WORKING PAPER · NO. 2021-14

Revising the Canon: How Andy Warhol Became the Most Important American Modern Artist

David W. Galenson

FEBRUARY 2021

Revising the Canon: How Andy Warhol Became the Most Important American Modern Artist

David W. Galenson

University of Chicago

Universidad del CEMA

January 2021

Abstract

Quantitative analysis of narratives of art history published since 2000 reveals that scholars and critics now judge that Andy Warhol has surpassed Jackson Pollock and Jasper Johns as the most important modern American painter. Auction prices suggest that collectors share this opinion. Disaggregated analysis of the published narratives by decade reveals that Warhol first gained clear critical recognition as the leading Pop artist in the 1990s, and then as the most important American artist overall in the 2000s. This rise in Warhol's status appears initially to have been a result of his enormous influence on Jean-Michel Basquiat, Keith Haring, and others in the cohort that transformed the New York art world in the 1980s, and subsequently of his persisting influence on leading artists around the world who have emerged since the 1990s, including Damien Hirst, Takashi Murakami, and Ai Weiwei. Warhol's many radical conceptual innovations, that transformed both the appearance of art and the behavior of artists, made him not only the most important American artist, but the most important Western artist overall of the second half of the twentieth century.

Introduction

In 2002, a survey of studies published since 1980 found that art scholars considered Jackson Pollock the most important American artist.¹ In 2018, a similar survey of studies published since 2000 found that Andy Warhol placed first, ahead of Pollock.² This paper explores when and why Andy Warhol has become the most important American modern artist.

Rankings

Critical rankings of the most important American modern artists were created by counting the reproductions of artists' work in textbooks or other surveys of art history. The scholar Robert Jensen explained that "Because art historians use textbooks to introduce students to both the materials and to the methods of the discipline, these texts represent the consensus view of what has been considered important in the art surveyed."³ Consulting large numbers of texts draws on the judgements of scores of art historians and critics as to the most important painters, and this method has now been used in a number of studies.⁴

The 2002 ranking was based on 56 books published during 1980-2001.⁵ Table 1 presents the six leading painters in that ranking. They include the two leading Abstract Expressionists (Pollock and de Kooning), the two artists who initiated the conceptual revolution that followed (Johns and Rauschenberg), and the two leading Pop artists (Warhol and Lichtenstein).

The 2018 ranking was based on 55 books published during 2000-18.⁶ Table 2 shows the ranking of the same six artists listed in Table 1. Their ordering has now changed. Whereas in the earlier ranking Warhol placed third behind Pollock and Johns, in the more recent ranking Warhol stands first.

The change is dramatic. Pollock was the acknowledged leader of the Abstract Expressionists, who gained international recognition as the most important painters of their era.

Warhol was also the acknowledged leader of a movement, Pop art, that was widely recognized as the most important of its time. Yet Pollock's position ahead of Warhol in the 2002 ranking appeared understandable in view of the fact that Abstract Expressionism achieved the remarkable feat of changing the geography of the art world, by breaking the century-old monopoly of Paris as the center of western advanced art, and establishing New York as the new capital. Although Johns, Rauschenberg, Warhol, and their peers did succeed in creating an artistic revolution, by changing the dominant paradigm of the art world from experimental to conceptual, they did not bear the additional burden that Abstract Expressionism had carried, of simultaneously having to demonstrate that American artists could be the leaders of western art.⁷ The achievement was epic, for Pollock and a handful of others not only had to overcome the hostility and condescension of powerful European artists and critics, but also had to convince a skeptical and indifferent American public that truly innovative art could be made in New York, developing their techniques in an isolation that the critic Clement Greenberg described in 1947 as "inconceivable, crushing, unbroken, damning."⁸ The story of their struggles looms large: the critic David Sylvester described Abstract Expressionism as a movement steeped in legend – "legendary hopes, legendary deeds, legendary battles, legendary rags to riches, legendary drinking and, alas, legendary deaths."⁹ That Andy Warhol could overtake the most celebrated member of this movement to become the most important American artist is therefore a remarkable feat.

Table 1 shows that in 2002 Warhol was already recognized as the most important Pop artist, ahead of Roy Lichtenstein. A key question for this study is how Warhol subsequently came to be considered more important than both Pollock and Johns. The first step will be to locate more precisely when this change occurred.

The Rankings Extended and Disaggregated

As noted above, the rankings of both Tables 1 and 2 were derived from surveys of art history published over periods of approximately two decades. To obtain a more complete and detailed view of how the critical assessment of Warhol has changed over time, this section will modify that method in two ways. First, the dates of the books analyzed will be extended: instead of beginning with books published in 1980, books from the preceding two decades will also be examined. And second, the evidence of all the books will be presented by the specific decade of publication, instead of the aggregated two-decade periods used previously.

To assess Warhol's changing position over time, in each decade his illustrations can be compared to those of the other five artists who appear in Tables 1 and 2. This comparison is shown in Table 3.

It is not surprising that Lichtenstein and Warhol both trailed the other artists in books published in the 1960s: Pollock and de Kooning had made their greatest contributions in the '40s and '50s, and Johns and Rauschenberg in the '50s, but Pop art did not begin until the early '60s, so the art world had had less time to react to Pop art, and art scholars had had less time to judge its importance.¹⁰ It is notable, however, that Lichtenstein's illustrations from the '60s placed him ahead of Warhol. This soon ceased to be true, however, as Warhol ranked marginally above Lichtenstein in the '70s, and by a modestly larger margin in the '80s. Warhol's advantage over Lichtenstein became large in the '90s, larger in the '00s, and larger still in the '10s, as in that decade Warhol had two and a half times as many illustrations as Lichtenstein. Thus it appears that it was in the '90s that Warhol came to be clearly recognized as the leading Pop artist, and that that recognition grew stronger in the decades that followed.

Warhol ranked far behind the other four artists in the '60s, but by the '70s his illustrations were similar to those of Johns, de Kooning, and Rauschenberg, and the same was true in the '80s. Pollock ranked first overall throughout the '60s, '70s, '80s, and '90s. But a significant change occurred in the '90s, as Warhol remained well behind Pollock, but now ranked well ahead of the other four.

Table 3 thus suggests that the 1990s were a key turning point in Warhol's critical evaluation; it was in that decade that he clearly emerged in the narratives as the most important Pop artist, and as second only to Pollock in overall importance. His ascent then continued, as he narrowly surpassed Pollock in the 2000s, and held the top position by a larger margin in the 2010s.

Publications

Two other summary sources based on publications can provide additional evidence on the timing of Warhol's ascension. Both of these measure a combination of popular and scholarly interest in individual artists.

Table 4 uses the catalogue of the Getty Research Institute to count the number of books devoted to Warhol and the five other artists considered above, by decade of publication.¹¹ These data show no consistent ordering of the six during the '60s and '70s, but Warhol had more than twice as many books devoted to him as any of the other artists in the '80s, more than three times as many in the '90s and '00s and more than four times as many in the '10s.

The Arts and Humanities Citation Index, which covers a wide range of journals, presents a similar pattern over time. Thus Table 5 shows that Warhol emerges as the clear leader in citations in the '80s, and remains in that position in the later decades.

Prices

Warhol's recent importance in the auction market is well known. So for example during 2000-17, 85 of his paintings each sold at auction for more than \$10 million – more than twice as many as those of any other American artist, and more than 30% of all modern American paintings that reached this price during this period.¹²

But of course Warhol's paintings were not always so highly prized. At his first solo exhibition of paintings, at Los Angeles' Ferus Gallery in 1962, his portraits of Campbell's soup cans were priced at \$100 each, just a tenth of what he was then receiving for a commercial drawing, and only six were bought by collectors. And when Irving Blum, the gallery owner, decided he wanted to keep the paintings together as a set, Warhol agreed to sell him all 32 for a total of \$1,000.¹³ Although Eleanor Ward, who presented Warhol's first New York exhibition later that year, recalled that his art was "accepted instantly with wild enthusiasm," prices remained modest: William Seitz, a curator at New York's Museum of Modern Art, bought a portrait of Marilyn Monroe for the museum for \$250, and the architect Philip Johnson bought *Gold Marilyn* for \$800.¹⁴

Warhol's prices rose during his lifetime, but the dealer Ronald Feldman, who worked with him in the early '80s, recalled that "Andy always thought that his prices should have been higher."¹⁵ His position in the market remained uncertain: a 1982 exhibition of his painting of dollar signs at Leo Castelli's prestigious gallery failed to sell a single work.¹⁶ In 1983, Warhol complained in his diary that an early painting scheduled for auction was "only estimated at \$100,000... And Roy's things go for five, six, or seven, and Jasper's go for a million."¹⁷ The 1986 Neiman Marcus Christmas catalogue offered a sitting in Warhol's studio for a "portrait of you in the tradition of his museum quality pieces," for \$35,000.¹⁸

Yet although Warhol's prices were not the highest among contemporary artists, his vast output meant that his income almost certainly was. A 1984 magazine profile estimated his annual income at \$3-5 million, and his wealth at \$20 million.¹⁹ He was a compulsive collector, not only of fine art, but also of a wide range of objects, from Art Deco furniture and folk art (in 1977, New York's Museum of Folk Art presented an exhibition of 75 items from his collection) to cookie jars (175 at final count). After his death, the Sotheby's auction of his possessions comprised more than 10,000 items, in 3,400 lots; the fine art included works by Picasso, Braque, Klee, Miro, Duchamp, Dali, Magritte, Johns, Twombly, Lichtenstein, Hockney, and Basquiat, but none of Warhol's own work. The 10-day sale – the largest single collection sold at Sotheby's in its 244-year history – yielded a total of \$25 million, which was used to establish the Andy Warhol Foundation. The Foundation also received Warhol's collection of his own art, including 4,100 paintings, 4,500 drawings, and 19,000 prints.²⁰

Table 6 presents a summary view of the timing of the rise of Warhol's prices in the auction market, showing the single highest auction price achieved by his work in each decade, compared to the same measure for Pollock, de Kooning, Rauschenberg, Johns, and Lichtenstein. The ordering of the artists in these rankings is understandably more volatile than that of the critical rankings considered above, largely because important works by Pollock and Johns do not come to auction as frequently as those of more prolific painters like de Kooning and Warhol. But the 1990s again appear to have been pivotal for Warhol. Thus whereas both he and Lichtenstein were both below the other four artists in the '70s and '80s, Warhol's highest price was above those of all the other artists in the '90s, and remained in that position hereafter.

Warhol's dominance of the art market in recent decades has not been limited to the individual paintings represented in Table 6. Considering all auctions actions held during 2000-17,

Warhol accounted for 9 of a total of 27 paintings by American artists that sold for more than \$30 million, and 85 of 276 that sold for more than \$10 million. In each case, he placed first among American artists. So for example his 85 paintings that reached more than \$10 million were more than double the 41 by Mark Rothko, the 36 by Jean-Michel Basquiat, the 31 by de Kooning, and the 25 by Lichtenstein – the four artists who followed him in this ranking.²¹

The enormous volume of Warhol's work – prints and photographs as well as paintings – in fact gives him a quantitative position in the art market that is not approached by his American rivals. In the two decades 2000-19, a total of 27, 188 works by Warhol in all media were sold at auction, compared to 9, 017 by Lichtenstein, 5, 585 by Rauschenberg, 2, 992 by Johns, 1, 981 by de Kooning, and 251 by Pollock.²² The ubiquity of Warhol's work prompted the dealer Richard Polsky to describe his art as “the unifying element in the world of contemporary art.”²³

Critics

Critical evaluation of Warhol's art has never reached full consensus, but the balance of critical views has shifted over time, from predominantly negative to predominantly positive. The basic themes on both sides can be briefly summarized.

Disapproval of Warhol's art has taken a number of consistent forms. From the beginning, one of these was the charge of ephemerality. Thus in 1962 Michael Fried doubted “that even the best of Warhol's work can much outlast the journalism on which it is forced to depend.”²⁴ Closely related was tedium, as in the same year Jules Langener contended that the momentary shock of Warhol's art quickly disappeared, “leaving one as bored with the painting as with the object it presents.”²⁵ A third persistent theme was that Warhol was unoriginal, as for example in 1971 John Canaday described Warhol as “a manipulator...of borrowed material rather than a creator of his own.”²⁶

Condemnation of Warhol's openly avowed desire for fame and fortune was often combined with other criticisms. In 1965, for example, Thomas Hess deplored Warhol's superficiality and venality, declaring that he made "empty metaphysical vessels that are continually being filled with real money."²⁷ Three decades later, in 1995, Roger Kimball echoed this charge, describing Warhol as "one of the most notorious art hucksters of our time," and asserting that his "true genius was for commerce and publicity, not art."²⁸ Some critics extended this opinion into the judgement that Warhol was not an artist at all, as for example in 1977 Harold Rosenberg described him as "the artist changed into media celebrity and manufacturer of art substitutes."²⁹

When Warhol died in 1987, Calvin Tomkins contended that his great fame had little to do with his art: "He was neither the best nor the most popular artist of his era." Interestingly, Tomkins cited Warhol's prices in support of his claim, adding that "his prices – a reliable barometer in the commercialized art world that Warhol did so much to foster – did not keep pace with those of several of his less famous contemporaries."³⁰ In 2011, Brian Appleyard echoed Tomkins' belief, predicting that in time "the idea that Warhol is a greater artist than, say, Robert Rauschenberg or Jackson Pollock will be seen as the absurdity that it is." Since Warhol's prices had risen to great heights, Appleyard could not use them in support of his opinion, but he discounted them, predicting that "The bubble will burst, prices will fall."³¹

Early critical praise for Warhol was relatively scarce, but in 1966 Lucy Lippard wrote that he was "one of the most important artists working today," and that he was "greatly admired by many younger artists."³² Rainer Crone opened the first substantial catalogue of Warhol's art in 1970 by declaring that he was "the most important living artist in North America for the history of the visual arts and film, yet almost no critical work on him has recognized this fact."³³

As the awareness of Warhol's importance grew over time, perhaps the most surprising extended disquisition on behalf of his art was that of the philosopher and critic Arthur Danto, who proclaimed in 1989 that Warhol was "the nearest thing to a philosophical genius the history of art has produced." Danto contended that Warhol had successfully transfigured commonplace objects into art, revealing in the process that a philosophical definition of art could not have a visual basis. Danto considered this revelation so fundamental that "When the final multivolume *Popular History of Art* is published, ours will be the Age of Warhol." In 2009, Danto explained that Picasso had been the most important artist of the first half of the twentieth century, and Warhol the most important of the second half.³⁴

In recent decades Peter Schjeldahl has stressed Warhol's persisting importance. In 2000, he reflected that "Warhol's great moment was brief," but "his peak performance stands higher and higher, while everything that once seemed to contest it falls away."³⁵ Two years later, he mused that "Warhol, fifteen years after his death, remains a contemporary; the revolution in taste that he set off in 1962, his year of miracles, rolls on." Asking rhetorically how decisively Warhol had broken with tradition, Schjeldahl responded that "To travel back to art before 1962 requires a tourist visa."³⁶ In 2018, Schjeldahl observed that Warhol's impact remained ubiquitous: "Trends in art come and go like the weather. The several that Andy Warhol initiated six decades ago constitute a climate unabated by time...Love him or hate him,...he is inescapable."³⁷

The critical literature on Andy Warhol is both large and varied: it remains true that, as Kelly Cresap wrote in 2004, "Many years after his death Warhol continues to polarize experts."³⁸ But the opinions of scholars and critics do not determine artistic importance. This proposition might appear to undermine the empirical basis of this study, which used studies by scholars and critics to measure artistic importance. But there is in fact no contradiction. In their surveys of art

history, scholars and critics painstakingly record the canon of the discipline, describing and illustrating the contributions of the innovators who have transformed art from generation to generation. But recording an intellectual genealogy is not the same thing as creating it. It is artistic innovators who determine artistic importance, and they do this with their art by reacting to and building upon the contributions of their predecessors. This process of selection by practitioners is the true source of artistic importance. And so it is to artists that we must look to understand why and how Warhol's influence has grown over time.

Artistic Influence

Warhol idolized Robert Rauschenberg and Jasper Johns when he was a commercial artist: he was inspired by their success, and their art had a substantial impact on his early Pop paintings.

³⁹ But Warhol in turn influenced both of them. In 1962, Warhol introduced Rauschenberg to silkscreens. Rauschenberg had previously transferred images by putting lighter fluid on magazine and newspaper photographs, then pressing them onto paper. Warhol showed him that with silkscreens he could enlarge the images, and the technique subsequently became a staple of Rauschenberg's art.⁴⁰ And although silkscreening was much less important for Johns, the first screen he ever used, in the 1964 painting *Arrive/Depart*, was one Warhol gave him.⁴¹

Warhol's earliest Pop paintings had an almost immediate impact on a number of younger artists. In 1962 Gerhard Richter, then an art student in Dusseldorf, saw illustrations of Pop paintings by Warhol and Lichtenstein in an art magazine, and soon began to base his own paintings on photographs. This became Richter's characteristic practice, and he later explained that Warhol's paintings were important to him for their "astonishing simplification."⁴² In 2002, Peter Schjeldahl observed that "Richter's oeuvre may be seen, with some distortion, as a long, complex extrapolation from Warhol."⁴³

Early in his career, Ed Ruscha saw Warhol's first show in Los Angeles in 1962, and was excited by "a real departure, a logical departure from Abstract Expressionism." Warhol's art helped Ruscha to flatten his painted surfaces: "Warhol had a real disdain for the surface embellishment... He was able to rid the picture of any kind of sentimentality. That was great."⁴⁴

Chuck Close recalled seeing an exhibition of Warhol's work in 1964, the year Close graduated from art school: "I felt wonderful, momentary outrage, yet I was totally won over by seeing the limits and definitions of what art could be." Close subsequently developed a distinctive method of painting from photographs, and reflected that "We don't think of Warhol as a figurative painter essentially but that's a role that he offered, and the fact that he was working from photographs was important."⁴⁵ Close's choice of motifs was also influenced by Warhol: "I had to paint anonymous people because Andy owned famous people."⁴⁶

When Elaine Sturtevant began making the replicas of the other artists' work that she called "repetitions," one of the first artists she selected was Warhol. At her first New York gallery show, in 1965, she covered the walls with her versions of Warhol's *Flowers*, made from a silkscreen he had given her.⁴⁷ Between 1965 and 2004, Sturtevant also made more than 30 silkscreened paintings, many titled *Warhol Marilyn*, based on the same publicity photograph of Monroe that Warhol had used in 1962.⁴⁸

Bruce Naumann first began making videos in the late 1960s. He explained that his earliest videos came "in a certain sense from Andy Warhol's films. They just go on and on."⁴⁹

A key moment early in Cindy Sherman's career occurred when she abandoned painting for photography: she went on to create a novel form of photography, using herself to play roles. When an interviewer asked about her influences, she responded, "Definitely Warhol, early on."⁵⁰ Among Sherman's numerous commercial activities are self-portraits for a Comme des Garçons ad campaign in 1993 and a portfolio for *Harper's Bazaar* in 2016. In 2006, a fashion director

marveled that an important artist would feature his product in her photographs, but Warhol had broken that ice decades earlier.⁵¹

Richard Prince recalled that when he first arrived in New York in 1973, “I was enamored with Andy Warhol.”⁵² His art would subsequently draw heavily on photographic images, often taken from advertisements.

In Moscow, Vitaly Komar and Alexander Melamid were inspired by Pop art in the early 1970s. In 1973, one of the paintings in a series they called *Post-Art*, a tattered image of a Campbell’s soup can, was subtitled (*Warhol*).⁵³

The Swiss artist Thomas Hirschhorn has declared that “I love Andy Warhol and I love the work of Andy Warhol.” Hirschhorn first saw a painting by Warhol in 1978, when he was 21, and his response was immediate: “This was the first time in my life that art had an impact for me...¹²⁹ *Die in Jet* did change my life.” Hirschhorn’s background was in applied art, and he was inspired by Warhol’s continued use of mechanical techniques in painting: “Andy Warhol never deviated from his initial approach to art.”⁵⁴

In the late ‘70s, the German artist Anselm Kiefer based one of his key early works on a Pop style and format taken from Warhol. Thus his large canvas, *Ways of Worldly Wisdom* (1978-80) portrayed historical German personages who had been celebrated by the Nazis, in a grid format that echoed Warhol’s controversial *13 Most Wanted Men* (1964), that had been installed on the New York State Pavilion at the New York World’s Fair, then removed because of the objections of fair officials.⁵⁵

Warhol’s influence exploded on the New York art world in the 1980s, as a new generation of artists who had grown up with his early work came of age. Anthony Haden-Guest recalled that Warhol’s reputation had faded since the early days of Pop, but made a recovery in the ‘80s: “The

revival of Warhol's fortunes was brought about by the most effective engine in the art world: the continuing interest of younger painters.”⁵⁶ Bob Colacello remarked that “the whole approach to being an artist of the eighties came directly from Andy. Salle, Haring, Schnabel – they were like Andy's children.”⁵⁷

Keith Haring wrote in his journal:

Andy's life and work made my work possible. Andy set the precedent for the possibility of my art to exist...[H]is art and life changed the concept we have of “art and life” in the 20th century...

He reinvented the idea of the life of the artist being Art itself. He challenged the whole notion of the “sacred” definition of art. He blurred the boundaries between art and life so much that they were practically indistinguishable.

Haring explained that Warhol “set the precedent for my venture into the commercial world and the popular culture,” providing validation for the “tightrope I am walking between ‘high’ and ‘low’ art.” He contended that the origins of Pop art in Warhol's “honest evolution of his early graphic sensibility” provided a precedent for Graffiti to become a form of advanced art. Haring called Warhol “a teacher for a generation of artists now, and in the future, who grew up on Pop, who watched television since they were born, who ‘understand’ digital knowledge,” and considered him “the most important artist since Picasso.”⁵⁸

For Kenny Scharf, Warhol was “my hero, the reason I came to New York in the first place. He just turned art around and made it fun. I used to call him Papa Pop. He was the father and we were the children.”⁵⁹ Julian Schnabel considered Warhol's contribution “as great as Jackson Pollock's – maybe even greater. I loved him and I love his work.”⁶⁰

Jean-Michel Basquiat, the brightest star in the firmament of New York's art world in the '80s, idolized Warhol: a friend recalled that “Andy Warhol was the apple of his eye since he was fifteen or sixteen. He wanted Warhol's fame.” Another friend added, “He always said he was

going to be the next Warhol.”⁶¹ Basquiat deliberately pursued Warhol, finally gaining his attention in 1982 by painting a dual portrait of Warhol and himself titled *Dos Cabezas*. The two eventually became close friends: the biographer Phoebe Hoban wrote that “By the time he was twenty-three, Basquiat had realized his fantasy: he was not only Warhol’s protégé but his collaborator and partner; they hung out together, worked out together, painted and partied together.”⁶² Warhol’s Pop images influenced Basquiat throughout his career, from his early graffiti to his late canvases.⁶³ As a result of a dealer’s suggestion, in 1984 Warhol and Basquiat began making paintings together. This was an unusual practice for painters, but over two years they coauthored more than 50 paintings.⁶⁴ Both were influenced by their joint work, but their partnership effectively ended when Basquiat was stung by a 1985 *New York Times* review that called their collaboration “one of Warhol’s manipulations,” and referred to Basquiat as an “art-world mascot.”⁶⁵

Alison Pearlman observed that Jeff Koons’ “deadpan embrace of his role as guru of capitalism represents a more aggressive and extreme version of the persona notoriously instigated by the predecessor of all contemporary artists’ media-savvy self-fashioning – Andy Warhol. Koons builds on Warhol’s notorious defiance of the earlier romantic image of the fine artist as expressive individualist...Koons intensified this early 1960s Warhol.” Pearlman contended that Koons’ exaggeration of Warhol’s pose became “his principal means of fashioning his public persona.”⁶⁶

The Italian painter Francesco Clemente moved to New York in the early ‘80s, and soon met Warhol, who became a central influence on his art. Clemente admired Warhol for finding his subjects in “common places,” for his “democratic” approach to the image, and for making his

public persona an artistic creation. In 1984, Clemente collaborated with both Warhol and Basquiat on a group of 12 paintings.⁶⁷

The gestural paintings Christopher Wool made with mechanical techniques prompted a series of critics to identify his central influences as Pollock and Warhol. Wool followed Warhol not only in using rubber stamps, stencils, and silkscreens, but even in making silkscreened images that were deliberately off-register.⁶⁸

Basquiat, Haring and others of their cohort were recognized as important new artists by critics and collectors in the booming New York art market of the '80s, and their success prompted a reassessment of Warhol, that was intensified by his premature death in 1987. The august Museum of Modern Art, which had shown little interest in Warhol's art during his lifetime, gave him an extensive retrospective exhibition in 1989, supported by a 500-page catalogue that declared him to be "one of the most serious, and one of the most important, artists of the twentieth century."⁶⁹ Henry Geldzahler, who had been a close friend and one of Warhol's earliest art world supporters, observed that the show was "as important for the Modern as it is for Andy...They were a little late in claiming him," and pointed out that Warhol "had his own personal relationship with the public, something that makes museums nervous."⁷⁰ A reviewer of the exhibition wrote in *Art of America* that "two years after his death Andy Warhol continues to loom over the contemporary art scene like a silver specter. Everywhere his influence is evident: in the kitschy readymades that critique consumerism; in the easy passage between art-making and fashion, rock music, entertainment, or films; in the celebration of artists as celebrities or stars; and in the endless fascination of the mass media with the art world as a rather bizarre and freewheeling sideshow."⁷¹

Warhol's influence continued to spread beyond the '80s. The Italian Maurizio Cattelan, who arrived in New York in the early '90s, named Picasso and Warhol as his favorite artists, and followed Warhol in blurring the line between art and advertising.⁷² Cattelan considered Warhol's influence pervasive, explaining that "We live in a Warhol world as much as we live in the city of the Empire State Building."⁷³

In 1990, the Chinese artist Wang Guangyi began a series of large paintings that combined Chinese socialist propaganda images with Pop art. Each painting had the main title *Great Criticism*, with a subtitle that was the name of a famous western brand, such as Coca-Cola and McDonalds. In a special tribute, one of the paintings was subtitled *Andy Warhol*. In later years, Wang featured Warhol's name on several more of his paintings.⁷⁴

Damien Hirst, the leader of the Young British Artists in the '90s, praised Warhol for his honesty in openly avowing his pursuit of fame and fortune, and he has done the same himself.⁷⁵ Hirst has assistants execute his paintings, and his statement that he wants his spot paintings "to look like they've been made by a person trying to paint like a machine" carries distinct echoes of Warhol's famous declaration that "The reason I'm painting this way is that I want to be a machine."⁷⁶ Louisa Buck recognized another similarity: "Hirst doesn't make great claims for his art: like a true child of Warhol he professes to be happy with any response."⁷⁷

During 1992-98, Deborah Kass carried out The Warhol Project, a series of silkscreened paintings in which she transformed famous Warhol paintings by changing their subjects – substituting, for example, Barbra Streisand for Marilyn Monroe, Sandy Koufax for Roger Maris, and Kass herself for Warhol. The subjects were chosen to make statements – "I used art history the way other painters used light, color, and form" – but the series was also about Warhol – "the whole project is a big homage, no question."⁷⁸

Takashi Murakami is routinely described as the Japanese Andy Warhol, and although some scholars consider the description simplistic, Murakami himself embraces it. His practices follow and extend Warhol's in a number of respects, above all in treating art as business. Murakami initially named his Tokyo studio the Hiropon Factory, and staffed it with scores of assistants. He devoted considerable time and effort to developing the theory and practice of Superflat, which has been seen as an extended elaboration of Warhol's celebrated declaration that "If you want to know all about Andy Warhol, just look at the surface: of my paintings and films and me, and there I am. There's nothing behind it."⁷⁹ Murakami once explained that "Warhol laid the foundations for an art world where artists such as myself and Yoshitomo Nara, armed with contemporary Japanese culture, or even those already at its center, such as Jeff Koons and Damien Hirst, are able to climb free and unrestrained up and down the societal ladder. I have named this unique characteristic 'superflat,' as a catchphrase of a theory that I hope will succeed Pop."⁸⁰ When a journalist asked Murakami what he did not like about Warhol, he replied "I like everything."⁸¹

Kara Walker recalled seeing a Warhol exhibition when she was 12 years old: "The gallery was filled with screen prints of soup cans. I had never seen anything so grand and empty before, and so similar to actual life." She was intrigued by "the idea that a painting or picture was nothing more than its surface." To the annoyance of her artist father, "Warhol became my idol for the remainder of my high school years." Asked about Warhol's lasting influence on her, she replied, "It's all too obvious, isn't it? Just look at the surface of my work. There's nothing behind it."⁸²

In 2005, Mike Bidlo made 100 exact replicas of the Brillo Box sculptures Warhol made in 1964. Bidlo commented that "I thought it would be interesting to appropriate a work by another appropriator," and titled his works *Not Warhol*.⁸³

When Ai Weiwei came to the United States to study art in 1981, “The first book I read was *The Philosophy of Andy Warhol: (From A to B and Back Again)*. I loved that book. The language is so simple and beautiful.”⁸⁴ Ai remained in New York for more than a decade and learned a great deal about contemporary art and artists, “but to me Warhol always remained the most interesting figure in American art.” He wrote of Warhol, “Understand him, and you will understand the United States.” A number of Ai’s practices, including painting commercial logos on ancient pots and his use of repetition, have been considered extensions of Warhol’s art. He freely acknowledges his debt, as in 2015 he declared that “Warhol is the most important artist of this era, even though he has been gone for more than twenty years.”⁸⁵

Warhol’s influence has spread far beyond visual art. A prime example is David Bowie. A friend recalled that early in his career Bowie “had such huge admiration for Warhol because of Warhol’s ability to change, to steal. And to not worry about being original. Bowie *loved* that.”⁸⁶ These practices – consistently creating new personas, and wholesale theft from earlier artists – became central to Bowie’s career. Bowie’s launch of his first persona, Ziggy Stardust, came shortly after he saw a London production of Warhol’s play *Pork*, and hired four of the cast members. And Bowie’s musical declaration of his commitment to varying his identity, “Changes,” appeared on the same 1971 album as his tribute “Andy Warhol.”⁸⁷ When Julian Schnabel directed a biographical movie about Jean-Michel Basquiat in 1996, Bowie played Warhol, wearing wigs and glasses borrowed from the Andy Warhol Museum in Pittsburgh, portraying the artist with what Alison Pearlman called “a baffling degree of accuracy.”⁸⁸

In 2012, New York’s Metropolitan Museum presented an exhibition titled “Regarding Warhol: Sixty Artists, Fifty Years,” that featured artists “who pay tribute to Warhol...[and] who have absorbed, transformed, or challenged his example.” A 300-page catalogue accompanied the

exhibition, which aimed “to present the diversity of response to and continuing debate about the life and work of Andy Warhol.” The show’s curator observed that “Warhol’s protean art would become a veritable mainstream from which many offshoots and points of view would be spawned and significant careers forged.”⁸⁹ The theme and scope of that exhibition underscores the point made by the brief survey given here of some of the important artists who have been influenced by Warhol, that his impact on contemporary art has been large, diverse, and durable. Many recent artists have been influenced by both practices and behaviors of Warhol that were either widely denounced or largely overlooked during his lifetime. But with the benefit of these artists’ contributions, we can now look back and more clearly identify Warhol’s many innovations.

Innovations

Warhol’s major formal innovations were introduced in 1962, with the stenciled paintings of Campbell’s soup cans and the silkscreened portraits of Marilyn Monroe and Coca-Cola bottles. John Coplans identified two of these innovations: “First, the actual as against the simulated use of an anonymous and mechanical technique, and second, the use of serial forms.”⁹⁰ Warhol was of course not the first painter to use either a mechanical technique or serial forms, but he featured these to a much greater extent than any earlier artist had. Similarly, David Sylvester identified a third important formal innovation in the early paintings, in the use of photography. He acknowledged that painters had long exploited photography in a variety of ways, but noted that “Warhol went much further. He created an art which would be utterly meaningless to anyone who didn’t realize that it was made from photographs and was about photographs.”⁹¹ One consequence of this was no less than a new conception of painting, as Sylvester observed that “all of Warhol’s nature work is as if inspired by revelation that a modern painter could and should exploit the photograph as Renaissance painters exploited classical antiquities.”⁹² These formal innovations

have transformed the appearance of advanced art in the past half century, and Warhol's art of the early '60s was the single greatest source of this change.

In the early '60s Warhol significantly extended and publicized the practice of painting by proxy. In 1963 he emphasized his personal detachment from the execution of his art by hiring an assistant to make his paintings, calling his new studio the Factory, and declaring in a leading art magazine that "I think somebody should be able to do all my paintings for me."⁹³ The process of silk screening, the use of advertisements and news photographs for his images, and the serial repetition of these images all emphasized the absence of the touch of the artist in Warhol's art, as did his 1963 declaration of his profession as "Factory owner."⁹⁴ Since the Renaissance, many artists had relied on assistants to help make their works, and in the twentieth century Yves Klein had made paintings without physically participating in the execution.⁹⁵ But in 1969, after Warhol told *Time* magazine that Brigid Polk had made all his paintings for the past several years, he was forced to issue a public retraction in response to complaints from collectors.⁹⁶ Over time, however, it became recognized that assistants had in fact often made Warhol's paintings: in 1970, he told Emile de Antonio in a filmed interview that Polk had been doing his paintings for the past three years, and Gerard Malanga later recalled that he had often worked without Warhol when he had first been hired as an assistant in 1963.⁹⁷ Warhol's practice appears to have been key to overturning a hallowed tradition that the authenticity of a painting was conferred by the touch of the master.⁹⁸ Thus in 1995, Takashi Murakami christened his Tokyo studio the Hiropon Factory, and he and several other contemporary artists were known to employ scores of assistants.⁹⁹ And there was barely a stir in the art world in 2001 when Jeff Koons told an interviewer that having assistants execute his paintings gave him time "to grow as much as possible as an artist, instead of being tied down in the execution of the work," or in 2002 when Damien Hirst explained that

making his own spot paintings was tedious – “I couldn’t be fucking arsed doing it” – and that in any case his assistants did a better job than he could.¹⁰⁰ Interestingly, when David Hockney placed a notice in his 2012 exhibition at London’s Royal Academy stating that all the works “were made by the artist himself, personally,” the ensuing outcry in defense of Hirst prompted the Academy to issue a statement that Hockney’s comments were not intended to criticize any other artist’s working practices.¹⁰¹

Warhol was not the first celebrity artist, but he perfected the role. He not only actively and openly courted fame, but he made celebrity a theme of his art: he made paintings of the Hollywood stars he had idolized since childhood, he made movies featuring followers he called Superstars, and he published a magazine in which celebrities were interviewed, often by other celebrities. In 1970, *Vogue* declared that “For millions, Warhol is the artist personified.”¹⁰² He became a model for generations of younger artists of a particular inclination – Bob Colacello recalled that he attracted “narcissists who were into fame and their own stardom.”¹⁰³ David Bourdon wrote:

By redefining the public’s perception of what a successful artist could be, Warhol became a role model for younger painters who craved publicity more than the respect of their peers. Success in the post-Warhol art world meant not just feverish acclaim and high prices, but also a fame so pervasive that one’s name appears in gossip columns, fashion magazines, and television game shows. These were hardly lofty standards of achievement, but they affected the aspirations of subsequent generations of art students who were less interested in creating serious art than in getting their faces published in the fashion press and living it up in style.¹⁰⁴

A related innovation was Warhol’s extension of the practice of the artist as trickster. Henry Geldzahler remarked that there was “a quality to Andy Warhol’s public persona that inspires endless discussion, quite unlike that of any other artist.”¹⁰⁵ Marcel Duchamp had created a powerful model for conceptual innovators, in which critical attacks on radical innovations as

cynical hoaxes could be turned into a positive force in establishing the importance of the art. The artist's use of ambiguity and irony to fuel persistent controversy was a key to this transformation. This practice originated with Duchamp's submission of *Fountain*, a porcelain urinal, to the 1917 exhibition of the American Society of Independent Artists, and its subsequent rejection by the society's directors. A friend of Duchamp's, Louise Norton, wrote of this episode that "there are those who anxiously ask, 'Is he serious or is he joking?' Perhaps he is both!"¹⁰⁶ Norton's question was echoed by the director and critic Jonas Mekas, who asked in 1963, "Is Andy Warhol really making movies, or is he playing a joke on us?"¹⁰⁷ But Warhol took the practice farther than Duchamp, by creating a persona that presented him as the equivalent of the naïve and unsophisticated images of his paintings. Often wearing a silver fright wig, he proclaimed his own lack of intelligence – "I'm not more intelligent than I appear" – and his superficiality: "If you want to know all about Andy Warhol, just look at the surface: of my paintings and films and me, and there I am. There's nothing behind it."¹⁰⁸ Warhol's "naïf – trickster persona" helped to stoke continuing debate over whether his art was serious or a joke, extending his fame far beyond the world of art, and his success inspired a number of later artists to create their own versions of the artistic trickster, including notably Damien Hirst's cultivation of a public images as a punk hooligan to complement the gruesome sculptures he made from sectioned animals suspended in formaldehyde.¹⁰⁹

A radical Warhol innovation was his open expression of his desire for wealth. Since the Renaissance, artists had virtually universally followed the convention that they should never publicly appear to be concerned with material rewards. Not in the least fazed by this taboo, Warhol was fascinated by money, he loved earning it, and he never hesitated to declare this. His images of currency – including the 7-1/2 foot-long *200 Dollar Bills* – were the first silkscreened

paintings he made in 1962; he recalled that a friend had asked, “Well, what do you love most?,” and explained, “That’s how I started painting money.”¹¹⁰ He devised the concept of business art, explicitly describing art as a business and himself as a Business Artist, declaring that “making money is art,” and he wrote of his “Fantasy about Money: I’m walking down the street and I hear somebody say – in a whisper – ‘There goes the richest man in the world.’”¹¹¹ Salvador Dali had earlier suffered vitriolic attacks and been widely ostracized for his violation of this art world prohibition, but Warhol did not hesitate to socialize with Dali, or to declare his fascination with the older artist.¹¹² Warhol’s stance later allowed Jeff Koons to claim that “The market is the greatest critic,” Damien Hirst to declare that “the art world’s about money,” and Takashi Murakami to reflect that “I don’t understand why artists pretend as if the market did not exist,” without suffering any obvious damage to their standing in the art world.¹¹³

When Picasso invented collage, the poet and critic Guillaume Apollinaire celebrated the use of nonart materials and subjects for their potential to allow artists to reach more and more deeply into modern life.¹¹⁴ Decades later, Arthur Danto credited Warhol for effectively reaching a limit of this process by “making art out of what was an entirely vernacular object of everyday life.”¹¹⁵ From Picasso’s on, a series of artists used new subjects and techniques to bridge what Robert Rauschenberg famously called the gap between art and life, but Danto contended that Warhol had achieved this more conclusively than any other modern artist. This contribution was not of interest only to philosophers of art, for in recent decades many prominent artists have followed Warhol in rejecting or ignoring any distinction between high and low art, both in their embrace of vernacular subject matter and in their use of industrial techniques of fabrication.

A corollary of Warhol’s celebration of mundane subjects – in his words, “images that anybody walking down Broadway could recognize in a split second...all the great modern things

the Abstract Expressionists tried so hard not to notice at all” – was his wish to democratize art.¹¹⁶

In an early interview, he declared “I don’t think art should be only for the select few, I think it should be for the mass of American people.”¹¹⁷ The widespread popularity of his art made it acceptable for later artists to embrace the goal of reaching a vast public. So Jeff Koons would write that “I want to communicate to as wide a mass as possible,” Damien Hirst would state his desire “to communicate an idea to a hell of a lot of people on a massive scale,” and Takashi Murakami would contend that “art should be exposed to a general audience,” and each in his own way would make art that did gain broad exposure.¹¹⁸

Warhol also innovated in the diversity of his activities. He used his success as a painter to extend his production not only into other genres of visual art, but into entirely different media.

David Bourdon recalled that Warhol wanted to be a “jack of all arts”:

It wasn’t enough for him to be recognized as merely an artist, filmmaker, and show business entrepreneur. He fantasized about having a hit movie playing at Radio City Music Hall, a Broadway show at the Winter Garden, a television special, a book on the best-seller list, a Top-40 record, and the cover of *Life*. He truly believed he could keep several careers going simultaneously, winning acclaim in all of them.¹¹⁹

He didn’t achieve all these goals, but he did make movies, publish a novel, manage the rock group The Velvet Underground, and publish *Interview* magazine. He also developed his own cable television show, made segments for *Saturday Night Live*, endorsed products, and worked as a celebrity model. Dieter Buchhart recently noted that Warhol’s success in crossing disciplines led Basquiat, Haring, Schnabel, and others to follow his example by working in multiple fields, so that during the ‘80s “moving between artistic disciplines became a matter of course, anticipating the multidisciplinary work of many artists in the 1990s” – and beyond.¹²⁰

Warhol's detachment from his art, his trickster persona, his declarations of cupidity, and his mundane subjects were all elements of a broader assault on the very status of the artist in our society. For centuries, artists had been widely regarded as exalted spiritual beings. This was stated as early as 1435, when Leon Battista Alberti contended that "any master painter who sees his works adored will feel himself considered another god," and it remained current in 1957, when the eminent scholar Meyer Schapiro could describe the artist as "one of the most moral and idealistic of beings."¹²¹ With characteristic bluntness, Warhol rejected this vision, asking, "Why do people think artists are special? It's just another job."¹²² The history of modern art in the century prior to Warhol was to a great extent a process of creating novel products and practices, testing the boundaries of what art could be and how artists could act. Warhol carried these explorations to a limit, not by embracing all possible forms and behavior, but by establishing that virtually anything was possible. Thus after Warhol there was no particular way art had to look, and no particular way artists had to act.¹²³ In 1989 the conceptual artist John Baldessari declared that Warhol had definitively changed the template for artists who came after him: "The model of the artist as sufferer wielding his brush heroically against the world is no more."¹²⁴

Andy Warhol was a radical conceptual innovator in a century characterized by radical artistic conceptual innovation. What sets him apart from nearly all the other major innovators of the century, however, is the remarkable number of important innovations he created, that allowed him to influence so many later artists in so many different ways. Conceptual innovations break existing conventions by creating unexpected syntheses of elements that were not previously related to each other. As Peter Schjeldahl observed, "The '60s were about erasing boundaries. Warhol did it best because the boundaries – between high and low, art and commerce, etc. – scarcely existed for him in the first place."¹²⁵ Gerard Malanga, the first assistant Warhol hired to

make his silkscreened paintings in 1963, reflected that Warhol's "role of setting the pace, of being first, by definition meant doing things that had not been done before or that had failed in the past. It necessitated a vicious disregard for tradition and common sense."¹²⁶

As surveyed above, many of the leading artists working today have been directly influenced by Warhol. And his influence will persist even after this ceases to be the case. A recent example is Brian Donnelly, aka KAWS, whose transition from graffiti to paintings and sculptures has gained him considerable success both in the auction market and museum exhibitions. The artist recently told a journalist that when he entered the art world in the '90s, "there was definitely a feeling of it being taboo, and that you could either be a fine artist or a commercial artist but you can't be both." His role model in violating this taboo was Keith Haring: "the only artist that I looked at who was doing something like that was Keith Haring and what he did with the Pop Shop."¹²⁷ After Warhol's death, Haring had written in his journal that "Andy practically convinced me to open the Pop Shop when I started to get cold feet."¹²⁸ Warhol's influence will thus continue indirectly even after his direct impact dwindles.

Warhol in Western Art

Late in his life, Ernest Hemingway described his literary progress as a series of imaginary boxing matches:

I started out very quiet and I beat Mr. Turgenev. Then I trained hard and I beat Mr. de Maupassant. I've fought two draws with Mr. Stendhal, and I think I had the edge in the last one. But nobody is going to get me in any ring with Mr. Tolstoy unless I'm crazy or keep getting better.¹²⁹

Andy Warhol never would have used boxing as a metaphor, but it is clear that he also compared himself to illustrious predecessors. He admired Johns and Rauschenberg, and was jealous of their success.¹³⁰ His friend Ruth Kligman, who had been close to both Pollock and de Kooning, recalled that Warhol was fascinated with them, and "wanted to be part of that lineage."¹³¹ And his

view extended to earlier modern masters. A friend recalled that when he asked Warhol whether he wanted to be a great artist, he replied, “I want to be Matisse.”¹³² And in his memoir of the ‘60s, Warhol declared that “Picasso was the artist I admired most in all of history.”¹³³

Table 7 presents a critical ranking that compared Warhol to the most important western painters of the twentieth century, based on counts of illustrations of these artists’ work in 33 textbooks of art history published during 1990-2005. Warhol ranked eighth overall, behind Picasso, Matisse, four other European artists, and Pollock (he had already surpassed Johns, Rauschenberg, and de Kooning, who placed tenth, twelfth, and fourteenth, respectively, in that ranking). Table 8 then presents a ranking of these same artists based on a survey of 34 books published during 2006-18. Warhol’s illustrations now place him ahead not only of Pollock, but also of Mondrian, Malevich, Braque, and (narrowly) Duchamp, and behind only Picasso and Matisse.

As was the case in the earlier rankings of American artists, Tables 7 and 8 show that Warhol rose considerably over time in these evaluations. Thus whereas Warhol had 21% as many illustrations as Picasso and 46% as many as Matisse in the earlier ranking, in the later ranking these had risen to 40% and 70%, respectively. The simplest narrative from the ranking of Table 6 is that Picasso and Matisse revolutionized western painting in the first half of the twentieth century, then Warhol revolutionized it in the second half.

In one respect, Warhol placed second only to Picasso among the greatest artists of the twentieth century. In considering the importance of the work of modern artists in a single year, a study of textbooks published during 1990-2005 found that Warhol’s paintings from 1962 ranked below only Picasso’s paintings of 1907 in total illustrations. Thus art historians have judged that Warhol’s introduction of mechanical reproduction in the paintings of Campbell’s soup cans and

Marilyn Monroe was the second greatest artistic breakthrough of the century, behind only Picasso's announcement of the Cubist revolution with the *Demoiselles d'Avignon*.¹³⁴

Conclusion

Pop art burst upon the American art world in 1962. The evidence of art history textbooks shows that scholars were well aware of its importance within a decade, as in books published during the '70s Andy Warhol and Roy Lichtenstein were recognized as the movement's coequal leaders and placed on a level with the Abstract Expressionist Willem de Kooning and the two originators of the conceptual revolution that led to Pop, Robert Rauschenberg and Jasper Johns. Yet Jackson Pollock, the leading Abstract Expressionist, was still clearly considered the greatest American artist.

This basic view persisted during the '80s, but a change occurred in the '90s. Pollock remained atop the rankings, but Warhol moved ahead not only of Lichtenstein, but also of de Kooning, Rauschenberg and Johns. This made him not only the leading artist of the Pop movement, but the second most important American artist overall. Warhol's critical position then continued to rise, as he ranked narrowly ahead of Pollock in the 2000s, and by a wider margin in the 2010s. Warhol's ascent above his major American rivals thus began in the 1990s, and continued in the following two decades. The auction market confirms the importance of the '90s for Warhol's position. Thus it was during that decade that the auction prices of his paintings rose above those of all the other American painters, and he has remained the clear leader ever since.

Critics, scholars, and collectors don't determine artistic importance: their narratives and purchases merely record and reflect the true source of importance, an artist's influence on the discipline. Textbooks and auction outcomes consequently necessarily lag behind the actions of participants in the discipline, the artists whose decisions actively determine the significance of

their predecessors. Examining the quantitative evidence of the textbooks and auctions in light of the brief survey given above of leading artists influenced by Warhol therefore suggests that the turning point in the emergence of Warhol's dominant role in modern art was the 1980s.

Warhol had become influential on younger artists since the time of his first Pop innovations in the early '60s, but not obviously more so than a number of other important American artists. It was in the '80s that a brash new generation of flamboyant young artists announced their takeover of the New York art world, while not only declaring but demonstrating their allegiance to Warhol. Basquiat, Koons, Haring, Schnabel, and their peers did not make paintings that resembled those of Warhol, nor did they mimic Warhol's particular adopted persona. But their art and behavior nonetheless unmistakably reflected what they had learned from Warhol. Thus the simplified figures of Basquiat, the graphic sensibility of Haring, the commercial products of Koons, and the mixture of high and low motifs of Schnabel were all made possible by the earlier mechanical silkscreened images of Warhol. And the same was true of the public images the younger artists constructed: Basquiat's paint-spattered designer suits were as distinctly a trademark as Warhol's silver fright wig, and Koons' self-aggrandizing declarations and open embrace of the moral values of the market were obviously related to Warhol's earlier immodesty and open pursuit of financial gain, just as were Schnabel's grandiose and bombastic statements and writings. The inspiration of Warhol was thus inescapable in the frenetic New York art world of the '80s, both in the works the galleries displayed, and in the behavior of the artists who made them, or had them made.

The art stars of the '80s elevated Warhol through their work and actions, but his influence persisted when Basquiat and his peers were followed by new rising stars in the '90s and beyond. As photography, mechanical reproduction, careerism, business art, and personas tailored to

complement specific forms of conceptual innovation became staples of advanced contemporary art, Warhol's legacy continued to loom over the art world of New York, and even those of London, Tokyo, and Beijing, in recent decades. And it is consequently not surprising that scholars now consider Warhol to be not only the leading American painter, but the most important western painter of the second half of the twentieth century, behind only Picasso and Matisse among the greatest painters of the entire century.

Endnotes

1. David Galenson, "Was Jackson Pollock the Greatest Modern American Painter? A Quantitative Investigation," *Historical Methods*, Vol 35 (2002), p. 119.
2. David Galenson, "Do the Most Important Artists Make the Most Expensive Paintings?," BFI Working Paper No. 2018-73, p.18.
3. Robert Jensen, "Measuring Canons: Reflections on Innovation and the Nineteenth-Century Canon of European Art," in Anna Brzyski, ed., *Partisan Canons* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), p. 33.
4. E.g. David Galenson, *Artistic Capital* (New York: Routledge, 2006), Chapters 1-4, 7-8; Robert Jensen, "Anticipating Artistic Behavior: New Research Tools for Art Historians," *Historical Methods*, Vol. 37 (2004), pp. 137-53; Jensen, "Measuring Canons," in Brzyski, *Partisan Canons*, 27-54; Galenson and Jensen, "Young Geniuses and Old Masters," in D. Eltis, F. Lewis, and K. Sokoloff, eds., *Human Capital and Institutions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 221-47; James Cutting, "Mere Exposure, Reproduction, and the Impressionist Canon," in Brzyski, *Partisan Canons*, pp. 79-94; John O'Hagan and Elish Kelly, "Identifying the Most Important Artists in a Historical Context," *Historical Methods*, Vol. 38 (2005), pp. 118-25; Aaron Kozbelt and Yana Durmysheva, "Lifespan Creativity in a Non-Western Artistic Tradition," *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, Vol. 65 (2007), pp. 23-51.
5. Galenson, "Was Jackson Pollock the Greatest Modern American Painter?," pp. 126-27.
6. Galenson, "Do the Most Important Artists Make the Most Expensive Paintings?," pp. 24-26.
7. Galenson, "The New York School vs. the School of Paris," *Historical Methods*, Vol. 35 (2002), pp. 141-53; William Seitz, *Abstract Expressionist Painting in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983).
8. Clement Greenberg, *The Collected Essays and Criticism*, Vol. 2 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 170.
9. David Sylvester, *About Modern Art* (New York: Henry Holt, 1997), p. 353.
10. Galenson, "Pricing Revolution: From Abstract Expressionism to Pop Art," *Research in Economics*, Vol. 72 (2018), pp. 86-100.
11. On the use of the Getty catalogue, see Jensen, "Measuring Canons," p. 36.
12. Galenson, "Do the Most Important Artists Make the Most Important Paintings?," pp 21-22.
13. Victor Bockris, *Warhol* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1997), pp. 148-49.
14. Bockris, *Warhol*, p. 156.

15. Alan Pratt, ed., *The Critical Response To Andy Warhol* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997), p. 168.
16. Bockris, *Warhol*, p. 454.
17. Pat Hackett, ed., *The Andy Warhol Diaries* (New York: Hachette, 2014), p. 546.
18. Annette Michelson, ed., *Andy Warhol* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), p. 3.
19. Bockris, *Warhol*, p. 459.
20. Paul Alexander, *Death and Disaster* (New York: Villard Books, 1994), pp. 121-52.
21. Galenson, "Do the Most Important Artists make the Most Expensive Paintings?", "Table 4"
22. Artnet.
23. Richard Polsky, *I Bought Andy Warhol* (NY: Bloomsbury, 2003), p. 119.
24. Alan Pratt, ed., *The Critical Response to Andy Warhol* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997), p. 2.
25. Steven Madoff, ed., *Pop Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 33.
26. Pratt, *The Critical Response to Andy Warhol*, p. 75.
27. Madoff, *Pop Art*, p. 281.
28. Roger Kimball, *Art's Prospect* (Chicago: Ivan Dee, 2003), pp. 215, 220.
29. Harold Rosenberg, *Art and Other Serious Matters* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 137.
30. Calvin Tomkins, *Post- to Neo-: the Art World of the 1980s* (New York: Penguin, 1989), p. 69.
31. Brian Appleyard, "A One-Man Art Market," *1843 Magazine (The Economist)*, November 2011.
32. Lucy Lippard, *Pop Art* (New York: Praeger, 1966), p. 100.
33. Rainer Crone, *Andy Warhol*, (New York: Praeger, 1970), p. 9.
34. Pratt, *The Critical Response to Andy Warhol*, p. 201, 207; Arthur Danto, *Unnatural Wonders* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005), pp. 9, 365; Danto, *Andy Warhol* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 4, 48.

35. Peter Schjeldahl, "The Art World," *New Yorker*, (May 15, 2000), p. 102.
36. Peter Schjeldahl, *Let's See* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2008) p. 163-64.
37. Peter Schjeldahl, "No Escape," *The New Yorker* (Nov. 19, 2018).
38. Kelly Cresap, *Pop Trickster Fool* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004), p. 110.
39. Calvin Tomkins, *Off the Wall* (New York: Penguin, 1981), p. 215; David Bourdon, *Warhol* (New York: Abrams, 1989), p. 69.
40. Andy Warhol and Pat Hackett, *Popism* (Orlando: Harcourt, 1980), p. 29; Tony Scherman and David Dalton, *Pop* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009), p. 111; Bourdon, *Warhol*, p. 132.
41. Jasper Johns, *Writings, Sketchbook Notes, Interviews* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1996), p. 250.
42. Gerhard Richter, *The Daily Practice of Painting* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995), pp. 22, 138.
43. Schjeldahl, *Let's See*, p. 164.
44. Ed Ruscha, *Leave Any Information At the Signal* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002), pp. 138, 255.
45. Robert Storr, *Chuck Close* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1998), pp. 87-89.
46. Mark Rosenthal, et al., *Regarding Warhol* (New York: Metropolitan Museum, 2012), p. 162.
47. Peter Eleey, *Sturtevant* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2014), pp. 47-49.
48. Patricia Lee, *Sturtevant: Warhol Marilyn* (London: Afterall, 2016), p. 16.
49. Bruce Nauman, *Please Pay Attention Please* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), p. 306.
50. Eva Respini, *Cindy Sherman* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2012), p. 74.
51. Derek Blasberg, "Cindy Sherman," *Wall Street Journal Magazine* (Nov. 2019), pp. 104-06.
52. Greg Allen, ed., *Canal Zone Richard Prince* (Lexington, KY: greg.org, 2011), Document 49, p. 3.
53. Joann Wypijewski, ed., *Painting by Numbers* (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1997), pp. 128-130, 201.
54. Thomas Hirschhorn, "My Andy Warhol" (unpublished, June 2004).

55. Matthew Biro, *Anselm Kiefer and the Philosophy of Martin Heidegger* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 172-82.
56. Anthony Haden-Guest, *True Colors* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1996), p. 153.
57. Phoebe Hoban, *Basquiat* (New York: Penguin, 1999), p. 202.
58. Keith Haring, *Journals* (New York: Penguin, 2010), pp. 154-58.
59. Hoban, *Basquiat*, pp. 201-02.
60. Bockris, *Warhol*, p. 464.
61. Hoban, *Basquiat*, pp. 201.
62. Hoban, *Basquiat*, pp. 204.
63. Eric Fretz, *Jean-Michel Basquiat* (Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2010), pp. 22-24, 39, 73, 140.
64. Fretz, *Jean-Michel Basquiat*, p. 140; David Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), Chapter 10.
65. Fretz, *Jean-Michel Basquiat*, p. 140-45; Hoban, *Jean-Michel Basquiat*, pp. 216-20, 263-67; Hackett, ed., *The Andy Warhol Diaries*, p. 691.
66. Alison Pearlman, *Unpackaging Art of the 1980s* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), pp. 143-44.
67. Ann Percy and Raymond Foye, *Francesco Clemente* (New York: Rizzoli, 1990), pp. 117-18; Lisa Dennison, *Clemente* (New York: Guggenheim Museum, 1999), pp. 29-30.
68. Katherine Brinson, ed., *Christopher Wool* (New York: Guggenheim Museum, 2013), pp. 38-50; Ann Goldstein, ed., *Christopher Wool* (Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art, 1998), pp. 259-69; Gary Garrels, ed., *The Work of Andy Warhol* (Seattle: Bay Press, 1989), pp. 77-78, 86-88.
69. Kynaston McShine, ed., *Andy Warhol* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1989), p. 13.
70. Alice Marquis, *The Pop Revolution* (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 2000), p. 176.
71. Irving Sandler, *Art of the Postmodern Era* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996), p. 555.
72. Calvin Tomkins, *Lives of the Artists* (New York: Henry Holt, 2008), p. 154.
73. Nancy Spector, *Maurizio Cattelan* (New York: Guggenheim, 2011), p. 118.

74. Karen Smith, *Nine Lives* (Zurich: Scalo Verlag, 2005), pp. 37-77.
75. Damien Hirst and Gordon Burn, *On the Way to Work* (New York: Universe Publishing, 2002), p. 84.
76. Virginia Button, *The Turner Prize* (London: Tate Publishing, 2002), p. 116.
77. Louisa Buck, *Moving Targets 2* (London: Tate Publishing, 2000), p. 28.
78. Michael Plante, *Deborah Kass* (New Orleans: Tulane University, 1999), pp. 25, 31.
79. Paul Schimmel, ed., © *Murakami* (Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art, 2007), p. 22.
80. Rosenthal, *Regarding Warhol*, p. 138.
81. Sarah Thornton, *Seven Days in the Art World* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2008), p. 199.
82. Kara Walker and Bob Nickas, "Depth and Dying," *Artforum* (October 2004); Katherine Atkins and Kelly Kivland, eds., *Artists on Andy Warhol* (New York: Dia Art Foundation, 2010), pp. 105-06.
83. Arthur Danto, *What Art Is* (New Haven: Yale University, Press, 2013), pp. 49-50.
84. Ai Weiwei, *Ai Weiwei Speaks* (London, Penguin, 2011), p. 81.
85. Max Delany and Eric Shiner, eds., *Andy Warhol/Ai Weiwei* (Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria, 2015), pp. 6, 37, 73.
86. Dylan Jones, ed., *David Bowie* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2018), p. 144.
87. Theodore Ammon, ed., *David Bowie and Philosophy* (Chicago: Open Court, 2016), pp. 38-42; Peter Doggett, *The Man Who Sold the World* (London: Bodley Head, 2011), pp. 120-126.
88. Doris Berger, *Projected Art History* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2014), p. 243; Pearlman, *Unpackaging Art of the 1980s*, p. 51.
89. Mark Rosenthal, et al., *Regarding Warhol* (New York: Metropolitan Museum, 2012), pp. 6, 12.
90. John Coplans, *Andy Warhol* (New York: New York Graphic Society, 1970), p. 49.
91. Sylvester, *About Modern Art*, p. 384-85.
92. Sylvester, *About Modern Art*, p. 385
93. David Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 192.
94. Kenneth Goldsmith, ed., *I'll Be Your Mirror* (New York: Carroll and Graf, 2004), p. 48.

95. Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art*, pp. 186-91.
96. Bourdon, *Warhol*, p. 303.
97. Emile de Antonio and Mitch Tuchman, *Painters Painting* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1984), p. 121; Bockris, *Warhol*, p. 164.
98. E.g. see Etienne Gilson, *Peinture et Réalité* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique, 1958), p. 43.
99. Schimmel, ©*Murakami*, p. 68.
100. David Sylvester, *Interviews with American Artists* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), p. 351; Hirst and Burn, *On The Way to Work*, p. 90.
101. David Galenson, "Painting by Proxy," *Huffington Post*, March 20, 2012.
102. Pratt, *The Critical Response to Andy Warhol*, p. 60.
103. Hoban, *Basquiat*, pp. 202.
104. David Bourdon, *Warhol* (New York: Abrams, 1989), p. 13.
105. Henry Geldzahler, *Making It New* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1994), p. 250.
106. Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art*, p. 161-66.
107. Blake Gopnik, *Warhol* (NY:Harper Collins, 2020), p. 321.
108. Goldsmith, *I'll Be Your Mirror*, pp. 90-91.
109. Cresap, *Pop Trickster Fool*, p. 5.
110. Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art*, p. 331.
111. Andy Warhol, *THE Philosophy of Andy Warhol* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1975), pp. 92, 135.
112. Michael Taylor, ed., *The Dali Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 24-29.
113. Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art*, p. 336-37; Schimmel, ©*Murakami*, p. 81.
114. Leroy Breunig, ed., *Apollinaire on Art* (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 2001), pp. 279-81.
115. Arthur Danto, *Andy Warhol* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 64.

116. Warhol and Hackett, *Popism*, p. 3.
117. Goldsmith, *I'll Be Your Mirror*, p. 90.
118. Jeff Koons, *The Jeff Koons Handbook* (New York: Rizzoli, 1992), p. 56; Hirst and Burn, *On the Way to Work*, p. 72; Schimmel, ©Murakami, p. 68.
119. Bourdon, *Warhol*, p. 10.
120. Dieter Buchhart and Eleanor Nairne, eds., *Basquiat* (London: Prestel, 2017), p. 14.
121. Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting*, rev. ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), p. 64; Meyer Schapiro, *Modern Art* (New York: George Braziller, 1982), p. 226.
122. Warhol, *THE Philosophy of Andy Warhol*, p. 178.
123. Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art*; Arthur Danto, *After the End of Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), Chap. 7.
124. McShine, *Andy Warhol*, p. 447.
125. Peter Schjeldahl, *The "7 Days" Art Columns, 1998-1990* (Great Barrington, MA: The Figures, 1998), p. 103.
126. Bockris, *Warhol*, p. 188.
127. David Meagher, "Star, or conceptually bankrupt?" *The Australian* (May 3, 2019).
128. Haring, *Journals*, p. 156.
129. Jeffrey Meyers, *Hemingway* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1999), p. 465.
130. Warhol and Hackett, *Popism*, p. 29; Bob Colacello, *Holy Terror* (New York: Random House, 2014), p. 33.
131. Bockris, *Warhol*, p. 162.
132. Bockris, *Warhol*, p. 14.
133. Warhol and Hackett, *Popism*, p. 143.
134. Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art*, p. 82.

Table 1: 2002 Ranking of American Modern Artists

Artist		Total Illustrations
1.	Jackson Pollock	135
2.	Jasper Johns	124
3.	Andy Warhol	114
4.	Robert Rauschenberg	106
5.	Willem de Kooning	94
6.	Roy Lichtenstein	93

Source: David Galenson, "Was Jackson Pollock the Greatest Modern American Painter?" *Historical Methods*, Vol. 35 (2002), p. 119.

Table 2: 2018 Ranking of American Modern Artists

Artist		Total Illustrations
1.	Andy Warhol	135
2.	Jackson Pollock	127
3.	Jasper Johns	99
4.	Robert Rauschenberg	97
5.	Willem de Kooning	92
6.	Roy Lichtenstein	74

Source: David Galenson, “Do the Most Important Artists Make the Most Important Paintings?”
BFI Working Paper No. 2018-73, p. 18.

Table 3: Numbers of Illustrations of Works by American Artists, by Decade

Artist	Decade					
	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Willem de Kooning	34	41	26	53	61	36
Jasper Johns	15	36	34	71	83	37
Roy Lichtenstein	11	40	27	51	57	32
Jackson Pollock	43	61	37	99	96	68
Robert Rauschenberg	15	44	31	59	76	37
Andy Warhol	5	41	30	81	101	80
No. of Books	24	25	20	36	37	42

Note: *n* is the total number of illustrations of the work of an artist in the decade indicated.

Source: For a listing of the books used, see Appendix 1.

Table 4: Number of Citations to Selected Artists in Library Catalogue of Getty Research Institute, by Decade

Artist	Decade					
	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Willem de Kooning	12	14	12	25	21	15
Jasper Johns	8	18	13	20	18	19
Roy Lichtenstein	6	7	11	15	22	23
Jackson Pollock	9	10	13	21	14	26
Robert Rauschenberg	10	15	20	19	29	25
Andy Warhol	4	15	43	78	96	107

Note: *n* is the total citations found through a subject heading search of the catalogue, by decade of publication of the works cited.

Table 5: Number of Citations to Selected Artists in Arts and Humanities Citation Index, by Decade of Publication

Artist	Decade				
	1970s	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Willem de Kooning	3	2	20	27	20
Jasper Johns	10	12	21	14	10
Roy Lichtenstein	3	8	9	7	5
Jackson Pollock	13	12	21	40	36
Robert Rauschenberg	4	5	19	14	22
Andy Warhol	2	41	46	62	82

Table 6: Single Highest Auction Price for Each American Artist, by Decade

Artist	1965-69	Artist	1970-79
Jackson Pollock	\$350,200	Jackson Pollock	\$1,536,400
Willem de Kooning	287,900	Jasper Johns	1,325,000
Robert Rauschenberg	155,600	Willem de Kooning	993,700
Andy Warhol	14,400	Robert Rauschenberg	745,800
Jasper Johns	--	Andy Warhol	745,300
Roy Lichtenstein	--	Roy Lichtenstein	337,600

Artist	1980-89	Artist	1990-99
	(millions)		(millions)
Willem de Kooning	\$36.041	Andy Warhol	\$24.420
Jasper Johns	30.994	Willem de Kooning	20.515
Jackson Pollock	20.129	Jasper Johns	11.876
Robert Rauschenberg	11.498	Robert Rauschenberg	11.743
Roy Lichtenstein	9.585	Roy Lichtenstein	10.106
Andy Warhol	7.093	Jackson Pollock	5.145

Artist	2000-09	Artist	2010-17
	(millions)		(millions)
Andy Warhol	\$83.210	Andy Warhol	\$110.471
Willem de Kooning	32.253	Roy Lichtenstein	98.131
Jasper Johns	20.188	Willem de Kooning	67.446
Roy Lichtenstein	19.850	Jackson Pollock	61.146
Robert Rauschenberg	16.438	Jasper Johns	37.159
Jackson Pollock	14.638	Robert Rauschenberg	19.186

Notes:

All prices are in constant 2017 dollars, adjusted with the CPI.

Source:

Enrique Mayer, *Annuaire international des ventes* (Paris: Editions E.M., various years).

Artnet, *Price Database Fine Art and Design*. Artnet Worldwide Corporation.

Table 7: 2005 Ranking of Greatest Western 20th-Century Artists

	Artist	Total Illustrations
1.	Pablo Picasso	395
2.	Henri Matisse	183
3.	Marcel Duchamp	122
4.	Piet Mondrian	114
5.	Georges Braque	101
6.	Jackson Pollock	96
7.	Kazimir Malevich	93
8.	Andy Warhol	85

Source: David Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art*, p. 32.

Table 8: 2018 Ranking of Greatest Western 20th-Century Artists

Artist		Total Illustrations
1.	Pablo Picasso	202
2.	Henri Matisse	117
3.	Andy Warhol	81
4.	Marcel Duchamp	80
5.	Jackson Pollock	68
6.	Piet Mondrian	64
7.	Kazimir Malevich	60
8.	Georges Braque	49

Source: For a listing of the books used, see Appendix 2.

Appendix 1. The books surveyed for Table 3 are listed here, by decade of publication.

1960-69

1. Dore Ashton, *The Unknown Shore* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1962).
2. David Robb and J. Garrison, *Art in the Western World*, 4e (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).
3. John McCoubrey, *American Tradition in Painting* (New York: George Braziller, 1963).
4. Kurt Kranz, *Art* (New York: Shorewood Publishers, 1964).
5. Norman Schlenoff, *Art in the Modern World* (New York: Bantam Books, 1965).
6. Katherine Kuh, *Break-Up* (Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1965).
7. Rene Huyghe, *Larousse Encyclopedia of Modern Art* (New York: Prometheus Press, 1965).
8. Werner Haftmann, *Painting in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Frederick Praeger, 1965).
9. Oto Bihalji-Merin, *Adventure of Modern Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1966).
10. Dale Cleaver, *Art* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1966).
11. Sheldon Cheney, *A Primer of Modern Art*, 14 rev. ed. (New York: Liveright Publishing, 1966).
12. Edward Henning, *Fifty Years of Modern Art* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Modern Art, 1966).
13. Samuel Green, *American Art* (New York: Ronald Press, 1966).
14. Albert Elsen, *Purposes of Art*, 2e (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967).
15. Lloyd Goodrich, et al., *The Artist in America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967).
16. Bernard Myers, *Art and Civilization*, 2e (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).
17. Barbara Rose, *American Art Since 1900* (New York: Frederick Praeger, 1967).
18. H.H. Arnason, *History of Modern Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1968).
19. H.W. Janson and Joseph Kerman, *A History of Art and Music* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968).

20. Michael Levey, *A History of Western Art* (New York: Frederick Praeger, 1968).
21. Dore Ashton, *A Reading of Modern Art* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1969).
22. Louis Kronenberger, ed., *Quality* (New York: Atheneum, 1969).
23. H.W. Janson, *History of Art* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1969).
24. Neville Weston, *The Reach of Modern Art* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969).

1970-79

1. Horst de la Croix and Richard Tansey, *Gardner's Art Through the Ages*, 5e (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970).
2. George Heard Hamilton, *19th and 20th Century Art* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970).
3. Burton Wasserman, *Modern Painting* (Worcester, MA: Davis Publications, 1970).
4. Barbara Rose, *American Painting* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1970).
5. Robert Myron and Abner Sundell, *Modern Art in America* (New York: Crowell-Collier Press, 1971).
6. Daniel Mendelowitz, *A History of American Art*, 2e (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971).
7. Werner Haftmann, et al., *Art Since Mid-Century*, 2 vols. (Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1971).
8. Matthew Baigell, *A History of Modern Painting* (New York: Praeger, 1971).
9. Sam Hunter, *American Art of the 20th Century* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1972).
10. Richard McLanathan, *Art in America* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973).
11. Morton Abramson, et al., *Phaidon Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Art* (London: Phaidon, 1973).
12. David Britt, ed., *Modern Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1974).
13. John Russell, *The Meanings of Modern Art* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1974).

14. Ariane Ruskin, *History in Art* (New York: Franklin Watts, 1974).
15. Gaeton Picon, *Modern Painting* (New York: Newsweek Books, 1974).
16. Harold Spencer, *The Image Maker* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975).
17. Michele Cone, *The Roots and Routes of Art in the 20th Century* (New York: Horizon Press, 1975).
18. Frederick Hartt, *Art*, Vol. 2 (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1976).
19. Edward Lucie-Smith, *Late Modern*, 2e (New York: Praeger, 1976).
20. Harold Spencer, et al., *Readings in Art History*, 2e (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976).
21. John Wilmerding, *American Art* (New York: Penguin Books, 1976).
22. H.W. Janson, *History of Art*, 2e (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977).
23. Milton Brown, et al., *American Art* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1979).
24. Joshua Taylor, *The Fine Arts in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979).
25. Abraham Davidson, *The Story of Modern Painting* (New York: Galahad Books, 1979).

1980-89

1. Horst de la Croix and Richard Tansey, *Gardner's Art Through the Ages*, 7e (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1980).
2. William Fleming, *Arts & Ideas*, 6e (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980).
3. Norbert Lynton, *The Story of Modern Art* (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1980).
4. Rosemary Lambert, *The Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
5. Harold Osborne, ed., *The Oxford Companion to Twentieth-Century Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981).
6. Dore Ashton, *American Art Since 1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).
7. Robert Hughes, *The Shock of the New* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).

8. Sara Cornell, *Art* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1983).
9. Dennis Sporre, *The Arts* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984).
10. David Piper, *The Illustrated Dictionary of Art and Artists* (New York: Random House, 1984).
11. Ralph Britsch and Todd Britsch, *The Arts in Western Culture* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984).
12. Edward Lucie-Smith, *Movements in Art Since 1945*, new rev. ed., (London: Thames and Hudson, 1984).
13. Frederick Hartt, *Art*, 2e (New York: Harry Abrams, 1985).
14. Edmund Feldman, *Thinking About Art* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1985).
15. Hugh Honour and John Fleming, *The Visual Arts*, 2e (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986).
16. Edward Lucie-Smith, *Lives of the Great Twentieth-Century Artists* (New York: Rizzoli, 1986).
17. Joseph Muller and Ramon Bellido, *A Century of Modern Painting* (New York: Universe Books, 1986).
18. Duane and Sarah Preble, *Artforms*, 4e (New York: Harper Collins, 1989).
19. Bruce Cole and Adelheid Gealt, *Art of the Western World* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989).
20. Jean-Louis Ferrier, ed., *Art of Our Century* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1989).

1990-99

1. Sally Montanari, *Look Again!* (Washington, DC: Starrhill Press, 1990).
2. Kirk Varnedoe, *A Fine Disregard* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1990).
3. David Wilkins and Bernard Schultz, *Art Past, Art Present* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1990).
4. Philip Yenawine, *How to Look at Modern Art* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1991).

5. Horst de la Croix, et al., *Gardner's Art Through the Ages*, 9e (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1991).
6. Ronald Tamplin, ed., *The Arts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
7. Daniel Wheeler, *Art Since Mid-Century* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1991).
8. Carole Strickland, *The Annotated Mona Lisa*, 2e (Kansas City: Andrews McMeel, 1992).
9. Sandro Sproccati, ed., *A Guide to Art* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1992).
10. Paul Wood, et al., *Modernism in Dispute* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).
11. John Kissick, *Art* (New York: Brown Communications, 1993).
12. Nikos Stangos, ed, *Concepts of Modern Art*, 3e (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994).
13. Wayne Craven, *American Art* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1994).
14. Hugh Honour and John Fleming, *The Visual Arts*, 4e (New York: Harry Abrams, 1995).
15. H.W. Janson, *History of Art*, 5e (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1995).
16. E.H. Gombrich, *The Story of Art*, 16e (London: Phaidon Press, 1995).
17. Jonathan Fineberg, *Art Since 1940* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1995).
18. Marilyn Stokstad, *Art History* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1995).
19. Walter Robinson, *Instant Art History* (New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1995).
20. Walter Robinson, *Art History* (New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1995).
21. Rachel Barnes, et al., *The 20th Century Art Book* (London: Phaidon Press, 1996).
22. Liz Dawtrey, et al., *Investigating Modern Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).
23. Shearer West, ed. *The Bulfinch Guide to Art History* (Boston: Bulfinch Press, 1996).
24. Matthew Baigell, *A Concise History of American Painting and Sculpture*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper Collins, 1996).
25. Robert Hughes, *American Visions* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997).

26. Edward Lucie-Smith, *Visual Arts in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1997).
27. Paul Crowther, *The Language of Twentieth-Century Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).
28. Jurgen Tesch and Eckhard Hollmann, eds., *Icons of Art* (Munich: Prestel, 1997).
29. Rita Gilbert, *Living with Art*, 5e (Boston: McGraw Hill, 1998).
30. Julian Freeman, *Art* (New York: Watson-Guptill, 1998).
31. Volker Gebhardt, *The History of Art* (New York: Barron's, 1998).
32. Loredana Parmesani, *Art of the Twentieth-Century* (Milan: Skira, 1998).
33. Jay Tobler, ed., *The American Art Book* (London: Phaidon Press, 1999).
34. Matthew Collings, *This is Modern Art* (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1999).
35. Sandro Bocola, *The Art of Modernism* (Munich: Prestel, 1999).
36. Bruce Cole, *The Informed Eye* (Chicago: Ivan Dee, 1999).

2000-9

1. David Hopkins, *After Modern Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
2. Martin Kemp, ed., *The Oxford History of Western Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
3. Jane Turner, ed., *From Expressionism to Post-Modernism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).
4. Cory Bell, *Modern Art* (New York: Watson-Guptill, 2001).
5. Klaus Richter, *Art* (Munich: Prestel, 2001).
6. Bernard Blistene, *A History of 20th Century Art* (Paris: Flammarion, 2001).
7. David Bjelajac, *American Art* (New York: Harry Abrams, 2001).
8. Sandro Bocola, *Timelines – the Art of Modernism* (Cologne: Taschen, 2001).

9. H.W. Janson and Anthony Janson, *History of Art*, 6e (London: Thames and Hudson, 2001).
10. Robert Belton, ed., *Art* (New York: Watson-Guption, 2002).
11. Erika Doss, *Twentieth-Century American Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
12. Paul Johnson, *Art* (New York: Harper Collins, 2003).
13. David Joselit, *American Art Since 1945* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2003).
14. Francesca Marchetti, ed., *American Painting* (New York: Watson-Guption, 2003).
15. Sam Hunter, John Jacobus, and Daniel Wheeler, *Modern Art*, 3e (New York: Vendome Press, 2004).
16. Hal Foster, et al., *Art Since 1900* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2004).
17. Dana Arnold, *Art History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
18. Hugh Honour and John Fleming, *A World History of Art*, 7e (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005).
19. Karl Ruhrberg, *Art of the 20th Century*, Vol. 1 (Cologne: Taschen, 2005).
20. Barbara Eschenburg, et al., *Masterpieces of Western Art*, Vol. 2 (Cologne: Taschen, 2005).
21. Stefano Zuffi, *Dictionary of Painters* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 2005).
22. David Cottington, *Modern Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
23. Robert Cumming, *Art* (New York: DK Publishing, 2005).
24. Paul Greenhalgh, *The Modern Ideal* (London: V&A Publications, 2005).
25. John Carlin and Jonathan Fineberg, *Imagining America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005).
26. Michael Lewis, *American Art and Architecture* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2006).
27. Jon Thompson, *How to Read a Modern Painting* (New York: Abrams, 2006).
28. Michel Nuridsany, *100 Masterpieces of Painting* (Paris: Flammarion, 2006).
29. Julian Bell, *Mirror of the World* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2007).

30. Penelope Davies, et al., *Janson's History of Art*, 7e (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2007).
31. Elke Buchholz, et al., *Art* (New York: Abrams, 2007).
32. Laurie Adams, *Art Across Time*, 3e (Boston, McGraw Hill, 2007).
33. Stephen Farthing, ed., *1001 Paintings* (New York: Universe, 2007).
34. Flaminio Gualdoni, *Art* (Milan: Skira, 2008).
35. Francesco Poli, *Postmodern Art* (New York: Harper Collins, 2008).
36. Edward Lucie-Smith, *Lives of the Great Modern Artists* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2009).
37. Charles Harrison, *An Introduction to Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

2010-19

1. Stephen Farthing, ed., *Art* (New York: Universe, 2010).
2. Michael Bird, *100 Ideas That Changed Art* (London: Laurence King, 2010).
3. Amy Dempsey, *Styles, Schools, and Movements* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2010).
4. Debra Mancoff, *50 American Artists You Should Know* (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 2010).
5. Joan Marter, ed., *The Grove Encyclopedia of American Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
6. Frances Pohl, *Framing America*, 3e (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2012).
7. Camille Paglia, *Glittering Images* (New York: Pantheon, 2012).
8. Will Gompertz, *What Are You Looking At?* (New York: Penguin, 2012).
9. Loredana Parmesani, *Art of the Twentieth Century and Beyond* (Milan: skira, 2012).
10. Sam Phillips, *...isms: Understanding Modern Art* (London: Bloomsbury, 2012).
11. Dorothea Eimert, *Art and Architecture of the 20th Century* (New York: Parkstone Press, 2013).

12. Andy Pankhurst and Lucinda Hawksley, *What Makes Great Art* (London: Quintessence Editions, 2013).
13. Martin Kemp, *Art in History* (London: Profile Books, 2014).
14. Fred Kleiner, *Gardner's Art Through the Ages*, 14e (Boston: Wadsworth, 2014).
15. Tom Melick, ed., *Art in Time* (London: Phaidon Press, 2014).
16. Stephen Little, *...isms: Understanding Art* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).
17. Larry Ball, et al., *30,000 Years of Art*, 2e (London: Phaidon Press, 2015).
18. Dana Arnold, *A Short Book About Art* (London: Tate Publishing, 2015).
19. A.N. Hodge, *The Story of Art* (London: Arcturus, 2015).
20. Andy Tuohy, *A to Z Great Modern Artists* (London: Cassell, 2015).
21. Morgan Falconer, *Painting Beyond Pollock* (London: Phaidon Press, 2015).
22. Thomas Koster, *50 Artists You Should Know* (Munich: Prestel, 2016).
23. Kristina Lowis and Tamsin Pickeral, *50 Paintings You Should Know* (Munich: Prestel-Verlag, 2016).
24. Mark Getlein and Annabel Howard, *Art Visionaries* (London: Laurence King Publishing, 2016).
25. Dietmar Elger, et al., *Modern Art* (Cologne: Taschen, 2016).
26. Susie Hodge, *The Short Story of Art* (London: Laurence King, 2017).
27. Susie Hodge, *Modern Art in Detail* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2017).
28. George Bray, et al., *Artists* (New York: DK Publishing, 2017).
29. Erika Doss, *American Art of the 20th-21st Centuries* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).
30. Caroline Bugler, et al., *The Art Book* (London: Penguin, 2017).
31. Stefanie Adam, et al., *The Paintings That Revolutionized Art* (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 2017).
32. Christiane Weidemann and Christine Nippe, *50 Modern Artists You Should Know* (Munich: Prestel, 2017).

33. Diane Fortenberry, ed., *The Art Museum*, rev. ed. (London: Phaidon, 2017).
34. Iain Zaczek, *A Chronology of Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2018).
35. Karen Janes, et al., *Great Paintings* (London: Penguin Random House, 2018).
36. Ian Chilvers, et al., *The Illustrated Story of Art* (London: DK Publishing, 2018).
37. Amy Dempsey, *Modern Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2018).
38. Dorling Kindersley, ed. *Art*, 2e (New York: DK Publishing, 2018).
39. Lee Cheshire, *Key Moments in Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2018).
40. Kelly Grovier, *A New Way of Seeing* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2018).
41. Dorling Kindersley, *Great Paintings* (London: Penguin, 2018).
42. Simon Morley, *Seven Keys to Modern Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2019).

Appendix 2. The books surveyed for Table 8 are listed here, by date of publication.

1. Laurie Adams, *Art Across Time*, 3e (New York: McGraw Hill, 2006).
2. Jon Thompson, *How To Read a Modern Painting* (New York: Abrams, 2006).
3. Penelope Davies, et al., *Janson's History of Art*, 7e (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2007).
4. Julian Bell, *Mirror of the World* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2007).
5. Carol Strickland, *The Annotated Mona Lisa*, 2e (Kansas City: Andrews McMeel, 2007).
6. Elke Buchholz, et al., *Art* (New York: Abrams, 2007).
7. Two books treated as one:
Gabriele Crepaldi, *Modern Art, 1900-45* (New York: Collins, 2007).
Francesco Poli, *Postmodern Art* (New York: Collins, 2008).
8. Stephen Farthing, *1001 Paintings* (New York: Quintet, 2007).
9. Flaminio Gualdoni, *Art* (Milan: Skira, 2008).
10. John Onians, ed., *The Art Atlas* (New York: Abbeville Press, 2008).
11. Charles Harrison, *An Introduction to Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).
12. Edward Lucie-Smith, *Lives of the Great Modern Artists*, rev. ed. (London: Thames and Hudson, 2009).
13. Stephen Farthing, ed., *Art* (New York: Universe Publishing, 2010).
14. Amy Dempsey, *Styles, Schools, and Movements* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2010).
15. Hal Foster, et al., *Art Since 1900*, 2e (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2011).
16. Michael Bird, *100 Ideas That Changed Art* (London: Laurence King Publishing, 2012).
17. Camille Paglia, *Glittering Images* (New York: Pantheon, 2012).
18. Will Gompertz, *What Are You Looking At?* (New York: Dutton, 2012).
19. Loredana Parmesani, *Art of the Twentieth Century and Beyond* (Milan, Skira, 2012).
20. Dorothea Eimert, *Art and Architecture of the 20th Century* (New York: Parkstone Press, 2013).

21. Fred Kleiner, *Gardner's Art Through the Ages*, 14e (Boston: Wadsworth, 2014).
22. Martin Kemp, *Art in History* (London: Profile Books, 2014).
23. Tom Melick, ed., *Art in Time* (London: Phaidon Press, 2014).
24. Larry Ball, et al, *30,000 Years of Art* (London: Phaidon Press, 2015).
25. Mark Getlein and Annabel Howard, *Art Visionaries* (London: Laurence King, 2016).
26. Kristina Lowis and Tamsin Pickeral, *50 Paintings You Should Know* (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 2016).
27. Susie Hodge, *Modern Art in Detail* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2017).
28. Christiane Weidemann and Christine Nippe, *50 Modern Artists* (Munich: Prestel, 2017).
29. Caroline Bugler, et al., *The Art Book* (New York: DK Publishing, 2017).
30. Diane Fortenberry, ed., *The Art Museum*, rev. ed. (London: Phaidon, 2017).
31. Iain Zaczek, ed., *A Chronology of Art* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2018).
32. Amy Dempsey, *Modern Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2018).
33. Dorling Kindersley, ed., *Art*, 2e (New York: DK Publishing, 2018).