities, no absolute standards, characteristics, or codified methods, and there are no privileged materials.
>
> Meyer Schapiro, 1948[35]

> Art is invention, exciting and fantastic … When someone tells me I can't do something, so far I've always found out that I can.
>
> Damien Hirst, 1996[36]

As discussed above, art critics and scholars have been at a loss to explain the development of advanced art in the late twentieth century. Perhaps their most basic problem is that they have failed to recognize the full significance of a shift that occurred in art in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In a classic narrative of this period, George Heard Hamilton aptly described this shift:

> In the half-century between 1886, the date of the last Impressionist exhibition, and the beginning of the Second World War, a change took place in the theory and practice of art that was as radical and momentous as any that had occurred in human history. It was based on the belief that works of art need not imitate or represent natural objects and events. Therefore artistic activity is not essentially concerned with representation but instead with the invention of objects variously expressive of human experience, objects whose structures as independent artistic entities cannot be evaluated in terms of their likeness, nor devalued because of their lack of likeness, to natural things.[37]

Neither Hamilton nor his fellow art scholars understood that this momentous change was not simply a transformation in the appearance of art, but at a deeper level signaled the beginning of a change in the very behavior of artists, that would progress further over time, and that later in the century would produce forms of art that defied all earlier definitions of art.

Art scholars invariably comprehend the history of art as the analysis of styles. Concerning the first century of modern art, they have generally observed that the most important change was an acceleration in the development of new styles. As discussed above, they have recognized that the proliferation of styles in the late twentieth century has made their analytical approach problematic, yet they have failed to understand the causes of this, and they have consequently been unable to develop an alternative approach.

What art scholars have not understood is that the acceleration in the rate of artistic innovation in the early twentieth century not only caused styles to develop more rapidly, and to multiply, but that in the hands of conceptual artists style began to be undermined altogether. Picasso pioneered the creation of the most influential style of the century, but he also initiated a behavior, in changing styles at will, that later conceptual artists would extend into a virtual elimination of personal or individual style. Duchamp's invention of the readymade was the most provocative of his acts, but his entire career can be seen as an effort to eliminate style from art. Dada was the first group movement that explicitly set out to destroy style. The legacies of Picasso, Duchamp, and Dada became powerful forces in the second half of the twentieth century, as conceptual innovators used a wide variety of objects in new ways to produce art that did not appear to reflect the personality of the artist.

Confronted by a contemporary art world that is marked by a wide diversity of styles and genres, and by important artists, including Richter, Koons, and Hirst, whose art seems characterized only by inconsistency, art scholars have responded by declaring that advanced art has become random or incoherent. Yet this is wrong: the multiplicity of styles in contemporary art, and the apparent lack of recognizable style of many important artists, do not imply that art is random. They are manifestations of important systematic patterns that dominate contemporary art. To see these patterns, however, it is crucial to recognize that they are not based on style.

Throughout the twentieth century, great experimental artists, from Mondrian and Kandinsky, through Pollock and de Kooning, to Serra and Bourgeois, have painstakingly pursued aesthetic goals through the gradual development of a personal style. Yet from Picasso and Duchamp, through Rauschenberg and Warhol, to Koons and Hirst, conceptual innovators have discovered that new and more radical forms of art can be developed much more quickly by

reducing style to a short-run strategy rather than a long-run goal. This discovery has led them to make rapid changes of style, and to create works that violate the boundaries of traditional artistic genres. Conceptual innovators have also engaged in a series of other behaviors that are novel within the context of art history. Thus they have intentionally provoked observers to debate the question of whether their work is serious or a joke; they have had their work executed entirely by others, thus stressing that their contribution is the concept; they have consistently co-authored their work; they have extended the use of language in art, and in some instances made art almost entirely out of language; and they have created personal art, making their work entirely out of their own lives. These are all significant features of conceptual twentieth-century art: all are patterns, involving systematic artistic behavior, but these patterns have generally been overlooked by art scholars because they do not involve style.

Art historians thus failed to recognize that the shift described by George Heard Hamilton was not merely a change in the appearance of art, but was one symptom of a more basic change that would continue into the future – a change in the behavior of artists, as conceptual artists became more extreme in their pursuit of innovation than ever before in the history of art. Nor could art historians understand why this latter change occurred. Art scholars have consistently ignored the economic basis of artistic behavior, but this holds the key to the new era of conceptual artistic revolution. The new and more radical approaches adopted by conceptual artists in the twentieth century were a direct result of the rise of a competitive market for art. As discussed earlier, this new market structure was the outcome of a process that began when the Impressionists' group exhibitions effectively overthrew the Salon monopoly of the ability legitimately to present fine art to the public, and that progressed as the value of the work of the Impressionists and Post-Impressionists rose in value over time, thus demonstrating the

investment value of innovative art. Picasso was the prototype of the conceptual innovator who maximized the economic value of his inventiveness in the new market setting, and Duchamp quickly followed him by making logical extensions of many of his innovations. Much of the history of the art of the twentieth century is comprised of the novel products and behaviors devised by scores of conceptual artists who followed in the footsteps of those early masters of the new era of artistic freedom.

Footnotes

1. Peter Schjeldahl, *Let's See* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2008), p. 222.

2. Clement Greenberg, *The Collected Essays and Criticism*, vol. 4 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), pp. 86-87.

3. Theirry de Duve, *Kant After Duchamp* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 91-92, 375-77.

4. Michael Archer, *Art Since 1960*, second ed. (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002), p. 183.

5. David Galenson, "Who Were the Greatest Women Artists of the Twentieth Century? A Quantitative Investigation," NBER Working Paper 12928 (2007).

6. Schjeldahl, *Let's See*, p. 9.

7. David Galenson, "The Reappearing Masterpiece: Ranking American Artists and Art Works of the Late Twentieth Century," *Historical Methods*, vol. 38, no. 4 (Fall 2005), pp. 183-84.

8. David Galenson, "And Now for Something Completely Different: The Versatility of Conceptual Innovators," *Historical Methods*, vol. 40, no. 1 (Winter 2007), pp. 17-27.

9. Galenson, "Who Were the Greatest Women Artists of the Twentieth Century?"

10. David Galenson, "Co-Authoring Advanced Art," NBER Working Paper 13484 (2007).

11. David Galenson, "Do the Young British Artists Rule? Evidence from the Auction Market," *World Economics*, vol. 7, no. 1 (2006), pp. 175-84.

12. Calvin Tomkins, I (New York: Penguin, 1989), p. 242.

13. Corinne Robins, *The Pluralist Era: American Art 1968-1981* (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), p. 1; Jonathan Fineberg, *Art Since 1940*, second ed. (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2000), p. 365.

14. Schjeldahl, *Let's See*, pp. 182-83.

15. Also see Arthur Danto, *The Abuse of Beauty* (Peru, Ill.: Open Court Publishingi Company, 2003), p. 123: "These traditional genres [painting and sculpture] play a decreasingly central role in the contemporary system of the arts."

16. David Galenson, "A Conceptual World: Why the Art of the Twentieth Century is So Different from the Art of All Earlier Centuries," NBER Working Paper 12499 (2006).

17. Wall caption, Room 27, Tate Britain, London, March, 2008. Also see Andrew Wilson, "Out of Control," *Art Monthly,* 177 (1994), pp. 3-9.

18. Jasper Johns, *Writings, Sketchbook Notes, Interviews* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1996), pp. 93-94.

19. Robert Motherwell, "Introduction," in Pierre Cabanne, *Dialogues with Marcel Duchamp* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1987), p. 12.

20. Thomas McEvilley, *The Triumph of Anti-Art* (Kingston, NY: McPherson and Company, 2005), p. 24.

21. Charlotte Higgins, "Work of art that inspired a movement … a urinal," *Guardian*, Dec. 2, 2004.

22. Higgins, "Work of art;" Calvin Tomkins, *Off the Wall* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1980), p. 125.

23. Kristine Stiles and Peter Selz, eds., *Theories and Documents of Contemporary Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), p. 321.

24. Arthur Danto, *The Madonna of the Future* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), pp. 273-78.

25. Clement Greenberg, *Late Writings* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), p. 10; Marjorie Perloff, *The Futurist Moment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), p. 52; Joseph Masheck, ed., *Marcel Duchamp in Perspective* (New York: Da Capo Press, 2002), p. 11.

26. Robert Motherwell, ed., *The Dada Painters and Poets: An Anthology* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), p. 235; Brandon Taylor, *Collage* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2004), p. 38.

27. Herta Wescher, *Collage* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1968), pp. 199-200.

28. Motherwell, *Dada Painters and Poets*, pp. 36-37.

29. Rosenberg, *Art on the Edge*, p. 176.

30. Robert Mattison, *Robert Rauschenberg* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 57-64; Paul Schimmel, ed., *Robert Rauschenberg Combines* (Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art, 2005), pp. 14-26, 211-12.

31. Allan Kaprow, *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), pp. 11, 63.

32. Clive Bell, *Since Cézanne* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922), pp. 11, 83.

33. Bell, *Since Cézanne*, p. 2; Michael Doran, ed., *Conversations with Cézanne* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), p. 39.

34. Jack Flam, ed., *Matisse on Art*, revised ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), p. 124; Brassaï, *Conversations with Picasso* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), p. 107.

35. Meyer Schapiro, *Worldview in Painting – Art and Society* (New York: George Braziller, 1999), p. 144.

36. Gabriele Detterer, ed., *Art Recollection* (Florence: Danilo Montanari, Exit, and Zona Archives Editori, 1997), p. 117.

37. George Heard Hamilton, *Painting and Sculpture in Europe, 1880-1940* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), p. 15.

Table 1: Ranking of Artists by Total Illustrations of Works Executed in 1975 or Later

Artist	N	Date of birth	Date of Death	Country of Birth
Cindy Sherman	25	1954	–	United States
Gerhard Richter	23	1932	–	Germany
Jeff Koons	22	1955	–	United States
Damien Hirst	19	1965	–	England
Anselm Kiefer	18	1945	–	Germany
Jean-Michel Basquiat	15	1960	1988	United States
Rachel Whiteread	14	1963	–	England
Matthew Barney	12	1967	–	United States
Richard Serra	12	1939	–	United States
Jake and Dinos Chapman	11	1966, 1962	–	England
Jenny Holzer	11	1950	–	United States
Richard Prince	11	1949	–	United States
Julian Schnabel	11	1951	–	United States
Jeff Wall	11	1946	–	Canada

Source: see text and appendix.

Appendix. The 21 books surveyed for this paper are listed here.

Adams, Louise Schneider, *Art Across Time*, third ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2007).

Archer, Michael, *Art Since 1960*, second ed. (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002).

Arnason, H.H., *History of Modern Art*, fifth ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2004).

Bell, Cory, *Modern Art* (New York: Watson-Guptill, 2001).

Bell, Julian, *Mirror of the World* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2007).

Buchholz, Elke Linda, et al., *Art* (New York: Abrams, 2007).

Collings, Matthew, *This is Modern Art* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2004).

Cottington, David, *Modern Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Cumming, Robert, *Art* (London: DK Publishing, 2005).

Davies, Penelope, et al., *Janson's History of Art*, seventh ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2007).

Dempsey, Amy, *Art in the Modern Era* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2002).

Fineberg, Jonathan, *Art Since 1940*, second ed. (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2000).

Foster, Hal; Rosalind Krauss; Yve-Alain Bois; and Benjamin Buchloh, *Art since 1900* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2004).

Honour, Hugh and John Fleming, *The Visual Arts*, sixth ed., (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2002).

Hopkins, David, *After Modern Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Hunter, Sam, John Jacobus and Daniel Wheeler, *Modern Art*, third ed. (New York: Vendome Press, 2004).

Kemp, Martin, ed., *The Oxford History of Western Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Lucie-Smith, Edward, *Movements in Art Since 1945*, new ed. (London: Thames and Hudson, 2001).

Parmesani, Loredana, *Art of the Twentieth Century* (Milan: Skira, 2000).

Richter, Klaus, *Art* (Munich: Prestel, 2001).

Taylor, Brandon, *Contemporary Art* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005).