NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

CO-AUTHORING ADVANCED ART

David Galenson

Working Paper 13484
http://www.nber.org/papers/w13484

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
October 2007

Co-Authoring Advanced Art
David Galenson
NBER Working Paper No. 13484
October 2007
JEL No. J01

ABSTRACT

The joint production of paintings by more than one artist was not uncommon in the past: a number of Old Masters had assistants do much of the work on their paintings, executing images that had been planned by the master. Yet prior to the twentieth century very few paintings were actually signed by more than one artist. Early in the twentieth century, many important conceptual artists occasionally co-authored paintings or drawings, but consistent co-authorship of paintings, sculptures, and photographs is a practice that is novel to the late twentieth century. These recent instances have generally involved pairs of conceptual artists. The English team, Gilbert and George, is the most important pair that has consistently produced co-authored works; they have executed all of their work jointly since 1969, when they made Singing Sculpture, their first and most famous piece. A number of pairs of young conceptual artists had worked closely together earlier in the century, but they did not formally co-author their work, perhaps because of the art world's commitment to the ideal of the autonomous artist. Since the critical and economic success of Gilbert and George has demonstrated that this resistance can be overcome, co-authorship has become more common among younger conceptual artists, and this trend is likely to continue in future.

David Galenson
Department of Economics
University of Chicago
1126 East 59th Street
Chicago, IL 60637
and NBER
galenson@uchicago.edu

Introduction

Consistent co-authorship of painting or other works of advanced visual art did not occur prior to the late twentieth century. In recent decades, however, this practice has been followed by a handful of teams of important artists. Yet the history of visual artists working together suggests that co-authorship is likely to become more widespread in the future, and for this reason the practice is of greater interest than would be warranted by the limited number of artists who have already adopted it. A brief survey of this history can help us to understand its recent emergence.

Before Modern Art

Joint production of paintings was an accepted practice in the Renaissance, as eminent masters presided over studios that might comprise dozens of students and assistants. So for example Vasari reported that when Raphael became successful he employed a large number of assistants and "was never seen at court without some fifty painters."[1] John Pope-Hennessy noted that in this phase of his career "Raphael over a large part of his work became an ideator instead of an executant," as he made detailed preparatory drawings or cartoons for works that would then be painted by assistants.[2] Raphael's practice of having his plans executed by others was a consequence of his conceptual approach to art, for he clearly considered the essence of his works to lie in their conception. Art scholars have generally agreed, as for example E. H. Gombrich described Raphael's images as "ideas come to life."[3] Like other conceptual masters of his time. Raphael consequently did not hesitate to present joint products of his studio as his own work. Yet although several artists might work on a single painting, it was very rare for the finished product to bear the signature of more than one artist, for in virtually all cases there was a clear

distinction between the roles of the master and his assistants.

Occasional instances can be found prior to the modern era in which two independent masters jointly produced a painting. One example is the case of Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) and Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568-1625), the two most important painters in Antwerp in the early seventeenth century. The two were good friends, and they executed about two dozen paintings together between 1598 and Brueghel's death in 1625. Although only one of these paintings was actually signed by both artists, Anne Woollett observed that their joint works "are distinguished by the evident separateness of their hands in a composition," and that "their established specialties and styles of painting serve as the visual equivalent of a signature."[4]

In general, Brueghel appears to have initiated the joint paintings, carrying out the drawing of the overall composition and much of the painting, including landscape and other natural motifs, which were his specialty. Rubens then painted the figures, which were his particular strength. That the paintings contain few significant pentimenti (changes made during the process of execution) suggests that the compositions were planned carefully in advance. Scholars assume that the two painters worked on these paintings sequentially, and that in fact each probably worked in his own studio, with the canvases being moved back and forth. That both Brueghel and Rubens were conceptual artists, who were accustomed to painting from preliminary drawings, obviously facilitated the process, for neither typically found it necessary to alter work the other artist had already done on a particular painting.[5]

Although the older Brueghel was more established when the two artists began working together, Rubens soon gained greater prominence, and ultimately became a much more famous painter. So for example a survey of 18 recent textbooks of art history found a total of 65

illustrations of paintings by Rubens, compared to six for Brueghel. The textbooks also show that the joint paintings were not among Rubens' most important contributions, for only two of his illustrations are of co-authored paintings.[6]

The Twentieth Century

Co-authorship of paintings and other works of visual art became much more common in the twentieth century, as a number of groups of conceptual artists produced significant numbers of joint productions, that two or more artists would sign. So for example many co-authored works were made by Dada artists in the late 1910s and early '20s, by Russian Suprematists and Constructivists during the 1920s, by Surrealists from the 1920s on, and by members of the Cobra group from the late 1940s on. Co-authored works consequently exist by many prominent artists, including the Dada artists Jean Arp, George Grosz, and Raul Hausmann, the Russians Kazimir Malevich and Georgii and Vladimir Stenberg, the Surrealists Joan Miró, Yves Tanguy, Salvador Dali, and Roberto Matta, and the Cobra painters Asger Jorn, Pierre Alechinsky, and Karel Appel.[7] The Surrealists in fact produced hundreds of drawings, each of which was co-authored by three or four artists: these were the products of a game the group often played, that they named Exquisite Corpse.[8]

Yet although there were many co-authored works made by artists in these groups during the first half of the twentieth century, these works did not make co-authorship an important phenomenon in the visual arts. The co-authored works were rarely significant efforts: although they were often produced by important artists, in no instance did they rank among those artists' most important contributions. The co-authored works were typically minor pieces, made quickly, and often, as in the case of the Surrealists' Exquisite Corpse drawings, primarily for the

artists' amusement. Very few artists in the first half of the twentieth century consistently co-authored works with one other artist and devoted significant effort to this joint activity. In a few exceptions to this last generalization, including the case of Jean Arp and his wife, Sophie Taeuber-Arp, both artists had made substantial bodies of work before they began working together, and one of the partners had a considerably greater reputation based on the earlier work, so the joint work was typically overshadowed by the more prominent artist's productions.

Throughout most of the century, an effective barrier to the serious and sustained production of co-authored art remained in place. Specifically, co-authorship was prevented by the traditional conception of the artist as an autonomous agent. Curiously, this conception persisted in spite of the fact that both patrons and critics have long recognized that Western art has always been in many respects a communal activity: the workshops of the Old Masters, where many paintings were jointly made by several artists, and the many stylistic groups in which modern artists worked closely together – Impressionism, Fauvism and Cubism, to name a few – immediately provide evidence of this recognition. Yet critics and collectors nonetheless appear to have insisted that individual works be identified with the name of a single artist.

In the second half of the twentieth century, significant cases of co-authorship have become more common in advanced art. In a number of cases, this is a consequence of instances in which a husband and wife who were already both working as artists decided to sign all their works jointly. Examples of this include Edward Kienholz and Nancy Reddin, Claes Oldenburg and Coosje van Bruggen, and Christo and Jeanne-Claude Javacheff. Although some of the work these artists have made has achieved prominence, in general these teams' joint work has been overshadowed by the reputations established earlier by the more eminent of the two partners. So

for example an art scholar remarked that "Although [Kienholz] has included his wife's name as co-creator, he has not yet allowed her to have great impact on his style." The same scholar judged that "Although the Oldenburgs' collaboration is acknowledged, . . . the style belongs to the husband," and that in yet another case, "the ideas are Christo's; the financial organization Jeanne-Claude's."[9]

A new practice emerged in the late twentieth century, however, in which teams of two artists working together from the beginning of their careers, making all of their art jointly, have become significant contributors to advanced art. In most cases these artists have had family relationships: they include husbands and wives (Bernd and Hilla Becher), brothers (Mike and Doug Starn, Jake and Dinos Chapman), and partners in long-term relationships (Gilbert and George, Tim Noble and Sue Webster). A survey of 20 textbooks of art history published since 1990 serves to measure the relative importance of the most prominent of these recent artistic teams. Most notable is the success of Gilbert and George, as Table 1 shows that they have an average of almost one illustration per book. Gilbert and George appear to be genuine innovators in creating a successful model of artistic co-authorship, and their case is consequently of considerable interest.

Gilbert and George

Gilbert Proesch (1943-) and George Pasmore (1942-) met in 1967, when they were students in the sculpture department of St. Martin's School of Art in London. Both were dissatisfied with the formalist orientation of the program: "They taught you to think solely about form: Extraordinary! The entire course was about the work's form, color, shape, weight. The teachers didn't think about content, meaning didn't come into it."[10] They decided that together

they would create a new type of art, in which they themselves would become the art. The critic David Sylvester later found the key to their art in its beginning: “everything they’ve done depends from that marvelous wheeze they had as students that a couple of artists could be living sculptures.”[11] Gilbert agreed: “we decided we were the object and the subject. And I think that was the biggest invention we ever did… We made a decision, like another artist who tells himself the most important thing is the form. And for us the most important thing was us as objects speaking to the world.”[12] An element of the decision was that the two would be one artist: “Two people make one artist. We think that we are an artist.” When asked if each could make art individually, Gilbert responded “I think it would be totally impossible.”[13]

As part of their position that they are a single artist, Gilbert and George deny that their work is the product of any functional division of labor: “All those partnerships you think of, it’s one person doing one thing and another doing another, bringing their different talents to bear on something. We don’t think we’re doing that. We never see it that we are doing a picture together in that way.”[14] Early in their career, Gilbert and George made large charcoal drawings based on photographs, but they abandoned these, in part because some viewers would attempt to separate their contributions. To make this impossible, their subsequent work has been based on photography: “We invented a technical form to make one art that doesn’t distinguish between us. You don’t see the brush strokes, the handwritten message that every artist is so proud of.” [15] This served their original decision to become one artist, for “it was a way of getting away from self.”[16]

Gilbert and George have explained why they consider their practice of making art together to be advantageous: “We can never have self-doubt. Because the normal artist is always asking himself questions, he is sitting in front of the canvas saying, ‘Should I put another green

cow in the corner, should I change the color of the sky?', and no answer comes back. Whereas with two people you've always got an answer. Self-doubt is vanishing. As long as the other always says yes – and we always say yes to each other. I think we share an enormous sense of purpose. I think that's our greatest strength."[17] When they are asked how they resolve disagreements about their work, they deny that they have any: "we never argue."[18]

When Gilbert and George left St. Martin's, they set out to become successful artists: "We were desperate to draw attention to ourselves." In 1969, dressed in matching tweed suits, with bronze paint on their faces and hands, they sang an old music hall song, "Underneath the Arches," continuously for eight hours in Charing Cross, one of the busiest spots in London. Titled *Singing Sculpture*, the work became famous, and during the next five years they presented it in clubs, art schools, and museums throughout Europe, Australia, Asia, and the United States.[19] Gilbert and George consider *Singing Sculpture* to have been their first work, and it remains their most important: photographs of it appear in eight of the 20 textbooks surveyed by this study, whereas none of their other works appears in more than two books.

Gilbert and George have consistently maintained that art should be conceptual. In a 1982 interview they declared that "Art is completely abstract, intellectual," in 1987 they stated that "Art is pure thought," and in 1993 they explained that "Art is about having new ideas." [20] What matters to them is not the process of making art, but the result: "The work is totally unimportant except for the end result. It is only the message that is important."[21] In pursuit of powerful images, over time their works have become larger and more colorful, recently filling large walls with grids of panels made with digital technology. Their images nearly always feature themselves, often dressed in their trademark tweed suits, but occasionally in the nude, and they

frequently include enlarged photographs of bodily fluids and waste products, with provocative texts referring to religion, homosexuality, male prostitution, AIDS, and other topics of obvious social significance. They contend that their goal is to influence people: "We are not here to reflect or illustrate life. We want to form it, change it."[22] Curiously, however, although the images and language in their works are often shocking, their messages are generally unclear: as David Sylvester noted, "there is something deeply equivocal about what is expected of us." Sylvester placed this within a conceptual tradition: "Gilbert and George, like Duchamp, never forget the importance of keeping us guessing."[23]

The Next Generation

Gilbert and George appear to be appreciated more in England than elsewhere: Louisa Buck recently observed that they, along with Damien Hirst and David Hockney, are Britain's best-known living artists, and in 2002 Hirst complained that "I can't help thinking if Gilbert and George were American, they'd be much more significant." [24] The impact of the pair in England may account for the greater prominence in London of artistic teams of the next generation. So for example the younger team of sculptors Tim Noble (1966 -) and Sue Webster (1967 -) announced their first exhibition by making flyers on which they superimposed photographs of their own faces on a picture of Gilbert and George.[25]

Louisa Buck listed several ways in which Jake (1966 -) and Dinos (1962 -) Chapman are indebted to their older colleagues: "Like contemporary art's other famous double act, Gilbert and George (for whom they once worked as assistants), the Chapmans have benefitted from the PR advantages of presenting a twinned front. They have also embraced scandal and outrage by creating images that many people find offensive... while declaring that they are only dealing with

what is already floating in the cultural ether. More significantly, however, the Chapmans have followed the example of Gilbert and George by presenting often outrageously transgressive subject matter in a way that appears mechanical and pristine - thus further distancing themselves from the work."[26]

The Chapman brothers' art is highly conceptual: "They play with visual and verbal correspondences, create hilariously vulgar and impenetrably obscure associations, layer images onto existing historical imagery and cyclically reconfigure motifs that reappear in different guises. They employ word games, visual puns, illogical anachronism and time leaps, biological shifts and moral conundrums, unexpected variations in scale and sudden alterations between media to create both amusing and unsettling ambiguities."[27] One of their characteristically conceptual practices is to draw heavily on earlier artists' work. Early in their careers they became fascinated with Francisco Goya's series of etchings, *The Disasters of War*, and they proceeded to make a number of works based on it. These include *Insult to Injury*, of 2003. After purchasing an edition of Goya's *Disasters* series for £25,000, they defaced or (in their word) "rectified" Goya's black-and -white images by drawing colored cartoon faces over those of some of the original figures, and occasionally adding helmets decorated with swastikas. They presented these "improved" works in an exhibition titled *The Rape of Creativity*.[28] When some critics expressed outrage at what they called an act of vandalism, the Chapmans made two arguments in their defense. One was economic: noting that each of the 80 etchings in their series sold for £13,500, they asked how an act that raised the value of a work of art could be considered vandalism. The other argument was canonical, as the brothers pointed to the famous precedent of the young Robert Rauschenberg erasing a drawing by Willem de Kooning to create a new work

of art in 1953.[29]

The comparison between the Chapmans' *Insult to Injury* and Rauschenberg's *Erased de Kooning Drawing* is of course inexact, because rather than eliminating Goya's work, the Chapmans added to it, and thus effectively made themselves co-authors of Goya's. The Chapmans have made other works that refer to artistic co-authorship, including a set of etchings, titled *Exquisite Corpse*, that mimic the composite drawings made in the course of the game of that name by the Surrealists, in which each of several panels on a folded sheet of paper was drawn by a different artist who could not see the forms made by preceding participants. The frequency with which the Chapmans appropriate other artists' images and practices implies that one of the themes underlying their work is in fact artistic collaboration. Consistent with this, they have spoken of the history of art as a continuity, and have claimed that "We're trying to diffuse the creative importance of the artist in the process of making art."[30]

Artistic Teams

The twentieth century has seen a number of significant instances of two young conceptual artists working closely together. Several of these have attained almost mythic status. From 1909 until the outbreak of World War I, Picasso and Braque joined forces in developing Cubism. Picasso recalled how closely they had worked together: "At that time our work was a kind of laboratory research from which vanity was excluded."[31] Braque similarly stressed that they had cooperated to solve problems: "In the early days of Cubism, Pablo Picasso and I were engaged in what we felt was a search for the anonymous personality. We were inclined to efface our own personalities in order to find originality. Thus it often happened that amateurs mistook Picasso's painting for mine and mine for Picasso's. This was a matter of indifference to us

because we were primarily interested in our work and in the new problem it presented."[32]

Jasper Johns and Robert Rauschenberg worked closely together during the late 1950s, when both were making what proved to be their most important innovations. Rauschenberg recalled that "Jasper and I literally traded ideas."[33] Johns stated that "I suppose I learned more about painting from Bob than I learned from any other artist or teacher, and working as closely as we did and more or less in isolation, we developed a strong sense of kinship. When that ended, each of us seemed to develop - where there had been none before - some sense of self-interest."[34] At a time when the two artists were receiving little encouragement from the art world at large, Rauschenberg explained that the support they got from each other gave them "permission to do what we wanted."[35] Today Johns and Rauschenberg object to comparisons between their early working relationship and that of Picasso and Braque, pointing out that unlike the two young Cubists, they never shared an artistic style. During that early time, however, they nonetheless drew comfort from the parallel they perceived between their situation and that of the Cubists. Thus Johns recently told a journalist, "I remember once, I was reading Gertrude Stein's *Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* to him, reading it out loud, and Bob turned and said, 'One day they'll be writing about us like that.'"[36]

Like these other pairs of young artists before them, Gilbert and George faced considerable opposition to their work early in their careers. One example occurred shortly after they left St. Martin's, and had begun to present themselves as living sculptures. Hoping to get support from their former teachers, they went back to see several, including Anthony Caro, the most eminent sculptor at St. Martin's. "We went to a pub near his studio and sat and had half a bitter and a cheese roll, and explained where we wanted to take our art. He listened very

carefully, quite politely. Then he said, 'I hope very much that you don't succeed, but I rather think you might.'"[37] Like the young Picasso and Braque, and the young Johns and Rauschenberg, the young Gilbert and George joined together to solve problems, with a primary emphasis on artistic concepts, rather than the personality of the artist. And like those earlier teams, Gilbert and George made their early innovations in the face of considerable adversity. Unlike their earlier counterparts, however, Gilbert and George not only worked *as if* their art was a joint product, but actually formally co-authored their work. And unlike the earlier teams, Gilbert and George did not part company after an initial period of discovery: in 2007, their retrospective exhibition at London's Tate Modern Museum surveyed work that they had done over the course of 38 years, from 1969 through 2006. In their complete and consistent co-authorship of their work, and the degree of their success, Gilbert and George effectively became pioneers of a new practice in advanced art. They have succeeded in convincing the art world that a pair of individuals can jointly make a significant contribution. The introduction to the booklet distributed at their recent retrospective exhibition in London includes a sentence that simultaneously points to the English art world's view of their importance and the acceptance of the pair as a unit, noting that "it is fitting that *Gilbert & George: Major Exhibition* is the largest retrospective of any artist to be held at Tate Modern."[38]

As the survey of art history textbooks demonstrates, Gilbert and George are the most successful team working today, but they are not unique among contemporary artists in their consistent production of co-authored art. Key aspects of their practice also appear to be common to other contemporary artistic teams. So for example, the photographers Bernd and Hilla Becher have explained that in their practice "there is no division of labor in the sense that one person is

always responsible for one aspect or phase of the work. Both of us do everything: at times we each do a certain task and then we swap... Outsiders cannot tell who has taken a particular photo and we also often forget ourselves. It simply is not important."[39] And Jake and Dinos Chapman have declared that they always work together in order to suppress their individual preoccupations: "We work together as a means to avoid coalescing into a single boring artist preoccupied with all things personal and internal."[40]

The Future of Co-Authorship in Art

Co-authorship has become not only common but typical in many academic disciplines. Although it is not common in visual art, in recent decades it has become a consistent practice for a handful of important pairs of artists, and it is now widely accepted by art critics as well as collectors. So for example Gilbert and George were awarded the English Turner Prize in 1986, and Jake and Dinos Chapman were short-listed for that prize in 2003, as Jane and Louise Wilson had been in 1999. And a number of artistic teams, including Gilbert and George, Bernd and Hilla Becher, Tim Noble and Sue Webster, Peter Fischli and David Weiss, and Jake and Dinos Chapman, have all had individual works sell for $100,000 or more at auction.

Throughout the past century, a number of pairs or small groups of young conceptual artists have worked closely together, often to solve specific technical problems, and to give each other encouragement while breaking accepted rules of art. During most of the century, these artists did not actually co-author their works, perhaps in part because they feared this would not be accepted by others in the art world. This is no longer true, for co-authored art is now exhibited in the most important museums of modern art, and generates substantial prices at auction. In view of this, it is likely that in future increasing numbers of young artists will not only make

their work jointly, but will present it explicitly as their joint product. It is also likely that, as in the past, these teams will generally be made up of conceptual artists, for ideas appear to be more readily exchanged and negotiated than visions.

Footnotes

1. Giorgio Vasari, *Vasari's Lives of the Artist* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1946), p. 232.

2. John Pope-Hennessy, *Raphael* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 217-21.

3. E. H. Gombrich, *Gombrich on the Renaissance*, Vol. 1, fourth edition (London: Phaidon Press, 1985), p. 68.

4. Anne Woollett and Ariane van Suchtelen, *Rubens and Brueghel: A Working Friendship* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2006), pp. 2-36.

5. On the process of making the joint paintings, see Woollett and van Suchtelen, *Rubens and Brueghel*, pp. 215-48. On Rubens' conceptual practice of a division of labor within his studio in general, see Svetlana Alpers, *Rembrandt's Enterprise* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 101.

6. The textbooks surveyed in chronological order, are the following: Ariane Ruskin, *History in Art* (New York: Franklin Watts, 1974); Sara Cornell, *Art* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1983); Frederick Hartt, *Art*, third ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1989); Sandro Sproccati, *A Guide to Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1992); Carol Strickland, *The Annotated Mona Lisa* (Kansas City: Andrews and McMeel, 1992); Laurie Adams, *A History of Western Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994); William Fleming, *Arts and Ideas*, ninth ed. (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 1995); E. H. Gombrich, *The Story of Art*, sixteenth ed. (London: Phaidon, 1995); Marilyn Stokstad, *Art History* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1995); David Wilkins, Bernard Schultz, and Katheryn Linduff, *Art Past, Art Present*, third ed. (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997); Volker Gebhardt, *The History of Art* (New York: Barron's, 1998); Rita Gilbert, *Living With Art*, fifth ed., (Boston: McGraw Hill, 1998); Martin Kemp, ed., *The Oxford History of Western Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Hugh Honour and John Fleming, *The Visual Arts*, sixth ed. (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2002); Paul Johnson, *Art* (New York: Harper Collins, 2003); Robert Cumming, *Art* (London: DK Publishing, 2005); Ingo Walther, ed., *Masterpieces of Western Art* (Cologne: Taschen, 2005); Penelope Davis, et. al., *Janson's History of Art*, seventh ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2007).

7. For a catalogue with many examples of these works, see Cynthia McCabe, *Artistic Collaboration in the Twentieth Century* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1984).

8. André Breton, *Surrealism and Painting (*Boston: MFA Publications, 2002), pp. 288-90.

9. McCabe, *Artistic Collaboration in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 74-75.

10. François Jonquet, *Gilbert and George* (London: Phaidon Press, 2004), p. 58.

11. David Sylvester, *About Modern Art*, second ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), p. 518.

12. David Sylvester, *London Recordings* (London: Chatto and Windows, 2003), p. 162.

13. Robert Violette and Hans-Ulrich Obrist, eds., *The Words of Gilbert & George* (New York: Violette Editions, 1997), p. 195.

14. Sylvester, *London Recordings*, p. 149.

15. Sylvester, *London Recordings*, p. 149.

16. Violette and Obrist, *The Words of Gilbert & George*, p. 257.

17. Sylvester, *London Recordings*, pp. 147-48.

18. E.g. see John Tusa, *The Janus Aspect* (London: Methuen, 2006), p. 108.

19. Jonquet, *Gilbert & George*, pp. 65-67.

20. Violette and Obrist, *The Words of Gilbert & George*, pp. 132, 168, 190.

21. Violette and Obrist, *The Words of Gilbert & George*, p. 192.

22. Violette and Obrist, *The Words of Gilbert & George*, p. 168.

23. Sylvester, *About Modern Art*, p. 316.

24. Louisa Buck, *Moving Targets 2* (London: Tate Publishing, 2000), p. 20; Damien Hirst and Gordon Burn, *On the Way to Work* (New York: Universe, 2002), p. 55.

25. Buck, *Moving Targets 2*, p. 128.

26. Buck, *Moving Targets 2*, pp. 47-48.

27. Christoph Grunenberg, "Attraction-Repulsion Machines: The Art of Jake and Dinos Chapman," in Jake and Dinos Chapman, *Bad Art for Bad People*, (London: Tate Publishing, 2006), p. 12.

28. Virginia Button, *The Turner Prize: Twenty Years* (London: Tate Publishing, 2003), p. 190; Jake and Dinos Chapman, *Insult to Injury* (Gottingen: Steidlmack, 2003); Christopher Turner, "Great Deeds Against Dead Artists," in Jake and Dinos Chapman, *Bad Art for Bad People*, p. 52.

29. Turner, "Great Deeds Against Dead Artists," p. 52.

30. Jake and Dinos Chapman, *Bad Art for Bad People*, p. 122.

31. Françoise Gilot and Carlton Lake, *Life With Picasso* (New York: Anchor Books, 1969), p. 77.

32. Marilyn McCully, ed., *A Picasso Anthology* (Princeton: Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 64.

33. Calvin Tomkins, *Off the Wall* (Hamondsworth: Penguin, 1980), p. 118.

34. Jasper Johns, *Writings, Sketchbook Notes, Interviews* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1996), pp. 280-81.

35. Tomkins, *Off the Wall*, p. 118.

36. Calvin Tomkins, "Everything in Sight," *New Yorker* (May 23, 2005), p. 76.

37. Violette and Obrist, *The Words of Gilbert & George*, p. 256.

38. Tate Modern, *Gilbert & George Major Exhibition* (London: Tate Modern, 2007), not paginated.

39. Susanne Lange, *Bernd and Hilla Becher* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2007), p. 187.

40. Jake and Dinos Chapman, *Bad Art for Bad People*, p. 122.

Table 1: Total Illustrations of Work of Five Artistic Teams in 20 Textbooks

Artist	N
1. Gilbert and George	18
2. Bernd and Hilla Becher	10
3t. Jake and Dinos Chapman	4
3t. Mike and Doug Starn	4
5. Komar and Melamid	3

Sources: see text and Appendix.

Appendix: The textbooks used to construct Table 1 are listed here. The artists included in Table 1 are all co-authors whose work was illustrated in at least two of the three books asterisked below.

Adams, Laurie, *Art Across Time*, third ed. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2007.

*Archer, Michael, *Art Since 1960*, new ed. London: Thames and Hudson, 2002.

*Arnason, H. H., *History of Modern Art*. fifth ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003.

Blistène, Bernard, *A History of 20th-Century Art*. Paris: Flammarion, 2001.

Britt, David, ed. *Modern Art*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1999.

Cumming, Robert, *Art*. New York: DK Publishing, 2005.

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

Foster, Hal., et. al., *Art Since 1900*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 2004.

Gilbert, Rita, *Living with Art*, fifth ed. Boston: McGraw Hill, 1998.

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.

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

Lucie-Smith, *Visual Arts in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997.

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

Perry, Gill, and Paul Wood, eds., *Themes in Contemporary Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Sandler, Irving, *Art of the Postmodern Era*. New York: Harper Collins, 1996.

Stangos, Nikos, ed., *Concepts of Modern Art*, third ed. London: Thames and Hudson, 1994.

Stokstad, Marilyn, *Art History*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1995.

Walther, Ingo, ed., *Art of the Twentieth Century*. Cologne: Taschen, 2005.