

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

THE GREATEST ARTISTS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

David W. Galenson

Working Paper 11899

<http://www.nber.org/papers/w11899>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH

1050 Massachusetts Avenue

Cambridge, MA 02138

December 2005

The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

©2005 by David W. Galenson. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

The Greatest Artists of the Twentieth Century
David W. Galenson
NBER Working Paper No. 11899
December 2005
JEL No. J0, J1

ABSTRACT

Pablo Picasso was by far the greatest artist of the 20th century: textbooks of art history contain more than twice as many illustrations of his work as of that of his closest rival, Henri Matisse. A survey of textbooks also identifies Jackson Pollock as the greatest American artist, by a narrow margin over Andy Warhol. The 15 greatest artists of the century include nine conceptual innovators, who made their greatest contributions early in their lives, in their 20s and 30s, and six experimental innovators, who generally did their greatest work in their 40s and 50s - and even, in the case of Mondrian, in his 70s. Contrary to the belief of many humanists, the textbooks show that in art, as in all intellectual activities, importance is determined by innovation.

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

Introduction

Perhaps the importance that we must attach to the achievement of an artist or a group of artists may properly be measured by the answer to the following question: Have they so wrought that it will be impossible henceforth, for those who follow, ever again to act as if they had not existed?

Walter Sickert, 1910¹

Important artists are innovators: they are important because they change the way their successors work. The more widespread, and the more profound, the changes due to the work of any artist, the greater is the importance of that artist.

Recognizing the source of artistic importance points to a method of measuring it. Surveys of art history are narratives of the contributions of individual artists. These narratives describe and explain the changes that have occurred over time in artists' practices. It follows that the importance of an artist can be measured by the attention devoted to his work in these narratives. The most important artists, whose contributions fundamentally change the course of their discipline, cannot be omitted from any such narrative, and their innovations must be analyzed at length; less important artists can either be included or excluded, depending on the length of the specific narrative treatment and the tastes of the author, and if they are included their contributions can be treated more summarily. The judgments of different authors can of course differ. Surveying a large number of narratives can reduce the impact of idiosyncratic opinions, and serves to reveal the general consensus of expert opinion as to the relative importance of the artists considered.

Today, well into the first decade of a new century, it is possible to survey a large collection of narratives of the art of the past century, and to see which artists emerge most

prominently from these accounts. One result of this survey is a ranking of the greatest artists of the twentieth century.

The Ranking

Lists seem trivial, but in fact they are crucial symptomatic indices of underlying struggles over taste, evaluation and the construction of a canon... [T]here is a complex genealogy of influence and indebtedness which is left for critics and historians to unearth.

Peter Wollen, 2002²

The artists selected for this study are those whose major contributions were made entirely in the twentieth century and who were found to be the most important artists at particular times and places by a series of earlier surveys of art history textbooks. Specifically, 15 different artists were found to have an average of at least two illustrations per textbook in a series of nine previous studies of artistic importance.³ These artists are listed in Table 1.

For the present study a new data set was created by recording all illustrations of the work of these 15 artists in 33 textbooks of art history.⁴ All of these books surveyed the history of art in the 20th century, and all were published in 1990 or later.

Table 2 ranks the 15 artists by using the total number of illustrations of each artist's work that appeared in the 33 textbooks. A number of important facts emerge from this ranking.

Perhaps the most striking feature of Table 2 is the dominant position of Picasso. Remarkably, the textbooks surveyed contain an average of 12 illustrations of his work, more than twice as many as the average for his rival and friend, Matisse. Table 2 clearly demonstrates that it would be difficult to overstate the importance of Picasso for 20th-century art.

More generally, Table 2 also points to the privileged position given to artistic developments in France. The top five artists are all Europeans, and all spent some if not all of

their careers in Paris. Pollock ranks sixth, making him the most important American artist of the century. He is joined in the top 10 by Warhol and Johns. Thus New York is given a prominent role, second to that of Paris.

Table 2 provides the basis for a brief overview of the specific roles of the most important artists of the 20th century, and this will be the subject of the following section of this paper. The data set constructed for this study can be used to provide a more precise focus for that overview, by pointing to when each of the artists made his major contribution. Thus Table 3 shows the five-year period in each artist's career that accounts for the most textbook illustrations. Arranging these periods in chronological order provides quite a precise outline for a consideration of the sequence in which the greatest artistic innovations of the 20th century occurred.

Revolutionary Minds

Every consequential contribution to *l'art moderne* has been made
by revolutionary minds.

Robert Motherwell⁵

Fauvism was the first significant art movement of the 20th century. Matisse was its leader, and Table 3 shows that his most important period began in 1905, when he and several friends, including André Derain and Maurice Vlaminck, first presented their new work, at the Salon d'Automne. At that exhibition the critic Louis Vauxcelles' facetious remark gave the group the name of *fauves*, or wild beasts.⁶ Fauvism followed the lead of Gauguin and van Gogh in liberating the use of color, but it was more extreme in its anti-naturalistic use of pure bright colors: in Matisse's words, it was based on the realization "that one could work with expressive colors that are not necessarily descriptive colors."⁷ This would later directly influence the Blue Rider movement and many other expressionist artists.

Fauvism was a conceptual innovation, based not on visual perception but on an idea. André Gide immediately understood this, as he responded to the widespread claim that Fauvism was irrational by observing that in fact just the opposite was true: “Everything can be deduced, explained... Yes, this painting is reasonable, or rather it is itself reasoning.”⁸ Matisse was a protean conceptual artist, who went on to make a number of other contributions in his long career. In his famous “Notes of a Painter” in 1908, he explained that his artistic goal was not to imitate nature, but to express his reaction to it: “I am unable to distinguish between the feeling I have about life and my way of translating it.”⁹

Fauvism was short-lived, and it was soon overshadowed by a very different movement, that was concerned with form rather than color. Cubism was the most important innovation in the visual arts of the 20th century, its preeminence witnessed not only by the dominant position of Picasso in Table 2, but also by Braque’s fifth-place ranking in that table. Cubism is often considered to have been announced by Picasso’s large painting, *Les Femmes d’Alger*, of 1907, which would become the most important work of art of the 20th century.¹⁰ In 1909 Picasso and Braque joined forces, and from then until the outbreak of World War I the two worked, in Braque’s words, “rather like two mountaineers roped together.”¹¹

Cubism revolutionized the representation of forms. Since the Renaissance, the most prevalent approach to form in Western painting had been one-point perspective, which provided a systematic method for recording what the eye sees. Cubism replaced this with a principle that allowed the artist to represent not just what he could see from a single vantage point, but what he knew of his subject as a result of having seen it from many different positions. As John Golding observed, “The Cubism of Picasso and Braque was to be essentially conceptual. Even in the

initial stages of the movement, when the painters relied to a large extent on visual models, their paintings are not so much records of the sensory appearance of their subjects, as expressions in pictorial terms of their idea or knowledge of them.”¹²

In less than a decade the young artists Picasso and Braque, joined in progress by the even younger Juan Gris, successfully established “for the first time in Western art the principle that a work of art... need not be restricted to the phenomenal appearance of the object for which it stands.”¹³ This became the most fundamental watershed for the art of the modern era, not only in painting but in all the visual arts. In recognition of the impact of this principle on the art of the 20th century, Golding called Cubism “the most complete and radical artistic revolution since the Renaissance.”¹⁴ The leader in the development of Cubism was the greatest artist of the 20th century, the young genius David Sylvester described as “the quintessential finder.”¹⁵

In 1910, Picasso and Braque took Cubism to the brink of abstraction, but both then stopped short of making a completely non-representational art. By 1915, however, a number of other artists had created non-objective forms of painting. The three greatest pioneers of abstraction were Mondrian, Malevich, and Kandinsky, all of whom rank in the top ten in Table 2.

Mondrian, Malevich, and Kandinsky all believed that art could have redemptive value, and that it could contribute to the creation of better societies, but the specific forms of their art differed greatly. And not only did the three make distinctively different versions of abstraction, but they arrived at it in very different ways. Mondrian sought harmony and rhythm in the relations among colors and lines, and he worked experimentally, constantly changing his paintings as a result of visual inspection. He stressed that his paintings were “created *consciously* but not *calculatingly*.”¹⁶ Kandinsky also proceeded by trial and error, explaining that as he works

“the painter always ‘hears’ a ‘voice’ that simply tells him, ‘That’s right!’ or ‘That’s wrong!’ If the voice becomes very faint, the artist must put his brushes down and wait.”¹⁷ In contrast, Malevich’s paintings systematically recorded forms that were meticulously planned with mathematical calculations and measurements in order to express his ideas, for his art was intended to communicate his ideas. Thus he declared that “The important thing in art is signs flowing from the creative brain.”¹⁸ The difference between the cautious approach to abstraction of the experimentalists Mondrian and Kandinsky and the precipitous arrival of the conceptual Malevich was apparent to John Golding, who observed that “It might be fair to say that Malevich’s abstraction sprang, Athena-like, ready formed from the brow of its creator; this distinguishes Malevich’s approach very sharply from that of both Mondrian and Kandinsky, who had sensed and inched their way into abstraction over a period of many years.”¹⁹

Marcel Duchamp was a central influence on the anti-art Dada movement that began during World War I, and in 1934 André Breton, the founder and leading spirit of Surrealism, declared that Duchamp had been “at the very forefront of all the ‘modern’ movements which have succeeded each other during the last twenty-five years.”²⁰ Yet by nature Duchamp was a maverick, who avoided formal labels and alliances, and consistently stood apart from the normal practices of artists. He made very few works of art, and never presented his work at a commercial gallery. But as his position in third place in Table 2 suggests, Duchamp’s influence was enormous. This was a result not only of the works of art he made, but also for the ironic and detached persona he created, which became a new model of the artist’s image for many conceptual artists later in the century.

Duchamp’s avowed goal was to change the course of modern art. Thus in 1946 he

explained that “until the last hundred years all painting had been... at the service of the mind. This characteristic was lost little by little during the last century.”²¹ To return art to its conceptual role, Duchamp produced works that undermined a series of central conventions of Western art. Perhaps none did this more violently than his invention of the “readymade,” manufactured objects he purchased and signed, which at one stroke eliminated the distinction between art and reality, and challenged the sanctity of the touch of the artist. This innovation was so radical and subversive that its full impact was delayed for decades after its introduction in 1912, but with the wholesale departure of Johns, Rauschenberg and others from the traditional methods and materials of art from the mid-1950s on, Duchamp came to be recognized by many as “the most influential artist of the second half of the twentieth century.”²²

Brancusi was the greatest sculptor of the 20th century. His distinctive contribution was to bring abstraction to sculpture. He did this visually, for the source of his inspiration was always real, and his forms always originated in human or other natural shapes. Unlike most of his contemporaries, Brancusi did not have plaster models translated to marble by technicians, but worked directly in the stone. He furthermore did this without sketches or other plans, for his approach became a philosophy as well as a method: “all those works are conceived directly in the material and made by me from beginning to end, and... the work is hard and long and goes on forever.”²³

Brancusi’s experimental approach meant that the completion of an individual sculpture was not a resolution, but only one step in the sequential development of a theme. This process was often gradual and protracted, as for example he made versions of *The Kiss* over an elapsed span of 35 years. His forms generally became progressively simpler and more abstract over time

as he searched for what he called “the essence of things.”²⁴ David Sylvester remarked that Brancusi was “an extreme instance of the seeker, with his indefatigable exploration of a few themes, eschewing duplication to create variations involving the subtlest of differences.”²⁵ Henry Moore explained Brancusi’s role in modern sculpture: “Since the Gothic, European sculpture had become overgrown with moss, weeds - all sorts of surface excrescences which completely concealed shape. It has been Brancusi’s special mission to get rid of this overgrowth, and to make us more shape-conscious. To do this he has had to concentrate on very simple direct shapes.”²⁶

Pollock, de Kooning, and Rothko were the most prominent members of the Abstract Expressionists, a large group of New York painters who came to be recognized as the most important advanced artists to emerge after World War II. The group was unified not by a style but by an interest in drawing on the subconscious to produce images, and in doing so by working directly on the canvas by trial and error, without plans or preconceptions. Pollock’s signature drip method of applying paint, with its inevitable splashing and puddling that could not be completely controlled by the artist, became the most famous emblem of this search for the unknown image, as Pollock explained that “I have no fears about making changes, destroying the image, etc., because the painting has a life of its own. I try to let it come through.”²⁷ De Kooning also worked without a specific goal: “I find sometimes a terrific picture... but I couldn’t set out to do that.”²⁸ Rothko stressed the absence of preconceived images more dramatically: “The picture must be for [the artist] ... a revelation, an unexpected and unprecedented resolution.”²⁹ The Abstract Expressionists’ incremental approach caused their art to develop slowly, and Thomas Hess’ description of the evolution of de Kooning’s mature style, as “a continuous process - a gradual,

logical, steady development, marked by hundreds of insights, but no blinding revelation,” applies equally to the other members of the group.³⁰ The Abstract Expressionists created the most important artistic movement based on experimental innovation since Impressionism, and in the process shifted the center of the advanced art world for the first time from Paris to New York.

Johns and Rauschenberg, who worked together during their key innovative periods in the late 1950s, reacted against the attitudes and methods of the Abstract Expressionists, and initiated an era of conceptual art that has persisted to the present. Like Duchamp before them the two young artists wanted to depersonalize and demystify art. Thus Johns believed that “looking at a painting should not require a special kind of focus like going to church. A picture ought to be looked at the same way you look at a radiator.” To this end Johns selected familiar subjects, and presented them in a way that effectively predetermined each painting’s appearance. Thus he explained that he painted the American flag “because I didn’t have to design it. So I went on to similar things like the targets - things the mind already knows.”³¹ Rauschenberg’s invention of the “combine,” in which he attached real things to his canvases, was intended to make his paintings independent objects rather than illusionistic representations of them: “I don’t want a picture to look like something it isn’t. I want it to look like something it is. And I think a picture is more like the real world when it’s made out of the real world.”³²

Johns’ deadpan portrayal of two-dimensional motifs, and Rauschenberg’s use of found objects, powerfully revived Duchamp’s earlier efforts to eliminate the traditional barriers between art and everyday life. And like Duchamp, their highly conceptual approach raised the possibility of irony that had been altogether absent from the almost spiritual quests of the Abstract Expressionists. Their work opened the door to a series of movements that have made art

that has differed radically in form and appearance, but that have all been characterized by the use of common images and objects and the real or ostensible rejection of the vision of the artist as a privileged maker of hallowed relics.

Warhol and Oldenburg were central figures in Pop Art, which exploded on the advanced art world in 1962. Pop was a conceptual movement based on the preconceived representation of commercial images and objects. As John Coplans pointed out, Warhol's celebrated paintings of 1962, including the hand-painted images of Campbell's soup cans and the silk-screened canvases of Marilyn Monroe, introduced two influential formal innovations: "First, the actual against the simulated use of an anonymous and mechanical technique, and second, the use of serial forms."³³ In another conceptual practice that subsequently became standard procedure for many leading artists including Jeff Koons and Damien Hirst, Warhol planned works which he then had fabricated by others. He explained that "Paintings are too hard. The things I want to show are mechanical."³⁴ Although Warhol took advantage of his celebrity to promote his work, he consistently claimed not to believe in the mystique of the artist: "Why do people think artists are special? It's just another job."³⁵ In 1962 Oldenburg made his first soft sculptures, which originated as props for Happenings. These oversized canvas representations of hamburgers, ice-cream cones, and other common objects challenged "the traditional concept of sculpture because they were soft rather than hard, as one expects sculpture to be."³⁶ In language that probably pleased the aged Marcel Duchamp, in 1961 Oldenburg declared that he was "for an art... that does something other than sit on its ass in a museum."³⁷

Young Geniuses and Old Masters

At the age of ten, twenty, a hundred, very young, a little

older, and very old, an artist is always an artist.

Isn't he better at some times, some moments, than at others? Never impeccable, since he is a living, human being?

Paul Gauguin, 1903³⁸

The data set constructed for this paper can be used to examine the creative life cycles of the artists considered by this study. Table 3 shows that the nine artists categorized as conceptual innovators all had their best five-year periods during their 20s and 30s, whereas five of the six experimental artists had their best five-year periods during their 40s and 50s. Even more narrowly, Table 4 presents the ages of the 15 artists in the single year from which their work received the most illustrations. The ages of the nine conceptual artists in their single best years range from 25 for Johns to 37 for Malevich, all below the ages for the six experimental artists, which range from 38 for Pollock to 71 for Mondrian. The median age of 33 for the conceptual artists in their best years is fully 16 years below the median age of 49 for the experimental artists.

Table 5 presents the percentage distributions of all of each artist's illustrations over their entire careers. The differences between the conceptual and experimental artists are again clear. For eight of the nine conceptual artists - all except Matisse - more than half of their total illustrations represent work they did before the age of 40; for five of them, more than 80% of their illustrations are of work done before that age. In contrast, for five of the six experimental artists - all except Pollock - less than one third of their total illustrations are of work they did before 40, and for four of them this share is less than 20%.

Conceptual innovators tend to make their greatest contributions early in their careers, when they are least constrained by fixed habits of thought and least accustomed to following the existing conventions of their disciplines. In contrast, experimental innovators generally improve

with age, with the deepening of their understanding of their craft and their increasing knowledge of the subjects they are trying to represent. The greatest artists of the 20th century clearly follow these contrasting life cycles. The conceptual painters Braque, Johns, and Picasso made their greatest contributions in their 20s, while their conceptual peers Duchamp, Malevich, Matisse, Oldenburg, Rauschenberg, and Warhol made their major contributions in their 30s. Of the experimentalists, Pollock made his greatest contribution in his late 30s, while Brancusi, Kandinsky, de Kooning, and Mondrian made theirs in their 40s, and Rothko did his greatest work in his 50s. The art of the 20th century was thus developed by both young geniuses and old masters.

Conclusion

Today movements are just that; they have no time to stagnate before they are replaced.

Lucy Lippard, 1967³⁹

The twentieth century was a time of fundamental change in advanced art, as artists embraced radically new methods and materials. This study has used scholarly narratives of modern art to identify the most important innovators of the past century. Picasso dominates these narratives, but other artists also made key contributions in Europe early in the century, and in New York later, as the center of advanced art changed continents.

As the analysis of this study has shown, the greatest artistic innovators of the century made their discoveries in very different ways. Some, including Picasso, Matisse, and Duchamp, made sudden breakthroughs based on the formulation of new ideas. Others, including Mondrian, Kandinsky, and Pollock, made more gradual progress dictated by visual criteria. As in earlier centuries, the tension between conceptual and experimental innovation played a major role in the

transformation of fine art.

The process of change continued to dominate fine art in the final decades of the 20th century, and in fact accelerated over time. The enormous demand for innovation was a key element in making conceptual approaches to art the dominant feature of the art world in the late 20th century. The extremely rapid pace of change created by a succession of conceptual movements in fact may account for the absence from this study of any artist who came to prominence after the early 1960s. There is no doubt that Robert Smithson, Bruce Nauman, Jeff Koons, Damien Hirst and other artists who worked in the late 20th century have made important contributions that have changed the practices of their peers. Yet the rapidity of change in this era has limited the extent of their influence relative to that of their predecessors. A central reason for this is the nature of the conceptual changes that have occurred in art over the course of the 20th century, for many of them have served to create new genres that have become independent specialties for many artists. The resulting fragmentation of art in the new era of pluralism restricts the proportion of the art world's territory that any single innovation can reach. Until some future innovator reverses this process by creating an art form that restores greater unity to the visual arts, Picasso and the other great artists of the early and mid-20th century may be the last in a line of giants each of whom, since the Renaissance, has for a time dominated the entire world of advanced art.

Footnotes

I thank Robert Jensen for discussions of the issues treated in this paper.

1. Walter Sickert, *The Complete Writings on Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 253.
2. Peter Wollen, *Paris Hollywood* (London: Verso, 2002), pp. 217, 222.
3. Five of these studies are included in David W. Galenson, *Artistic Capital* (Routledge, 2006); see Table 1.3, p. 7; Table 2.1, p. 25; Table 3.2, p. 48; Table 4.3, p. 68; and Table 7.5, p. 111. The other studies are Galenson, "One-Hit Wonders: Why Some of the Most Important Works of Modern Art Are Not by Important Artists," *Historical Methods*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2005), Table 7, p. 107; Galenson, "Toward Abstraction: Ranking European Painters of the Early Twentieth Century," *Historical Methods*, forthcoming, Table 2; Galenson, "Who Are the Greatest Living Artists? The View from the Auction Market," NBER Working Paper 11644 (2005); and Galenson and Bruce A. Weinberg, "Age and the Quality of Work: The Case of Modern American Painters," *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 108, No. 4 (2000), Table 4, p. 774.
4. On the use of illustrations as a measure of importance, see e.g. Galenson, *Artistic Capital*, pp. 5-6.
5. Robert Motherwell, *The Collected Writings of Robert Motherwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 35.
6. Hilary Spurling, *The Unknown Matisse* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), p. 332.
7. Jack Flam, *Matisse on Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), pp. 84, 178.
8. Alfred Barr, *Matisse* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1951), p. 63.
9. Flam, *Matisse on Art*, pp. 37-38.
10. See David W. Galenson, "The Most Important Works of Art of the Twentieth Century," (unpublished paper, University of Chicago, 2005).
11. Douglas Cooper, *The Cubist Epoch* (London: Phaidon, 1994), p. 42.
12. John Golding, *Cubism* (London: Faber and Faber, 1959), p. 60.
13. George Heard Hamilton, *Painting and Sculpture in Europe, 1880-1970* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967), p. 235.
14. Golding, *Cubism*, p. 15.

15. David Sylvester, *About Modern Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1995), p. 31.
16. Carel Blotkamp, *Mondrian* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1995), p. 81.
17. Wassily Kandinsky, *Complete Writings on Art* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1994), p. 769.
18. John Golding, *Paths to the Absolute* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 76.
19. Golding, *Paths to the Absolute*, p. 67.
20. André Breton, *Surrealism and Painting* (Boston: MFA Publications, 2002), p. 86.
21. Marcel Duchamp, *The Writings of Marcel Duchamp* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1989), p. 125.
22. Calvin Tomkins, *Off the Wall* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987), p. 125.
23. Sidney Geist, *Brancusi/The Kiss* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), p. 99.
24. Hamilton, *Painting and Sculpture in Europe*, p. 462.
25. Sylvester, *About Modern Art*, p. 431.
26. Henry Moore, *Henry Moore: Writings and Conversations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), p. 145.
27. Pepe Karmel, editor, *Jackson Pollock* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1999), p. 18.
28. David Sylvester, *Interviews with American Artists* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), p. 57.
29. James E. B. Breslin, *Mark Rothko* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), p. 240.
30. Thomas Hess, *Willem de Kooning* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1968), p. 46.
31. Jasper Johns, *Jasper Johns* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1996), p. 82.
32. Tomkins, *Off the Wall*, p. 87.
33. John Coplans, *Provocations* (London: London Projects, 1996), p. 98.
34. Victor Bockris, *Warhol* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1997), p. 163.
35. Andy Warhol, *The Philosophy of Andy Warhol* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1975), p. 178.
36. Steven Madoff, editor, *Pop Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 228.

37. Madoff, *Pop Art*, p. 213.
38. Paul Gauguin, *The Writings of a Savage* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1996), p. 267.
39. Lucy Lippard, *Changing* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1971), p. 27.

Table 1: Greatest Artists of the Twentieth Century

Artist	Date of birth	Date of death	Country of birth
Brancusi, Constantin	1876	1957	Romania
Braque, Georges	1882	1963	France
Duchamp, Marcel	1887	1968	France
Johns, Jasper	1930	--	US
Kandinsky, Wassily	1866	1944	Russia
de Kooning, Willem	1904	1997	Netherlands
Malevich, Kasimir	1878	1935	Russia
Matisse, Henri	1869	1954	France
Mondrian, Piet	1872	1944	Netherlands
Oldenburg, Claes	1929	--	Sweden
Picasso, Pablo	1881	1973	Spain
Pollock, Jackson	1912	1956	US
Rauschenberg, Robert	1925	--	US
Rothko, Mark	1903	1970	Russia
Warhol, Andy	1928	1987	US

Source: see text.

Table 2: Ranking of Artists by Total Illustrations

Artist	N	Mean illustrations per book
1. Picasso	395	12.0
2. Matisse	183	5.5
3. Duchamp	122	3.7
4. Mondrian	114	3.5
5. Braque	101	3.1
6. Pollock	96	2.9
7. Malevich	93	2.8
8. Warhol	85	2.6
9. Kandinsky	84	2.5
10. Johns	75	2.3
11. Brancusi	71	2.2
12. Rauschenberg	62	1.9
13. Oldenburg	58	1.8
14. de Kooning	52	1.6
15. Rothko	52	1.6

Source: This and subsequent tables are based on the data set constructed for this study. See the text and appendix for the method used and sources.

Table 3: Best Five-Year Period in Each Artist's Career, by Total Illustrations

Artist	Years	Ages
Brancusi	1924-28	48-52
Braque	1907-11	25-29
Duchamp	1910-14	23-27
Johns	1955-59	25-29
Kandinsky	1910-14	44-48
de Kooning	1949-53	45-49
Malevich	1913-17	35-39
Matisse	1905-09	36-40
Mondrian	1912-16	40-44
Oldenburg	1960-64	31-35
Picasso	1906-10	25-29
Pollock	1947-51	35-39
Rauschenberg	1957-61	32-36
Rothko	1956-60	53-57
Warhol	1962-66	34-38

Table 4: Best Single Year in Each Artist's Career, by Total Illustrations

Artist	Year	Age
<u>Conceptual</u>		
Johns	1955	25
Picasso	1907	26
Braque	1911	29
Duchamp	1917	30
Oldenburg	1962	33
Rauschenberg	1959	34
Warhol	1962	34
Matisse	1905	36
Malevich	1915	37
<u>Experimental</u>		
Pollock	1950	38
De Kooning	1950	46
Kandinsky	1913	47
Brancusi	1925, 1928*	49, 52
Rothko	1957	54
Mondrian	1943	71

*two years tied for most illustrations.

Table 5: Percentage Distributions of Illustrations Over Artists' Careers

Age:	20-9	30-9	40-9	50-9	60-9	70-9	80-9	90-9	Total
<u>Conceptual</u>									
Braque	58	28	6	3	5	0	0	-	100
Duchamp	39	48	2	4	2	5	0	-	100
Johns	60	27	7	5	1	0	-	-	100
Malevich	1	68	21	10	-	-	-	-	100
Matisse	1	44	26	7	6	4	12	-	100
Oldenburg	0	67	26	5	2	0	-	-	100
Picasso	35	25	17	14	4	2	2	1	100
Rauschenberg	10	84	3	0	3	0	0	-	100
Warhol	0	88	5	7	-	-	-	-	100
<u>Experimental</u>									
Brancusi	0	31	32	23	14	0	0	-	100
Kandinsky	0	1	70	20	4	5	-	-	100
De Kooning	0	2	73	13	6	6	0	0	100
Mondrian	0	11	47	20	5	17	-	-	100
Pollock	8	76	16	-	-	-	-	-	100
Rothko	0	6	17	62	15	-	-	-	100

Appendix: The 33 books surveyed for this paper are listed here, ordered by date of publication.

1. Varnedoe, Kirk. 1990. *A Fine Disregard: What Makes Modern Art Modern*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
2. Hughes, Robert. 1991. *The Shock of the New*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
3. Tamplin, Ronald, ed. 1991. *The Arts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Yenawine, Philip. 1991. *How to Look at Modern Art*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
5. Sproccati, Sandro. 1992. *A Guide to Art*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
6. Strickland, Carol, and Boswell, John. 1992. *The Annotated Mona Lisa*. Kansas City: Andrews and McMeel.
7. Series of three books treated as one:

 Harrison, Charles; Frascina, Francis; and Perry, Gill. 1993. *Primitivism, Cubism, Abstraction*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

 Fer, Briony; Batchelor, David; and Wood, Paul. 1993. *Realism, Rationalism, Surrealism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

 Wood, Paul; Frascina, Francis; Harris, Jonathan; and Harrison, Charles. 1993. *Modernism in Dispute*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
8. Adams, Laurie. 1994. *A History of Western Art*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
9. Stangos, Nikos, ed. 1994. *Concepts of Modern Art*, third ed. London: Thames and Hudson.
10. Fleming, William. 1995. *Arts and Ideas*, ninth ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.
11. Stokstad, Marilyn. 1995. *Art History*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
12. Dawtre, Liz; Jackson, Toby; Masterson, Mary; Meecham, Pam; and Wood, Paul. 1996. *Investigating Modern Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
13. Lucie-Smith, Edward. 1997. *Visual Arts in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
14. Wilkins, David; Schultz, Bernard; and Linduff, Katheryn. 1997. *Art Past, Art Present*,

- third ed. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
15. Freeman, Julian. 1998. *Art*. New York: Watson-Guptill.
 16. Gebhardt, Volker. 1998. *The History of Art*. New York: Barron's.
 17. Gilbert, Rita. 1998. *Living With Art*, fifth ed. Boston: McGraw Hill.
 18. Blistène, Bernard. 1999. *A History of 20th-Century Art*. Paris: Flammarion.
 19. Bocola, Sandro. 1999. *The Art of Modernism*. Munich: Prestel.
 20. Britt, David, ed. 1999. *Modern Art*. New York: Thames and Hudson.
 21. Lucie-Smith, Edward. 1999. *Lives of the Great 20th-Century Artists*. London: Thames and Hudson.
 22. Kemp, Martin. 2000. *The Oxford History of Western Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
 23. Parmesani, Loredana. 2000. *Art of the Twentieth Century*. Milan: Skira.
 24. Bell, Cory. 2001. *Modern Art*. New York: Watson-Guptill.
 25. Janson, H. W., and Janson, Anthony. 2001. *History of Art*, sixth ed. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
 26. Richter, Klaus. 2001. *Art*. Munich: Prestel-Verlag.
 27. Dempsey, Amy. 2002. *Art in the Modern Era*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
 28. Honour, Hugh, and Fleming, John. 2002. *The Visual Arts*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
 29. Arnason, H. H. 2004. *History of Modern Art*, fifth ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
 30. Foster, Hal; Krauss, Rosalind; Bois, Yve-Alain; and Buchloh, Benjamin. 2004. *Art Since 1900*. New York: Thames and Hudson.
 31. Hunter, Sam; Jacobus, John; and Wheeler, Daniel. 2004. *Modern Art*, third ed. New York: Vendome Press.
 32. Cumming, Robert. 2005. *Art*. New York: DK Publishing.

33. Walther, Ingo, ed. 2005. *Art of the 20th Century*, 2 vols. Cologne: Taschen.