Journal of Cultural Economics (2023) 47:489–511
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-023-09476-9

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Two old masters and a young genius: the creativity of Francis Bacon, Lucian Freud, and Jean-Michel Basquiat

David W. Galenson[1,2] · **Simone Lenzu**[3]

Received: 23 January 2023 / Accepted: 17 April 2023 / Published online: 8 June 2023

Abstract
Francis Bacon, Lucian Freud, and Jean-Michel Basquiat were key figures in the resurgence of expressive figurative painting in the late twentieth century. All three made personal visual art, drawing their subjects from among the people and things they cared most about. Yet they worked in very different ways, toward very different goals. This paper considers how their differing motivations and methods resulted in radically differing life cycles of creativity, measured both by auction market outcomes and by the judgments of art scholars. The experimental art of Bacon and Freud developed gradually and produced masterpieces late in their long lives, whereas the conceptual Basquiat made his most innovative art well before his premature death.

Keywords Francis Bacon · Lucian Freud · Jean-Michel Basquiat · Experimental innovator · Conceptual innovator · Personal visual art · Age-price profiles

1 Introduction

> What has never been analyzed is why this particular way of painting is more poignant than illustration. I suppose because it has a life completely of its own.
> Francis Bacon (Sylvester, 1987:17)
> The picture in order to move us must never merely *remind* us of life, but must acquire a life of its own.
> Lucian Freud (Feaver, 2019: 390)
> I like to have information, rather than just have a brushstroke.

✉ David W. Galenson
dgalenso@uchicago.edu

[1] University of Chicago, Chicago, USA

[2] Universidad del CEMA, Buenos Aires, Argentina

[3] New York University, New York City, USA

Jean-Michel Basquiat (Saggese, 2021: 47)

Abstraction became the dominant form of western advanced art after World War II, with the rise of Abstract Expressionism in New York and Tachisme in Paris. A return to figuration occurred during the 1960s, led by Pop art in New York. The figuration in question was impersonal, as the Pop artists portrayed commercial motifs with techniques that were or appeared to be mechanical. By the 1980s, however, more personal forms of representational art gained new prominence in the advanced art world. In some cases this art was made by painters who had been working in relative obscurity for decades, while in others it was made by younger painters who were recognized much more quickly.

This paper examines the careers of three of the leading figures in the revival of personal representational art. Although they differed greatly in many respects, including their techniques and the appearance of their works, all three were concerned with portraying people and things they cared about, in ways that were very distinctive. The work of all three has also had notable success at auction. In 2008, Lucian Freud's *Benefits Supervisor Sleeping* (1995) sold for $33.6 million, then the highest price ever paid at auction for a painting by a living artist. In 2013, Francis Bacon's *Three Studies of Lucian Freud* (1969) sold for $142.4 million, at the time the highest price ever paid at auction for a work of art. And in 2017, the $110.5 million paid for Jean-Michel Basquiat's *Untitled* (1982) was then the highest price ever paid at auction for a painting by a US artist.

This paper will measure the creative life cycles of these three painters, using evidence produced both by auction markets and art scholars. The differences in these life cycles across artists will then be considered as consequences of the different approaches they took in pursuing their differing goals.

2 Age–price profiles

I must say painting is a mug's game when it comes to making money. I seem to have spent so much on materials.
Francis Bacon (Stevens and Swan 2020: 350)
Until I was fifty I never had a bank account, always lived from hand to mouth. I used to lie awake at night wondering if I'd be able to go on with my paintings or whether the paint would run out.
Lucian Freud (Greig, 2013: 38)

This paper will use hedonic regression analysis to estimate the relationships between auction prices and the age at which paintings were executed for Bacon, Freud, and Basquiat, using auction results from 1990–2022. The regression specifications for Bacon and Freud will differ from that for Basquiat.

Table 1 presents estimates in which the natural logarithm of the auction price of a painting is expressed as a function of a third-degree polynomial in the artist's age at the time of the painting's execution. Independent variables are included for the size

Table 1 Age–price profiles for Bacon and Freud

Dep. Var. ln(Price)	Bacon	Freud	Freud	Freud
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Age	−0.3559^{+}	0.1474	0.0251***	0.0009
	(0.2180)	(0.1855)	(0.0083)	(0.0080)
Age^2	0.0098**	−0.0022		
	(0.0043)	(0.0040)		
Age^3	−0.0001***	0.0000		
Size	(0.0000) 0.3486***	(0.0000) 0.6688***		0.6632***
	(0.0623)	(0.0796)		(0.0770)
Sale Year Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.4778	0.5047	0.1893	0.4923
Observations	174	108	108	108

Heteroscedasticity robust standard errors are reported in parenthesis. ***Denotes statistical significance at the 1% level. **Denotes statistical significance at the 5% level. **Denotes statistical significance at the 10% level. $^{+}$Denotes statistical significance at the 11% level. Source: Artnet

of the painting and the date of the auction; the latter allows for fluctuations in the art market and for changes in the general price level.

For Bacon, the age coefficients trace out an inverse U-shaped price profile that is now familiar from earlier studies of modern artists' careers (Galenson, 2000; Galenson and Lenzu 2016; Mei, Moses, and Zhou 2022). The profile rises throughout most of Bacon's career, to a peak at age 69. Curiously, however, the age coefficients for Freud are all statistically insignificant. Does this imply that there is no difference in the value of his work from different years?

The answer is no. Inspection of the regression suggests two potential contributing reasons for the absence of a statistically significant age–price profile. One is the small sample. Freud was not a prolific painter, and only 108 of his oil paintings were sold at auction during the decades considered here. The second is the coefficient of the size variable, which is both large—nearly twice as great as that for Bacon, for example—and highly significant statistically.

The insignificance of the age variables and the large coefficient of size together point to an important fact about Freud's oeuvre. For successful painters, the average size of their works often increases over the course of their careers. One reason is economic: oil paints and canvas are expensive, and young artists often cannot afford to make large works. Another reason, particularly for experimental painters like Freud, involves skill. Experimental painters want to discover forms as they work, so they avoid preconceiving their images and do not make preparatory drawings (Galenson, 2006: 11–14). Large images pose much greater problems of organization than small ones, particularly in the absence of preparatory drawings, so experimental painters typically avoid these early in their careers. With experience, successful experimental painters generally develop ways of organizing larger compositions, and this allows them to work on a larger scale as they grow older. Freud's career was affected by

Table 2 Summary statistics: Bacon and Freud

Age	Observations	Bacon		Observations	Freud	
		Average ln(Price)	Average Surface (Inches^2)		Average ln(Price)	Average Surface (Inches^2)
18–29	3	13.82	1288.20	21	12.98	140.44
30–39	2	14.76	1986.68	18	14.29	265.18
40–49	40	15.08	1818.18	10	14.20	390.21
50–59	58	15.46	2556.31	17	13.53	416.53
60–69	42	15.87	1671.67	20	14.36	709.45
70–84	29	15.57	2134.34	22	15.06	1725.44
All ages	174	15.45	2074.35	108	14.08	660.58

Source: Artnet

both of these factors: his extended early lack of commercial success constrained his use of materials and his highly improvisatory approach limited his early art to small scale works.

Table 2 shows how the size of Freud's paintings changed over time, from the evidence of the auction sample, with data for Bacon for comparison. Bacon's paintings increase in size with age: the mean size of paintings from his 50 s is twice that of those from his 20 s. But for Freud this increase is much greater. The mean size of his paintings increases in every decade of his career, until the mean for the 22 paintings from his 70 s is—strikingly—more than 12 times as great as the mean of the 21 paintings from his 20 s. The strength of the relationship between Freud's age and the size of his paintings points to the source of the insignificance of the age coefficients in Table 1.

Column 3 of Table 1 shows that Freud's paintings did increase in value over the course of his career, as the coefficient of the single age variable is positive and highly significant statistically. And column 4 shows that this age effect is reduced to statistical insignificance by the inclusion of painting size in the equation. The puzzle for Freud is solved: his paintings did increase in value, considerably, over the course of his career, but the steady and large increase in their size over time results in a high degree of collinearity between age and size that makes the statistical separation of these two effects problematic in a small sample. The dramatic increase in the sizes of Freud's paintings over time is an important fact about Freud's career that will be analyzed later in this paper.

Unlike Bacon and Freud, who both made art into their 80 s, Jean-Michel Basquiat died at the age of 27. Yet also unlike Bacon and Freud, who produced relatively small bodies of work, Basquiat was among the most prolific of modern artists. He was also less conventional in his use of materials, so the analysis of his auction results will not be restricted to oil paintings on canvas, but will also include works on paper, as well as such other supports as wood, metal, and masonite.

The sample of more than 1400 auction sales from a career of barely more than a decade allows us to estimate a non-parametric regression that includes a variable

Table 3 Age–price profile for Basquiat

Dep. Var. ln(Price)				
Year	Estimate	Standard error	Difference from peak year	Number of observations
1977–79	6.9665	0.1822	−0.9681***	42
1980	7.5487	0.1970	−0.3859*	23
1981	7.4992	0.0825	−0.4354***	265
1982	7.9346	0.2423	–	382
1983	7.4419	0.0850	−0.4927***	201
1984	7.1691	0.0789	−0.7655***	212
1985	7.4108	0.0882	−0.5238***	132
1986	7.2934	0.1197	−0.6412***	80
1987	7.2876	0.1049	−0.6470***	80
1988	6.8526	0.1727	−1.0820***	32
Size	−0.0671	0.0866		
Paper	−0.5625	0.0759		
Other support	0.8869	0.0291		
Sale Year Controls	Yes			
*R*2	0.8056			
Observations	1449			

The first column reports the year when the artist produced a given work. The second column reports the estimates of each year dummy. The third column reports the heteroscedasticity robust standard errors associated with each estimate. The fourth column reports the difference from the highest age coefficient (1982). The fifth column reports the number of observations in each year. ***Denotes statistical significant at the 1% level. **Denotes statistical significance at the 5% level. **Denotes statistical significance at the 10% level. $^{+}$Denotes statistical significance at the 11% level. Source: Artnet

for each year of Basquiat's adult life. Table 3 shows that not only are all these age coefficients statistically significant, but that they are all significantly different from the coefficient for his peak year of 1982. In that year Basquiat burst on the art world, with his first solo New York exhibition, and solo exhibitions later in the year in Los Angeles, Zurich, and Rotterdam.

3 Scholars' evaluations

> I think that only time tells about painting. No artist knows in his own lifetime whether what he does will be the slightest good.
> Francis Bacon (Sylvester, 1987: 60)

To compare the life cycles implied by the regression estimates to the evaluations of art scholars, we collected the illustrations of the work of the three artists from a total of 57 art history textbooks published since 1990. Pooling the

Table 4 Distribution by age of textbook illustrations, Bacon and Freud

Age	Bacon	Freud	Age	Bacon	Freud
29		2	55		2
30		2	56	1	
35	7		57		1
36		1	58	1	9
37	2		59	1	
40	2		60	3	
42	1	1	61	1	
43		2	62	2	1
44	23	1	63	7	1
45	4	1	64	7	1
46	2		65		1
48	1		67	1	
50	2		68		2
51	1		70	1	2
52	1		72		1
53	8		77	3	
			Total	82	31

Source: See Appendix

evidence of all available textbooks effectively allows us to survey scholars' opinions of what constitutes each artist's most important work (Jensen, 2009).

Table 4 presents tabulations of the illustrations of the two British artists' work, distributed by the age of execution, in the books surveyed. Bacon's earliest illustrated paintings were done when he was 35, while his latest illustrated paintings were made 42 years later, when he was 77. His single year with the most illustrations was age 44, followed by age 53, and three years tied for third—35, 63, and 64. Bacon's five best years by this metric thus span 30 years.

Freud's best year in Table 4 was at age 58. He had six years tied for second place in illustrations, from age 29 to 70. His eight best years thus range from 29 to 70, a span of 42 years.

Table 5 Distribution by age of textbook illustrations, Basquiat

Age	Basquiat
20	1
21	4
22	16
23	9
24	15
25	6
Total	51

Source: See Appendix

Table 5 shows that Basquiat's illustrations span just six years, from age 20 to 25. His single year with the most illustrations was age 22.

The textbook illustrations thus tell very different stories about Bacon and Freud than about Basquiat. The single year most emphasized by the textbooks for Basquiat is the same as that in which his age–price profile peaks. The same is not true for the British artists: the peak of Bacon's age–price profile, for example, differs by 25 years from the year most frequently illustrated in the textbooks. Yet the textbook illustrations suggest that neither of the British artists had a distinct career peak, but rather that they produced important work over long periods. Thus whereas 40 of Basquiat's illustrations, or 78%, date from a span of just three years, no *decade* of either Bacon's or Freud's career accounts for more than 40% of their total illustrations. And Bacon's two best decades by this metric, his 40 s and 60 s, were not even consecutive. The absence of any clear prime period in the British artists' careers is of obvious importance for understanding their creative life cycles, as is the extremely sharp peak in Basquiat's career in understanding the nature of his achievement.

4 Francis Bacon (1909–92)

> After all, I'm not really trying to *say* anything, I'm trying to *do* something.
> Francis Bacon (Sylvester, 1987:198)

Unlike most successful painters, early in his life Francis Bacon had no artistic interests: "I read almost nothing as a child; as for pictures I was hardly aware that they existed" (Rothenstein, 1984: 150). He did not attend art school: Lucian Freud remarked that "He was completely untrained, and couldn't draw at all but was so absolutely brilliant that through sheer inspiration he could somehow make it work" (Gayford, 2019: 29).

Bacon never denied that he deformed his subjects: he admitted that "A thing has to arrive at a stage of deformity before I can find it beautiful" (Stevens and Swan 2020: 123). His practice was inspired by a series of beach scenes Picasso had made in the late 1920s. Bacon was startled by Picasso's creation of "an organic form that relates to the human image but is a complete distortion of it" (Sylvester, 1987:8). He explained that Picasso's distortion had achieved "real realism, because it conveys a whole sensation of what it's like to be on the beach. They're endlessly evocative." Bacon reflected that "Once you've seen them they remain in the mind," and they became the inspiration for his life's work (Peppiatt, 2008: 145).

For Bacon, Picasso's invention pointed to a way of making the human figure once again relevant to art. In a world flooded with photographic images, realistic painting had lost its impact: "Photography has covered so much: in a painting that's even worth looking at, the image must be twisted if it is to make a renewed assault upon the nervous system." Restoring the power of painting required the artist to reject what Bacon dismissed as "literal realism" and develop a new approach: "To create realism without falling into illustration you have to invent a technique." Paintings of people would have to transcend mere appearance: "The living quality is what you have to get. In painting a portrait the problem is to find a technique by which you

can give overall the pulsations of a person" (Peppiatt, 2008: 16, 164, 183). A successful portrait would "get near not only to their appearance, but also to the way they have affected you." Bacon considered this the true goal of art: "Isn't it that one wants a thing to be as factual as possible and at the same time as deeply suggestive or deeply unlocking of areas of sensation other than simple illustration of the object that you set out to do? Isn't that what all art is about?" (Sylvester, 1987: 56, 130).

For Bacon, the secret to achieving this lay in the materiality of paint. In 1953, he praised an artist he admired for "attempting to make idea and technique inseparable. Painting in this sense tends toward a complete interlocking of image and paint, so that the image is the paint and vice versa" (Gayford, 2019: 34). Bacon often returned to two experimental masters, Rembrandt and Velazquez, as the painters who had had the greatest success in achieving this artistic alchemy, creating a sense of reality by making brushstrokes appear to be the objects they represented.

Although Bacon's distortions often prompted comparisons to Edvard Munch, he explained that his art was not expressionist: "I'm not really saying anything, because I'm probably much more concerned with the aesthetic qualities of a work than, perhaps, Munch was." Bacon was at pains to avoid narrative: "the moment the story is elaborated, the boredom sets in; the story talks louder than the paint" (Sylvester, 1987: 22, 82). Nor did he consider his distorted portrayals to be nightmare images. John Russell explained that they were selective composites: "They offer a superimposition of states, in which certain characteristics of the person concerned appear with exceptional intensity, while others are obliterated" (Russell, 1993: 124).

Bacon consistently stressed that the pursuit of his elusive goal was fraught with uncertainty. The main reason for this was the power and unpredictability of the paint itself. He explained that "real painting is a mysterious and continuous struggle with chance – mysterious because the very substance of the paint... can make such a direct assault upon the nervous system; continuous because the medium is so fluid and subtle that every change that is made loses what is already there in the hope of making a fresh gain." Planning was of little use: "I have an idea of what I would like to do, but as I start working that completely evaporates." Asked if he began by sketching on the canvas, he replied "Sometimes, a little bit. It never, never stays that way. Often, you just put on paint almost without knowing what you're doing. You've just got to get some material on the canvas to begin with. Then it may or may not begin to work." Developing an image meant changing and looking: "I just go on putting paint on or wiping it out. And sometimes the shadows of the marks left from this lead to another image and the possibility of something else coming up" (Peppiatt, 2008: 79, 194–5).

Bacon once remarked that as he painted "I watch the forms form themselves" (Sylvester, 1987:136). He in fact disdained preconceived images: "I never know quite how the image will come about. If I did know, I should become just an eccentric illustrator and I could never surprise myself" (Russell, 1993: 113). He described his process as accidental: "I don't in fact know very often what the paint will do, and it does many things which are very much better than I could make it do." The reward was "a possibility that you get through this accidental thing something much more profound than what you really wanted" (Sylvester, 1987: 17). This was the source of discovery: "the excitement and the possibilities are in the working and obviously

can only come in working" (Sylvester, 1987: 156). Bacon consistently rejected critical interpretations of his paintings, maintaining that no translation of their meaning was possible from their original form: in a sentiment widely shared by experimental artists, he remarked that "if you could explain it, why would you go to the trouble of painting it?" (Peppiatt, 2009: 117).

Bacon also had the perennial dissatisfaction of an experimental innovator. A friend, the painter Frank Auerbach, observed that "He never thought that what he had done was good enough" (Gayford, 2019: 40–1). One consequence was that he often destroyed his own paintings. In 1949, a *Time* magazine article stated that he had destroyed 700 canvases to date (Stevens and Swan 2020: 303). This may have been an exaggeration, but the critic Martin Gayford reflected that Bacon's "tendency to reduce to obliteration his own pictures is hard to parallel in art history" (Gayford, 2019: 40).

Bacon spoke of "trapping the image at its most living point;" he always hoped to create "one absolutely perfect image which will cancel all the others out." He had no system: "I can't explain my art, or even my working method" (Peppiatt, 2015: 27–8). Talking about painting was ultimately useless, "because if you could explain your painting you would be explaining your instincts" (Sylvester, 1987: 100). He could not anticipate how any painting would develop, because "a painting has a life completely of its own" (Russell, 1993: 182). He told the poet Allen Ginsberg that the only way he could complete a painting was "with a chance brushstroke that locked in the magic – a fortuitous thing he couldn't predict or orchestrate" (Peppiatt, 2008: 75). David Sylvester pointed out that the titles Bacon gave his paintings witnessed his reluctance to consider his work as final: "So there are studies *from*, studies *for*, studies *of*, studies *after*, as it to say that at least some of the works were preliminary sketches for more definitive statements. What is in fact being said is that the artist wishes all his works to be regarded as provisional" (Sylvester, 1997: 457).

Bacon was unusual among experimental painters in working from photographs. But he understood how his use of photographic images differed from that of conceptual painters: "I believe that I am different from the mixed-media jackdaws who use photographs more or less literally or cut them up and rearrange them... In my case the photographs become a sort of compost out of which images emerge from time to time" (Russell, 1993: 71). For Bacon photographs served as starting points—what he called "triggers of ideas" – rather than desired images to be replicated in paint (Peppiatt, 2009: 174).

5 Lucian Freud (1922–2011)

> I would wish my portraits to be *of* the people, not *like* them. Not having a look of the sitter, *being* them.
> Lucian Freud (Gayford, 2010: 30)

John Craxton, a painter who shared a house with Lucian Freud early in their careers, was amused by what he considered Freud's lack of imagination: "Lucian, of course, *never* invented. He finds it very hard to" (Gayford, 2019: 23). But Freud was

proud of being a visual painter: he told a critic that "I could never put anything into a picture that wasn't actually there in front of me" (Feaver, 2021: 214).

Most of Freud's paintings were of people, and he studied his sitters – "The subject must be kept under closest observation" – in order to portray not only their appearance, but "the essence of their character" (Gruen, 1991: 321). He worked with deliberation, and a portrait took as long as he felt necessary: during the 1970s and '80 s he made nine portraits of his mother in more than a thousand four-hour sittings (Feaver, 2021: 64). He liked to paint in series, "because I feel I have a lot of information on which I can build" (Feaver, 2021: 311). He declined requests to paint numerous celebrities, including Tony Blair, Princess Diana, Andrew Lloyd Webber, and Mick Jagger, because he had to work at his own pace: "The idea of someone being fairly desperate for being painted yet looking at their watch: 'Time's up'" (Feaver, 2021: 334).

Freud painted directly: "I don't like to plan in advance" (Gayford, 2010: 37). He wanted to make discoveries in the course of working:" I think half the point of painting a picture is that you don't know what will happen" (Gayford, 2010: 81). He wanted a picture to "acquire a life of its own, precisely in order to reflect life;" he declared that "I want the fact that the people I paint are alive to be the subject of my pictures" (Gayford, 2010: 108; Feaver, 2021: 284). No image was ever fixed: "I like to think that everything in the picture is changeable, removable and provisional" (Gayford, 2010: 199). Changes in composition as he worked sometimes resulted in sending a painting to a workshop to have an extra piece of canvas attached to make it larger. And finishing a painting was always problematic: Freud might abandon a canvas after months of work, only to take it up again months later (Gayford, 2010: 25, 29).

The curator Virginia Button (2015: 42) compared Freud to Cézanne and Giacometti for his "protracted creative process overshadowed by existential doubt. Anxiety registered in the paint itself." The discrete brushstrokes that remain distinct in Freud's late paintings, like those in Cézanne's late paintings and the touches that remain visible in Giacometti's late sculptures, animate their subjects even as they suggest that the image is in the process of being created. David Hockney sat for a portrait, and reflected that the finished painting had more than one hundred hours "layered into it," with many different moods and emotions. He considered that the painting was not him but was rather "an account of looking at me by a very intelligent and skilled painter. That's what a Cézanne portrait is – an account of looking" (Feaver, 2021: 408). Freud explained that when he looked at one of his finished paintings, he thought "so this is the sum total of all those decisions" (Feaver, 2021: 52). Working deliberately added dimensions to the finished work: "The advantage of taking so long is that it allows me to include more than one mood, though goodness knows I don't always succeed" (Gayford, 2010: 152–3).

In 1954, Freud wrote a statement about his art for the BBC. The closing paragraph presented his version of an experimental artist's impossible dream:

> A moment of complete happiness never occurs in the creation of a work of art. The promise of it is felt in the act of creation but disappears towards the completion of the work. For it is then that the painter realizes that it is only a

> picture he is painting. Until then he had almost dared to hope that the picture might spring to life. Were it not for this, the perfect picture might be painted, on the completion of which the painter could retire. It is this great insufficiency that drives him on (Feaver, 2019: 391).

Freud admired Honoré de Balzac and owned a bronze cast of Rodin's sculpture of the novelist. In this passage, it is not difficult to recognize an allusion to the fictional master Frenhofer, from Balzac's *Unknown Masterpiece*, who devoted a decade to the quixotic goal of painting a portrait so real that the beautiful woman it portrayed would come to life. Over time, Frenhofer became the patron saint of numerous experimental artists, including notably Cézanne, and it appears likely that Freud's account of his recurring disappointment in his art was an oblique reference to Balzac's tale of the experimentalist's holy grail (Feaver, 2019: 544, 561, 575; Feaver, 2021: 150, 376–82).

6 Jean-Michel Basquiat (1960–88)

I like the ones where I don't paint as much as others, where it's just a direct idea.

Jean-Michel Basquiat (Saggese, 2021: 34)

The paintings of Jean-Michel Basquiat developed from the street art of SAMO, the aphorisms that Basquiat and a friend wrote on the walls of New York art galleries and museums in the late 1970s. Conceptual innovators make novel and unexpected combinations of previously unrelated elements. The curator Richard Flood called Basquiat "a brilliant synthesist of a number of elements happening in the '80 s" (Hoban, 2004: 348). Diego Cortez, Basquiat's first agent, elaborated: "Basquiat's work was related to graffiti, the street, Pop art, and the music scene" (Saggese, 2021: 189).

Basquiat broke the color line in American art. There had been black painters earlier, but they had always been relegated to minor status: thus the *New York Times* stated in 1985 that Basquiat was the "first black artist to achieve anything close to blue-chip status in the contemporary art market" (Saggese, 2014: 17). Basquiat also brought the subject of race squarely into fine art. Pop, the representational art of the Civil Rights era, had almost entirely avoided the subject of race, but Basquiat made blacks and their culture the focus of his art. Observing that "black people are… not even portrayed in modern art," he put scores of black heroes into his paintings, including baseball players, boxers, and jazz musicians (Saggese, 2021: 278). He made paintings titled "History of Black People," "Slave Auction," "Jim Crow," and simply "Black." He said he used blacks as protagonists because he himself was black, and he clearly felt a special kinship with a few. He owned a case of copies of *Bird Lives*, Ross Russell's biography of Charlie Parker, and his paintings often referred to Parker, another young genius nearly as famous for his tragic life as for his art (Saggese, 2014: 93).

Basquiat's artistic goals were conceptual: "I was trying to communicate an idea... I was trying to make paintings different from the paintings that I saw a lot of at the time, which were mostly Minimal and they were very highbrow and alienating, and I wanted to make very direct paintings that most people would feel the emotion behind" (Saggese, 2021: 42). To this end he combined a number of characteristically conceptual practices.

Nearly all of Basquiat's paintings included words, and some were made up almost entirely of language. Since Braque and Picasso had first begun to use letters and words in their paintings, a series of conceptual painters had used language to refer to popular culture, to make puns and pose verbal puzzles, to engage with philosophy and semiotics, and to make political or social commentaries (Galenson, 2009). Basquiat used language in all these ways. Keith Haring called Basquiat a "supreme poet; every gesture symbolic, every action an event... He used words like paint. He cut them, combined them, erased them, and rebuilt them. Every invention a new revelation" (Saggese, 2021: 208–9).

Basquiat's language contained myriad allusions: scholars have devoted hundreds of pages to tracing and analyzing these. Allusion is means of making art directly from earlier art, which is a conceptual practice, inconsistent with the direct expression of perception that is characteristic of experimental art. In the extraordinarily large volume and range of his allusions, Basquiat placed himself in a lineage of modern conceptual innovators in a number of arts, including T.S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, James Joyce, Jean-Luc Godard, Bob Dylan, and John Lennon and Paul McCartney. Basquiat often painted with a book in one hand and a brush in the other, and he made no secret of his practice: "I get my background from studying books. I put what I like from them in my paintings" (Saggese, 2014: 7).

Basquiat made liberal use of collage, another device invented by Picasso and subsequently adopted by a series of modern conceptual artists. Collage is intrinsically conceptual: it produces abrupt transitions that call attention to the technique of a work of art, and juxtaposes elements that were previously unrelated (Galenson, 2009: 113–4, 355–8). Basquiat often made collage elements from his own work, as he would tear up drawings, glue them to a canvas, and paint over and around them.

Basquiat's conceptual approach was also reflected in a novel form of revision. Bacon and Freud often revised their paintings in progress, by either scraping off or painting over the elements they rejected. In contrast, Basquiat often crossed out images or words, leaving these corrections visible. He considered this a means of emphasis: "I cross out words so that you will see them more; the fact that they are obscured makes you want to read them" (Saggese, 2014: 136). Instead of hiding his corrections, as experimental artists would do, the conceptual Basquiat displayed them, to underscore his ideas.

Basquiat brought racial diversity to an art world that had been almost entirely white. He didn't want to be judged as a minority: "I don't think I should be compared to Black artists but with all artists" (Saggese, 2021: 63). His dealer Mary Boone believed that his impact went beyond being black: "Jean-Michel paved the way for not only blacks but artists of color to enter the world. He opened a lot of doors for a lot of artists, Félix González-Torres, Takashi Murakami, Kara Walker, Ellen Gallagher" (Hoban, 2004: 348). The critic Peter Schjeldahl agreed: "As a

black artist, Basquiat isn't the Jackie Robinson of the American art world... so much as its Willie Mays, abolishing forever racial identity as remarkable in the field's top rank" (Schjeldahl, 2008: 215).

7 Age

I seem to have been a late starter.

> Francis Bacon (Sylvester, 1987: 70)
> I nearly always start twice. Very often – I've learned a lot – it's to do with age and time.
> Lucian Freud (Feaver, 2021: 367)
> I think my mind affects my work more than it used to . . . I think as you get older, you can't help it, the mind just pulls into it.
> Jean-Michel Basquiat (Saggese, 2021: 46)

Francis Bacon dated his career as a painter from 1945, when he was 36. Tracing his earlier development is problematic, because he destroyed nearly all his art from before that date. His explanation was that "I think I was kind of delayed." The most notable change in his art after 1945 was in subject matter, away from anguished anonymous figures screaming in darkened rooms, to portraits of his friends: "When I was young I needed extreme subject matter for my paintings. Then as I grew older I began to find my subject matter in my own life" (Peppiatt, 2009: 254). He judged that his technique had improved over time, as he became "better at manipulating the marks that have been made by chance, which are the marks that one made quite outside reason. As one conditions oneself by time and by working to what happens, one becomes more alive to what the accident has proposed for one" (Sylvester, 1987: 53).

John Rothenstein (1984: 185) observed that Freud's art never stopped evolving: "his mind is too exploratory and too probing to make permanence likely." Freud made a major change during the 1950s and '60 s, away from meticulously drawn images produced with fine sable brushes to heavy brushstrokes of thick paint applied with coarse hog's hair brushes. He explained that "I got very impatient with the way I was working. It was limiting and a limited vehicle for me and I also felt that my drawing and my making artefacts – graphic artefacts – stopped me from freeing myself and I think my admiration for Francis came into this. I realized that by working in the way I did I couldn't really evolve" (Feaver, 2019: 362–3). The new style sacrificed precise detail but achieved a greater sense of volume, and was better suited to larger images.

Freud subsequently made a change in subject matter. Virginia Button (2015: 53) considered the defining achievement of Freud's career "his explosive development of the 'naked portrait' during the 1980s and 1990s" – large, full-length portrayals of nude models. This produced the paintings that are often considered Freud's finest (Hatchwell, 2017: 32–3). The painter R.B. Kitaj spoke enviously of Freud's late works: "See this man who was a wonderful painter become a *great* painter between the ages of sixty and seventy" (Feaver, 2021: 293).

Basquiat arrived very early at the synthesis of elements that would become his mature style. Richard Marshall wrote of his work of 1981 that "Although he was only twenty-one years of age, the paintings reveal that Basquiat had already established a signature style" (Chiappini 2005: 56). His canvases were dense and complex, as images and words jostled against each other: the critic Dick Hebdige commented that "Trying to 'read' a Basquiat painting is like trying to listen to a melody on a radio with a faulty tuner – the dominant signal is constantly under attack from static interference, unannounced intrusions from other stations" (Saggese, 2021: 232).

As early as 1984, a review opened with the declaration that "It's quite absurd to speak of the decline of an artist who's barely 25" (Saggese, 2021: 118). Mary Boone, who presented Basquiat exhibitions in 1984 and '85, later remarked that "I didn't show him at his creative peak, more at his peak of popularity. He did his best paintings when he was showing with Annina," referring to Basquiat's dealer in 1981–82 (Hoban, 2004: 246). The painter Rick Prol, who worked as Basquiat's studio assistant in 1988, reflected that the paintings of that year "in relation to his earlier paintings...were really like knocked off and not really worked on that much" (Hoban, 2004: 294).

In 1986, the critic Barry Schwabsky offered an analysis of why Basquiat's work had deteriorated. He described the strengths and weaknesses of Basquiat's style: "It can accommodate any kind of mark that remains fixed at the level of inscription, that does not inject any ambiguity into its status as an addition to a surface to which it remains flatly parallel, but it is incapable of assimilating anything suggestive of representational space." Schwabsky noted that this technique had allowed Basquiat to become a very good decorative painter, but that his ambition to achieve more had revealed its constraints, so that over time "we see him flailing more and more against the limitations of his technique." At an age when most aspiring artists were still trying out existing styles, Basquiat "has created one of his own and is also discovering (as he hadn't three years ago) that it is a trap." Schwabsky speculated that escaping would require Basquiat to develop "a more sophisticated concept of space, one that allows for description as well as inscription" (Saggese, 2021: 142). Schwabsky's analysis of Basquiat's development distinctly parallels Joyce Carol Oates' (2005: 6) trenchant commentary on another conceptual young genius who died young, that "Plath's meticulously documented example suggests how precocity is not maturity and may in fact impede maturity."

8 Personal visual art

My whole life goes into my painting.

Francis Bacon (Peppiatt, 2008: 103)

My work is purely autobiographical.

Lucian Freud (Feaver, 2021: 52)

> I use the Black as the protagonist because I am Black, and that's why I use it as the main character in all the paintings.
> Jean-Michel Basquiat (Saggese, 2021: 44)

Bacon, Freud, and Basquiat were all personal visual artists. This practice originated in Vincent van Gogh's decision to make his art entirely out of his own life – the people he knew, the things he saw every day, and the places where he lived (Galenson, 2009). Not coincidentally, Bacon, Freud, and Basquiat all admired van Gogh. But because of their differing approaches, personal art meant something different to Bacon and Freud than to Basquiat.

A change occurred in Bacon's art around 1950, as for the rest of his life he would paint portraits of specific people, nearly always those he liked or loved. He told David Sylvester that "I couldn't do people I didn't know very well. I wouldn't want to. It wouldn't interest me to try and do them unless I had seen a lot of them, watched their contours, watched the way they behaved" (Sylvester, 1987: 73–4). A friend explained that "In catching the likeness of his friends, Bacon also caught their dominant characteristics, which in turn, he hoped, would give the portraits greater universality" (Peppiatt, 2009: 255). He compared Bacon's art to that of two experimental novelists, Dickens and Balzac, in creating a portrait of his time: "If ever one wanted to get a vivid picture of London life, high and low, stretching from Soho to the Ritz during the 1960s and 1970s, one would only have to look at a selection of Bacon portraits" (Peppiatt, 2008: 182).

In his 1954 statement, Freud declared that "The painter makes real to others his innermost feelings about all that he cares for" (Button, 2015: 32). John Rothenstein (1984: 183) reflected that "Many artists are drawn to depict the exotic, the remote, the imagined, the out-of-focus. Not Freud: he is obsessed by his friends and other familiars, by his immediate environment, a shabby and untidy workroom flat, and its neighborhood." Freud commented that his own life was his subject matter: "it seems absolutely obvious, as well as convenient, to use as a subject what you are thinking and looking at all the time – the way your life goes" (Feaver, 2019: xviii). He explained that his work was "about myself and my surroundings. It is an attempt at a record. I work from the people that interest me, and that I care about and think about, in rooms that I live in and know. I use the people to invent my pictures with, and I can work more freely when they are there." He wanted his paint to become the object it portrayed: "representation *is* them... For instance, a resemblance reminds you of them, but a likeness makes you think about the actual" (Feaver, 2021: 52, 63).

Freud wanted to achieve depth in his art – not only visually, but psychologically, to capture not only the appearance of his subjects, but what he called "the essence of their character" (Gruen, 1991: 321). He stressed that his art was never symbolic, for his goal was to make life into art as directly as possible: "Nobody is representing anything. Everything is autobiographical, and everything is a portrait, even if it's a chair." He rarely left London: "My idea of travel is downward travel really. Getting to know where you are, better, and exploring feelings that you know more deeply. I always think that thing 'knowing something by heart' gives you a depth of

possibility which is more potential than seeing new sights, however marvelous and exciting they are" (Button, 2015: 38–41).

Basquiat worked rapidly. In total, he made approximately 700 paintings on canvas and 1,000 works on paper: Diego Cortez observed that "He accomplished more in seven or eight years than most people accomplish over a 45-year career" (Francis Bacon's catalogue raisonné, for comparison, contains 584 paintings) (Saggese, 2021: 191; Harrison, 2016). Basquiat's own summary of his subject matter was "Royalty, heroism, and the streets," but the range of his specific subjects was vast (Chiappini 2005: 40). Many of his allusions came from books – *Gray's Anatomy*, a gift from his mother, was a favorite – including textbooks of art history and museum catalogs. He made frequent reference to popular culture, including cartoons and advertisements. He paid tribute to great black athletes, including Joe Louis, whom he canonized as *St. Joe*, and famous jazz musicians, including Charlie Parker, who gained a kingdom as *Charles the First*.

Like Bacon and Freud, Basquiat made personal visual art. But unlike the two British experimentalists, who painted the people and things they saw, the conceptual Basquiat painted the people and things he thought about. Basquiat's use of allusion parallels that of the conceptual filmmaker Jean-Luc Godard. A critic wrote of *Breathless* that "Godard dosed his film with quotations because they were what he was thinking about at the time of its making," so that the film became "the cinematic equivalent of Godard's stream of consciousness" (Brody, 2008: 70–1). As a result, another critic observed that each of Godard's films became "a chapter in an amazingly broad intellectual and aesthetic autobiography" (Brown, 1972: 112). The same was true of Basquiat, as the spontaneity of his process meant that his art provided a detailed and exhaustive record of his current interests.

9 Friendships

> I've always thought of friendship as where two people really tear one another apart and perhaps in that way learn something from one another.
> Francis Bacon (Sylvester, 1987: 67)
> I think I helped Andy more than he helped me, to tell the truth.
> Jean-Michel Basquiat (Hoban, 2004: 205)

Bacon and Freud met in the mid-1940s, and quickly became close friends. They were nearly inseparable during the 1950s and '60 s: Caroline Blackwood, who was married to Freud during 1953–58, complained that "I had dinner with [Francis Bacon] nearly every night for almost the whole of my marriage to Lucian" (Gayford, 2019: 114).

Bacon and Freud differed artistically, in both style and temperament. One revealing difference lay in their disagreement over the greatest painter of the twentieth century. Bacon, who embraced violence in his art, preferred Picasso for what Bacon called his "brutality of fact," whereas Freud chose Matisse, whose aesthetic values he preferred to what he considered Picasso's theatrical desire to "amaze, surprise, and astonish" (Gayford, 2019: 221; Gayford, 2010: 147). Yet there were several

forces that pulled Bacon and Freud together. In the early years of their friendship, their relationship was strengthened by their mutual belief in the poverty of abstraction, which was beginning to dominate western art. They were also united in their rejection of what they called "illustration" – representational art that they considered superficial (Gayford, 2019: 120). Their shared common cause was to avoid direct imitation of appearances while seeking novel means of representation that they perceived as realistic but more immediate and intense than reality: in Freud's words, "I am only interested in art that is in some way concerned with truth" (Gayford, 2010: 41).

Influence within their relationship ran primarily from the older artist to the younger. Bacon loved paint, and his emphasis on the power of the medium impressed Freud. The speed with which Bacon worked, and Bacon's embrace of accidental effects, helped Freud move toward a greater freedom in applying paint:

> Francis had an effect. I had never before thought of paint . . . He talked a great deal about the paint itself carrying the form, and imbuing the paint with this sort of life; he talked about packing a lot of things into a single brushstroke. Things which amused and excited me and I realized that it was a million miles from anything I could, or would ever, do.
> The idea of paint having that power was something that made me feel I ought to get to know it in a different way that wasn't subservient. I wanted to see what it could do. I hardly ever saw a painting of his that I couldn't really admire or be surprised by (Feaver, 2019: 477-8).

In an interview published in 1975, Bacon spoke of his regret at never having a true working colleague: "I've always hoped to find another painter I could really talk to – who really tore my things to bits and whose judgment I could actually believe in... I think it would be marvelous to have somebody who would say to you, 'Do this, do that, don't do this, don't do that!' and give you the reasons" (Sylvester, 1987: 67). He gave as his ideal the relationship between Ezra Pound and T.S. Eliot. Bacon's comment appears telling. Over more than two decades, he and Freud talked about art for hundreds, even thousands, of hours. Yet it appears that their artistic approaches and styles were too different for either to influence the work of the other in more than a very general way: their exchanges apparently never became as specific as Pound's editing of *The Waste Land*, or the studio conversations of Picasso and Braque in the early years of Cubism, when both recognized that they were engaged in a common effort.

Basquiat's most consequential friendship was with Andy Warhol, who was his artistic idol. One friend recalled that "Andy Warhol was the apple of his eye since he was fifteen or sixteen," another that "He always said that he was going to be the next Warhol." Basquiat admitted that "I just wanted to meet him, he was an art hero of mine" (Hoban, 2004: 201, 205). Basquiat won Warhol's friendship in 1982 by painting *Dos Cabezas*, a portrait of himself with Warhol. The next year Basquiat began living in a building Warhol owned in the Bowery. (As Basquiat's confidant, Warhol recorded in his diary that the younger artist had told him of his fear of being merely a flash in the pan. Warhol wrote that he told Basquiat not to worry, that he wouldn't be, but added: "I got scared because...what if he is a flash in the pan and doesn't

have the money to pay his rent?") (Hoban, 2004: 212). The two artists painted each other several times; one of Basquiat's most celebrated portraits was his 1984 *Brown Spots (Portrait of Andy Warhol as a Banana*), an apparent homage to Warhol's 1966 album cover for the Velvet Underground that featured the image of a banana.

Warhol was known for making relationships work to his advantage, but his friendship with Basquiat appeared to be real: Keith Haring remembered how the two "exercised together, ate together and laughed together" (Gopnik, 2020: 860). Phoebe Hoban (2004: 106) observed that for Basquiat their friendship was the realization of a fantasy, but that there was a real benefit for Warhol as well. Warhol's reputation had faded since the early excitement for Pop art in the 1960s, but made a recovery in the '80 s with the arrival of a successful new generation of young artists who acknowledged him as their artistic inspiration. These included Haring, Julian Schnabel, Kenny Scharf, and David Salle, but the brightest star in the group was Basquiat. Warhol enjoyed the energy these artists brought to New York's art world and the adulation they gave him, although even he did not imagine that his influence on them was the beginning of a process that would eventually make him the most important of all American modern artists (Galenson, 2021).

The relationship ended abruptly. Late in 1983, Basquiat's dealer proposed that he and Warhol collaborate on series of paintings. The project began hopefully: Warhol confessed that he agreed to participate because "I'd run out of ideas," while Basquiat exulted that he had induced Warhol to paint with a brush for the first time in 20 years (Saggese, 2021: 61, 126). But the resulting canvases were badly reviewed when they were shown in New York in 1985. One review in particular touched a nerve, as a *New York Times* critic called the collaboration "one of Warhol's manipulations," and declared that it had made Basquiat "an art world mascot" (Saggese, 2021: 138). When he read that review Warhol understood immediately that his friendship with Basquiat would not survive; he wrote in his diary of how much he missed Basquiat, and later he wrote that "Jean Michel hasn't called me in a month, so I guess it's really over" (Hoban, 2004: 265–6). When Warhol died, unexpectedly, less than two years later, Basquiat was devastated. When Basquiat gave up graffiti in the early '80 s, he had written "SAMO is dead" on walls in the East Village. Now he wrote "AW lives – SAMO lives." A friend recalled that "When Andy died it was like his life was over," and a year later it was, dead of an overdose at 27 (Hoban, 2004: 34, 285).

Warhol's artistic influence on Basquiat was probably complete before their friendship began. Their formal collaboration was a failure: only two of the illustrations of Basquiat's work in the textbooks surveyed for this study were of a joint painting. The collaboration did not produce innovations, for Basquiat, like Warhol, had used up his innovative ideas at the very beginning of his career.

10 Conclusion

Painting is an old man's business.

Francis Bacon (Russell, 1993: 182)

> When one is doing something to do with quality, even a lifetime doesn't seem enough.
> Lucian Freud (Gayford, 2010: 34)
> Basquiat incarne partaitement l'une des deux categories de cette typologie: celle du "jeune genie."
> Nathalie Heinich (2011).

Francis Bacon, Lucian Freud, and Jean-Michel Basquiat are three of the most important figures in the art history of the late twentieth century, and they shared a number of characteristics. All three felt themselves to some extent outsiders in their home societies—the first two because of their birth in Ireland and Germany, respectively, the last because of his race. All three made figurative art, and rejected what they considered the emptiness of Abstract Expressionism, the mechanical forms of Pop, and the austerity of Minimalism. All three wanted to use their art to express their own thoughts and feelings, and created distinctive personal styles to accomplish this. And all three faced the problem of figurative art in the late twentieth century that photographic images had become so ubiquitous and sensational that paintings had to make extreme statements to attract notice. But the two British artists differed fundamentally from the American in their conception of what they wanted their art to do, and in how they made it.

Bacon and Freud loved paint. Both used it primarily to portray people, and believed that these images could express a knowledge of their chosen subjects that was deeper than any written text. They did not believe that this could be achieved by any reasoned or systematic process, but that it depended on fortuitous accidents and discoveries they hoped would occur as they worked. Both wanted to follow Rembrandt and Velazquez in creating a sense of the inner lives of their subjects rather than merely portraying their external appearance. They worked very differently—Bacon in frenetic sessions using photographs of familiar subjects as points of departure, Freud slowly, gradually building up images over the course of scores of protracted sessions with his sitters before him. But both were archetypal experimental artists, who hoped that novel visual effects would almost magically appear as they applied paint to their canvases. And like the experimental masters they revered, both Bacon and Freud gradually developed their skill over decades of work, and arrived at their greatest achievements late in their long lives.

In sharp contrast, Basquiat was an archetypal conceptual innovator. His art was not concerned with realistic portrayal or subtle psychological depth. His interest was not in aesthetic values, but in intellectual messages. To this end, he used a variety of characteristically conceptual practices in his paintings, including language, collage, and wholesale allusion. His art did not depend on the practice and development of craft skills, but rather on the immediate recording of his ideas, and this accounts for the dramatic rapid early maturation of his work.

Basquiat died four months shy of his 28th birthday, so it might seem natural to wonder how much greater his achievement might have been if he had lived as long as Bacon or Freud. Yet Basquiat's place in art history stems from a bold conceptual innovation he made in his early twenties. Pop art brought images from mass commercial culture into high art; Basquiat made a parallel contribution, by breaking

down the barrier between the popular art of the streets and fine art. Both of these innovations were radical new ideas, that could be executed immediately. Andy Warhol had made his contribution to visual art almost completely within a single year, and Basquiat's achievement mirrored that of his idol in this respect. Both the econometric analysis of auction sales and the survey of art scholars' judgments indicate that Basquiat's art had been in decline for five years prior to his death. Remarkably, the scores of art history textbooks consulted by this study do not contain a single illustration of any work that Basquiat made in the last two years of his brief life. The highly conceptual nature of Basquiat's innovation allowed him to join such earlier conceptual innovators as Arthur Rimbaud, Georges Seurat, Vincent van Gogh, Sylvia Plath, and his beloved Charlie Parker in making an enormous contribution in spite of dying shockingly young.

Jean-Michel Basquiat was an artistic meteorite. His conceptual innovation arrived suddenly, it was recognized immediately, and his disastrous fall occurred almost as precipitously. In contrast, both Francis Bacon and Lucian Freud worked for decades in relative obscurity, gradually developing their experimental art, before they were recognized as great artists late in their long lives.

Appendix The 57 textbooks of art history surveyed for this paper are listed here, ordered by date of publication.

1. Ronald Tamplin, *The Arts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991)
2. Horst de la Croix, et. al., *Gardner's Art Through the Ages* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1991)
3. Carol Strickland and John Boswell, *The Annotated Mona Lisa* (Kansas City: Andrews McMeel, 1992)
4. Sandro Sprocatti, *A Guide to Art* (New York: Abrams, 1992)
5. Paul Wood, et. al., *Modernism in Dispute* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993)
6. Wayne Craven, *American Art* (New York: Abrams, 1994)
7. E.H. Gombrich, *The Story of Art*, 16th ed. (New York: Phaidon, 1995)
8. Rachel Barnes, *The 20th-Century Art Book* (London: Phaidon, 1996)
9. Jurgen Tesch and Eckhard Hollmann, *Icons of Art* (Munich: Prestel, 1997)
10. Julian Freeman, *Art* (New York: Watson-Guptill, 1998)
11. Rita Gilbert, *Living With Art*, fifth ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 1998)
12. Volker Gebhardt, *The History of Art* (New York: Barron's, 1998)
13. David Britt, ed., *Modern Art* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1999)
14. Matthew Collings, *This Is Modern Art* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1999)
15. Jay Tobler, *The American Art Book* (London: Phaidon, 1999)
16. Marilyn Stokstad, *Art History*, revised ed. (New York: Abrams, 1999)
17. Sandro Bocola, *The Art of Modernism* (Munich: Prestel, 1999)
18. David Hopkins, *After Modern Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
19. Cory Bell, *Modern Art* (New York: Watson-Guptill, 2000)

20. Martin Kemp, *The Oxford History of Western Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
21. H.W. Janson and Anthony Janson, *History of Art*, sixth ed. (New York: Abrams, 2001)
22. Sandro Bocola, *Timelines* (Cologne: Taschen, 2001)
23. Erika Doss, *Twentieth-Century American Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
24. Hugh Honour and John Fleming, *The Visual Arts* (New York: Abrams, 2002)
25. Amy Dempsey, *Art in the Modern Era* (New York: Abrams, 2002)
26. Robert Belton, *Art* (New York: Watson-Guptill, 2002)
27. Robert Hughes, *The Shock of the New* (New York: Knopf, 2002)
28. Sam Hunter, et. al., *Modern Art*, third ed. (New York: Vendome, 2004)
29. Hal Foster, et. al., *Art Since 1900* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2004)
30. Stefano Zuffi, *Dictionary of Painters* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 2005)
31. Robert Cumming, *Art* (New York: DK Publishing, 2005)
32. Ingo Walther, *Masterpieces of Western Art* (Cologne: Taschen, 2005)
33. David Bjelejac, *American Art* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2005)
34. John Carlin and Jonathan Fineberg, *Imagining America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)
35. Lawrence Gowing, *Biographical Encyclopedia of Artists* (New York: Facts on File, 2005)
36. Ingo Walther, *Art of the 20th Century* (Cologne: Taschen, 2005)
37. Julian Bell (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2007)
38. Elke Buchholz, et. al., *Art* (New York: Abrams, 2007)
39. Larry Ball, *30,000 Years of Art* (London: Phaidon, 2007)
40. Flaminio Gualdoni, *Art* (New York: Rizzoli, 2008)
41. Edward Lucie-Smith, *Lives of the Great Modern Artists*, revised ed. (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2009)
42. Christiane Weidemann, *50 Modern Artists* (Munich: Prestel, 2010)
43. Jonathan Fineberg, *Art Since 1940*, third ed. (Boston: Prentice Hall, 2011)
44. Joan Marter, *The Grove Encyclopedia of American Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011)
45. Michael Bird, *100 Ideas That Changed Art* (London: Laurence King, 2012)
46. Dorothea Eimert, *Art and Architecture of the 20th Century* (New York: Parkstone, 2013)
47. H.H. Arnason and Elizabeth Mansfield, *History of Modern Art*, seventh ed. (Boston: Pearson, 2013)
48. Martin Kemp, *Art in History* (London: Profile, 2014)
49. Tom Melick, *Art in Time* (London: Phaidon, 2014)
50. Mark Getlein and Annabel Howard, *Art Visionaries* (London: Laurence King, 2016)
51. Erika Doss, *American Art of the 20th–21st Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)
52. Susie Hodge, *Modern Art in Detail* (New York: Thames and Hudon, 2017)
53. George Bray, et. al., *Artists* (New York: DK Publishing, 2017)

54. David Hopkins, *After Modern Art, 1945–2017*, second ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018)
55. Agnes Berecz, *100 Years, 100 Artworks* (Munich: Prestel, 2019)
56. Edward Lucie-Smith, *Movements in Art Since 1945*, fourth ed. (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2020)
57. Stephen Farthing, *Art* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2020)

Funding N/A.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

Brody, R. (2008). *Everything is Cinema*. Henry Holt.
Brown, R. (1972). *Focus on Godard*. Prentice-Hall.
Button, V. (2015). *Lucian Freud*. Tate Publishing.
Feaver, W. (2019). *The Lives of Lucian Freud: The Restless Years*. Alfred A. Knopf.
Feaver, W. (2021). *The Lives of Lucian Freud: Fame*. Alfred A. Knopf.
Galenson, D. (2021). Revising the Canon. Chicago: BFI Working Paper No. 2021–14.
Galenson, D. (2000). The Careers of Modern Artists. *Journal of Cultural Economics, 24*(2), 87–112.
Galenson, D. (2006). *Old Masters and Young Geniuses*. Princeton University Press.
Galenson, D. (2009). *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art*. Cambridge University Press.
Galenson, D., & Lenzu, S. (2016). Pricing Genius. *Journal of Applied Economics, 19*(2), 219–248.
Gayford, M. (2010). *Man with a Blue Scarf*. Thames and Hudson.
Gayford, M. (2019). *Modernists and Mavericks*. Thames and Hudson.
Gopnik, B. (2020). *Warhol*. Harper Collins.
Greig, G. (2013). *Breakfast with Lucian*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Gruen, J. (1991). *The Artist Observed.* Chicago: a cappella books.
Harrison, M. (2016). *Francis Bacon*. Estate of Francis Bacon.
Hatchwell, S. (2017). *Auctioning Francis Bacon and Lucian Freud*. Piano Nobile Publications.
Heinich, N. (2011). Les vieux maitres et les jeunes génies. *Temporalités,* 14.
Hoban, P. (2004). *Basquiat*. Penguin Books.
Jensen, R. (2009). Measuring Canons. In A. Brzyski (Ed.), *Partisan Canons* (pp. 27–54). Duke University Press.
Mei, J., Michael M., Yi, Z. (2022). Residual Variance and Asset Pricing in the Art Market. *Journal of Cultural Economics.*
Oates, J. C. (2005). *Uncensored*. Harper Collins.
Peppiatt, M. (2008). *Francis Bacon: Studies for a Portrait*. Yale University Press.
Peppiatt, M. (2009). *Francis Bacon: Anatomy of an Enigma*. Skyhorse Publishing.
Peppiatt, M. (2015). *Francis Bacon in Your Blood*. Bloomsbury.
Rothenstein, J. (1984). *Modern English Painters* (Vol. 3). Macdonald.
Russell, J. (1993). *Francis Bacon* (revised). Thames and Hudson.
Saggese, J. (2014). *Reading Basquiat*. University of California Press.
Saggese, J. (Ed.). (2021). *The Jean-Michel Basquiat Reader.* University of California Press.
Schjeldahl, P. (2008). *Let's See*. Thames and Hudson.
Stevens, M., & Swan, A. (2020). *Francis Bacon*. Alfred A. Knopf.
Sylvester, D. (1987). *Interviews with Francis Bacon*. Thames and Hudson.
Sylvester, D. (1997). *About Modern Art*. Henry Holt.