Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

Laura E. A. Braden   9/7/2011
                                                          Date

The Persistence of Memory:

The Consecration of Artists in the US Field of Modern Art

By

Laura E. A. Braden, Doctor of Philosophy

Sociology

_____

Timothy J. Dowd, Ph.D.
Advisor

_____

John Boli, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____

Susanne Janssen, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____

Cathryn Johnson, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Accepted:

_____

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

_____

Date

The Persistence of Memory:

The Consecration of Artists in the US Field of Modern Art

By

Laura E. A. Braden

B.A., Trinity University, 2001

Advisor: Timothy J. Dowd, Ph.D., Princeton University, 1996

An abstract of

a dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Sociology

2011

Abstract

The Persistence of Memory:
The Consecration of Artists in the US Field of Modern Art

By
Laura E. A. Braden

This dissertation examines how individual attributes, e.g., gender and nationality, and field level factors, e.g., extent and type of museum exhibition, affect the chances and extent of an artist's recognition within the art historical canon. Over the course of the 20th century, I track the population of 308 artists that exhibited at the 1913 Armory Show—the watershed visual art exhibition credited for introducing US audiences to modern art—through exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art, the first US museum dedicated to modernist aesthetics, and college-level, survey art history textbook editions. After establishing the historical context of the modern art movement in the United States at the beginning of that century, my first chapter examines the early factors that shaped retrospective consecration in textbooks published during the last 20 years (1989-2009). The results of this chapter indicate the role of early MoMA exhibition decisions in highlighting artists through small group and solo shows and as a gatekeeper, preferring male and European Armory artists. Given the importance of early organizational choices, my second chapter examines the establishment of the modern art field within the US during the first half of the 20th century by examining the interaction between academia and MoMA. I follow the changing canonical choices of texts, through eight early editions (1926-1970), and MoMA, through approximately 1,000 exhibitions (1929-1968). Results for this chapter show that MoMA served as an early leader in modern art's canon creation, with textbooks following the Museum's artist selections. As the field professionalized, however, MoMA and texts' choices coalesced, largely excluding both female and non-European artists. Focusing on MoMA exhibition choices, my third chapter explores how the Museum connected Armory artists to each other through in-common exhibition. Results reveal that MoMA worked not simply to highlight individual artists but also created meaningful network connections between Armory artists. Thus, those artists who were repeatedly connected to a large network of peer Armory artists through MoMA exhibition receive increased coverage within contemporary text editions (1970-2009). Overall, this research specifies the importance of field level factors and individual attributes in the historical creation of the cultural canon.

The Persistence of Memory:

The Consecration of Artists in the US Field of Modern Art

By

Laura E. A. Braden

B.A., Trinity University, 2001

Advisor: Timothy J. Dowd, Ph.D., Princeton University, 1996

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Sociology

2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Every page of this dissertation has been improved by the involvement of others—except this page. This page is mine alone and, in a way, I have been writing it since I entered graduate school six years ago. Though this one page I am writing alone, I am writing it because I was not alone for the following 228 pages. It is fitting, then, that this page contains the names of those without whom I would not be here.

First, in all things, I thank Joshua Lee Elzy.

Second, thank you to my parents Barbara and Frank Braden, who quite literally made this dissertation possible. Thank you also to my grandmother, Margaret Braden, who was one of those who paved the way for women to earn a doctorate.

Thank you to my dissertation committee. Thank you to John Boli. Your clear and perceptive mind, which so impressed me when I took Theory Construction, coupled with your fantastic, dry sense of humor convinced me I needed your input on my dissertation—and I was right. Thank you to Susanne Janssen, who organized the Classification in the Arts and Media Conference at Erasmus University and co-edited a special edition of the journal *Poetics.* Your acceptance of me on those two occasions, as well as your acceptance of my dissertation work, made me think I could actually do sociology professionally—and that was a great feeling. Thank you to Cathryn Johnson. You are a great inspiration and a wonderful friend. I enjoy every time we talk and, even when you push me, it always feels like encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The artist Pablo Picasso (1881-1973) is arguably the most recognizable figure of 20th century art. Considered a central artist in the modern art movement, he helped create and popularize such revolutionary art movements and forms as Cubism (Analytic Cubism, 1907; Synthetic Cubism, 1912) and Collage (1912). At present, there are six museums internationally dedicated to his works. Picasso art ranks among the most expensive in the world, with the artist invariably taking the first or second position on the art market (based on total revenue generated by public sales (McAndrew, 2010). Given Picasso's standing as one of the super-stars of the art world, one might think his career would have a quick and direct trajectory from introduction to canonization. Indeed, several current art history textbooks, as well as other sources, depict Picasso's career with such a rapid and consistent ascendancy (Hartt, 1998; Janson, 2006; MoMA/Grove Art Learning Resources, 2009; Stokstad, 2008).

However, this rapid rise was not the case in the United States. Picasso's first US show in 1911 caused the *New York Times* to dismiss his work as "audacious deviltry." In 1913, while French newspaper where generally lauding his genius (see Green, 2003; for historical examples, see Salmon, "Carnet de Paris et d'ailleurs" in *Revue littéraire de Paris et de Champagne,* 1905; Salmon, *La Jeune Peinture francaise* in 1912; Apollinaire's *Les Peintres cubists*, 1913; and Gleizes and Metzinger, *Du Cubisme*, 1912), Picasso was largely overlooked—even ignored—by US critics. Noting and rejecting Picasso's fame in Europe, US critic Royal Cortissoz (1913: 812) stated, "[Picasso] is credited with profound gifts. Why does he not use them? Why must we sit patient, if not

with awe-struck and grateful submissiveness, before a portrait or a picture seemingly

representing a grotesque object made of children's blocks cut up and fitted together?" To

add insult to injury—in the catalogue of Picasso's first large-scale exhibition in the US,

the 1913 Armory Show—Picasso's name was still unrecognizable enough to be

unceremoniously changed from Pablo to Paul. All this occurred despite the fact that

Picasso's most inventive and enduring periods (the "Blue Period," "Rose Period" and his

invention of cubism) were already part of his formidable resume. Though Picasso gained

more favorable notoriety in the following years, it was only in 1939 that Picasso was

given his first solo exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), entitled *Picasso:*

Forty Years of His Art. This event did not come until ten years and 91 exhibitions after

the MoMA's opening in 1929—with 37 of the 91 exhibition being solo exhibitions for

other artists. This exhibition could even be considered as initiated by Picasso himself,

who, before the exhibition, entrusted his masterpiece *Guernica* to MoMA for safekeeping

during WWII. In contrast to his US reception, seven years before Picasso's MoMA

retrospective in 1932, both Picasso's first retrospective exhibition and the release of the

first volume of Christian Zervos' 34 volume *catalogue raisonne*—the publication of

which was an honor never before bestowed on a living artist—were to be found in Paris.

Despite this slow start in the United States, Picasso would eventually garner 17 more solo

exhibitions at MoMA, more than any other artist. By 2008, Picasso would be firmly a

part of—if not a key figure in—the canon of the now-established field of modern art.

Moreover, he would be touted by US museums as "the most influential artist of the 20th-

century" a quote found in the biographies of Picasso on the websites of the Museum of

Modern Art (see MoMA/Grove Art Learning Resources, 2009), Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum (2009) and Metropolitan Museum of Art (2011).

The consecration of Picasso in the US—almost 30 years after his introduction and 10 years after his canonization in Paris—serves to illustrate some of the intricacies involved in, as well as the convoluted trajectories of, what is called "cultural consecration." Such consecration occurs when specific artists or artworks are regarded as truly legitimate representations of their field of production and, thus, deserving of particular esteem and honor (Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Schmutz, 2005; also, see Johnson, Dowd and Ridgeway, 2006). Whereas cultural valorization is a general and pervasive process, consecration produces a rupture of sorts (Bourdieu, 1991: 120); in other words, consecration serves to separate the rare great works from the more frequent but merely good works.

Consecration thus imposes a distinction that separates those that are worthy of long-term recognition and respect from those that are not. The most important of these evaluative distinctions are imposed by cultural organizations—such as museums and universities—that base their existence, in part, on being able to discern and maintain such divisions (see DiMaggio, 1991, 2009; Dowd, forthcoming). However, as with culture itself, consecration is not a fixed condition, but rather an evolving one (see, for example, Levine, 1984). Time often shuffles the deck of history. Formerly revered artists may be discarded, while those previously overlooked are rediscovered and glorified (Corse and Griffin, 1997; Dowd et al., 2002; Kapsis, 1992). Those that enjoy *retrospective* consecration—where artists are selected from the scope of history rather than just the current landscape—can be (and often are) deemed more legitimate than those who only

enjoy contemporary prestige (Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Craig and Dubois, 2010; Dowd and Kelly, forthcoming; Schmutz, 2005; Schmutz and Faupel, 2010). This increased legitimacy is based on the assumption that only the very best cultural producers and achievements will survive the "test of time" (Becker, 1984: 365).

Consecration is of particular importance in artistic production, where artist strive primarily for legitimacy rather than the profits that entertainers seek (Craig and Dubois, 2010).[1] Popular artists are easily panned by critics as too commercial to be "serious" creators (Schmutz, 2005); however, such artists are reconsidered if their works are later valorized by the advocacy of important organizations (e.g., universities) or "reputational entrepreneurs" (e.g., well-regarded artists, or well-situated patrons) (Corse and Griffin, 1997; Corse and Westervelt, 1997; DiMaggio, 1982; Kapsis, 1992; Schmutz and Faupel, 2010). This type of valorization offers enormous rewards—an artist's status can be elevated to such a point that his or her artwork is almost beyond critical judgment, with its market value rising in concordance with its increased prestige. Because consecration designates what should merit attention and who is worthy of respect and admiration, the ability to confer such status is in actuality the power to ascribe social value and, as a result, privilege. This power is particularly salient in the visual arts, where beauty, import and merit are not simply inherent within the work of art, but also arise out of

---

[1] Cultural sociologists have long been interested in the boundary constructed between what is socially considered to be artistic creation and what is not (Bourdieu, 1984; DiMaggio, 1982; Johnson, Dowd and Ridgeway, 2006; Levine, 1984). While the division between high and popular culture—that is, between art and commercial entertainment—has been well examined, some recent research is interested in the gray area between these delineations. For example, some note how works deemed to be art can emerge from commercial industries—as was the case for film (Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Baumann, 2002; Kapsis, 1992), while others focus on the relative attention that well-positioned critics give to both high and popular culture (Janssen, Kuipers, and Verboord, 2008; Schmutz, 2009).

judgments made on the basis of social understandings (see Berghman and van Eijck, 2009; Bruder and Ucock, 2000; Greenfield, 1989; Halle, 1993). Consecration, consequently, often dictates what books line library shelves, what personages are considered in classrooms and what music is played in concert halls.

It is not surprising, then, that sociologists have devoted considerable attention to the factors that aid in the endurance of artistic reputation (Craig and Dubois, 2010; Dowd and Kelly, forthcoming; Lang and Lang, 1988), processes of cultural valorization (Corse and Griffin, 1997; Corse and Westervelt, 1997; Tuchman and Fortin, 1984) and ultimate consecration (Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Schmutz, 2005; Schmutz and Faupel, 2010). Such research demonstrates that the relationship between merit and designations of legitimacy is often mediated by social characteristics and contextual factors. In particular, these scholars show that a range of factors shape the consecration process— both in the short-term and in the long-term (i.e., retrospective consecration). These factors including the legitimating organizations that proclaim the worth of certain artists (e.g., DiMaggio, 1982; Janssen, Kuipers, and Verboord, 2008), the social characteristics of the artists themselves—such as gender (e.g., Schmutz, 2009; Tuchman and Fortin, 1980) and nationality (e.g., Bevers, 2005; Corse, 1995)—and networks of connections between artists (e.g., Craig and Dubois, 2010; Giuffre, 1999). Despite such extensive research, however, these factors have not typically been combined to discern which have both immediate and lasting effects. This dissertation attempts to shed light on this gap within the scholarship.

To make my efforts manageable, I have made several analytical choices. First, I have chosen a particular group of artists to study: the population of the 308 artists that

exhibited at the 1913 International Exhibition of Modern Art, designated the "Armory Show" after its location in the 69th Infantry Regiment Armory in New York City, New York. This is a crucial group because—as I discuss in the next chapter—the artists of the Armory Show represent developments in Europe regarding "modern art" and introduced those developments to the United States. As Hartt (1998: 889) writes, "The rise of European and American modernism in the early twentieth century was driven by such exhibitions as the *Salon d'Automne* in Paris, which launched the Fauve movement; the first exhibition of *Der Blaue Reiter* group in Munich in 1911; and the 1913 New York Armory Show, the first large-scale introduction of European modernism to American audiences." Thus, by tracking this entire group of artists, I have an important vantage by which to assess the US field of modern art.[2]

Second, I have chosen to focus on one organization that played a central role in the emergent (and later established) field of US modern art. Cultural organizations typically perform the formal rites of recognizing and endorsing the representative achievements within an art field (Becker, 1984). This recognition serves not only to legitimize the individual artist's work but, in turn, promotes the legitimacy of the entire

---

[2] There are numerous reasons that the Armory Show marks the emergence of modern art in the United States—the most important reason probably being the beginning of WWI in 1914. Several modern artists—particularly those who had been well-received at the Armory Show—migrated to the United States from Europe in 1913 and 1914. In fact, comparing the exhibits in Paris to those in New York reveals the following: while the US had about one-fourth the number of exhibits—around three to six per year compared to Paris' 18 to 25 per year—from 1915 onward, the number of Paris exhibitions actually fell compared to the number of US exhibitions (Gordon, 1974). In 1915, there are no major recorded exhibitions in Paris. The number of US exhibitions, on the other hand, holds steady and even increases after the onset of WWI. These numbers point to the importance of the relatively unaffected US market during times of European turmoil, and they run contrary to common knowledge that the US art market only became significant with the rise of Abstract Expressionism (as argued by Staples, 2001).

field of production. In the United States, "a key event in shaping the modernist canon was the 1929 opening of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, which rapidly assembled the world's finest modernist collection" (Hartt, 1998: 925).   The MoMA was America's premier museum dedicated solely to the display of modernist art. Now considered one of the most influential modern art museums in the world, MoMA is retrospectively credited as the institution most responsible for developing avant-garde art in the US (Kleiner and Mamiya, 2005). Indeed, as the first US museum of its kind—and, thereafter, the most important legitimating organization for modern art in the United States—MoMA's exhibitions are singularly important in both aiding the success of the artists selected for exhibition and advancing the field of US modern art. Consequently, I have inspected all the exhibitions offered in the Museum's first four decades of operation (1929 to 1968)—paying particular attention to the recognition it gave to Armory artists. Among other things, this allows me to see how MoMA curators evaluated and sifted through the Armory artists—choosing some for exhibition, while ignoring others.

Finally, when it comes to another type of critical reception afforded to Armory artists—that offered by academia—I focus on the leading textbooks that survey art history for US college students. This focus allows me to see the extent to which influential critical works heeded and acknowledged Armory artists in the decades, if not a century, after their watershed exhibition in 1913. Furthermore, given the numerous editions of two of these textbooks—exceeding a total of 20 books—I am able to track longitudinally the coverage given to Armory artists both in the short-term (e.g., 1926) and long-term (e.g., 2009).

Those analytical choices, in turn, allow me to address several important substantive questions—which can be grouped as follows:

1) Which of the artists that exhibited at the 1913 Armory Show are retrospectively consecrated in textbooks approximately 100 years later? What role did the exhibitions of MoMA (1929 to 1968)—as well as attributes of the Armory artists themselves (e.g., gender)—play in the retrospective consecration process?

2) If MoMA exhibitions played a role in long-term (retrospective) consecration, how did those exhibitions figure in the short-term consecration of Armory artists? That is, to what extent did the ongoing choices of *both* museum curators (1929-1968) and textbook authors (1926-1970) influence each other with regards to the canonization of Armory artists? Did the personal attributes of those artists play any contributing role in this unfolding reciprocal influence?

3) If MoMA exhibitions proved consequential in the short-term, then how did its first four decades influence the canonization of Armory artists in the medium- to long-term? Specially, how did the curatorial grouping of Armory artists (e.g., networks afforded by common exhibition) from 1929 to 1968, in turn, shape the extent to which Armory artists were covered by textbooks from 1969 to 2009? Did artist attributes continue to play a role, or are these network connections ultimately key?

In addressing these three groupings, I also offer theoretical arguments that pertain—such as those dealing with retrospective consecration, the construction of artistic

fields and their canons and the implications of artistic networks for success. I now turn to the first grouping in Chapter One.

References for Introduction

Apollinaire, G., 1913. Les peintres cubists: mèditations esthètiques. Figuière.

Allen, M., Lincoln, A., 2004. Critical discourse and the cultural consecration of American films. Social Forces 82, 871-894.

Baumann, S., 2001. Intellectualization and art world development: film in the United States. American Sociological Review 66, 404-426.

Becker, H., 1984. Art Worlds. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Bevers, T., 2005. Cultural education and the canon: a comparative analysis of the content of secondary school exams for music and art in England, France, Germany and the Netherlands, 1990-2004. Poetics 33, 388-416.

Bourdieu, P., 1984. Distinction: A Sociological Critique of the Judgment of Taste. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Bourdieu, P., 1991. Language and Symbolic Power. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Brown, M.W., 1988. The Story of the Armory Show. Abbeville Press, New York.

Bruder, K.A., Ucok, O., 2000. Interactive art interpretation: how viewers make sense of paintings in conversation. Symbolic Interaction 23, 337-358.

Corse, S., 1995. Nations and novels: cultural politics and literary use. Social Forces 73, 1279-1308.

Corse, S., Griffin, M., 1997. Cultural valorization and African American literary history: reconstructing the canon. Sociological Forum 12, 173-203.

Corse, S.M., Westervelt, S.D., 1997. Gender and literary valorization: the awakening of a canonical novel. Sociological Perspectives 45, 139-161.

Craig, A., Dubois, S., 2010. Between art and money: the social space of public readings in contemporary poetry economies and careers. Poetics 38, 441-460.

Cortissoz, R., 1913. The Post-Impressionist illusion. Century Magazine 85, 805-815.

DiMaggio, P., 1982. Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: the creation of an organizational base for high culture in America. Media, Culture, & Society 4, 33-51.

DiMaggio, P., 1991. Social structure and cultural goods: the case of the United States. In: Bourdieu, P., Coleman, J. (Eds.), Social Theory for a Changing Society. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 133-166.

DiMaggio, P., 2009. Introduzione. In: Santoro, M. (Ed.), L'Organizzazione della Cultura. Il Mulino, Bologna.

Dowd, T.J., forthcoming. Production and producer of life styles: fields of classical and popular music in the United States. Kölner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie 51.

Dowd, T.J., Kelly, K., forthcoming. Composing a career: the situation of living composers in the repertoires of U.S. orchestras, 2005-06. In: Mathieu C. (Ed.), Careers in Creative Industries. Routledge, London.

Dowd, T.J., Liddle, K., Lupo, K., Borden, A., 2002. Organizing the musical canon: the repertoires of major U.S. symphony orchestras, 1842 to 1969. Poetics 30, 35-61.

Giuffre, K., 1999. Sandpiles of opportunity: success in the art world. Social Forces 77, 815-32.

Gleizes, A. Metzinger, J., 1912. Du 'cubisme.' Figuière

Gordon, D.E., 1974. Modern art exhibitions, 1900-1916; selected catalogue documentation. Prestel-Verlag, New York.

Green, C., 2003. Art in France, 1900-1940. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Greenfield, L., 1989. Different Worlds: A Sociological Study of Taste, Choice and Success in Art. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Guggenheim, Solomon R., Museum of Art, 2003. From Picasso to Pollock: Classics of Modern Art. Press release.

Halle, D., 1993. Inside Culture: Art and Class in the American Home. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hartt, F., 1998. Art: A History of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture. 3rd edition. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Janson, H.W., Roberts, A.M., 2006. Janson's History of Art. 7ᵗʰ edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Janssen, S., Kuipers, G., Verboord, M., 2008. Cultural globalization and arts journalism: the international orientation of arts and cultural coverage in American, Dutch, French, and German newspapers, 1955-2008. American Sociological Review 73, 719-740.

Johnson, C., Dowd, T.J., Ridgeway, C., 2006. Legitimacy as a social process. Annual Review of Sociology 32, 53-78.

Kapsis, R., 1992. Hitchcock: The Making of a Reputation. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Kleiner, F., Mamiya, C., 2005. Gardener's Art through the Ages. 12ᵗʰ edition. Thomson Wadsworth, New York.

Lang, G., Lang, K., 1988. Recognition and renown: the survival of artistic reputation. American Journal of Sociology 94, 79-109.

Levine, L.W., 1984. Highbrow / Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in the United States. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

McAndrew, C., 2010. The International Art Market 2007-2009: Trends in the Art Trade During the Global Recession. European Art Foundation, Helvorit.

Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2011. Heilbrunn timeline of art history.
http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/ht/?period=11&region=eusi

MoMA/Grove Art Learning Resources, 2009. Artist's work/artist's voice: Picasso.
http://www.moma.org/collection/artist.php?artist_id=4609

Salmon, A., 2005a (1905). Carnet de Paris et d'ailleurs. In: Gersh-Nesic, B.S. (Ed.),
Andrè Salmon on French Modern Art. Cambridge University Press.

Salmon, A., 2005b (1912). Le jeune peinture francaise. In: Gersh-Nesic, B.S. (Ed.),
Andrè Salmon on French Modern Art. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Schmutz, V., 2005. Retrospective cultural consecration in popular music: Rolling Stone's
greatest album of all times. American Behavioral Scientist 48, 1510-1523.

Schmutz, V., 2009. Social and symbolic boundaries in newspaper coverage of music,
1955-2005: gender and genre in the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. Poetics
37, 298-314.

Schmutz, V., Faupel, A., 2010. Gender and cultural consecration in popular music. Social
Forces 89, 6845-707.

Staples, S., 2001. As Avant-Garde as the Rest of Them: An Introduction to the Armory

Show. *http://xroads.virginia.edu/~museum/armory/intro.html*

Stokstad, M., 2008. Art History. Revised 3rd edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River,

NJ.

Tuchman, G., Fortin, N., 1984. Fame and misfortune: edging women out of the great

literary tradition. American Journal of Sociology 90, 72-96.

Zervos, C., 1957-1978. Pablo Picasso 1895-1973, catalogue raisonné. 34 volumes.

Editions Cahiers d'Art, Paris.

CHAPTER ONE

From the Armory to Academia:

Careers and Reputations of Early Modern Artists in the United States

1. Introduction

Which of those artists working approximately a century ago are remembered and celebrated today? One immediate answer is a list of brilliant superstars whose work illuminated new directions in art. However, recent work in sociology suggests there is more to an artist's evolving reputation than pure talent. This previous research indicates a number of factors that shape the consecration process, including the legitimating organizations that proclaim the worth of certain artists (DiMaggio, 1982; van Rees and Dorleijn, 2001), the attributes of the artists themselves—such as gender (Schmutz, 2009; Tuchman and Fortin, 1984) and nationality (Bevers, 2005; Corse, 1995)—the exhibition patterns of artists (Giuffre, 1999) and posthumous support for particular artists (Lang and Lang, 1988).

This chapter takes up this question as well. In particular, I examine how various factors emphasized in other research combine to shape consecration, assessed here as inclusion of artists within contemporary, college-level art history textbooks. To do so, I follow over time *all* of the 308 artists that exhibited at the 1913 Armory Show. This exhibition was a watershed moment in art history, credited with introducing modern art to the United States (Bjelejac, 2001; Brown, 1988; Watson, 1991). Using the Armory Show as a starting gate for artists who *potentially* could be consecrated, I examine each artist's early trajectory in the art world by documenting how they fared with an important

legitimating organization. Thus, I track the number of exhibitions that each Armory artist

enjoyed at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) since its opening in 1929 to the year

1967 (898 exhibitions in total). I likewise attend to attributes of each artist, including

gender, nationality and early European success. In this manner, this chapter seeks to

address the interplay that unfolds across time between a legitimating organization

(MoMA) and artist attributes, demonstrating how such factors shape which artists are

consecrated by influential textbooks approximately a century later.

2. Consecration and legitimation

It is useful to think of *consecration* as distinct from *valorization*. Bourdieu (1984:

6) used the term consecration to describe the phenomena whereby a "magical division" is

created between "sacred" artistic offerings and "facile" products. Building on Bourdieu's

concept of consecration, Allen and Lincoln (2004) argue that there are levels of

valorization located between the sacred and facile divide. Merely distinguishing an artist

as worthy of recognition above others serves to valorize the person. In this way,

valorization assigns value and, as a result, serves to distinguish the good from the

ordinary. From that which is valorized, a select few works or artists are further

distinguished, or consecrated. Acts of cultural consecration identify specific cultural

producers as truly legitimate and, consequently, deserving of particular esteem and

praise. Whereas valorization is a general and pervasive process, consecration produces a

"discontinuity out of continuity" (Bourdieu, 1991: 120); that is, consecration separates

the great from the merely good (i.e., valorized). This collection of great artists forms the

canon, which is then reinforced, maintained and formalized by institutions such as universities, museums and textbooks (DiMaggio, 1982).

Conventional wisdom suggests that consecration is governed by objective aesthetic laws, where the best artists organically emerge from the crowd to form the cultural canon (see Becker, 1984). In this view, the consecrated artist's "greatness" is proved by his or her survival over time and the dynamics of history. Surviving older works are assumed to have endured because they are simply more valid than their forgotten peers.

Sociological scholarship, however, has criticized the "cream-rises-to-the-top" argument in favor of viewing consecration as the result of social factors and historical context, which are not reducible to the efforts of the individual producer or the content of the cultural product. For example, researchers in the field of collective memory show that representations of public figures and historical events often shift over time in response to changing social conditions and the efforts of individuals and groups (Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Corse and Griffin, 1997). Fine (1996: 1159) defines these latter individuals or groups as "reputational entrepreneurs." Since reputations are socially constructed, reputational entrepreneurs are those who attempt to control the memory of historical figures. At any given time, there is the potential for several entrepreneurs to be working simultaneously, putting forth different—even conflicting—statements regarding the same reputation.

Allen and Lincoln (2004) find that the reputations of historical figures are predominantly shaped by the discourse of entrepreneurs who possess the institutional and rhetorical resources needed to effectively construct and disseminate their preferences.

Usually these people are critics and scholars—those individuals who base their profession on being able to create distinguishing evaluations. Thus, canon formation can be seen as an arena of "competition for the power to grant cultural consecration" (Bourdieu, quoted in Corse and Griffin, 1997: 175), an institutionalized form of authority through which actors, acting as reputational entrepreneurs, promote works as a way of enhancing their own reputation or status.

However, reputational entrepreneurs are compelled to include already legitimated cultural producers in the canon, despite their own personal efforts and beliefs. Indeed, the entrepreneur's own legitimacy would be questioned without certain inclusions. This is because, although legitimacy is mediated by individuals, it is fundamentally a collective process (Johnson, Dowd and Ridgeway, 2006). In other words, legitimacy occurs through a collective construction of social reality that is perceived as consistent with the "norm, values and beliefs" (Johnson, et al., 2006: 55) individuals presume are commonly shared, whether or not they personally share them. Thus, legitimacy originates from, and depends on, the perceived presence of a larger social entity, and this collective validation creates a presumption of normative support for the inclusion of certain legitimated producers.

Not all artists are included within the canon equally, however. As consecration is often subject to power struggles, recent scholars have posited that, although canonization does denote legitimacy, there are distinctive levels of acceptance. Just as there are levels of valorization between the sacred and facile divide, there are levels of legitimacy between those simply included within the canon and the "stars" of the canon. Baumann (2007) argues that all cultural legitimacy cannot simply be understood as dichotomous;

rather, legitimacy would be more accurately measured as a scale: the broader the consensus or agreement, the greater the acceptance and, consequently, a higher placement on the scale of legitimacy. An obvious example of this is found in rankings of top artists: the artist ranked number 99 does not have the same legitimacy as the artist ranked number one. Though ranking is evident within a numbered list, canonizing texts and institutions, such as academic textbooks and museums, may be less explicit about these levels of legitimacy. Instead, levels must be found through a close examination of how artists are differentially endorsed. That is what I attempt here.

3. Modern art in the US: The 1913 Armory Show

This chapter examines the population of artists that exhibited at the 1913 International Exhibition of Modern Art—designated the "Armory Show" after its location in the 69th Infantry Regiment Armory in New York City—to see who achieves acceptance within consecrating textbooks. The artists of the Armory Show serve as an ideal population because of important *substantive* and *analytical* reasons. Substantively, the quality and breadth of the exhibitors coupled with the exhibition's historical significance is unparalleled in US art history. The group responsible for the Armory Show was the Association of American Painters and Sculptors (AAPS), a small collection of artists who wanted to bring the modern art revolution to the US. Succinctly, the modern art "revolution" was a cultural upheaval beginning in late nineteenth-century Europe. The representational artwork that had been the primary style since the Renaissance was being displaced by "modern art," an umbrella term for a number of avant-garde art movements of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, including

Impressionism, Expressionism, Fauvism, Futurism and Cubism. In stark contrast to

representational art, whose primary goal is accurate depiction, modern art emphasized

individual interpretation—experimenting with unconventional themes, subject matter,

color and material usage, often with the depictions moving toward symbolism and

abstraction (Kleiner and Mamiya, 2005; Stokstad, 2008).

Concurrent to this European cultural revolution, the US was still involved in

nation building, with the expansion of railroads and the economy (Dobbin and Dowd,

1997; Johnson et al., 2006) arguably receiving more attention than international art

movements (see DiMaggio, 1982). Contrary to the abstract styles of modernism in

Europe, a vigorous realist movement, centered around the artist Robert Henri and the

Ashcan school, characterized US avant-garde (Stokstad, 2008). In stark contrast to Paris'

Cubist exhibition of the same year, "The Eight" exhibition, representing Henri's group of

realist painters, was the revolutionary exhibition in the United States in 1908 (Stokstad,

2008). Perhaps in consequence, while a handful of art aficionados were aware of the

modern art movement's sweep through Europe and small galleries (most notably Alfred

Stieglitz's *291*) offered select collectors rare, usually invitation-only viewings of these

new artists, modern art was completely unknown to the vast majority of Americans

(Bjelejac, 2001; Brown, 1988).

The 1913 opening of the Armory Show served as America's introduction to

modern art. Displaying more than 1,300 works, from painting and sculpture to

embroidery and cartoon drawings, by 308 artists from approximately 25 countries, the

Armory was the first large-scale, comprehensive modern art exhibition to take place in

the US (Bjelejac, 2001; Brown, 1988). The exhibition was created as a survey of modern

art of the time, from its early roots in Impressionism to the Cubist revolution, by which the Show's creators hoped to establish the genesis of modern art in the US.

　　　　To say that the Amory Show was a success is an understatement. Conservative estimates put attendance at 3,214 visitors a day, or a total of 90,000 visitors in the four weeks of the Armory's run, though some estimate the overall attendance closer to a quarter of a million (Brown, 1988). The Armory Show's success, however, is probably best measured by its enduring historical importance. Retrospective analysis of the Armory's impact is generally found to be one of the primary means of explaining the genesis of modern art in the US, prior to the development of abstract expressionism (Staples, 2001). The formation of several of the nation's most important modern art collections—which in turn have become the backbone of US art museums—have been directly linked to the Armory Show. Collections first influenced by visits to the Armory include the Lillie Bliss collection, which became the core of MoMA, the Arensberg collection, which became the Louise and Walter Arensberg Collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Katherine Drier's Collection of the Société Anonyme, now at Yale University and the Eddy collection, which became the Chicago Art Institute's Arthur Jerome Eddy Memorial Collection (Brown, 1988). Additionally, after the success of the Armory, new galleries, publications, associations and exhibitions dedicated to modern art proliferated (Brown, 1988). Whereas previously, doors in the US had been closed to artists with progressive tendencies, these artists were now actively sought and patronized. In short, the Armory has been credited as the most important art exhibition in US history, the watershed moment that ultimately resulted in the US becoming a leader in the avant-garde art world (Bjelejac, 2001; Brown, 1988; Watson, 1991).

Armory artists are an analytically valuable population for this research because, prior to 1913, most were unknown in the US art market. Moreover, the AAPS discouraged inequity between the exhibited artists (Brown, 1988). Placards with the artist's name and work's title were not included next to the artworks, though the practice was common in previous large exhibitions (Staples, 2001), and rooms were only loosely distinguished by nation. Nevertheless, some artists exhibited substantially more works at the Armory than others, perhaps resulting in an advantage that translated into subsequent success (see Section 6.2.3). That said, being presented together at the Armory may have placed artists on surer footing in terms of audience awareness and evaluation. In theory, then, each Armory artist had an equal opportunity to achieve future success in the US. In actuality, many of these artists did not enjoy the success and consecration that flowed to only a few.

Additionally, using the population of Armory artists sidesteps an analytical challenge common in studies of consecration. Past research has explored retrospective consecration by first locating those artists or works celebrated in periodicals, anthologies or dictionaries, and then turning to other historical sources to locate similar contemporaries excluded from such texts (see Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Lang and Lang, 1988; Tuchman and Fortin, 1984). The present research takes a different approach by starting with a population of artists who ranged from relatively unknown to those celebrated in their time, then following these artists collectively to see who is consecrated decades later. Thus, the Armory Show serves as a natural laboratory of sorts, providing a grouping of artists that reflect certain evaluations of the period, as well as providing a pool of artists who were candidates for retrospective consecration. Overall, using the

population of Armory artists offers a compelling vantage from which to view

consecration as it unfolds over time. I now turn to the attributes of those artists, drawing

on insights from previous scholarship.

4. Artist attributes

4.1. Early European success

Though modern art was generally unknown to turn-of-the-century US audiences,

this was not the case in Europe. From the late 1860s, when arguably the paintings of the

French artist Monet began the Impressionist movement, artistic modernism predominated

European art (Watson, 1991). Indeed, much research in both art history and sociology

positions the important changes of the art world during the late nineteenth- and early

twentieth-century in Europe, particularly France (King, 2005; White and White, 1993).

Because of Europe's central role in the formation of modernism, several art historians

suggest that the history of modern art at this time closely follows European art history,

where valorization in Europe largely determined valorization in the US (Bjelejac, 2001;

Kantor, 2003; Stokstad, 2008).

Given its importance, I assess the possible impact of this European context by

attending to each Armory artist's early European success and each artist's nationality (see

section 4.2).

Early European success is gauged by an artist's inclusion within large

international exhibitions shown in the three years prior to 1913 (i.e., 1910-1912) and,

consequently, the exhibitions actually used by the Armory Show organizers as exemplars

by which to model their own US exhibition (Brown, 1988; Kuhn, 1938). I selected

exhibitions based on their temporal proximity to 1913 and their ability to capture turn-of-the-century valuations. European success prior to 1913 is important because, despite the relevance of European developments, the initial valorization of certain European artists has been traced to US exhibition (notable examples include the French artists Marcel Duchamp and Odilon Redon, who both owed their ultimate success to exhibition at the Armory Show; see Brown, 1988; Kuhn, 1938; Watson, 1991). These pre-1913 exhibitions also capture contemporary judgment, as they are survey exhibitions where artists were selected as representations of the best of modern art, from its early development to its future prospects.

The first two exhibitions chosen for this research were London's 1910 and 1912 Post-Impressionist exhibitions, organized by Roger Fry and Clive Bell. Similar to the Armory, these London exhibitions were conceived as a British introduction to modern art (Watson, 1991). The 1910 exhibition began with Édouard Manet and moved directly to Paul Cézanne, Vincent van Gogh and Paul Gauguin. Like the Armory Show, an assortment of international dealers lent to the London exhibition, including the central Parisian dealers Ambroise Vollard, Eugène Druet, Josse and Gaston Bernheim-Jeune, Paul Durand-Ruel and also Berlin's Paul Cassirer and Italy's Bernard Berenson (Watson, 1991). The success of this 1910 show prompted another exhibition two years later that widened the range of exhibited artists to include those from England and Russia. The AAPS's secretary, Walter Kuhn and president, Arthur Davies, visited the second London show, where they arranged for a large part of the exhibition to be transferred to the US for display at the Armory (Brown, 1988; Kuhn, 1938).

The third show considered here is the Sonderbund, which opened in 1912 in Cologne, Germany. Unlike the London shows, the Sonderbund took for granted its audience's familiarity with nineteenth-century painting and consequently concentrated on recent modern movements (Brown, 1988; Watson, 1991). The exhibition featured Paul Cézanne, Vincent van Gogh, Pablo Picasso, Paul Gauguin—but also newcomers, such as Paul Signac, Pierre Bonnard, André Derain, Edvard Munch, Henri Matisse, Maurice de Vlaminck and Jean-Édouard Vuillard. These artists, among others, were also contracted to exhibit at the Armory Show. Inclusion in one of these three exhibitions indicates a high level of European valorization, which in turn could increase the likelihood of later US consecration.

4.2. Nationality

Previous scholarship points to the possible importance of nationality in the consecration process (e.g., Bevers, 2005; Corse, 1995) and, as Europe, particularly Paris, was the center of the art world at this time, European nationality may have carried some cultural cache with US audiences. Moreover, the Armory Show selection process for European artists was somewhat different than for American artists. Though European selection was in large part guided by previous successful European exhibitions (i.e., London's 1910 and 1912 Post-Impressionist Exhibitions and Cologne's 1912 Sonderbund), AAPS members also toured studios in Germany (Cologne, Munich and Berlin), the Netherlands (Den Haag and Amsterdam), France (Paris) and England (London)—selecting several individual artists for exhibition (Brown, 1988; Kuhn, 1938). Such tours were arranged by gallery owners and collectors and, thus, denote a level of

endorsement and professional establishment for these artists—though generally the artists selected on these gallery tours were considered only minor talents in Europe (Brown, 1988; Kuhn, 1938).

In contrast, the majority of American artists selected to exhibit at the Armory had to submit their work directly to AAPS for consideration, as there were few large-scale exhibitions of American modern art from which to draw artists and few experts and institutions for the assessment and endorsement of modern American work. The AAPS was "flooded by [submissions from] American artists, good and bad, seeking representation" (Kuhn, 1938: 14). US artists, then, were less likely to be established professionals, not enjoying the support and advocacy that such establishment had afforded European artists. Given the different selection procedures and cultural milieus of Europe versus the US, European artists in general would seem to have a head start on contemporary valorization and eventual consecration.

4.3. Gender

In the US, as in most of Europe, the beginning of the twentieth-century saw the first generation of women to obtain a relatively comparable visual arts education to their male peers (Gaze, 1997; Staples, 2001). The movement toward modern art and Academy-independent exhibitions was moderately welcoming to women artists and, consequently, several of the Armory's female artists had previous exhibition experience. For example, in the US, Robert Henri's 1910 Independent Exhibition included many of the same women later featured in the Armory—Florence Barkley, Bessie Marsh Brewer,

Edith Haworth, Amy Londoner, Josephine Paddock, Mary Rogers and Hilda Ward (Staples, 2001).

Though the Armory Show was relatively open to female artists—52 of the 308 Armory artists were female—the research of Tuchman and Fortin (1984) suggests that the professionalization and consolidation of a cultural field will have a dissimilar effect on the posterity of male versus female artists: women are more likely to be "edged out" of a field that is experiencing growth in cultural legitimacy. Since the Armory Show both served as the beginning of the professionalization and consolidation process for modern art in the US (with the legitimating institution of MoMA opening 16 years later; see below), and it occurred at the pivotal period in which the differentiation of high from popular culture was occurring in the US (DiMaggio, 1982), female Armory artists will probably encounter more difficulties in attaining the contemporary valorization needed to propel them into later consecration and, consequently, could be under-represented in today's textbooks.

4.4. Posthumous exhibition

Lang and Lang (1988) contend that posthumous exhibition denotes a durable reputation and a fairly substantial amount of memory work already in place. Moreover, posthumous exhibition indicates the presence of an active and somewhat effective living advocate(s) still campaigning for the artist's importance and continued relevance. Such enduring support greatly increases the likelihood of an artist's lasting reputation. As time progresses, "the mechanisms of preservation [become] sufficiently unselective" (Becker, 1984: 232) and, consequently, merely having one's reputation outlast one's own lifetime

may be sufficient to increase one's chances at consecration. Of the 308 Armory artists,

27 exhibited posthumously and these artists may have a significantly greater chance at

consecration.

5. Legitimating organization: Museum of Modern Art

Cultural organizations typically carry out the formal rites of identifying and

endorsing the representative achievements within an art field (Becker, 1984). Such

recognition serves not only to legitimize the individual artist's work but, in turn,

promotes the legitimacy of the entire field of production (Allen and Lincoln, 2004;

Bourdieu 1984). In the US, "a key event in shaping the modernist canon was the 1929

opening of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, which rapidly assembled the

world's finest modernist collection" (Hartt, 1998: 925). MoMA was America's premier

museum dedicated solely to the display of modernist art. Currently considered one of the

most influential modern art museums in the world, MoMA is retrospectively credited as

the institution most responsible for developing avant-garde art in the United States

(Kleiner and Mamiya, 2005). Indeed, as the first US museum of its kind and, thereafter,

arguably among the most important legitimating organizations for modern art in the US,

MoMA's early exhibitions were singularly important to the success of selected artists,

advancing the American modern art movement and helping to legitimize modern art

overall as a high culture field of production.

MoMA serves as an ideal legitimating organization for the artists of the Armory

Show because of the temporal, artistic and cultural connections between the museum and

the exhibition. In 1949, MoMA's Founding Director, Alfred Barr, Jr., asserted that, "In a

sense, the epoch-making Armory Show was the real beginning of the Museum [of Modern Art]" (quoted in Bee and Elligot, 2004: 16). This statement was true in several ways. Though MoMA opened 16 years after the Armory Show, the two were strongly associated. The nucleus of MoMA's collection is the bequest of one of its founders, Lillie Bliss. Her art collection served as the impetus for MoMA to transition from "a temporary place of exhibitions to a permanent place of lasting activities and acquisitions [i.e., a true museum]" (Forbes Watson, 1967, quoted in Bee and Elligot, 2004: 33). As with several US collectors, Bliss was introduced to modernism through the Armory Show, and her collection was strongly influenced by her friend and artistic advisor, Arthur Davies, both an Armory Show artist and the President of the AAPS, the group responsible for the Armory Show (Brown, 1988; Lynes, 1973).

Even before the 1931 Bliss bequest, however, MoMA and the Armory were culturally joined as symbolic markers of modern art's promotion to high culture. In 1929, art historian and then Whitney Museum Director (1929 to 1968), Lloyd Goodrich, proclaimed, "Just as the Armory Show of 1913 was the opening gun in the long bitter struggle for modern art in this country, so the foundation of the new museum marks the final apotheosis of modernism and its acceptance by respectable society" (quoted in Bee and Elligot, 2004: 30).

Because of these temporal, artistic and cultural connections, I anticipate Armory Show artists achieving recognition and endorsement by MoMA. Armory artists were already part of important and celebrated US art collections, including the Bliss, Arensberg, Drier, Quinn and Eddy collections, and, thus, more likely to be solicited for loan and exhibition. Moreover, these artists, having already achieved a degree of

valorization by participating in the famous Armory Show, may have enjoyed a certain level of recognition, if not acceptance and even legitimacy, by MoMA's early audience members. Museum exhibition— particularly at such an important institution as MoMA—should both serve to valorize an artist and preserve his or her name within the organization's archives. In this manner, simply being included within a MoMA exhibition could greatly increase an artist's chances at enduring and achieving later consecration.

Not all museum exhibitions are equal, however. Some Armory artists achieved named exhibitions at MoMA (where an artist's name is included within the exhibition title), including *group* shows, where two to four artists are shown together, or—perhaps the most legitimizing form of exhibition—*solo* exhibitions, where the artist's work stands alone. Named exhibitions indicate a greater level of valorization and, thus, a greater likelihood of being included within consecrating texts than if the artist was not shown in MoMA, or shown in MoMA but not included in a named exhibit.

The present research is limited to the early, formative years of MoMA, examining the exhibitions from the Museum's opening in 1929 through 1967. Arguably, the artists selected for exhibition during these seminal years represent the most legitimate producers of the early modern art field, at least according to MoMA's early judgment. Although the young Museum may have entertained a debate as to what should be included within the definition of modern art during its formative years, early exhibitions unquestionably showcased those artists that the organization believed to be exemplars of the field. MoMA's early exhibitions were not simply endorsements of individual producers, but also assertions of legitimacy for the nascent field of modern art in the US (see Allen and

Lincoln, 2004; Bourdieu, 1984). Early exhibitors were proffered as both foundational

members of US modern art and the newly formed Museum that claimed the right to select

and represent such members.

The year 1967 was chosen as a demarcation because it represents the end of

MoMA's formative or exploratory period. With the creation of the NEA and the rise of

corporate sponsors, the mid-1960s marked a change in museum exhibition design from

scholarly and curatorial to a more popular and managerial approach (Alexander, 1996).

This broader cultural change coincided with an important change at MoMA. In 1967,

Alfred Barr, Jr., MoMA's Founding Director and the visionary behind the Museum's

formation, retired. During his tenure (1929-1967), Barr was primarily responsible for

MoMA's exhibition policies and aesthetic choices (Kantor, 2003). Though Barr's

example was largely followed by his successor, both Barr's retirement and broader

changes in funding conceivably produced a more conservative exhibition policy at the

Museum (2003). Overall, 1967 arguably marks a turning-point in MoMA's institutional

purpose from establishment to maintenance of modern art as a high culture art form in the

US, and, thus, is a good stopping point for this research.

6. Data

6.1. Dependent variables

I track the population of 308 artists from the 1913 Armory Show, based on the

catalogue compiled by art historian Milton Brown (1988).[3] My primary dependent

variable is whether a given Armory artist is included within art history texts. Academic

---

[3] See Appendix 1-A for discussion of the Brown (1988) source.

textbooks are an ideal way to evaluate cultural consecration (see Berkers, 2009). As a central instrument of education for the next generation of advocates and consumers, textbooks both communicate and impart cultural import. Through the act of being assembled, textbooks construct histories that recognize a limited number of individuals as the most important or essential figures within an art world. While compelled to maintain a somewhat universally recognized canon of artists, textbooks are the product of a number of minds, each with a unique agenda or perspective—whereby the importance of an artist may be promoted or reduced accordingly. Thus, such works should not only reflect but also advance changing evaluations (see Verboord and van Rees, 2009).

Three contemporary textbooks were selected for this measure: *Stokstad's Art History* (2008), *Janson's History of Art* (2007) and *Hartt's Art: A History of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture* (1998). These were selected from the US College Board's list of texts that meet the curricular requirements of AP Art History—in other words, these textbooks are considered appropriate college-level instructional resources. Furthermore, given the selected texts' multiple editions, each has enjoyed extended success in defining the terrain of US art, including the consecration of particular artists. For each textbook, I selected the most recent edition. For each artist, I recorded whether the artist was located within the textbooks. Given that this dependent variable is dichotomous (not included vs. included), I use logistic regression, a commonly used statistical technique for such dichotomous variables (Gujarati, 2003).

I also examine other dependent variables: the number of textbook pages devoted to each Armory artist (see Appendix 1-B) and whether each Armory artist did or did not exhibit subsequently at MoMA (see below).

6.2. *Independent variables*

6.2.1. *Early European success*

Artist's European success is measured through exhibition in London's 1910 and 1912 Post-Impressionist Exhibition and Cologne's 1912 Sonderbund. The catalogues for these exhibitions were used as the source of documentation. Those artists who participated at any one of these exhibitions were coded as "1" (prior success) and all others were coded as "0."

6.2.2. *Gender and nationality*

Other attributes of each Armory artist were documented. For cases in which incomplete information was found (three of the 308 artists could not be definitively identified and, thus, have almost no information), approximate identification was made, and these approximations were marked as incomplete data (see Appendix 1-A). In such cases, gender was estimated according to the artist's name. The resulting dummy variable coded men artists as "1" and women as the reference category. Nation of birth was defaulted either to the country of known residence or, if this information was unavailable, to the United States, as the majority of Armory Show artists were US-born (see Appendix 1-A). The resulting dummy variable coded European-born artists as "1" and others as "0."

6.2.3. *Armory Show involvement*

I also collected information on the number of works exhibited at the Armory Show by each artist. This information was primarily taken from Brown's catalogue raisonné. In the case of one artist, information was unavailable and accordingly marked as missing. Each artist's life span was also recorded, from which posthumous exhibition at the Armory was determined. In the case of 17 artists, year of death was unavailable and these cases were marked missing.

6.3.4. *Exhibition history at MoMA*

I assessed each Armory artist's exhibition pattern within MoMA to gauge the impact of this legitimating organization on later consecration. To do this, I first obtained a listing of the Museum's exhibition history from the organization's opening in 1929 to the year 1967 (898 exhibitions in total). Then, each of the exhibitions catalogues were examined for the names of the 308 Armory Show artists and, if found, their inclusion was documented. I also recorded if the exhibition was a *general*, *group* or *solo* show. Thus, the resulting variables addressed the number of MoMA exhibitions that each artist enjoyed from 1929 to 1967—specifically the respective number of general, group and solo exhibitions.

Through both interlibrary loan and research at MoMA's library and archives in New York, I attained catalogues and artist exhibition lists for 668 of the 898 exhibitions from 1929-1967, leaving 230 exhibitions without an accompanying catalogue or any other available archival information. Fortunately, missing exhibitions are evenly distributed over the time frame examined. Approximately 33% of the missing cases (72) were exhibitions presenting works from the Museum's collection. Upon comparison with

MoMA's collection records, all artists present in the collection from 1929 to 1967 had also exhibited in at least one of the 668 exhibitions documented in my research. In other words, although I do not have the detail of information that a missing catalogue would have provided, all Armory artists from the collection are also accounted for in exhibitions documented by this research. Additionally, another 35% of the missing cases (80) may be considered museum "activities" rather than actual museum exhibitions. Thus, 33 of these missing exhibitions were craft fairs for children (e.g., the annual "Children's Holiday Circus of Modern Art"). Another 47 exhibitions were dedicated to promoting education (e.g., "Understanding Your Child through Art: A Course for Parents" #411), community service (e.g., "Teaching Materials for NYC High Schools" #412) and supporting the Museum (e.g., "Junior Council Print Sale" #748a). Arguably, the very fact that these exhibitions did not have an accompanying catalogue or artist list indicates a minimal emphasis on displaying artworks and acknowledging professional artists; accordingly, these missing exhibitions should have little impact on consecration and, hence, this chapter's results.

7. Results

To explore the process of consecration, I examine which artists associated with a watershed exhibition, the 1913 Armory Show, are eventually featured in prominent textbooks approximately a century later. This examination becomes especially intriguing given the enormous selectivity that occurs among the three texts: 58 of the 308 artists featured at the Armory are recognized by at least one of the three textbooks. These 58 are listed in Table 1-A, along with information regarding their prior European success,

gender, national origins, status at the time of the Armory show (i.e., number of

exhibitions; living vs. dead) and their MoMA representation (within the MoMA and

number of general, solo and group exhibitions). For comparison's sake, I list in

Appendix 1-B the 250 artists omitted from the textbooks, along with their attributes.

Note that 10 artists of the artists in Table 1-A (Picasso, Monet, Matisse, Cezanne,

Duchamp, Delacroix, Goya, Manet, Courbet and van Gogh) account for nearly half

(46.6%) of the total number of pages devoted to the Amory artists among all three

textbooks. Table 1-B provides additional information, as it shows, in terms of allotted

page numbers, the top 10 artists for each of the three textbooks. In regards to the artists

that achieve the most number of pages, the textbooks demonstrate some difference.

Stokstad's, in particular, seems to be the most divergent. For instance, only seven of

Janson's 12 most recognized artists in terms of page representation overlap with

Stokstad's 15 top artists, while only half of *Hartt's* top artists overlap with *Stokstad's*

(five out of 10). Conversely, seven of *Hartt's* 10 top artists correspond to the 12 artists

most recognized by *Janson's*.

[TABLE 1-A ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 1-B ABOUT HERE]

7.1. Descriptive statistics

[TABLE 1-C HERE]

Table 1-C provides a summary of key characteristics of the Armory Show's

population. When considered in conjunction with Table 1-A and Appendix 1-B, the

following patterns emerge. Forty-six of the 308 Armory artists enjoyed prior European

success, represented in at least one of the 1910 and 1912 Post-Impressionist and the 1912 Sonderbund exhibitions. Of these, 21 appeared in at least one of the textbooks. While 52 women were selected to exhibit at the Armory, only two of them would later find coverage in textbooks. Approximately 46% of the Armory artists were European-born, representing 20 different countries. The US was the most represented country, with 49% of the total number of artists US-born. Meanwhile, subsequent textbook coverage of Armory artists would entail a mixture of about 72% European and 26% US-born. While the mean number of works an artist showed at the Armory was approximately four, the number of artworks exhibited ranged from one piece to 62 works. As can be seen in Table 1-D, the artists in the textbooks with the most pieces exhibited were Odilon Redon (with 62 pages), Augustus John (44 pages), Paul Cezanne (27 pages), Edouard Vuillard (22 pages) and Vincent van Gogh (18 pages).

Table 1-C also points to a distinguishing process in the three types of MoMA exhibitions (general, group and solo). Whereas almost a third (29%) of Armory artists displayed at MoMA in general shows, only 7% were selected for group exhibition (e.g., the "Weber, Klee, Lehmbruck and Maillol" exhibition) and 10% for solo shows (e.g., the "Henri Matisse" exhibition). Table 1-E lists those artists who secured group and solo exhibitions.

[TABLE 1-C ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 1-D ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 1-E ABOUT HERE]

7.2. Regression models

Table 1-F presents logistic regression results regarding the odds of being represented in three textbooks published in the early 21st century, thereby capturing retrospective consecration.

[TABLE 1-F HERE]

Considering prior European success alone (Model 1), the odds of textbook inclusion are significantly increased by participation in at least one of the three European precursor exhibitions. That is, European exhibition preceding exhibition at the Armory raises the odds of textbook inclusion by a factor of approximately 5.7—with this model accounting for roughly 12% of the variance in textbook inclusion.

When considering other artist attributes (Model 2), the odds of textbook inclusion are significantly increased by being either male or European. The former raises the odds of inclusion by a factor of about 4.6 and the latter raises the odds by a factor of about 3. Altogether, these artist attributes explains approximately 13% of the variance in textbook inclusion.

When only considering level of involvement at the Armory (Model 3), both being exhibited posthumously and exhibiting a greater number of works significantly increases the odds of consecration. While each additional artwork exhibited at the Armory increases an artist's chances at textbook inclusion by 14%, posthumous exhibition has a sizeable effect, making the odds of textbook inclusion nearly eight times more likely. Together, the Armory involvement variables moderately increase the amount of variance explained, as shown by the pseudo-R-square of .215.

Model 4 demonstrates the effect of participating in the three types of MoMA exhibitions versus not exhibiting at MoMA on the odds of textbook inclusion. Here, we see some striking results. Each of the three types of exhibition proves statistically significant. Yet, while the odds of being included within a textbook increase notably by the number of general exhibitions at MoMA—by a factor of 1.26—the inclusion of an artist's name within exhibition titles raises these odds drastically. Thus, the number of group exhibitions, where the artist's name is included with other artists in the exhibition's title, significantly increases the odds of being recognized in a textbook by a factor of approximately 70. The number of solo shows, meanwhile, raises the odds of textbook inclusion rise by a factor of 44. Additionally, Model 4 offers a substantial improvement in the pseudo-R-square, where the combined influence of MoMA exhibition history explains 60% of the variance in textbook inclusion.

Model 5 considers all factors simultaneously. This renders insignificant the impact of prior European success, gender, nationality and the number of works an artist exhibited at the Armory. Thus, when considering the effects of being featured at this legitimating organization, various artist attributes are no longer salient predictors for textbook inclusion. Rather, MoMA exhibition history and posthumous exhibition at the Armory Show emerge as crucial predictors of textbook recognition. Again, the number of group exhibitions particularly stands out, making the odds of textbook inclusion approximately 73 times more likely. This model accounts for 66% of the variance of textbook inclusion.

I complement the regression analysis in Table 1-F with additional analyses in the Appendices, which I summarize here. First, the variables represented in Table 1-F are

also regressed on the *number of pages* actually devoted to Armory artists within the three textbooks (rather than simple inclusion in these textbooks) (see Appendix 1-C). Note that the findings for both textbook inclusion and number of textbook pages are very similar – with the latter revealing additional effects for nationality and number of artworks at the Armory Show. This suggests, at least for the present analysis, that simple inclusion and extent of textbook coverage offer comparable, and possibly interchangeable, ways of capturing retrospective consecration. Second, I offer an additional analysis to determine the extent to which the three textbooks overlap in terms of artist inclusion and coverage (see Appendix 1-D). All three textbooks include a highly comparable grouping of artists. This finding suggests a well-defined canon for modern art in the US.

7.3. The MoMA effect

Given the substantial impact of MoMA exhibitions on subsequent consecration in textbooks, I next consider how artist attributes predict entry into MoMA during its formative years from 1929 to 1967. Since the dependent variable is dichotomous (never- vs. ever-exhibited at MoMA), I once again use logistic regression, the results of which are listed in Table 1-G.

[TABLE 1-G ABOUT HERE]

When considering prior European success alone (Model 6), the odds of ever-exhibiting at MoMA are significantly increased. Exhibition in at least one of the European shows prior to exhibiting at the Armory Show makes the odds of MoMA exhibition approximately 4.5 times more likely. The pseudo-R-square, however, is small (.089).

The odds of ever-exhibiting at MoMA are significantly increased by being either a male artist or of European origin (Model 7). The former makes the odds of inclusion more than five times more likely, and the latter raises the odds of MoMA inclusion by a factor of two. As with inclusion in textbooks (Model 2, Table 1-F), these artist attributes account for a slight pseudo-R-square (.146).

In Model 8, I examine the impact of Armory Show involvement. These factors also prove to be significant predictors of ever-exhibiting at MoMA. Artists who presented a greater number of works at the Armory increase their odds of MoMA inclusion by more than 27% per each work. Posthumous exhibition at the Armory Show also has a sizable effect on inclusion in MoMA, raising the odds by a factor of 3.5. Together, the Armory variables yield a modest pseudo-R-square of .207.

Whereas nearly all of the attributes ultimately prove to be insignificant predictors of textbook inclusion (Model 5, Table 1-F), this is not the case for ever-exhibiting at MoMA (Model 9, Table 1-G). Here, four of the five attributes remain significant predictors of artists finding their way into MoMA, including prior European success, posthumous exhibition and number of artworks displayed at the Armory. Notably, being male also remains a significant factor, indicating that women artists from the Armory Show faced barriers in attaining at least one MoMA exhibition. Yet, as Table 1-F suggests, those women lucky enough to make it into MoMA did not then face obstruction for subsequent textbook consecration. These findings suggest that MoMA proved to be not only an important legitimating organization, but also served as an important gatekeeper in its earlier years that, unlike contemporary textbooks, favored Armory

artists who had prior European success, numerous artworks displayed at the Armory, and who were men.

8. Discussion

The results of this analysis point to some intriguing conclusions. First, the way in which an artist is contemporaneously valorized matters for later consecration (i.e., inclusion in art history textbooks). While the factors of early European success, posthumous Armory exhibition and number of artworks displayed at the Armory each indicate a degree of valorization or, even, contemporary consecration, only posthumous Armory exhibition remains significant as a predictor of textbook inclusion in the presence of early MoMA exhibition. The endorsement of a legitimizing institution such as MoMA, then, seems to be by far the most powerful approval needed for retrospective recognition, at least with regards to this research. Becker (1984: 232) also points to this idea, stating that, "The work of those whom contemporary judgment singles out as exceptionally good…has a greater chance of lasting and being available for later judgments. They get this greater chance because the libraries, museum collections and similar repositories which preserve artworks naturally select what contemporary opinion thinks best."

Yet, this chapter also indicates that MoMA was more than a simple repository or preserver of what contemporary judgment liked. As a legitimating organization, MoMA also acted as an important gatekeeper, allowing only a certain type of artist into its exhibitions. This is especially evident in the differential effect gender has on textbook versus MoMA inclusion. While gender is not a significant determinant of inclusion in

consecrating textbooks of the early 21st century, an artist's gender does matter for exhibiting at MoMA (1929-1967). In other words, recent textbooks tend to address those Armory artists—men and women—who were previously featured at MoMA; however, MoMA exhibitions of the past favored men rather than women from the Armory Show. This finding is all the more important considering that MoMA exhibition greatly increases the likelihood of an Armory artist's inclusion within a consecrating text. Such findings indicate important filtering processes occurring at this seminal museum—filtering that is later replicated in consecrating textbooks.

This chapter also suggests that the earlier gatekeeping of MoMA was shaped by curatorial decisions. This is indicated by the sizeable discrepancy in the likelihood of textbook inclusion between artists with general exhibitions (with titles such as "Painting in Paris") versus named exhibitions (with titles such as "Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, van Gogh"). Again, while general MoMA exhibition increases the odds of textbook inclusion by a factor of 1.25, solo and group exhibitions raise these odds by a factor of 44 and 70 respectively. As with textbooks, while the exhibition of certain repertoire artists is expected, even required, in order for a museum to maintain legitimacy as an objective preserver of the arts, how artists are exhibited is determined by the curator (Alexander, 1996). In this way, the organization of an exhibition is by its very nature an act of reputational entrepreneurship. While less preferred artists are one of the crowd in general exhibitions, favored artists are highlighted and promoted through solo or group exhibitions. Such exhibitions, then, work as organizationally-sanctioned opportunities for curators to set apart and emphasize those artists they consider the best, i.e., those artists they consider good candidates for the cultural canon.

The curatorial hand is particularly perceptible in group exhibitions, where artists are selected for joint display. Through the process of uniting artists in exhibition, curators are creating new, or advocating previously held, connections between artists. When selected to display together, artists may attain a mutual benefit by the association of their respective reputations (as seen in the work of Crane (1987) and Giuffre (1999)). Joint exhibit may even widen an artist's viewing audience, leading to further prominence. On a historical level, associations formed through group exhibition may also work to situate an artist within a peer group to which the content and quality of his or her art is considered comparable. Exhibitions that position artists as artistic peers emphasize a flow of influence connecting the artists. Such connections may serve to create a narrative of "progression" in art. A famous example of such an institutionally-created progression narrative is from MoMA's Founding Director, Alfred Barr, Jr., who in 1936 published a causal diagram of the history of modern art, which illustrated linear paths of influence between artists and movements from 1890 to 1935. Progression narratives translate well into textbooks, where artists are positioned as innovators contributing to the advancement of art history. In this manner, group exhibitions may significantly aid in an artist's consecration by signaling the development of an organizational support system that attracts wider audiences, connects artists and ultimately leads to a place in the history of art.

Additionally, this chapter also found that posthumous exhibition at the Armory has a considerable effect on both MoMA exhibition and textbook inclusion. Achieving consecration may have been easier for those posthumously exhibited since their very presence at the Armory denotes a somewhat successful level of advocacy and memory

work already in place. Posthumous exhibition, then, likely indicates the presence of an effective reputational entrepreneur(s). The significant impact of posthumous exhibition on the odds of textbook inclusion, therefore, complements the significant impact of solo and group MoMA exhibitions.

I should also comment on some of the limitations of this research. First, although MoMA was the earliest and, arguably, the most important of the US' modern art museums, it is not the only institution that legitimated early modern artists. Institutions in New York, such as the Guggenheim and Whitney, across the US, from Chicago to San Francisco, and throughout the world were also influential, and further research is needed to determine the extent of these institutions' impact on consecration. Furthermore, the present research is limited to the US, and therefore does not take into account the similarities and divergences between the US visual arts canon and those of other nations. Such comparisons may further address the international interplay that contributes to an artist's consecration.

Finally, this research does not measure talent and quality. Griswold (1987: 1105) argues that canonical art has a "cultural power," a quality that captivates audiences yet resists definitive interpretation. An artist's ability to create such powerful work may be the primary reason he or she is chosen for consecration. Nevertheless, to succeed, even the greatest ability must be paired with opportunity. Artists selected for the Armory Show all had talent, yet only a few were chosen for the extraordinary opportunity of exhibiting at MoMA—thus, greatly increasing their likelihood of being included in textbooks. This research attempts to understand who among the talented gets this opportunity—and who does not.

These limitations notwithstanding, there are still several ways that the following chapters cast further light on the results in this chapter. In Chapter 2, I move from inspecting the distant impact of MoMA on university textbooks to examining the reciprocal impact of the Museum on contemporaneous textbooks and vice versa during the early- to mid-20th century. Not only does this highlight the curatorial hand discussed above, this work also helps situate the ongoing construction of the modern art field in the United States. In Chapter 3, I delve further into the implications of the curatorial hand—focusing on how groupings of artists by MoMA curators in the early to mid 1900s, in turn, impinged upon subsequent textbooks from the mid-1900s to the present. Such research attempts to make clear the converging agreement on canonical figures in the field of modern art.

Appendix 1-A. Additional notes on data sources.

My data include the population of all 308 artists identified in the catalogue for the 1913 Armory Show. The version of the catalogue from which I am drawing my sample was compiled by the art historian Milton Brown (1988). Considered one of the most comprehensive scholars on the Armory Show (Bjelejac, 2001), Brown assembled his catalogue raisonné from both the original Armory Show exhibition catalogue and its accompanying supplement. Brown added artists and works not represented in the original catalogue and supplement, but who were nevertheless part of the Armory Show based on documentary evidence found in Walt Kuhn's papers (The Association of American Painters and Sculptor's [AAPS] secretary), Elmer MacRae's accounts (AAPS's treasurer), and the sales books kept by Walter Pach (AAPS's European representative and

sales manager). Brown's catalogue is generally considered the most comprehensive and complete list of Armory Show artists currently available (Bjelejac, 2001; Staples, 2001).

Each Armory artist's individual attributes—including gender, nation of birth and year of death—were documented. Because the nature of this research captures obscure as well as successful and celebrated artists, it was necessary to use a variety of sources in locating bibliographic information on the population of Armory Show participants. To attain the population's social characteristics, every artist was researched through an ordered succession of different information sources, where each source cast an ever broader information "net." The more obscure the artist, the more information sources were consulted in order to capture what bibliographic information still existed.

I started with Brown's catalogue raisonné and then pulled information from several comprehensive bibliographic and art databases. First, I used *AskART*, which collects bibliographic data on artists from over 20,000 books, exhibition records and periodicals. Next, I used *Art Abstracts*, which searches periodicals internationally; *Artbibliographies Modern*, which searched journals, books, exhibition catalogs, dissertations and exhibition reviews on all forms of modern and contemporary art; and the *Bibliography of the History of Art*, a database that accesses information found in journal articles, art-related books, conference proceedings, dissertations and exhibition and dealers' catalogs across European and American visual art history. Finally, for US artists, I also consulted Peter H. Falk's *Who was who in American art 1564-1975* and *Who was who in American art: Biographies of American artists active from 1898-1947*.

For cases in which little or incomplete information was found (three of the 308 artists could not be definitively identified and, thus, have almost no information),

approximate identification was made, and these approximations were marked as incomplete data. In such cases, gender was estimated according to the artist's name. Nation of birth was defaulted either to the country of known residence or, if this information was unavailable, to the United States (as the majority of Armory Show artists were from the US). Birth and death year were not approximated.

Appendix 1-B. Armory artists omitted from art history textbooks of the early 21st century.

[TABLE 1-H ABOUT HERE]

Appendix 1-C. The impact of artist attributes and a legitimating organization upon the number of textbook pages devoted to each Armory artists

Table 1-I offers an enhancement of the logistic regression results in Table 1-F by providing an OLS regression analysis of the number of pages actually devoted to an artist within the three textbooks. It is of particular note that the findings in Table 1-I parallel those found in Table 1-F, where the dependent variable is simply inclusion within a textbook. This suggests, at least for the present analysis, that simple inclusion and total number of pages within a text represent a comparable capturing of consecration.

[TABLE 1-I ABOUT HERE]

As with the results for simple textbook inclusion, European success prior to the 1913 Armory Show is a significant predictor of the number of textbook pages dedicated

to an Armory artist, increasing the inclusion by an average of a little less than 5 pages. The R-square for this model is slight, however, at .061.

Unlike the results for simple textbook inclusion, being a male artist is not a significant predictor of the number of textbook pages. Instead, when only considering artist attributes (Model 2), being born in Europe is the sole significant predictor and increases textbook inclusion by an average of a little less than four pages. The R-square for this model is slightly larger than with European success, at .089.

Similar to Model 3 in Table 1-F, when solely considering an artist's involvement at the Armory Show in Table 1-I, both posthumous exhibition and number of works significantly increase the likelihood of consecration. For each additional work exhibited at the Armory, an artist enjoys an extra .212 textbook pages. However, of particular note in this model, posthumous exhibition at the Amory Show increases textbook recognition by 10 pages. Though Model 3 does increase the R-square, at .206, the variance explained is still on the modest side.

Analogous to results in Table 1-F, the effects of MoMA exhibition history on the number of pages garnered within a textbook (Model 4) are significant in Table 1-I. Again, while each general exhibition at the MoMA increases an artist's inclusion within a consecrating text by more than a third of a page, it is the named exhibition that really increases an artist's textbook representation. For each group show, an artist garners an additional three pages of text, while each additional solo show increases an artist's mean textbook representation by 3.7 pages. Of note here, solo exhibitions have a slightly greater impact on pages garnered, whereas in simple text inclusion, group exhibition had

the far larger effect. Overall, the combination of MoMA exhibition factors explains

42.3% of the variance.

Model 5 demonstrates the combined effect of European success, artist attributes,

Armory involvement and MoMA exhibition history on the number of textbook pages

dedicated to an artist. As with the results in Table 1-F (Model 4), the combination in

Table 1-I renders artist attributes and the number of works an artist exhibited at the

Armory insignificant, with the exception of being born in Europe (significant at the .05

level), which increases textbook representation by almost 1.5 pages. Again, MoMA

exhibition history and posthumous Armory Show exhibition emerge as significant

predictors. Each type of MoMA exhibition increases the mean number of textbook pages

an artist is likely to garner, with each general exhibition increasing representation by a

little more 0.3 pages, each additional group exhibition increasing representation by two

pages and each solo exhibition boosting representation by almost four pages. Of most

note, posthumous exhibition at the Armory Show increases textbook representation by

more than eight pages. Model 5 shows that the combination of all the factors (European

success, artist attributes, Armory involvement and MoMA exhibitions) explains 55.8% of

the variance in number of textbook pages between artists.

Since only a small percentage of Armory Show artists are represented in these

texts (19%), I also created a logged dependent variable—Log (1 + aggregate number of

textbook pages)[4]—to correct for the possibility of skewed results. Logging the

dependent variable did not change the direction or significance of my results and,

consequently, I report the unlogged results for easier interpretation.

---

[4] I added a value of "1" to all artists' aggregate number of pages to avoid the impossibility of taking the log of "0"—as many artists had no coverage in the textbooks.

Appendix 1-D. The impact of artist attributes and a legitimating organization upon the number of textbook pages devoted to each Armory artists

Additional analysis examines the extent to which the three different textbooks are similar, or dissimilar, in terms of both inclusion and number of pages. The results of these two analyses can be found in Table 1-J (simple textbook inclusion/logistic regression) and Table 1-J (number of pages/OLS regression).

[TABLE 1-J ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 1-K ABOUT HERE]

Briefly, both tables indicate that the three textbooks are highly comparable. As with the results in Table 1-F and Table 1-I, for the textbooks *Stokstad's* (2008) and *Hartt's* (1998), prior European success, artist attributes and number of works displayed at the Armory lose significance in the presence of other variables. *Janson's* (Davies et al., 2006) is the exception, with prior European success and European birth both being significant. Overall, what remains significant for all three texts is posthumous exhibition at the Armory and participation in MoMA exhibitions.

In large part, this pattern is repeated when running OLS regression for the number of textbook pages (Table 1-K). Differences between simple inclusion and number of pages are slight, but interesting. European origin attains significance for the *Hartt's* text, yet loses a degree of significance for *Janson's* (from p< .01 to p< .05). European success also loses all significance for *Janson's* in this analysis. Group exhibition at the MoMA loses a level of significance for *Stokstad's* (from p< .01 to p< .05), and loses significance altogether for *Hartt's*. In general, however, the factors shaping coverage by each

textbook are highly comparable and, in fact, the overlap of artist representation is approximately 57% for all three texts and 72% for at least two texts.

Again, in consideration of the possibility of skewed results, I also created logged dependent variables for this analysis—Log (1 + aggregate number of textbook pages). Once more, logging the dependent variable did not change the direction or significance of my results and, consequently, I decided to report the unlogged results here for a more straightforward interpretation.

References for Chapter One

Alexander, V., 1996. Museums and Money: The Impact of Funding on Exhibitions, Scholarship and Management. Indiana University Press, Indianapolis, IN.

Allen, M., Lincoln, A., 2004. Critical discourse and the cultural consecration of American films. Social Forces 82, 871-894.

Barr, A.H., Jr,. 1936. Cubism and Abstract Art. MoMA Press, New York.

Bauman, S., 2007. A general theory of artistic legitimation: how art worlds are like social movements. Poetics 35, 47-65

Becker, H., 1984. Art Worlds. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Bee, H., Elligott, M., 2004. Art in Our Time. MoMA Press, New York.

Berkers, P., 2009. Ethnic boundaries in national literary histories: classification of ethnic minority fiction authors in American, Dutch and German anthologies and literary history books. Poetics 37, 419-478.

Bevers, T., 2005. Cultural education and the canon: a comparative analysis of the content of secondary school exams for music and art in England, France, Germany and the Netherlands, 1990-2004. Poetics 33, 388-416.

Bjelejac, D., 2001. American Art: A Cultural History. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Bourdieu, P., 1984. Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Bourdieu, P., 1991. Language and Symbolic Power. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Brown, M.W., 1988. The Story of the Armory Show. Abbeville Press, New York.

Corse, S., 1995. Nations and novels: cultural politics and literary use. Social Forces 73, 1279-1308.

Corse, S., Griffin, M., 1997. Cultural valorization and African American literary history: reconstructing the canon. Sociological Forum 12, 173-203.

Crane, D., 1987. The Transformation of the Avant-Garde: The New York Art World, 1940-1985. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Davies, P., Denny, W.B., Hofrichter, F.F., Jacobs, J.F., Roberts, A.M., Simon, D.L., 2006. Janson's History of Art: The Western Tradition. Revised 7th edition. Pearsons Education, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

DiMaggio, P., 1982. Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: the creation of an organizational base for high culture in America. Media, Culture, & Society 4, 33-51.

Dobbin, F., Dowd, T.J., 1997. How policy shapes competition: early railroad foundings in Massachusetts. Administrative Science Quarterly 42, 501-529.

Fine, G.A., 1996. Reputational entrepreneurs and the memory of incompetence: melting supports, partisan warriors, and images of President Harding. American Journal of Sociology 101, 1159-1193.

Gaze, D. (Ed.), 1997. Dictionary of Women Artists. Fitzroy Dearborn, Chicago.

Giuffre, K., 1999. Sandpiles of opportunity: success in the art world. Social Forces 77, 815-32.

Griswold, W., 1987. The fabrication of meaning: literary interpretation in the United States, Great Britain, and the West Indies. American Journal of Sociology 92, 1077-1117.

Gujarati, D., 2003. Basic Econometrics. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Hartt, F., 1998. Art: A History of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture. 3rd edition. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Johnson, C., Dowd, T.J., Ridgeway, C., 2006. Legitimacy as a social process. Annual Review of Sociology 32, 53-78.

Kantor, S., 2003. Alfred H. Barr, Jr. and the Intellectual Origins of the Museum of Modern Art. MIT Press, Boston.

King, R., 2006. The Judgment of Paris: The Revolutionary Decade that Gave the World Impressionism. Walker and Company, New York.

Kleiner, F., Mamiya, C., 2005. Gardener's Art through the Ages. 12th edition. Thomson Wadsworth, New York.

Kuhn, W., 1938. The Story of the Armory Show. Kuhn, New York.

Lang, G., Lang, K., 1988. Recognition and renown: the survival of artistic reputation. American Journal of Sociology 94, 79-109.

Lynes, R., 1973. Good Old Modern: An Intimate Portrait of the Museum of Modern Art. Atheneum, New York.

Schmutz, V., 2009. Social and symbolic boundaries in newspaper coverage of music, 1955-2005: gender and genre in the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. Poetics 37, 298-314.

Staples, S., 2001. As Avant-Garde as the Rest of Them: An Introduction to the Armory Show. *http://xroads.virginia.edu/~museum/armory/intro.html*

Stokstad, M., 2008. Art History. Revised 3rd edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Tuchman, G., Fortin, N., 1984. Fame and misfortune: edging women out of the great literary tradition. American Journal of Sociology 90, 72-96.

van Rees, K., Dorleijn, G.J., 2001. The eighteenth-century literary field in Western Europe: the interdependence of material and symbolic production and consumption. Poetics 28, 331-348.

Verboord, M., van Rees, K., 2009. Dutch educational curriculum and institutional contexts: textbook content and teachers' textbook usage in Dutch education, 1968-2000. Poetics 37, 74-97.

Watson, S., 1991. Strange Bedfellows: The First American Avant-Garde. Abbeville Press, New York.

White, H., White, C., 1993. Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

CHAPTER TWO

Building a Canon:

The Early Years of the US Field of Modern Art

1. Introduction

The previous focus of Chapter One—the inclusion of Armory artists of the early 20th century in art history textbooks of the 21st century—makes sense given the current pre-eminence of art history; however, that focus also runs the risk of being overly static in its approach, taking art history as existing rather than evolving. The discipline of art history is presently the dominant paradigm by which to understand and evaluate art. Art professionals, such as scholars, critics, connoisseurs, curators, dealers and archivists, draw their expertise from investiture in art history's ideology (Preziosi, 2009). Yet, art history as we know it today—the study of art as the historical progression of visual expression—is a relatively new way of examining and judging art. Art history in the modern sense originated as an academic discipline around 1850 in Germany (Panofsky, 1955), but it was not established in the United States until the 1920s (see below). Art history's rise to ideological dominance on this side of the Atlantic was concurrent with the establishment of "high culture's" separation and isolation from popular culture in the United States—occurring approximately from 1850 to the early part of the 20th century (DiMaggio, 1982, 1994). This was not a temporal coincidence. Rather, art history worked as the intellectual belief system that supported and legitimized such a division. While the goal of separation may have been to revere high culture, as far as the visual arts are concerned, art history gave this reverence intellectual teeth—structuring the

education, scholarship, and even presentation of those organizations that served to give the high culture classification its meaning (DiMaggio, 1982). Through these organizations (e.g., museums, universities), art history professionalized—consolidating field knowledge and establishing new aesthetic standards. In this way, the establishment of art historical scholarship in the United States structured the framework for evaluating art during the 20th century (Groseclose and Wierich, 2009). Put another way, museums and universities played important and *ongoing* roles in making history—that of modern art in the US—not just in documenting it.

My goal in this chapter is to address the early construction of the US field for modern art. I do so by considering the choices made by two important actors, the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) and prominent art history textbooks. Rather than examining only the impact of the former on the latter (as done in Chapter One), I examine here the ongoing interplay between these two entities most responsible for the professionalization of art history, so as to determine how the modern art canon was initially formed with regards to a group of emerging artists. Examining the canonical choices of museums and the academy during the formation of art history as a serious scholarly discipline, therefore, reveals how the professionalization of art history worked to define US aesthetic judgments in this emergent field of modern art and in the broader cultural landscape ("high culture") of the early- to mid-20th century.

2. Conceptualizing the emergent field of modern art: DiMaggio's foundational work

In researching how organizations develop a shared canon in the United States, my thoughts are largely influenced by the foundational work of Paul DiMaggio. His seminal

research provides an explanation for how the advent of new artistic distinctions manifest

through organizational changes (DiMaggio, 2009: 9). At the core of his work is a

concern with the classification of cultural objects (e.g., paintings, music, plays), whereby

some of these objects become widely regarded (what he calls "universality") as not only

different from other culture objects ("differentiation") but also as superior ("hierarchy")

(DiMaggio, 1987, 2009). Seen in this light, DiMaggio's concern is very much like those

scholars who focus on "consecration" and "valorization" (see Chapter One). DiMaggio

extends such concerns by focusing on the settings (i.e., "fields") in which this type of

classification unfolds. Hence, he speaks of the field of "high culture"—what is often

meant by the term the "arts" in general—as well as *particular* fields that are part of that

broader field. Regarding the latter, he deals with the fields of orchestral and operatic

music (also known as "classical music"), dance, theater and, of course, the visual arts

(DiMaggio, 1982, 1992, 2009). For each setting, he uses the term "field" to invoke a

broad array of actors involved—including the creative personnel who make such

esteemed objects (e.g., artists), the organizations that disseminate and uphold them (e.g.,

museums), and those who critically appraise them (e.g., academics) (see also DiMaggio

and Powell, 1983). This array of actors is crucial for the emergence and ongoing

construction of a given artistic field. Obviously, creative personnel provide the objects to

which a particular field is oriented; however, DiMaggio does not tend to emphasize

creators and their works (but see DiMaggio and Stenberg, 1985). Instead, his attention is

more on the phenomenon of classification, whereby aesthetic hierarchy becomes widely

accepted and established; the epitome of this is the creation of a "canon" in various fields

of high culture. That is, he is arguably more interested in the creation of a classification

like "classical music" than in which particular composers are deemed to be "classic" (DiMaggio, 2009).

DiMaggio also emphasizes those organizations involved in the production and distribution of such objects, where an organization's leaders and personnel work to convey only esteemed works ("high culture") while avoiding mundane fare ("popular culture"). Such arts organizations in the US usually take the form of "the philanthropically supported and donor-governed nonprofit organization" (DiMaggio, 2009: 10). This non-profit form matters, he argues, because donations of various types can offset shortfalls at the box-office—thus, insulating these organizations from the losses that often occur when providing audiences with "exalted," rather than merely "entertaining," fare. DiMaggio (1982, 1991, 2009) further emphasizes that academics and critics play an important role by offering what Baumann (2002, 2007) calls a "legitimating ideology," or an accepted explanation for why particular artists and artistic works are worthy of esteem. Thus, the rise of museums, the emergence of university departments and curricula, and the resultant education and institutional accreditation of professional curators and art historians enabled the rise and spread of high culture in the United States (DiMaggio, 1982).

Rather than offering a static approach, DiMaggio focuses on three distinct historical periods that contained pivotal occasions of cultural change in the United States. First, during the turn of 20th century, he examines the emergence and establishment of hierarchical distinctions in the orchestral and visual arts field, finding that the donor-supported non-profit organizational form allowed the elite to control the choice, exhibition and mode of appreciation for high culture products (DiMaggio, 1982).

Second, looking beyond music and the visual arts, DiMaggio (1992) focuses on the national diffusion of the non-profit organizational form (and the high culture ideology that emerged in conjunction with it) to other high culture fields—particularly opera, theater and ballet, enabling these fields to also create a canon of revered and distinguished cultural works. DiMaggio notes the speed and extent to which such cultural entrepreneurship spread across the US, further highlighting the development (rather than a state of being) of cultural sacralization. This development is advanced for DiMaggio (1991; see also DiMaggio and Muhktar, 2004) in the challenges facing art organizations from the 1960s onward, where a growing upper class of cultural "omnivores" are increasingly less likely to embrace aesthetic hierarchy and, consequently, also less likely to patronize and propagate high culture organizations.

3. Engaging the emergent field of modern art in the US: building on the foundation

Motivated by DiMaggio's work, I speak of a particular field within the visual arts—that involving modern art in the US. This is reasonable given what I documented in Chapter One. The Armory Show artists represented the first wave of modern visual artists in the US, preceding such subsequent creators as the Abstract Expressionists (Crane, 1987), Pop artists (Sandler, 1978) and Minimalists (Haskell, 1984). By 1929, with the creation of MoMA, the first museum in the United States dedicated solely to the modernist aesthetic (see Chapter One), modern art's establishment within US high culture was clear. MoMA provided this emergent field its initial organizational base, preceding such other non-profits as Whitney Museum (est. 1931, whitney.org), Frick Collection (est. 1935, frick.org) and the Guggenheim Foundation (est. 1937, guggenheim.org).

Finally, the textbooks inspected in the previous chapter hint at the broader critical community—one that includes not only multiple editions of competing textbooks (see below), but also periodicals devoted to art, such as *ARTnews* (est. 1902) and *Art in America* (1913). I build on DiMaggio's foundational work by engaging three aspects that are suggested but not fully elaborated in his scholarship: (1) the rise of a legitimating ideology; (2) a dynamic approach that moves beyond discrete periods; and (3) the specific artists involved in canon formation. I comment on them below briefly before empirically addressing each in later sections.

3.1. The rise of a legitimating ideology: art history in the US

    Canon is from the Greek word for measuring stick—a standard against which something is compared. With the establishment of art history as a scholarly discipline, visual art's "measuring stick" fundamentally changed. The two entities perhaps most responsible for art history's development and professionalization were academia and the art museum (Mansfield, 2002). In the United States, art history did not galvanize into a professional discipline until the early 20th century. "Originally the private hobby of men of affairs and letters" (Panofsky, 1955: 327)—prior to the 1900s—art history in the US was part of a tradition of cultural edification, "entangle[d] with practical art instruction, art appreciation, and the amorphous monster 'general education'" (Panofsky, 1955: 327). In those early years, the dominant paradigm by which art was understood and evaluated was whether it achieved a representation of ideal beauty—and the majority of art scholarship worked to define such universal aesthetic norms (Hatt and Klonk, 2006). Early art "experts" rarely had formal training or academic preparation in art history.

Indeed, a professional chair for fine arts had been established at Harvard in the 1870s,
"but at that time the study of art history was not envisioned as a profession" (Brush,
2002: 69). Meanwhile, at the turn of the previous century, only Yale and Stanford
granted a fine art degree (Efland, 1990). Given such an environment, those who studied
culture (e.g., art) and its history were largely from the "gentry class, [who] valued certain
intangible graces at least as highly as a command of pertinent literatures" (Haskell, 1977:
168; regarding art in particular, see also Watson, 1991). Even by the time the College
Art Association of America (CAA) was founded in 1911, art history was still arguing for
its own scholarly merit. "The early issues of the [CAA's flagship journal], *Art Bulletin*
[sic] founded in 1913 and now recognized as the leading art-historical periodical of the
world, were chiefly devoted to such topics as 'What Instruction in Art Should the College
A.B. Course Offer to the Future Layman?'; 'The Values of Art in College Courses'; or
'Preparation of the Child for a College Course in Art'" (Panofsky, 1955: 327-328). In
fact, Panofsky (1955) claimed that only by 1923 did scholarly art historical articles
outnumber those on general art appreciation in *The Art Bulletin*.

During the 1920s, art history gained much of the institutional support and
infrastructure necessary to establish itself in the US as an independent discipline worthy
of serious consideration. Art history's "academic institutionalization" (Preziosi, 2009:
52) solidified during this decade as university art history classes proliferated. Under new
direction from George William Eggers (1916-1921), the Art Institute of Chicago included
classes in art history, described in the school's catalogue as "an intensive study of certain
phases of art so presented as to be of particular value to students as their training becomes
more specialized" (quoted in Jaffee, 2007: 210). By 1925, half of US colleges and

universities were providing some form of art education, if not instruction relating specifically to art history (Efland, 1990). In 1927, Harvard opened the new Fogg Art Museum—purposely built for the study and teaching of art history (2002). By 1943, Robert Goldwater's (1943) research found that art history courses were standard practice within American higher education. In response to such new curricula, and the demand that they created, Helen Gardner's survey art history text, *Art through the Ages*, was published, "which—if not the first single-volume history of art in the United States—then the first to achieve wide-spread adoption" (Jaffee, 2007: 208).

With the ascendancy of art history as a scholarly enterprise, museums began to require art history degrees of their professional personnel and administrators (DiMaggio, 1994). This was consequential for art history because the 1920s and 1930s were decades of museum expansion in the United States (Blau, 1995; Brush, 2002; DiMaggio, 1994). For example, in New York, the Museum of Modern Art, Whitney Museum, Frick Collection, and the Guggenheim Foundation were founded in short succession (1929, 1931, 1935 and 1937 respectively). This growing job market among museums for art historians was supplied by academia, which was itself experiencing a growing demand for art scholars to teach an expanding student body increasingly interested in the study of art as cultural history. For example, while there were five American universities offering an art history doctorate following World War I, 35 new departments were producing doctorates 30 years later (Efland, 1990).

As the most proliferative and prominent employers of art historians in the 20th century—as well in the early 21st century—institutions of higher education and museums enjoyed a leading role in the formation and professionalization of art history as a

discipline. Professionalization meant a solidifying of control over field knowledge and how that knowledge was gained, understood and disseminated. The academic department and art museum—two important types of organization—had considerable power over development of the distinct body of theory and knowledge that constituted and defined art historical scholarship. In turn, this knowledge gave meaning to the elevation and isolation of a few master artists and masterworks "considered to be the most significant and therefore the most worthy of study" (Brzyski, 2007: 1). DiMaggio's seminal work on construction of the high culture category in the United States likewise supports such an organizationally based approach for understanding 20th century aesthetic choices. "[T]he classification 'high culture/popular culture' is comprehensible only in its dual sense as characterizing both a ritual classification and the organizational systems that give that classification meaning" (DiMaggio, 1982: 394).

3.2. The dynamics of field construction

As noted above, DiMaggio captures dynamic processes via discrete periods: the establishment of high culture in the late 1800s to early 1920s; the expansion of high culture in the early to mid-1900s; and the possible erosion of high culture from the 1960s onward. Yet, as my discussion of art history suggests, much change can occur within a given period. This is important because Timothy Dowd argues that ongoing change (e.g., that occurring annually) also needs to be considered in order to comprehend larger field and cultural developments. For example, Dowd and colleagues (2002) find that even as high culture achieved dominance in the US, which DiMaggio locates around the turn of

the 20th century, orchestral repertoires experienced increased diversity through the early

1930s and beyond—not just moving away from emphasizing a few canonical composers,

but doing so almost steadily across the periods identified by DiMaggio. Thus, even when

the organizational base for a given field (e.g., the non-profit orchestra) is established and

relatively stable, canonical change can occur. "While organizational factors clearly

influence the tendency of symphony orchestras to favor the classics [or not to favor], they

are not the sole influences" (Dowd et al. 2002: 36). For example, Dowd finds that the

expanding music curricula of universities and colleges was followed by orchestras

performing increased numbers of new composers and US composers, somewhat diluting

their attention to the classical canon (Dowd, forthcoming; Dowd et al., 2002). In

responding to Dowd's work, DiMaggio (2009: 15) notes that "the understanding[s]…that

the cultural entrepreneurs of the 19th and early 20th century institutionalized came under

attack almost as soon as it was established, not only by modernist challengers, but by the

very institutions…that institutionalized it on the national level." Consequently, in order

to understand the impetus for changes in dominant cultural understandings (e.g., a given

canon), ongoing and evolving choices by those involved with a field's organizational

base (e.g., orchestra, museums) and its legitimating ideology (e.g., textbooks) must be

considered within their historical context.

However, I suggest moving beyond the lessons offered by Dowd (and endorsed

by DiMaggio). While his work demonstrates the impact of legitimating ideology

(university curricula) upon programming choices found among the organizational base

(symphony orchestras), he glosses over the reverse—how programming choices may

shape the legitimating ideology. I propose that key to understanding institutional change

over time is to capture not simply the evolving understanding that flow from academic organizations to artistic organizations and, by assumed proxy, to the field as a whole *but also* the ongoing influence that unfolds between both types of organizations. Canonical change in a field may be influenced by several factors, including the dissent, opposition, divergence and contestation among the organizations that structure the field. In this chapter, I capture inter-organizational interplay between the two entities most responsible for canon construction—academia and museums—while also contextualizing these organizations within and across the dynamics of history. Fields are where actors build, develop and promote shared understandings regarding the content and focus of their artistic endeavor. However, what is the extent to which the main players within the field, in fact, "share" these understandings? At what point does convergence occur between their choices and which actor's interpretation dominates? This chapter sheds light on such intra-field questions.

3.3. Canon formation and artists

A canon involves more than a measuring stick—it also involves choices about *which* artists and works are used to gauge measurement.[5] That said, such choices also unfold in a particular historical context. Taking a long-term view, the historical placement and importance of artistic works, as well as artists, became paramount— overriding prior classifications based on civil edification and "absolute beauty appreciated without context" (Sherman and Rogoff, 1994: 134). This change was

---

[5]While this research focuses on large arts organizations (academia and art museums), there are many ways to approach canonization. For example, much excellent work has examined the role of critics in the appraisal and evaluations of artists. Particularly influential for me have been the works of Bauman (2001), Janssen, Kuipers and Verboord (2008), and Schmutz and Faupel (2010).

physically evinced through the restructuring of displays in museums and academia. For example, collections of reproductions—such as plaster casts of classical sculpture—and other pedagogic artifacts were quickly superseded by original works of art, displayed chronologically and ordered by art historical period (Whitehall, 1970: 1:183, 201; see also DiMaggio, 1982). The emerging emphasis on art's historic movement and importance defined new understandings of aesthetic and cultural worth. Indeed, "the foundations of art historical scholarship in the United States were also the aesthetic framework for evaluating art" (Groseclose and Wierich, 2009: 3).

Choices about which artists to emphasize and celebrate have thus become important aspects of contemporary canons in the US — particularly choices made by those in the organizational base and in the critical community (see also Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Corse and Griffin, 1997; Dowd, forthcoming; Dowd et al. 2002; Kapsis, 1992; Schmutz and Faupel, 2010). In fact, in the visual arts, modernism and art history's "parallel courses" (Mansfield, 2002: 12) during the early 20th century allow for a significant historical dynamic by which to examine the development of the US modernist canon, as well as the movement of the artist's individual professional careers. As the Armory Show marks the beginning of modernism's consideration within US culture, the artists that exhibited there serve as an ideal population by which to observe how an art historical canon was created for new artists. Modern art was the first avant-garde artistic development encountered by the burgeoning discipline of art history, and modern artists were examined and understood in their own time under a scholarly rubric not applied to their historical predecessors. By examining how the careers of the newly introduced artists fared with the two organizations most responsible for art history's

professionalization—the academy and the museum—this chapter takes advantage of the unique intersection between emerging art movement and art scholarship, an intersection with potential influences flowing back and forth between textbooks and exhibitions.

In taking this approach to canon formation in an emergent field, I examine a largely overlooked cohort within sociological research in the visual arts, modern artists.[6] While modern artists, such as those who participated in the Impressionist, Post-Impressionist and Fauvist movements, have been considered with regards to the European art worlds (for example, Accominotti, 2009; White and White, 1993), few sociologists have looked at their introduction to the United States, tracking their reception across the Atlantic. Artists of the US art world, on the other hand, are usually first considered post-WWII, with the rise of Abstract Expressionism (see Crane, 1987 for an important example). Moreover, when examining canonization, much of the literature, including DiMaggio's work, focuses on "classics"—those artworks and artists that have long been revered. Yet, unless one examines the entirety of a given classic's history, understanding the ebb and flow of reputational development is fragmentary and incomplete (see Dowd, forthcoming; Dowd and Kelly, forthcoming). Given that reputational creation and establishment is an emphasis of this dissertation, examining modern artists allows me to track a group from their introduction to the modern art field in the US, and (for most, at least in the US) the beginnings of their reputational development, to their possible inclusion within the American artistic canon—thus, capturing the historical range of choices made by others that, in turn, define their resultant artistic reputation. Such a historical analysis is also critical for capturing

---

[6] In general, there is not much sociological research on the consumption of visual arts either, with the notable exceptions of Halle (1993), Berghman and van Eijck (2009), Bruder and Ucock (2000), and Greenfield (1989).

possible variation between a field's central organizations that are, for the first time,

encountering a new set of artists and a crafting a new canon.

4. Documenting the emergent field of modern art in the US: canonical choices

4.1. The choices of MoMA and survey textbooks

I document the emergent field of modern art in the US by examining the

canonical choices made by the two organizations that most served to espouse and

professionalize art history: the museum and academia. I am especially interested in how

choices by each type of organization influenced the other. Lacking any guiding

hypotheses from previous scholarship given the inattention to such reciprocal influences

in canon formation (see Section 3.2), I treat those influences as empirical questions to be

answered below. To limit this examination, first, I focus on choices regarding particular

artists, those that exhibited at the Armory Show. This allows me to offer in this chapter a

consideration of contemporaneous attention, thereby complementing Chapter One's focus

on retrospective attention. Second, I assess museum choices through the exhibitions of

arguably the most important museum in the formation of the US modern art canon, the

Museum of Modern Art in New York. In fact, Chapter One demonstrated its considerable

impact. The more exhibitions that Armory artists attained at MoMA, the more likely is

their inclusion in textbooks nearly a century later, and the greater number of pages they

received in those textbooks. Given that, I simply note the following difference here: in

Chapter One, I considered MoMA exhibitions from 1929 to 1967 in aggregate terms;

however, in this chapter I consider its exhibitions as they unfold across particular years—

and I expect that they will influence contemporaneous coverage in textbooks. Finally, for

academia, I have chosen to analyze the two most significant and longest-running art history textbooks in the United States, *Gardner's Art through the Ages* and *Janson's History of Art*. Not only are academic textbooks an important resource for documenting canonical choices (see Chapter One), they also prove an ideal way to track such choices across the years. For example, Berkers (2009) finds that textbooks reflect national cultural repertoires in regards to ethnic canonical inclusion, while Verboord and van Rees (2009) observe that secondary curriculum changes reflect a changing student population and reading preferences, rather than change based on professional valuations of literary merit.

Survey texts are where the debates over the formation of the art historical canons are most visible (Jaffee, 2007). The survey texts selected for this research, *Gardner's Art through the Ages* and *Janson's History of Art*, have enjoyed both enormous prominence in academia, as well as being amongst the longest running published textbooks in the US. Helen Gardner's *Art through the Ages*, if not the first single-volume history of art in the United States, then it is the first to achieve widespread popularity (Allen, 1971). The book went through three editions and thirty-nine printings between 1926 and 1948 (the years in which Gardner was the primary author)—for a total of 446,479 copies, of which 97,196 were sold in bookstores and the rest 349,283 were sold as textbooks (Allen, 1971). Following the author's death in 1946, the book's title became the more familiar *Gardner's Art through the Ages* for the fourth edition revised by Sumner McKay Crosby and the Yale Department of the History of Art (published in 1959). Horst de la Croix and Richard Tansey collaborated on the next five editions of the book (1970-1990), with contributions to the ninth edition made by Diane Kirkpatrick. The tenth edition of

Gardner's was revised by Tansey and Fred S. Kleiner, and it appeared in 1995. Despite considerable competition in the university market—most notably beginning with the 1962 publication of Janson's *History of Art—Gardner's Art through the Ages* continues to be a top-rated art history survey text, winning, in 2001, both the McGuffey Award for longevity and the Text and Academic Authors Association Text Award for excellence — the first textbook to be awarded with both these honors in the same year.

In 1959, Horst Woldemar (H.W.)[7] and Dora Janson jointly published *Key Monuments of the History of Art,* an abbreviated academic art history consisting of illustrative plates intended as a study aid for H.W. Janson's New York University undergraduate students. Three years later, in 1962, the husband and wife team followed this original work with a complete art history textbook, *History of Art.* The Jansons' text was enormously successful and became the new standard art history textbook for US college students, supplanting *Gardner's Art through the Ages* by its third edition in 1969, also written by H.W. and Dora Janson (Sorensen, 2002). The text's subsequent seven editions, between 1977 and 2006, were written in by H.W. and Dora's son, Anthony Janson (Jaffee, 2007). By 2001, the text became the best-selling textbook in the United States for any academic subject (Sorensen, 2002).

By heeding the choices that MoMA and two important survey textbooks made regarding which Amory artists to feature, this chapter is well situated to contribute to the

---

[7] As an interesting and potentially important aside, H.W. Janson was a US immigrant who left Germany before World War II (about 1935). Alfred Barr, founding director of the Museum of Modern Art, was Janson's U.S. sponsor during his immigration. Upon entrance into the US, Janson attended Harvard and worked under Paul J. Sachs, who, in 1929, was one of the seven founding members of MoMA and donated one of the Museum's first collection pieces. Sachs is also notably known for his associate directorship of Harvard's Fogg Art Museum and creation of the first museum studies courses in the United States, courses in which H.W. Janson was enrolled.

literature by revealing longitudinal processes involving the interplay between two types of consecrating organizations—museums and academia—particularly as they deal with the creation of a new chapter within the visual arts canon. Both types of organizations had ample opportunities to make such choices. For example, MoMA offered more than 900 exhibitions from 1929 to 1968. Likewise, *Gardner's* textbook, as the longest-running survey of art history, spans approximately a 90-year time frame, with a total of 13 editions in 1926, 1936, 1948, 1959, 1970, 1975, 1980, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, 2005 and 2009. The second longest-lived US art history survey text is *Janson's History of Art,* with 10 editions in 1959 (a forerunner to Janson's textbook, this is a visual survey book), 1962, 1969, 1977, 1986, 1991, 1995, 1997, 2001 and 2006. As a result, there are also a number of opportunities to observe the extent to which their choices converged or diverged across the years, particularly in the early period of this emergent field.

4.2. Canonical choices and the attributes of artists

Much previous research has indicated that canonical choices are shaped by the attributes of artists themselves, thereby reflecting broader social patterns. For example, several works have convincingly demonstrated the role that nationality plays in canonization, such as the reputation and attention that flows to artists from certain nations (Berkers, 2009; Corse, 1997; Dowd, forthcoming; Janssen et. al, 2008). I found such an impact in Chapter One. Those Armory artists born in Europe fared well retrospectively, garnering a significantly higher number of pages than others. Likewise, the gender of artists has also been identified as a significant factor in shaping differential access to canonical recognition (DeNora, 2002; Schmutz 2009; Schmutz and Faupel, 2010). For

instance, male Armory artists were more likely than female artists to be included in MoMA exhibitions (see Chapter One). Others note the importance of simple endurance, particularly as influential groups and organizations work to keep alive the memory of past artists (Craig and Dubois, 2010; Dowd and Kelly forthcoming; Lang and Lang, 1988). Given such "memory-work," it is not surprising that artists exhibiting posthumously at the Armory Show also fared well in terms of subsequent MoMA exhibitions and textbook coverage nearly a century later (see Chapter One).

Because I discussed the artist attributes in the previous chapter, I will not do so at length here; however, I will make some brief comments as to how these attributes could matter for contemporaneous attention in an emergent field. Regarding the nationality of artists, given that the European art world had more than a half a decade head-start on exhibiting, evaluating and promoting modern artists, it is likely that European judgments influenced evaluations and the like in the US—particularly given the emerging dominance of art history in the United States. Thus, I expect that artists born in Europe, and that had prior success in Europe, would fare well regarding choices made by US museums and textbooks. This is consistent with prior research. For example, in America's emerging orchestral field, symphonic performances were overwhelmingly for European audiences, particularly Germans, and this pattern continued over the course of decades (Dowd, forthcoming). In regards to contemporary attention, Janssen et al. (2008) find that nations associated with a rich and historically central artistic tradition tend to receive coverage by other nations. While I am hypothesizing that an artist's association with Europe will be important, particularly in the beginning when modern art is introduced to the US, I am also interested in finding whether this importance will last

over time—as Dowd (forthcoming) found with the orchestral field—or will fade as US cultural dominance increases (see Janssen, Kuipers and Verboord, 2008). That is, after World War II, the US emerges as both an economic and cultural world power. With the rise of the Abstract Expressionist artistic movement, the focus of the art world moves from Europe, specifically Paris, and to New York City. Will this artistic regime change serve to promote the importance of US modern artists over Europeans? Such change has been documented in other research, particularly DeNora's (1991) work on composers in late 18th- and early 19th-century Vienna, where she found that Italian composers' popularity was supplanted by Austro-Germans as the local art world expanded.

Regarding the gender of artists, some scholars find a temporal trend—one that plays out as emergent fields become established. For example, Schmutz (2009) finds that women receive fairly good coverage from contemporary critics when a music genre first appears. Over time, however, as once-new and periphery musical genres become more important, media attention tends to become more male-dominated. Such findings resonate with Tuchman and Fortin's (1984) earlier work which finds that once novels became a prominent high culture field, previously dominant women novelists were "edged out" and replaced by male writers (see also DeNora's (2002) work on the rise of masculine musical aesthetics between 1800-1810 in Vienna). Conversely, other research has found that broader cultural changes can create opportunities. For example, Dowd et al. (2005) find that both the logic of decentralized production and the presence of previous successful female musical acts increase future professional music opportunities for women.

Artists that exhibited posthumously at the Armory Show also have a "head-start"

in an emergent field where, given the recent professionalization of art history, notions of "classic" are in the process of being created. Hence, posthumous Armory exhibitors likely have an advantage in contemporary coverage by museums and textbooks. Indeed, merely being exhibited posthumously indicates successful reputational entrepreneurship at work for the deceased artist, as someone else must advocate for and ensure his or her participation. Such advocacy after death can be extremely effective. For example, Corse and Griffin (1997) find that the elevation of Zora Neal Huston to the literary canon was in part due to the endorsement of the contemporary writer Alice Walker. Lang and Lang (1988) likewise note that those artists with family members who perform memory work after their death, such as advocating for exhibition or donating papers and works to libraries and museums, tend to find a niche in cultural history by merit of simply persisting. More recently, Craig and DuBois (2010) note that "well-established" poets are those who not only gain influence and attention, but gain a renown that lasts beyond their own lives. Once an artist is so established in time, it is difficult to dislodge or erase the artist from the canon or cultural memory (see, for example, the work of Dowd and Kelly (forthcoming) on deceased composers and orchestral repertoires, and the work of Bevers (2005) on the continued importance of past artists in education).

Finally, I have also included a measure of how many works an artist exhibited at the Armory Show. Though the Armory served as a spacious gallery, with 307 artists each displaying an average of four artworks, space was limited. Given these constraints and the number of artists that wished to participate in the Armory Show, artists that were permitted extra gallery space to display many paintings were most likely considered prominent participants. Accordingly, I include in the analyses below a count of each

artist's exhibited artwork. While such numbers had no impact on coverage in textbooks at the turn of this century, they did influence the likelihood of MoMA exhibition in the early- to mid-1900s (see Chapter One). Thus, I inspect whether they also mattered for previous coverage in textbooks (i.e., that of the early- to mid-1900s).

5. Data

5.1 Dependent variables

To examine canonical choices in the US field of modern art, I turn to two types of dependent variables and, particularly, how they pertain to a watershed exhibition, the 1913 Armory Show. To get at the "organizational base," I examine the number of exhibitions a given Armory artist enjoyed at the Museum of Modern Art from 1929 to 1968. I do so by tracking the almost 1,000 exhibitions during this time period. Given that I have already described the gathering of this data in Chapter One, I refer the reader there for additional detail. While the analysis of MoMA exhibitions in this chapter complements that of the previous chapter, it differs in the following ways: rather than tracking the likelihood of exhibition at MoMA (Chapter One), I consider here the extent of exhibition and, rather than consider simultaneously all exhibitions for the entire time period (as I did in Chapter One), I examine here those exhibitions in years that immediately precede or follow the publication of particular textbook editions. To get at the "critical community," I examine, from 1926 to 1970, the extent to which, an Armory artist is included within subsequent editions of two survey academic art history textbooks, *Gardner's Art through the Ages* and *Janson's History of Art*. For each edition of *Gardner's* and *Janson's*, I document the number of pages of textbook in which an

Armory artist is represented. Thus, rather than focus on the retrospective choices of art

history textbooks (Chapter One), I focus here on the contemporaneous choices that occur

as the discipline of art history took root in the United States.

In order to gauge the reciprocal influences of textbook and MoMA choices during

the opening decades of the 20th century, I only examine the editions and exhibitions that

occur prior to a given dependent variable. For example, when considering whether the

choices of a textbook edition (dependent variable) are influenced by previous choices of

MoMA (independent variable), I examine the cumulative impact of all previous MoMA

exhibitions—considering those from its 1929 opening until two years prior to the

publication of a given textbook. The two-year lag allows for the process of publishing a

large survey textbook, whereby choices for which artists to include and discuss in the

textbook most likely are made well before its actual printing and distribution. For

example, when the dependent variable is the number of pages devoted to various Armory

artists in the 1946 edition of *Gardner's,* I examine MoMA exhibitions from 1929 to 1944.

When considering how a given textbook influences the number of Armory artists

exhibited at MoMA, I only focus on a limited span of exhibitions—those that that occur

in the immediate aftermath of a given textbook edition and before the publication of its

next edition. This allows me to tap the distinct nature of textbook editions, with each one

offering a definitive account that can diverge from accounts in previous editions (see

Verboord and van Rees, 2009). For instance, when analyzing how the choices of a

previous textbook edition (e.g., the 1936 *Gardner's* as independent variable) influence the

subsequent choices of MoMA (dependent variable), I only examine MoMA exhibitions

from 1936 (the year of that *Gardener's* edition) to 1946 (the year of its next edition). In

such instances, the influence of the most recent prior textbooks edition is examined

without a time lag, as a textbook publication may have immediate effect on an exhibition,

since exhibitions do not usually face the lengthy editorial and publishing process that

survey textbooks do (Alexander, 1996).

Given that my dependent variables are all continuous (number of textbook pages

and number of exhibitions representing an Armory artist), I use OLS regression, a

commonly applied statistical technique for such variables.

5.2. Independent variables

Most of the independent variables for this chapter are described in detail in

Chapter One. Rather than duplicate that description, I summarize the independent

variables in Table 2-A. Table 2-A also lists the independent variables that are unique to

this chapter—those of previous exhibitions and previous textbook editions (see Section

5.1.).

[TABLE 2-A ABOUT HERE]

6. Results

6.1. Textbook and MoMA choices regarding Armory artists

Before turning to the analysis, it is first helpful to see the actual choices made by

the textbook authors and MoMA personnel, thereby seeing how Amory artists fared with

both the critical community and organizational base of this emergent field. The most

obvious difference between *Gardner's* and *Janson's* text is the number of Armory artists

and the consistency of their representation over time. As shown in Table 2-B, *Gardner's*

seems unable or unwilling to settle on a canon of Armory artists, and includes and

jettisons its 89 represented Armory artists frequently, with only 16 (or about 18%) artists

in all five editions from 1926 to 1969. In stark contrast, *Janson's* has a much reduced

canon of Armory artists compared with *Gardner's* text (see Table 2-C). There are only 35

Armory artists within *Janson's* first three editions from 1959 to 1969 (compared to the 70

artists in *Gardner's* comparable 1959 publication). However, of the 35 Armory artists

within *Janson's*, 31 (or about 89%) artists are represented in all three text editions from

1959 to 1969. Moreover, no artists are ejected from *Janson's* canon (at least from the

1959, 1962 and 1969 editions); rather, the 3rd text edition in 1969 is an expanded and

enlarged text, allowing the coverage of a few more Armory artists. Seemingly, then, the

late-comer *Janson's* has a firm idea of which Armory artists should be canonical, and

which are peripheral.

MoMA falls somewhere in between these two texts in regards to the solidity of its

canonical choices over time (see Table 2-D). Of the 127 Armory artists represented by

MoMA exhibition from 1929 to 1968, 55 (or 43%) artists are represented in each of the

four time periods of this research. Furthermore, the Museum and the texts tended to

agree on many Armory artists. Of the artists that were featured in the three editions of

Janson's, 100% were also exhibited at the MoMA from 1929 to 1968. This pattern is

similar for *Gardner's* text. Of the 89 artists in *Gardner's* five editions between 1926 and

1968, 85 (or approximately 96%) were included in MoMA exhibition, again, from 1929

to 1968. Interestingly, of those 31 artists featured in all three editions of *Janson's*, only

24 were exhibited in all four time periods for MoMA. Similarly, of the 16 artists

represented in all five of *Gardner's* text, only 11 are exhibited in all four time periods of

MoMA from 1929 to 1968. The two texts also tend to overlap—only one artist,

Raymond Decamp-Villon—was included in *Janson's* but not *Gardner's* texts, and only

one artist, Camille Pissarro, is featured in all five *Gardner's* editions, but not in all three

Janson's editions.

[TABLE 2-B ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 2-C ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 2-D ABOUT HERE]

6.2. Descriptive statistics

[TABLE 2-E ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 2-F ABOUT HERE]

Table 2-E and 2-F provide a summary of key characteristics of the Armory

Show's population. Having already discussed many of these in Chapter One, I note the

two new elements here, specifically, the number of pages garnered by Armory artists in

Gardner's and *Janson's* texts. Interestingly, the mean number of pages dedicated to an

Armory artist in *Gardner's* text is much higher than in *Janson's* (2.290 in *Gardner's*

compared to 1.680 in *Janson's*), though *Gardner's* includes more than double the number

of Armory artists (89 artists in *Gardner's* versus 35 artists in *Janson's*), though this may

be due to the limited number of *Janson's* texts (three editions from 1959 to 1969) in

comparison to *Gardner's* (five editions from 1926 to 1970). Though the breadth of

coverage is dissimilar, *Gardner's* and *Janson's* text do overlap regarding the artists

represented (note the high correlation of .838 in Table 2-F).   Regarding MoMA

exhibition, *Janson's* canonical choices overlap more with MoMA's solo and group

exhibition choices (.683 and .553 respectively) than does *Gardner's* text (.515 and .469

respectively), though *Gardner's* overlaps a bit more with MoMA's general exhibition

choices than does *Janson's* (a correlation of .679 for *Gardner's* versus .660 for *Janson's*).

6.3. Canonical choices by Gardner's Art through the Ages

The 1926 edition of *Gardner's Art through the Ages* marks the work's first of 13

subsequent editions (see also Chapter Three). Published thirteen years after the Armory

Show and three years prior to the opening of MoMA, *Gardner's* textbook was an

important development in the U.S.'s emergent field of modern art. Previous evaluations

in Europe, and at the Armory show itself, would likely be taken into account by Helen

Gardner, especially given the limited development of art history in the US. In other

words, prior reputational judgments were probably seriously considered by her, as the

record of what past others have upheld as art usually helps to define future reputations

(de Duve, 2006). This is indeed the case for her 1926 text edition. As show in Table 2-

G, both posthumous exhibition at the Armory Show and the number of works an artist

displayed at the Armory Show are significant predictors of heightened coverage (i.e.,

more pages) in *Gardner's* first textbook. While each additional work an artist displayed

at the Armory Show only increases an artist's coverage incrementally (.01 pages), artists

that were posthumously exhibited at the Armory increased their coverage within

Gardner's textbook by about one page. Both of these factors indicate the importance of

an artist's (long-standing) professional presence prior to 1913, when the Armory Show

introduced most Americans to the modern art that was already percolating in Europe. In

fact, artists of European birth have a significantly greater extent of coverage within her textbook, increasing their representation by .15 pages. Thus, Gardner was apparently relying on such previous evaluations when doling out pages to particular Armory artists. Surprisingly, however, exhibition success in Europe prior to 1913 has a negative effect on textbook representation, decreasing an artist's coverage by .2 pages. This model accounts for 26% of the variance of coverage by *Gardner's* textbook, and only gender does not achieve significance as a predictor in this and all subsequent editions (see also Chapter Three).

[TABLE 2-G ABOUT HERE]

Although *Gardner's* 1926 textbook did not influence which of the Armory artists MoMA choose to exhibit (see Section 6.4), this was certainly not true in the reverse. That is, *Gardner's* 1936 edition—the second edition and still written by Helen Gardner— shows the influence of MoMA exhibitions. As the second column in Table 2-G reveals, MoMA exhibition of Armory artists from 1929 to 1934 (again, allowing a two year lag for the process of textbook publication) significantly predicts the coverage of Armory artists in *Gardner's* 1936 edition—be it general, group or solo exhibition. Interestingly, while each additional solo and general exhibition of Armory artists increases their presence in *Gardner's* work by .6 and .2 pages respectively, each additional group exhibition increases 1936 textbook representation by almost a full two pages. While looking to the burgeoning Museum for reference as to who belonged in the early modern art canon, Gardner also relied on some—but not all—evaluations that preceded or occurred at the Armory Show. Posthumous exhibition at the Armory Show is again significant and increases textbook coverage by almost one page. However, European

success prior to the 1913 watershed show remains negative, as it did for the first edition, decreasing textbook representation of Armory artists by .29 pages. Notably, European birth is no longer a significant factor for coverage in *Gardner's* 1936 textbook. This model accounts for almost 50% of the variance of coverage in the 1936 edition—almost double that of the model for *Gardner's* 1926 edition, and suggestive of MoMA's impact. In fact, that impact holds in all the remaining models.

Gardner's 1948 textbook, the third edition and the last to be written by the original author Helen Gardner, is particularly interesting in light of factors that prove insignificant in predicting coverage of Armory artists. As shown in the third column of Table 2-G, an artist's European birth and prior success in Europe before 1913 are, for the first time, both insignificant factors regarding representation in *Gardner's* new edition. This could indicate the rise of an American presence in modern art that rivals that of European artists, something suggested in Section 4.2. Meanwhile, only two types of factors remain significant in this model: those artists that were established enough to be exhibited posthumously at the Armory Show and MoMA's previous selection of Armory artists. Posthumous exhibition continues to increase an artist's incorporation in *Gardner's* textbook by about one page (.8) in the 1948 textbook. Each solo exhibition garnered previously increases an artist's textbook representation by 1.3 pages, while each group exhibition increases textbook coverage by almost two pages (1.7). However, each general exhibition only increases exposure fractionally (.1). Nonetheless, all MoMA exhibitions (solo, group and general) from 1929 to 1946, as well as posthumous exhibition at the Armory Show, are significant at the .01 level and the model explains 62% of the variance in *Gardner's* 1948 selection of Armory artists.

The 1959 edition of *Gardner's Art through the Ages* is the fourth installment and the first to be written by an editorial board (Sumner McKay Crosby and the Yale Department of the History of Art), rather than the original author Helen Gardner. The textbook's new leadership had a slightly different approach in selecting Armory artists than demonstrated by the previous three textbook editions. As shown in the fourth column of Table 2-G, posthumous exhibition at the Armory Show, while always a significant factor for editions of this textbook, becomes one of the most important factors regarding amount of textbook representation, increasing coverage by almost three pages. For the first time since the 1926 vanguard edition, the number of works an artist displayed at the Armory Show is also a significant factor, although it increases textbook exposure by only .04 pages per artwork displayed. An artist's recognition through solo and general MoMA exhibitions (from 1929 to 1957) remains a significant predictor of coverage, increasing textbook attention by .95 for solo and .12 pages for general exhibition. Interestingly, for the only time in this table, group exhibition is no longer a significant predictor of coverage in *Gardner's*. This is an interesting change for *Gardner's* textbook. Rather than completely converging with MoMA choices regarding the modern art canon, *Gardner's* 1959 edition seems to be subtly re-examining some of the textbook's canonical choices in regards to Armory artists. This re-examination may also be indicated by this model's lower R-square statistic. While the model for the 1948 edition explained 62% of the variance in textbook coverage of Armory artists, the model for *Gardner's* 1959 edition explains 49% of this variance.

The final edition of *Gardner's* considered here was published in 1970. The intervening decade was game-changing for *Gardner's* textbook. Though for the middle

third of the twentieth century *Gardner's Art through the Ages* was the principal survey

textbook for university art history classes in the US, Janson's 1959 and 1962 textbooks

effectively eclipsed *Gardner's* dominance of the US art history textbook market (Jaffee,

2007). Perhaps not surprisingly, then, *Gardner's* 1970 edition changes in ways that

converge with Janson's textbook in regards to selection of Armory artists for modern art

canon. The same factors that influence Janson's 1962 selection of the canon of Armory

artists now also influence *Gardner's* (see Section 6.5). As the final column in Table 2-G

shows, unlike most previous editions of *Gardner's*, European birth emerges as a

significant predictor for coverage in the 1970 edition, increasing an Armory artist's

representation by .34 pages. The number of works exhibited at the Armory Show,

however, is now no longer a significant predictor. These two changes in *Gardner's*

perhaps indicate that while historical judgments of American Armory artists once were an

important factor in *Gardner's* construction of the canon, this is no longer the case.

Rather, *Gardner's* choices (canon) are converging with *Janson's* in suggesting that the

important Armory artists are European (see Section 6.5). Similar to *Janson's* 1959 and

1962 editions, *Gardner's* is once again converging closely with MoMA's choices for

Armory artist exhibition. For each solo and group exhibition an Armory artists

previously receives at the MoMA, his or her textbook representation in 1970 *Gardner's*

increases by a half of a page (.5), and about a quarter of a page (.03) for each general

exhibition. Posthumous recognition at the Armory Show is also important, as this factor

increases textbook representation in *Gardner's* by 1.4 pages. This model accounts for

48% of the variance in *Gardner's* 1970 textbook coverage — marking its lowest level in

this table following MoMA's emergence.

6.4. Canonical choices by the Museum of Modern Art

[TABLE 2-G ABOUT HERE]

Between the publication of *Gardner's* first and second textbook editions, the Museum of Modern Art opened in 1929. This represented another pivotal moment in the emergent field of modern art, providing the US with an organizational base that extolled and made available this new type of visual arts. As I noted above, those making choices in this emergent field could rely on two forms of judgment—those that had occurred some time ago in European exhibitions of modern art (prior to 1913) and those that occurred at the Armory Show itself in 1913, with the latter involving attention to particular artists via posthumous exhibition and extensive exhibition (i.e., the number of works at the Armory). The measures used in this study thus capture early evaluations for a burgeoning art form. In her opening textbook, Gardner favored previous evaluations on both sides of the Atlantic, giving significantly more pages to established artists from both European exhibitions and the US Armory Show. In contrast, during its first six years, from 1929 to 1935, MoMA exhibitions focused on those Armory artists from the European art world.

As shown in the first column of Table 2-H, only European birth and success in European exhibitions prior to the 1913 Armory Show are significant predictors, each increasing an artist's representation by almost one exhibition (.8 and .9 exhibition, respectively). Just as U.S. orchestras in the emergent field of classical music turned their attention overwhelmingly to European creators, so too did MoMA (see Dowd, forthcoming). Regarding gender, male artists have no significant advantage over female

artists in this first time period. One way to understand this finding is that women are not yet "edged out" of exhibitions in this emergent field (see Schmutz, 2009; Tuchman and Fortin, 1984). Of particular note in model 1, *Gardner's* 1926 textbook is not a significant factor in shaping MoMA exhibitions. In other words, those Armory artists covered extensively by this survey textbook were not given extensive attention at MoMA during these early years. This indicates that *Gardner's* textbook—despite its widespread use and popularity in US academic institutions at this time (see Jaffee, 2007)—was not a resource guiding the newly established museum. This model, in which the critical community has no impact on an organizational base, captured 10% of the variance in MoMA exhibition, representing the lowest value in Table 2-H.

The next approximate decade of MoMA exhibitions, from 1936 to 1947, are slightly, yet interestingly, different from those of the preceding years (see the second column of Table 2-H). Notably, MoMA choices are somewhat, but not completely, moving away from Armory artists associated with the European art world. European birth is no longer a significant predictor of Armory artists receiving heightened attention at MoMA exhibitions from 1936 to 1947. That said, success in Europe prior to the 1913 Armory Show remains a significant factor for coverage, increasing an artist's representation in MoMA by approximately one exhibition. In contrast to the previous time period, gender is now a significant predictor of exhibition numbers, with male artists having more than female artists. That is, as the field becomes more established in terms of its age, we see women at a disadvantage; however, this possible "edging out" occurs only in this time period and in none of the others in Table 2-H. Thus, this time period

(1936 to 1947) is crucial in regard to gender differences.[8] Another difference appears between model 1 and 2: each added page in *Gardner's* 1936 edition increases an artist's MoMA exposure between 1936 and 1947 by almost one exhibition (.986). This finding represents an interesting development in the emergent field. Whereas the first edition of *Gardner's* has no significant impact on the exhibitions choices of MoMA, the choices made by MoMA in its early years have a significant impact on *Gardner's* second edition (see, respectively, column 1 in Table 2-H and column 2 in Table 2-G). This indicates somewhat of a disconnect between the critical community and organizational base, with the latter having the sole influence. However, as column 2 of Table 2-H demonstrates, that disconnect has now gone away. In the remaining years, we now see a reciprocal influence, with MoMA exhibitions shaping subsequent editions of *Gardner's*, and each edition of this textbook likewise shaping subsequent MoMA exhibitions (see Tables 2-G and 2-H). With this reciprocal influence now established, model 2 explains almost twice the variance than does the previous model for the museum (columns 1 and 2 of Table 2-H). Nonetheless, it only accounts for about 19% of the variance in the Museum's exhibition coverage of Armory artists.

In the period following World War II, the attention that MoMA gives to the European art world is still in flux. Unlike the previous decade, in the post-WWII decade, Armory artists of European birth are now also significantly favored in MoMA exhibitions, increasing MoMA coverage by approximately one exhibition. Another difference is that success in Europe prior to 1913 no longer influences exhibition numbers. Thus, MoMA choices are still made with an eye towards Europe, but more

---

[8] For an in-depth discussion of the effect of gender in MoMA exhibitions from 1936 to 1947, see Section 7.

likely towards recent developments than those of the early 20th-century. The flourishing

of Abstract Expressionism, which occurred in the US and involved artists from both sides

of the Atlantic, could well account for the flux shown between the two decades (see

Crane, 1987). Meanwhile, the reciprocal influence continues in this decade: each

additional page in *Gardner's* 1948 edition increases an Armory artist's museum coverage

by about one exhibition. This reciprocal influence may also be growing, as this model

explains 21% of the variance in the Museum's exhibition choices (versus the 19% of the

previous decade).

The remaining columns in Table 2-H address a particularly interesting 10 years—

when two textbooks are competing for readers while offering their respective critical

commentary on artists in the field of modern art. To disentangle the distinct influences

that *Gardner's* and *Janson's* texts have on MoMA exhibition of this decade, I break down

MoMA's exhibitions to capture the publication, on the one hand, of *Gardner's* 1959

edition and, on the other hand, of *Janson's* 1959 and 1962 editions. Across these three

columns one thing is clear: choices for MoMA exhibitions have moved away from

previous evaluations associated with Europe prior to 1913 and with the early Armory

Show, thus suggesting a contemporary orientation on the part of the Museum. This is

evident in that most variables associated with those previous evaluations are insignificant,

with the one exception being the negative impact of posthumous exhibition in the fourth

column (1959-1968). The fourth column in Table 2-H considers the influence of

Gardner's 1959 textbook on MoMA exhibitions. For every two pages of textbook an

Armory artist receives in that edition, an artist garners one extra MoMA exhibition.

Interestingly, posthumous exhibition at the Armory Show is the only other factor to

achieve significance in this model, decreasing an artist's chances for recognition at MoMA by 1.3 exhibitions from 1959 to 1968. This model accounts for 23% of the variance in MoMA exhibition of Armory artists—the highest level associated with *Gardner's* text. Based upon such R-squares, it may be the case that *Gardner's* choices have increasingly greater sway with the choices of MoMA officials (see columns 1 through 4).

Columns 5 and 6 in Table 2-H address the influence of *Janson's* two editions (one published in 1959 and the other published in 1962) on MoMA exhibitions. As when considering the impact of *Gardner's* fourth edition on MoMA exhibition from 1959 to 1968, previous evaluations from pre-1913 Europe and the Amory Show have little impact on the choices of MoMA. In fact, none of the measures gauging those previous evaluations attain significance in either the period from 1959 to 1961 (representing *Janson's* first edition) or from 1962 to 1968 (representing *Janson's* second edition). From 1959 to 1961, only the influence of *Janson's* 1959 edition is a significant variable for the model, increasing the likelihood of MoMA recognition by .27 exhibitions per page. Meanwhile, from 1962 to 1968, only the influence of *Janson's* 1962 textbook is significant, increasing MoMA exposure by .14 exhibitions per page of text. The model examining *Janson's* first edition explains only 13% of variance in MoMA exhibition of Armory artists from 1959 to 1961, while the model including *Janson's* 1962 textbook explains only 11% of the variance in Armory artist's incorporation into MoMA exhibitions from 1963 to 1968. In light of these R-square levels, it appears that *Janson's* influence is less than that of *Gardner's*.

6.5. Canonical choices by Janson's History of Art

[TABLE 2-I ABOUT HERE]

By the time that *Janson's* first text appeared in 1959, the US field of modern art had taken root.[9] One purveyor of the field's legitimating ideology—*Gardner's* influential textbook—had been available since 1926, and was already on its third edition by 1959. The field's organizational base solidified in 1929, with the founding of the Museum of Modern Art. To varying degrees, both of these entities looked to evaluations from 1913 and earlier when choosing which Armory artists to emphasize; however, that tendency grew less pronounced for MoMA across the early decades (see Tables 2-G and 2-H). As Table 2-I reveals, only one type of previous evaluation significantly matters for *Janson's* editions. Those artists who exhibited posthumously at the Armory Show consistently receive significantly more pages in the first three editions of *Janson's*. In *Janson's* first text (again, a visual survey), posthumous exhibition at the watershed Armory Show afforded artists approximately .95 more pages of *Janson's* text. However, as the text expanded with the 1962 and 1969 editions, those artists with enough clout to garner exhibition at the 1913 Armory Show posthumously, gained 3.347 and 3.164 pages of text, respectively.

In contrast, "prior European success," "born in Europe" and "number of works at Armory" are each consistently insignificant predictors regarding the number of pages that Armory artist receive in *Janson's*. In this way, the textbook resembles *Gardner's* by routinely heeding those Armory artists who benefitted from "memory-work" that kept

---

[9] *Janson's* 1959 textbook edition is not a textbook *per se*, but rather a book of plates intended as a study aid. Based on the positive reception to this initial project, the Jansons released a full textbook three years later in 1962—with 8 more editions to follow from 1969 to 2009 (Jaffee, 2007; Sorensen, 2000; also see Section 4.1 and Chapter Three).

alive their artistic contributions in 1913 (see Table 2-G), but it diverges from *Gardner's* (and MoMA) by not emphasizing Armory artists who were European born or with European successes. *Janson's* editions also converge with those of *Gardner's* in that gender does not play a role regarding which Amory artists receive extensive attention. Be it in 1959, 1962 or 1969, male Armory artists do not receive significantly more pages in *Janson's* than do Armory women.

While it took some time for *Gardner's* choices to influence those of MoMA's, the previous section shows that *Janson's* text enjoyed that influence from the outset (see Table 2-I). The question remains, however, whether previous MoMA choices influence the subsequent choices of *Janson's*. All the models in Table 2-I show the considerable impact of previous MoMA exhibitions. Each solo exhibition acquired by an Armory artist increases representation in *Janson's* textbook by .942 pages (1959 edition), 2.29 pages (1962) and 3.45 pages (1969). Group exhibitions show a similar pattern—both in terms of significance and rising page numbers. Considering previous MoMA exposure, each group exhibition raises Armory artists' pages in *Janson's* by .317 (1959), 1.19 (1962) and 3.45 (1969). Meanwhile general exhibitions also have significant influence on textbook coverage of Armory artists, but yield fewer pages per exhibit than do solo and group — .183 pages (1959), .414 pages (1962) and .376 pages (1969). As is the case for *Gardner's* editions that follow MoMA's emergence in 1929 (see Table 2-G), the models addressing *Janson's* attention to Armory artists explain a healthy amount of the variance, ranging from 49% in 1969 to 58% in 1959 and 1962.

7. Conclusions and discussion

Cultural classifications such as "high culture" have not always existed, but are rather recent creations that achieved prevalence only during the turn of the 20th century in the United States (DiMaggio, 1982). DiMaggio locates these cultural classifications in broader "fields" that contain such important actors as the creators themselves, as well as the critical community, which generates a legitimating ideology to distinguish certain creators and justify why they deserve particular attention, and cultural organizations that uphold classifications by bringing distinguished artworks and artists to the attention of the broader public, i.e., the audience. For DiMaggio, these cultural classifications have experienced change in three distinct periods: the turn of the 20th century when hierarchal distinctions in the orchestral and visual arts fields were established within donor-controlled, non-profit organizations (DiMaggio, 1982); the national diffusion of the non-profit form and high culture ideology to other fields, such as opera, theater and ballet, by the 1940s (DiMaggio, 1992); and, finally, the decline of the high culture organization from the 1960s onward, as elites increasingly reject aesthetic distinctions (DiMaggio, 1991; DiMaggio and Mukhtar, 2004).

However, as DiMaggio (2009) has recently acknowledged, movement in high culture fields is better understood as on-going, rather than occasional. Yet, capturing field movement is difficult as fields are composed of a variety of distinct players and organizations that are constantly building, repositioning and developing their field. For example, research trying to understand a field's legitimating ideology must contend with the sheer amount of critical discourse constantly being created, let alone the impact such discourse has on a field's organizational base (Janssen, 2001; Janssen, Kuipers and Verboord, 2008). In this research, I attempt to circumvent these complications by

focusing on important representatives of each broad type of field actor. For creative producers, I examine, not all modern artists, but those "first-movers" introduced to the US through the 1913 Armory Show. Similarly, for critical community, I focus, not on all scholars and critics, but on the first textbooks that surveyed the field, *Gardner's* and, its first competitor, *Janson's*. For the field's organizational base, I examine not all museums, but rather a preeminent "first-mover," the Museum of Modern Art. These "first-movers" were particularly crucial as they were established when art history was emerging as the dominant discipline in the study and understanding of art and, thus, they served to shape both the discipline and the modern art canon.

The canon, however, is not a fixed judgment, but rather a product of continuous interaction between past and present. Aesthetic value is always assessed through contemporary eyes, but contemporary vision can also look to assessments from the past, as well as from other locations. The Armory Show of 1913 did not emerge in a vacuum. Modern art was already flourishing in Europe, with artists from there and beyond enjoying recognition in notable exhibitions of modern art. The Armory Show's organizers also made their own choices and assessments, as seen in the posthumous exhibition of specific older artists (see Chapter One) and the amount of space given to the representation of some artists over others. Consequently, in the United States, those working in the emerging field of modern art could draw upon evaluations from either side of the Atlantic, as did the "first-movers" in the critical community and organizational base. However, these actors also drew upon each other's assessments. In other words, actors within the emerging field of modern art looked to and were influenced by distinct others within their field. In understanding the dynamisms of fields, some research

focuses on the critical community (Janssen, 2001; Janssen, Kuipers and Verboord, 2008; Schmutz, 2009) and others focus on the organizational base (Dowd and Kelly, forthcoming; Dowd et al., 2002), however, this research attempts to understand modern art's emerging field through the reciprocal and unfolding influences of the field actors on each other.

This chapter demonstrates such reciprocal influences, but also shows that they did not emerge full-blown into the field. At the time of the MoMA's opening in 1929, *Gardner's* 1926 edition was an established and well-respected academic art history textbook. However, *Gardner's* choices for the 1926 edition did not correspond with those of MoMA when deciding which of the Armory artists to highlight during those crucial first years of this nascent museum. Instead, the influence initially flowed in one direction. All MoMA exhibitions from 1929 to 1934—be they solo, group or general— are significant predictors for choices made in the *Gardner's* 1936 edition (i.e., those Armory artists receiving numerous exhibitions at MoMA tend to receive more pages in the textbook). MoMA's influence is illustrated by simply examining the raw numbers: *Gardner's* 1926 edition included 23 Armory artists, while *Gardner's* 1936 edition, published 7 years after the opening of the MoMA, included 76 Armory artists. Moreover, the overlap in represented artists between *Gardner's* 1926 textbook and MoMA exhibitions from 1929 to 1934 is 65%, while the overlap between *Gardner's* 1936 edition and MoMA exhibition 1929 to 1934 is 83%.

While such influence seems to be one-way early on, this is not the case forever. Rather, *Gardner's* and the Museum's canonical choices begin to overlap as the modern art field becomes more established. Choices of which Armory artists are included in

Gardner's editions subsequently influence choices in MoMA exhibitions, and visa versa. Furthermore, the next textbook to rise to prominence, *Janson's History of Art*, already demonstrates a reciprocal influence. That is, *Janson's* does not have the initial disconnect that the first edition of *Gardner's* text had with the MoMA's canonical selections. As noted earlier, of the artists that were featured in the three editions of *Janson's* text, 100% were also exhibited at the MoMA from 1929 to 1968.

Traditionally, textbooks are considered predominant institutions, where the artistic canon is solidified and disseminated (Verboord and van Rees, 2009). It is believed that within textbooks, artists are chosen as the most important representatives of their field and thus deserving to be included in the collective memory (Bevers, 2005; Dowd, et. al, 2002). However, this research suggests that art history texts communicate a canon that is influenced by other cultural organizations, i.e., an important museum, the Museum of Modern Art. This finding is further supported by my previous chapter, where MoMA worked as a preliminary gatekeeper for textbooks, serving to filter women artists out of the contemporary canon.

Canonical choices are also influenced by the attributes of the artists themselves. For example, those artists born in Europe are more likely to achieve coverage in both textbooks and MoMA exhibitions during certain periods of time. Another individual factor examined in this research, gender, also has an effect, but less pronounced. This may be because of the lack of women artists represented in both textbooks and MoMA exhibitions: only 2 women are represented in any of *Gardner's* five editions from 1926 to 1970, zero in *Janson's* first three editions from 1959 to 1969 and six in MoMA exhibitions from 1929 to 1968. Despite such small numbers, this research does find some

subtle effects regarding gender that make sense particularly when paired with the findings

from Chapter One. In my last chapter, I found that gender did not matter for inclusion in

contemporary textbooks, but was a factor for representation in early MoMA exhibits,

where women were significantly less likely to attain Museum recognition. This finding is

particularly important given that a main factor for inclusion in today's textbooks is prior

MoMA exhibition. Thus, I concluded in Chapter One that MoMA worked as an early

gatekeeper in the modern art field, effectively excluding women Armory artists from

recognition in the artistic canon almost a century later. In this chapter, I actually locate

the time period where the women are ousted from MoMA. Much like previous research

on gender and field development (see Schmutz, 2009; Schmutz and Faupel, 2010;

Tuchmin and Fortin, 1988), in this chapter, I find that women Armory artists are a part of

the early modern art field. Gender does not seem to affect early coverage by either

Gardner's (from 1926 to 1970) or *Janson's* (from 1959 to 1969) text. However, as the

modern art field becomes more established within high culture, I find evidence of MoMA

filtering or "edging out" (Tuchmin and Fortin, 1988) female Armory artists (see column

two, Table 2-H). This filtering process only lasts for a short, but decisive, period of time:

from 1936 to 1947 (interestingly, this period follows the Great Depression and extends

slightly beyond the end of WWII, a time when women were a growing presence in the

US work force). This "edging out" period is later in modern art's field development, with

MoMA opening in 1929 and *Gardner's* first text published in 1926, indicating that

women Armory artists were only jettisoned from the canon after the modern art field had

a chance to establish itself as part of high culture and, thus, may have felt the need to

represent only serious (male) artists.

While gender's effect is subtle and discrete, the effect of being posthumously exhibited at the Armory Show is large and extensive. In every textbook edition, those Armory artists that had died prior to 1913 were significantly more likely to be emphasized. This finding fits well with previous research. Lang and Lang (1988) found that artists who die with living advocates in-place, such as family members, have a better chance at simply enduring through time than those who die without leaving anyone behind. Being exhibited posthumously at an important international exhibition such as the Armory Show indicates the presence of a highly effective advocate for these artists. Moreover, once an artist has endured past a certain period, it becomes difficult to remove them from the cultural canon (Dowd and Kelly, forthcoming). In other words, after an extended time period, long deceased artists may be considered "traditional" or "classic" representations of the field (see Craig and DuBois, 2010). Interestingly, however, though posthumous Armory exhibition has a positive effect on textbook coverage, it has little effect on MoMA exhibition, except at one key period. Between 1959 and 1968 only, posthumous Armory exhibition *negatively* affects an artist's MoMA exhibition. This finding may indicate that such artists are becoming too traditional for MoMA, a museum that was founded for the display and support of the avant-garde. Age would not be a concern for textbooks, however, as their goal is to represent important artists through history.

The final artist attributes I want to discuss revolve around the importance of nationality within the art historical narrative for modern art. The current prevailing understanding with regards to modern art history is as follows: it is predominately European art—particularly, French modern art—that became the model of modern art for

Western culture (for example, see Hemingway, 2009). This perceived historical geography of cultural resources includes the robust belief that, prior to 1945, American artists have had, at best, marginal place in the artistic canon (Hemmingway, 2009). Yet this chapter indicates that while the Euro-centric narrative is strong within US art history, its influence has not been consistent over the course of the early- to mid-20th century. Furthermore, the marginality of US early modern artists (again, those Armory artists working pre-1945) has not been a uniform understanding during the development of the modern art canon in the US. Rather, this chapter indicates that within a period that DiMaggio (e.g., 1991, 1992) details as involving the substantial diffusion and widespread acceptance of high culture in the US, from the 1920s up to the 1960s, we see different readings, inclusions and exclusions from the US's art historical canon, showing the flux that occurs within a given period.

In the early third of the 20th-century, both *Gardner's* textbook and the Museum of Modern Art habitually featured artists of European birth rather than US born artists. Such Europhilia underlies most of the dominant traditional narratives of this time. For instance, in Charles Caffin's *The Story of American Painting*, France is identified as the "main source of influence, as well for American painting as for that of other countries" (Caffin, 1907: 121). Caffin further argues—as do many cultural authorities of this time (for example, Cox, 1905)—that modern culture is international and that local or national canons are passé within the "centripetal force of modern times" (Caffin, 1907: 21).

However, by the 1930s, several landmark events changed the landscape of the US art world, including the establishment of art history as the primary ideology by which art is assessed and valued. The 1913 Armory Show introduced the modern art movement not

only to the general public, but also to a new generation of art scholars and important US patrons (as detailed earlier in this work). Furthermore, the Museum of Modern Art opened in 1929 as the US's premier museum dedicated to the modernist aesthetic. Buoyed by both economic ascendancy and an increasingly decisive role in international affairs post World War I, a new belief in the ability of domestic modern artists flourished in the US. Though Suzanne La Follette's 1929 *Art in America* critiqued 19th-century American art as "too much absorbed in its own material development to make more than perfunctory obeisance before the shrine of art," she nevertheless saw the early 20th-century as a period of "revival" for American artists (La Follette, 1929: 111). Indeed, by the 1930s, scholars such as Lloyd Goodrich and Virgil Barker were eschewing the traditional narrative of France as the modern art model and offering a new perspective on American early modern artists. For Barker (1934: 785), the 1913 Armory Show was important as an incitement for American artists to move from the "shallow colonialism of imitating the Parisian modernists to the traditionalism of discovering the whole of art."

This ongoing reappraisal of American art and artists during the early 1900s resonated with the choices made by key actors in the emergent field of modern art. During this time, as seen in the results above, European birth is no longer a significant factor for an Armory artist's inclusion within MoMA exhibitions or *Gardner's* textbook. In fact, approximately 1/3 of the Armory artists featured in *Gardner's* 1936 edition are US born artists (24 artists out of 76). This number is even more impressive when considering that in the previous 1926 edition, only three US born Armory artists were included in the textbook (out of the 23 included Armory artists or 1/8 of the represented artists).

Moving past World War II, for *Gardner's* textbook, as well as MoMA exhibition, European birth remains an insignificant factor for recognition, while US born artists continue to receive increasing consideration. In *Gardner's* 1948 edition, 26 out of 76 Armory artists represented are American born. Of those Armory artists recognized in the 1959 edition of *Gardner's*, 20 out of 70 artists are from the United States. These findings gel with the reassessment of the importance of American artists, as well as the history of the American art tradition, that was occurring in the US art world during this period. A prominent example is Edgar Richardson's work, including the 1954 establishment of the Archives of American Art (later acquired by the Smithsonian, see www.aaa.si.edu) and his 1956 publication *Painting in America: The Story of 450 Years*, a title that clearly asserts a significant tradition of American art (Richardson, 1956). Not only was art historical scholarship advocating US born artists, but politics was also calling for a nationalistic canon. In 1949, Representative George A. Dondero of Michigan delivered an anti-communist speech to the House of Representatives critiquing those who fostered a Euro-centric viewpoint as encouraging "international art thugs" set on destroying American art and principles (Dondero, 1949a, 1949b).

In the post-WWII years, "contemporary" replaces "modern," and this new artistic movement is dominated by US artists—most notably the abstract expressionists and, in the 1950s, the pop artists (Crane, 1987). By the 1960s, then, modern artists of the US were asserting their international centrality. Yet, almost counter-intuitively, the rise to prominence of *contemporary* US artists did not increase the status of their modern art predecessors, i.e., the US-born Armory artists. Rather, by the 1960s, the trend of reassessing and promoting American modern artists severely waned. To foreshadow

somewhat Chapter Three, with its focus on later editions of the two textbooks, there is a

strikingly downward trend. In the 1970 edition of *Gardner's*, every US born Armory

artist is removed from the textbook. In fact, in the next eight editions of *Gardner's*

textbook, from 1975 to 2009, never again did American Armory artists receive such high

proportions of representation as they did in three editions between 1936 and 1959. The

jettisoning of American Armory artists from the art historical narrative is echoed in other

important US art history textbooks, such as *Janson's History of Art,* through to such

recently established textbooks as *Stokstad's Art History* and *Hartt's Art*, which, at best,

represent less than half of those US Armory artists included in *Gardner's* 1936, 1948 and

1959 editions.

Why the change, particularly when the US modern artists' star was finally on the

rise? Perhaps with the increased US international presence, both politically and

artistically, the critical community in the US had a difficult time drawing a coherent

narrative between American art pre- and post-1945—where the former were praised

nationally, but the latter internationally. This tension is well-represented in the Museum

of Modern Art's attempt to reconcile the accomplishments of American art pre-WWII

with those of abstract expressionism in the exhibition "The Natural Paradise: Painting in

America, 1800-1950." Writing on the success, or perhaps lack thereof, of the MoMA's

exhibition, Alan Wallach critiqued that "'The Natural Paradise' demonstrated—if

demonstration is still required—that the idea of 'Americanness,' with its chauvinist

pretensions, mystical overtones and inherent methodological circularity, is worthless as a

tool of serious art historical or critical inquiry" (Wallach, 1977: 34). At this point in art

history, then, the US born modern artists represented by the Armory Show were

considered almost completely historically irrelevant.

Critiques similar to Wallach's (above) reveal that the curatorial choices made by MoMA, as well as those made by textbook authors and editors, are not merely documenting the history of modern art in the United States, but those choices are also part of the making of this art history. As the Armory Show evinced the potential for an American field of modern art, the rise of a critical community with a legitimating ideology (e.g., art history textbooks) and an organizational base (e.g., MoMA) translated that potential into actuality. These two types of organizations, academia and museums, made choices about which Armory artists to celebrate, thereby making and re-making the measuring stick that is the field's canon. However, these organizations did not make such choices in isolation. Rather, their choices influenced each other. This chapter finds that in the beginning the Museum held sway, but then a reciprocal influence developed between MoMA and *Gardner's,* initially, and then *Janson's* text later.

By heeding these choices, this chapter has demonstrated the dynamic nature of canonization in the early field of modern art. Yet, by focusing on such organizational choices, this research has approached the canon in terms of celebrated artists, rather than the actual talk and debate regarding those artists. In that regard, this research is similar to that of Dowd (forthcoming; Dowd et al., 2002) and Janssen (2001, Janssen, Kuiper and Verboord, 2008). Other excellent work has examined critical discourse, such as Schmutz and Faupel (2010) and Baumann (2001). This is one limitation to this chapter. However, I attempt to address this weakness to some extent in my next chapter by heeding which artists the curatorial hand places together at MoMA. This third chapter does not so much emphasize the actual discourse behind canonization, but rather the "schools" of art that

such curatorial groupings suggests (such an approach has been used for concert music, see Gilmore, 1988).

References for Chapter Two

Accominotti, F., 2009. Creativity from interaction: artistic movements and the creativity of modern painters. Poetics 37, 267-294.

Alexander, V., 1996. Museums and Money: The Impact of Funding on Exhibitions, Scholarship and Management. Indiana University Press, Indianapolis, IN.

Allen, H., 1971. Helen Gardner. In: James, E., James, J., Boyer, P. (Eds.), Notable American Women, 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 13-15

Allen, M., Lincoln, A., 2004. Critical discourse and the cultural consecration of American films. *Social Forces* 82, 871-894.

Barker, V., 1934. The search for Americanism. American Magazine of Art 2, 759-790.

Baumann, S., 2001. Intellectualization and art world development: film in the United States. American Sociological Review 66, 404-426.

Baumann, S., 2007. A general theory of artistic legitimation: how art worlds are like

social movements. Poetics 35, 47-65.

Berghman, M., van Eijck, K., 2009. Visual arts appreciation patterns: crossing horizontal and vertical boundaries within the cultural hierarchy. Poetics 37, 348-365.

Berkers, P., 2009. Ethnic boundaries in national literary histories: classification of ethnic minority fiction authors in American, Dutch and German anthologies and literary history books. Poetics 37, 419-478.

Bevers, T., 2005. Cultural education and the canon: a comparative analysis of the content of secondary school exams for music and art in England, France, Germany and the Netherlands, 1990-2004. Poetics 33, 388-416.

Blau, J., 1995. Art museums. In: Carroll, G.R., Hannan, M.T. (Eds.), Organizations in Industry: Strategy, Structure, Selection. Oxford University Press, New York, 87-114.

Bruder, K.A., Ucok, O., 2000. Interactive art interpretation: how viewers make sense of paintings in conversation. Symbolic Interaction 23, 337-358.

Brush, K., 2002. Marburg, Harvard, and purpose-built architecture for art history, 1927. In: Mansfield, E. (Ed.), Art History and Its Institutions: Foundations of a discipline. Routledge, New York, 65-84.

Brzyski, A., 2007. Introduction: canons and art history. In: Brzyski, A. (Ed.), Partisan Canons. Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 1-26.

Caffin, C., 1907. The Story of American Painting. Frederick Stokes Company, New York.

Corse, S., 1995. Nations and novels: cultural politics and literary use. Social Forces 73, 1279-1308.

Corse, S., Griffin, M., 1997. Cultural valorization and African American literary history: reconstructing the canon. *Sociological Forum* 12, 173-203.

Cox, K., 1905. Old Masters and New: Essays in Art Criticism. Duffield, New York.

Craig, A., Dubois, S., 2010. Between art and money: the social space of public readings in contemporary poetry economies and careers. Poetics 38, 441-460.

Crane, D., 1987. The Transformation of the Avant-Garde: The New York Art World, 1940-1985. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

de Duve, T., 2006. Rediscovering aesthetics conference held July 11, 2004, University College Cork. In: Elkins, J. (Ed.), Art History versus Aesthetics. Routledge, New York, 52-89.

DeNora, T., 1991. Musical patronage and social change in Beethoven's Vienna. American Journal of Sociology 97, 310-346.

DeNora, T., 2002. Music into action: performing gender on the Viennese concert stage, 1790-1810. Poetics 30, 19-33.

DiMaggio, P., 1982. Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: the creation of an organizational base for high culture in America. Media, Culture, & Society 4, 33-51.

DiMaggio, P., 1987. Classification in art. American Sociological Review 52, 440-455.

DiMaggio, P., 1991. Social structure and cultural goods: the case of the United States. In: Bourdieu, P., Coleman, J. (Eds.), Social Theory for a Changing Society. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 133-166.

DiMaggio, P., 1992. Cultural boundaries and structural change: the extension of the high culture model to theater, opera and dance, 1900-1940. In: Lamont, M., Fournier, M. (Eds.), Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 21-57.

DiMaggio, P., 1994. Culture and Economy. In The Handbook of Economic Sociology. Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg, eds. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

DiMaggio, P., Mukhtar, T., 2004. Arts participation as cultural capital in the United States, 1982-2002: signs of decline? Poetics 32, 169-194.

DiMaggio, P., 2009. Introduzione. In: Santoro, M. (Ed.), L'Organizzazione della Cultura. Il Mulino, Bologna.

DiMaggio, P., Powell, W., 1983. The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review 48, 147-160.

DiMaggio, P., Stenberg, K., 1985. Why do some theaters innovate more than others? Poetics 14, 107-122.

Dondero, G., 1949a. Communists maneuver to control art in the United States. The Congressional Record, 3233-3235

Dondero, G., 1949b. Modern art shackled to communism. The Congressional Record, 11584-111587.

Dowd, T.J., forthcoming. Production and producer of life styles: fields of classical and popular music in the United States. Kölner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie 51.

Dowd, T.J., Kelly, K., forthcoming. Composing a career: the situation of living composers in the repertoires of U.S. orchestras, 2005-06. In: Mathieu C. (Ed.), Careers in Creative Industries. Routledge, London.

Dowd, T.J., Liddle, K., Lupo, K., Borden, A., 2002. Organizing the musical canon: the repertoires of major U.S. symphony orchestras, 1842 to 1969. Poetics 30, 35-61.

Dowd, T.J., Liddle, K., Blyler, M., 2005. Charting gender: the success of female acts in the U.S. mainstream recording market, 1940 to 1990. Research in the Sociology of Organizations 23, 81-123.

Efland, A.D., 1990. A History of Art Education: Intellectual and Social Currents in Teaching the Visual Arts. Teachers College Press, New York.

Gardner, H., 1926. Gardner's Art through the Ages. Harcourt Brace, New York.

Gardner, H., 1936. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 2nd edition. Harcourt Brace, New York.

Gardner, H., 1948. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 3rd edition. Harcourt Brace, New York.

Gardner, H. Crosby, S., 1959. Art through the Ages. 4th edition. Bell, London.

Gardner, H. de la Croix, H. Tansey, R.G., 1970. Art through the Ages. 5th edition. Harcourt, Brace and World, New York.

Gilmore, S., 1988. Schools of activity and innovation. Sociological Quarterly 29, 203-219.

Goldwater, R.J., 1943. The teaching of art in the colleges of the United States. College Art Journal 2 (4), 3-31 (supplement).

Greenfield, L., 1989. Different Worlds: A Sociological Study of Taste, Choice and Success in Art. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Groseclose, B., Wierich, J,. 2009. Introduction. In: Groseclose, B., Wierich, J. (Eds.), Internationalizing the History of American Art. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, PA, 1-4.

Halle, D.,1993. Inside Culture: Art and Class in the American Home. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Hartt, F., 1998. Art: A History of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture. 3rd edition. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Haskell, B., 1984. Blam! The Explosion of Pop, Minimalism, and Performance, 1958-1964. W.W. Norton, New York.

Haskell, T.L., 1977. The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority. University of Illinois Press. Urbana, IL.

Hatt, M., Klonk, C., 2006. Art History: A Critical Introduction to Its Methods. Manchester University Press. New York.

Hemingway, A., 2009. American art pre-1940 and the problem of art history's object. In: Groseclose, B., Wierich, J. (Eds.), Internationalizing the History of American Art. Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, PA, 61-80.

Jaffee, B., 2007. Gardner's variety formalism: Helen Gardner and Art through the Ages. In: Brzyski, A. (Ed.), Partisan Canons. Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 203-223.

Janson, H.W., Janson, D.J., 1959. Key Monuments of the History of Art: A Visual Survey. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Janson, H.W., Janson, D.J., 1962. History of Art: A Survey of the Major Visual Arts from the Dawn of History to the Present Day. 1st edition. Abrams, New York.

Janson, H.W., Janson, D.J., 1969. History of Art: A Survey of the Major Visual Arts from the Dawn of History to the Present Day. Revised and enlarged edition. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Janssen, S., Kuipers, G., Verboord, M., 2008. Cultural globalization and arts journalism: the international orientation of arts and cultural coverage in American, Dutch, French, and German newspapers, 1955-2008. American Sociological Review 73, 719-740.

Janssen, S. 2001. The empirical study of careers in literature and the arts. In: Schram, D., Steen, G. (Eds.), The Psychology and Sociology of Literature. John Benjamins Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 323-357.

Kapsis, R., 1992. Hitchcock: The Making of a Reputation. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

La Follette, Suzanne. 1929. Art in America. Harper and Row, New York.

Lang, G., Lang, K., 1988. Recognition and renown: the survival of artistic reputation. American Journal of Sociology 94, 79-109.

Mansfield, E., 2002. Art history and modernism. In: Mansfield, E. (Ed.), Art History and Its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline. Routledge, New York, 11-27.

Panofsky, E., 1955. Meaning in the Visual Arts: Paper In and On Art History. Doubleday, Garden City, NY.

Sandler, I., 1978. The New York School: The Painters and Sculptors of the Fifties. Harper & Row, New York.

Sorensen, Lee. 2002. Janson, H.W. Dictionary of Art Historians. www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org/wittkowerr.htm

Stokstad, M., 2008. Art History. Revised 3rd edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Preziosi, D., 2009. The Art of Art History. 2nd edition. Oxford University Press, New York.

Richardson, E.P., 1956. Painting in America, from 1502 to the Present. Crowell, Springfield, IL.

Schmutz, V., 2009. Social and symbolic boundaries in newspaper coverage of music, 1955-2005: gender and genre in the US, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. Poetics 37, 298-314.

Schmutz, V., Faupel, A., 2010. Gender and cultural consecration in popular music. Social

Forces 89, 6845-707.

Sherman, D.J., Rogoff, I., 1994. Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.

Tuchman, G., Fortin, N., 1984. Fame and misfortune: edging women out of the great literary tradition. American Journal of Sociology 90, 72-96.

Verboord, M., van Rees, K., 2009. Dutch educational curriculum and institutional contexts: textbook content and teachers' textbook usage in Dutch education, 1968-2000. Poetics 37, 74-97.

Wallach, A., 1977. Trouble in paradise. Artforum 15 (5), 34.

Watson, S. 1991. Strange Bedfellows. Abbeville Press, New York.

White, H., White, C., 1993. Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Whitehall, W. M., 1970. Museum of Fine Arts of Boston. Volume 1. Belknap Press, Boston.

CHAPTER THREE

Stabilizing the Canon:

The Later Years of the US Field of Modern Art

1. Introduction

The previous chapters, among other things, highlight the importance of

exhibitions by the Museum of Modern Art. Those artists garnering MoMA exhibitions

immediately enjoyed heightened coverage in art history textbooks of the time (Chapter

Two) and subsequently enjoyed textbook coverage nearly a century later (Chapter One).

However, these chapters also show that not all exhibitions are created equal. Some

exhibitions—such as solo shows—serve to emphasize certain artists over others. Other

exhibitions—such as group shows—create an association between artists. While solo

museum exhibitions have long been considered foundational for an artist's entry into the

canon (for example, see Becker, 1984; Danko, 2008), my chapters (particularly the first

one) indicate that group exhibition may be as beneficial, if not more so, for an artist's

long-term recognition. In Chapter One, I conjectured that group exhibition's importance

arises from the need for curators to present artists within the context of an evolving art

history—elaborating as to why particular artists fit together as a "group" worthy of

exhibition. Chapter Two hinted at the impact of this "curatorial hand," via its regression

analysis. For example, as MoMA exhibited Armory artists across the decades, its

curators did not rely on evaluations made in 1913, such as which Armory artists would be

allowed to exhibit the most works at that watershed event; instead, when choosing which

Amory artists to emphasize from 1929 onward, MoMA curators crafted their own evaluations.

In this final substantive chapter, I move beyond conjecture and, instead, turn my attention squarely on the decisions made by the curators of MoMA. Specifically, I examine the connections that curators make between artists when they choose to exhibit artists together as a group. I then examine the implications of such groupings for the established (rather than early) field of modern art in the United States—considering the impact of curatorial choices from 1929 to 1967 upon textbook editions from 1969 to 2009. This allows me to combine the emphasis on the dynamic nature of the canon found in Chapter Two—which, in this chapter, includes attention to which Armory artists gain (or lose) prominence in textbooks by virtue of their connections—with the emphasis on retrospective consecration in Chapter One—which, in this chapter, involves the relationship between previous curatorial choices and subsequent textbook coverage, but does so for the late 20th and early 21st centuries. This chapter also allows me to cast additional light on two artist attributes that have proven somewhat complicated in previous chapters: nationality and gender. In other words, perhaps the disadvantages that women and US born Armory artists faced flowed from the types of connections that curators created for them.

2. The importance of artistic networks

One common pattern has not gone unnoticed in the study of artistic fields: connections between groups of artists ("networks") can matter greatly for various types of success. Indeed, much research has shown networks play a pivotal role in artists'

careers, whether through aiding the entry and education of aspiring artists (Craig and Dubois, 2010; Lachmann, 1988; Menger, 1999) or, for more established artists, facilitating increased professional acclaim and honors (Becker, 1984; Rossman, Esparza and Bonacich, 2010; Torgler and Schmidt, 2007), as well as increased financial and critical gain (Becker, 1984; Crane, 1989; de Nooy, 2002; Giuffre, 1999, 2001, 2009; Uzzi and Spiro, 2005; White and White, 1993). These connections need not be of the personal type—such as socializing and dining together (see Anheier, Gerhards and Romo, 1995; Giuffre, 2009)—they can also be intellectually based: an artist's long-term, overall reputational development is at least partially dependent on the influence he or she has on the other artists in the field. For example, in their research on networks between writers in the German literary world, Anheier and Gerhards (1991) find that writers who are highly involved in literary culture and who acknowledge that their work is influenced by others in the field *also* tend to be the recipients of more prizes and honors. In fact, simply claiming to be influenced by prestigious others offers network rewards—the influenced artists are subsequently associated with the already successful and high-status artists that serve as their influence.

Though being labeled the student or follower of a major artist may be an initial impediment in building a reputation of one's own, in the long run, the association adds to an artist's credentials and, thus, visibility (Lang and Lang, 1988). For example, minor artists, who work in a certain style exemplified by a famous artist, may be regularly exhibited alongside as an example of the major artist's influence. This "satellite effect" also can apply when an artist has famous family members or friends. Moreover, Lang and Lang (1988) speculate that connection rewards are symbiotic. An attribution of

influence serves both to add to the credentials of the artist claiming the influence, while

further boosting and legitimizing an established artist's prestige (Lang and Lang, 1988).

Artists who deny professional influence, in contrast, do not cultivate associations and are

largely located outside formal or informal reputation building structures (e.g.,

membership in artistic movements, clubs or professional associations) and, consequently,

tend to receive far fewer art world rewards (Anheier and Gerhards, 1991; Craig and

Dubois, 2009; Giuffre, 1999, 2009; Lang and Lang, 1988).

While the above research compellingly reveals a correspondence between

networks and artistic success, certain researchers have pointed out that such

correspondences are not static, but are created, broken and re-created (e.g., de Nooy,

2002; Uzzi and Spiro, 2005; Zuckerman et al., 2003). In response, they have sought to

make dynamic their network analysis. Such research persuasively argues that an artist's

network structure should be seen as a product of past and present associations. The work

of Kathy Giuffre (1999), in this regard, has been particularly influential to my

understanding of longitudinal network analysis.

Giuffre (1999) focuses on the somewhat shifting and unstable relationships

between galleries and artists (a group of New York photographers) that unfolded from

1981 to 1992. Artists are connected to galleries in order to sell their work, but the artist-

gallery relation also serves to indicate the level of prestige achieved by both. The success

of both producer and distributor is in large part measured by their relation to each other;

in other words, artists gain increased prestige by joining a well-respected gallery, while

galleries are considered prestigious when they show the work of important artists. Yet

the connections between each are not permanent: both galleries and artists can create and

break ties to one another in order to increase their own prestige. Consequently, histories of past associations travel with both the artist and gallery as part of their respective reputational careers. Giuffre argues that specific sequences of career transitions can help to account for the success of an artist.

Heeding this dynamic process of artist and gallery connections, as well as the reputational shifts that accompany that dynamic, Giuffre's (1999) identifies three ideal career types for these photographers. The first is composed of long, unbroken careers involving membership in strong, tightly knit, dense groups or small subcultural niches. These artists are largely isolated from others outside their group; however, they enjoy long, stable gallery relationships and economically viable careers. The second type is characterized by inconsistent participation in generally unstable relationships. These artists drop in and out of galleries, sometimes lacking representation altogether for long stretches of time. Such artists are the least successful type. The third ideal type is composed of artists with long, unbroken careers involving almost entirely transitory membership in several different galleries. These artists usually have large, sparse networks with numerous weak ties. Giuffre finds this third type is by far the most successful, as such artists receive the greatest amount of critical attention. Overall, the artists who achieve enduring recognition manage to structure their particular network connections so as to remain continuously in strategic positions within the art world and over time.

While Giuffre's (1999) research forcefully demonstrates that important organizations within the artistic field, such as galleries, serve to bring together and form connections between artists, she does not actually explore the idea that such organizations

can create connections *without* the participation of the artists themselves.[10] For instance,

galleries often specialize in old masters—that is, those artists long since deceased. In

such a case, the artists themselves are not choosing either the connection to the gallery

nor to the other artists represented by that gallery. Rather, by selecting them, the gallery

is forming associations between artists that may have no previous connections. Such an

example points to a larger dynamic process—one not just involving galleries, but also art

history as a discipline.

While some within the visual arts field celebrate artistic genius—treating art as

the expression of a sole, individual producer—network associations between artists are an

essential component to art historical logic. Art history is an account of the "development

of painting and sculpture" (Princeton University, 2011) and, vital to providing an account

of art's development through time, associations must be made between artists, both to

group them together (usually called an "artistic movement," a "style" or a "school") and

to connect them through history with former and future groups (see Becker, 1984;

Gilmore, 1988; Giuffre, 2001). For examples of this type of progression history, consider

the legendary *Cubism and Abstract Art Graph* by MoMA's Founding Director Alfred

Barr or Fanelli's *Artist Timeline* permanently on display on the walls of level 3 and 5 of

London's Tate Modern. Both examples offer graphical displays of how various

groupings of artists map onto, as well as give shape to, modern art's history. Likewise,

consider the table of contents of most major art history textbooks, which chronologically

---

[10] However, in subsequent work, Giuffre (2001) does so by taking into account the stylistic groupings of artists that those in the critical community make—what she calls the "mental maps" by which critics position various artists, thereby pointing to aesthetic connections between them. Her 2001 work resonates with other works that focus on the groupings that critics make, be they stylistic or reputational, when evaluating artists of various types (e.g., Allen and Lincoln, 2004; Schmutz and Faupel, 2010; van Venrooij, 2009). These groupings by critics typically occur without the participation of the artists under consideration.

organize history in terms of various schools of art and the artists who comprise them.

Indeed, Becker (1984) argues that such progression histories are customary for all artistic

fields, as they demonstrate that the field has always produced works of artistic merit. In

connecting artists one to another, the impression of the field's advancement or

"progression" through history is affirmed.

Thus, although artists can cultivate both professional and personal connections

with other artists during their own lifetime, these relationships are not always the most

relevant associations for the development of art history. For example, a successful

artist's career is longer than his or her lifetime (Craig and Dubois, 2010; Dowd and

Kelly, forthcoming; Lang and Lang, 1988). New associations between artists must be

made in order to connect artists and advance the story of art. Here, reputational

entrepreneurs may emerge seeking to boost the historical importance of their favored

artist by associating him or her with important players within art's history. Indeed,

creating an association with a successful, well-known cultural producer has proved an

effective means by which to promote lesser-known artist; for example, see Corse and

Griffin's (1997) account of the association between Zora Neal Hurston and Alice Walker,

who offered a posthumous *and* influential re-evaluation of Hurston's literary merit.

One effective way in which connections between visual artists can be formed is

through museum exhibition. By exhibiting artists together, a museum and its curator(s)

are advocating that certain artists comprise a meaningful group in some sense. Exhibiting

artworks side-by-side implies similarity and comparability, an implicit assessment of

equivalent worth. Connections between artists are strengthened when an exhibition

connection is often repeated. Over time and exhibits, new connections may afford artists

entry into additional artistic movements or groups—even if the artist did not, or could not, join such a grouping in his or her own lifetime. It may also afford the artist entry into a higher (or lower) artistic status group, promoting (or demoting) his or her work to a new level of significance.

As my previous chapters show, MoMA exhibitions play a central role in an artist's recognition over time; in this chapter, I address how this role operates. I am interested in the connections not created by the artists themselves, but rather formed and advocated by important others, i.e., that of the curatorial hand. Are the connections afforded by exhibition and created by curators important to an artist's long-term success? Are exhibition connections important at all? Do they impact an artist's reputation and long-term recognition? Or, does an artist's work and talent stand alone?

3. The impact of artistic networks

It is one thing to emphasize the importance of artistic networks; however, the challenge is how to gauge empirically their impact on success within a given field. I address this challenge by focusing on a particular group of artists that exhibited in 1913, then seeing how curators subsequently grouped those artists over some four decades (1929 to 1968) and, finally, inspecting how the connections made via this curatorial hand shaped textbook coverage that followed in the established field of modern art (1969 to 2009).

3.1. Artists of the 1913 Armory Show

As with the previous chapters, I am using the 308 artists that exhibited at the 1913 Armory Show as my research population. Also like the previous chapters, but particularly in regards to the network variables explained below, I consider the population of artists from the Armory Show to represent a cohort of professional peers, i.e., a distinctive grouping in its own right. The Armory Show artists were brought together in exhibition in 1913 because they represented the scope of important artists working under the rubric of "modern art"—which included the avant-garde artistic developments of the time, such as Impressionism, Fauvism, Cubism, etc. (see Chapter One)—and working on such art at approximately the same time period, roughly from about 1860 to 1913. Note, then, that there was a curatorial hand of sorts at work in 1913: organizers of the Armory Show grouped these 308 artists together as constituting "modern art" broadly conceived. Subsequent choices about coverage of the Armory artists, whether by museum curators or academic authors, could have simply reproduced that original grouping, treating all 308 as still indicative of a coherent entity. Yet, as seen in the previous chapters, that did not happen. Instead, curators and textbook authors covered a portion of this original cohort, grouping and re-grouping particular Armory artists in different fashions. Furthermore, although only alluded to in previous chapters, those curators and authors also chose to cover artists from *other* cohorts (i.e., "non-peers")—those modern artists who did *not* exhibit at the Armory Show but may be nevertheless featured in the Museum of Modern Art (e.g., the Abstract Expressionists; see Crane, 1987). I suggest that the pattern of those groupings, i.e., the networks of connections made subsequently at MoMA, have implications for the eventual consecration of particular Armory artists.

3.2. Network structure and consecration

Rather than having to develop new measures by which to gauge patterns amidst the groupings that MoMA curators made with regard to Armory artists (i.e., "network structure"), I can draw on well-known measures devised by network analysts. In doing so, I am not offering a network analysis in the traditional sense, whereby the network itself is the primary concern. Instead, I am using network measures to examine the curatorial hand at work and, in turn, its subsequent impact on the established field of modern art. I should also note that, in the parlance of network analysis, the connections I examine between exhibited artists are not "directed ties" that are initiated by one of these artists but, rather, "*un*directed ties" that result from the decisions of MoMA personnel (see Emirbayer and Goodwin, 1994; Wellman, 1983).

Network analysts note that the way in which an actor is embedded in a relational network both imposes constraints on and offers opportunities to that actor. Network analysts describe beneficial structural positions as having few constraints and many opportunities (Hanneman and Riddle, 2005). While there are no precise network definitions for either "constraint" or "opportunity," the network research literature convincingly argues that certain structural positions and characteristics serve as reliable indicators. The following are especially helpful given my substantive concerns.

3.2.1. Centrality

Actors are central to a given network if they are well connected to the other actors composing the network. In network analysis, centrality is often used as a measure of

power within a network (Bonacich, 1972; Hanneman and Riddle, 2005). In other words, if the exercise of power is inherently relational, then the more people to whom you are connected, the more direct influence you can exert. Moreover, actors with a large network have more opportunities because they have more alternative connections than other actors. If some of an actor's connections turn out to be ineffective, the actor has several other alternative connections to use. Large networks, then, offer a level of autonomy—whereby an actor is not dependent on any other specific actors in the network and, therefore, is more powerful.

Studies of artistic fields suggest that centrality likely matters for success. For example, when considering the connections that artists of various types make (i.e., direct ties), those who have extensive networks of connections tend to have more job opportunities, more financial success and more stable careers (Faulkner and Anderson, 1987; Giuffre, 1999; Pinheiro and Dowd, 2009). Perhaps the positive benefits of centrality also apply to the connections that others make between artists (i.e., undirected ties): The more artists a given artist is connected to through common exhibition(s), the more opportunities and possibilities the artist accrues. Having numerous exhibition connections indicates an artist's relevance to many different artistic producers and, thus, provides a range of alternative associations and understandings regarding that particular artist. Given that this research is examining one cohort of artists (i.e., the artists of the 1913 Armory Show), having many connections to others in that cohort also indicates an artist's prominence among his or her peers. In other words, well-connected artists are likely the first to come to mind when an author is later making choices about which artists of a particular cohort to address in an art history survey. In sum, a large exhibition

network will likely signal the relevance and prominence of an artist—leading to my first

hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 1*: Artists connected to a large number of peers in museum exhibitions
>
> will receive more subsequent coverage in art history textbooks.

While the extent of an artist's network is important, so too may be the *strength* of

the artist's network connections. In other words, centrality can also be indicated by the

repetition of connections between artists. For example, studies of motion picture and

Broadway production demonstrate the advantages that can sometimes come from

working frequently with particular artists, including heightened job opportunities and

financial success (Baker and Faulkner, 1987; Uzzi and Spiro, 2005; Zuckerman et al.,

2003). Such advantages may also flow to strong connections formed by the curatorial

hand. Artists who exhibit with other artists over and over again can be described as

having stronger or more robust network connections. Moreover, repeated connections

indicate the creation of a productive association between artists—thereby offering a ready

example of artistic "movements" or "schools" that are appealing to the art historical logic

(Becker, 1984; Giuffre, 2001; Gilmore, 1988). This leads me to my second hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 2:* Artists with strong connections to peers in museum exhibitions will
>
> receive more subsequent coverage in art history textbooks.

3.2.2 Relativity

While being a central player amongst one's professional peers is important, being

linked to other artists outside one's own cohort signals the broader appeal and salience of

a given artist. For example, those poets who expand their ties to include poets from older (or younger) cohorts gain valuable allies in garnering attention for and circulation of their work (Craig and Dubois, 2010). We may see a similar dynamic occurring for inter-cohort connections that curators are creating in their exhibitions: artists who are grouped with others outside of their own peer cohort could have additional advantages toward long-term recognition, as they are already being allied with other artistic movements and, hence, identified as part of a stream of professional influence in art history. Put simply, then, Armory artists that exhibited with non-Armory artists may attract more scholarly attention than those Armory artists who lack such connections.

   Hypothesis 3: Artists with connections to non-peers in museum exhibitions will
      receive more subsequent coverage in art history textbooks.

3.2.3. Continuity

   As discussed above, network ties are not static, but rather connections are in a state of flux as actors enter and exit a given network (see de Nooy, 2002; Giuffre, 1999). Regarding museum exhibition, when a given artist gains additional connections to other artists over time, this indicates a fairly active amount of reputational entrepreneurship at work—which includes the work done by curators, as well as by others who successfully proclaim the importance of a given artist (see Corse and Griffin, 1997; Craig and Dubois, 2010; Lang and Lang, 1988). Indeed, curators who are making new associations for an artist are advocating for the importance of the artist and his or her influence in the art world. These additional connections not only increase the applicability of an artist, but also signify the artist's continued relevance. Such connections, then, could very well

have an impact upon choices made later by academic authors. Accordingly, my fourth

hypothesis is:

> *Hypothesis 4:* Artists who gain connections with peers in museum exhibitions will
>
> receive more subsequent coverage in art history textbooks.

3.2.4. Alter attributes

When examining how networks help or hinder an actor's success, much social

network research focuses on the characteristics of those within a given actor's network.

For example, Bonacich's (1972) seminal research argues that power must be measured

not simply by the actor's centrality within a network, but also by *who* is in that actor's

network. Actors connected to powerful or prestigious others have a positional advantage

over those who are connected to weak or insignificant others, because the former are

structurally closer to resources.

The characteristics of those others (i.e., "alters") in a given person's (i.e., "ego's")

network are also important in regards to the arts. Sociologists of culture have long

examined the importance of alters' attributes in networks of relations (Becker, 1984;

Giuffre, 1999; Lang and Lang, 1988; Rossman, Esparza and Bonacich, 2010). Evaluative

judgments may be influenced by the "halo effect" (Nisbett and Wilson, 1977), the idea

that the perceived features of a particular actor may positively influence one's assessment

of those associated with the actor. For example, artists who are aligned with successful

others may in turn be perceived as successful. As discussed above, simply claiming a

prestigious artist within one's influence network serves as enough of a connection to

promote both the influenced and influencer's prestige (Anheier and Gerhards, 1991; Lang

and Lang, 1988). Perhaps such a halo effect also occurs for the groupings that curators make when putting together exhibitions. Since a solo exhibition is considered one of the highest honors of the art world (Becker, 1984), artists whose exhibition network is composed of a large percentage of others who have had a previous solo exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art should be advantageously positioned to reap the rewards of such prestigious connections, leading to my fifth hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 5:* Artists whose exhibition network is largely composed of peer artists with prior solo exhibitions will receive more subsequent coverage in art history textbooks.

Nisbett and Wilson (1977) also document a "reverse halo effect," whereby negative traits can spillover to an actor's associates. My next two hypotheses deal with this by considering that associations with less favored artists may negatively influence an actor's access to long-term text recognition (Bowman, 1999). First, because the modern art movement largely began in Europe, particularly France, US born artists were often seen as less legitimate players within the modern art movement (see Chapters One and Two). Artists whose exhibition networks are largely composed of US born artists, then, may be considered less important or working on the periphery of the movement, directing my sixth hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 6:* Artists whose exhibition network is largely composed of US born peer artists will receive less subsequent coverage in art history textbooks.

Similarly, while female artists were relatively well represented in the modern art movement, they were still in the minority compared to the number and prestige of male artists working in the modern art movement (see Chapters One and Two). Being exhibited with a large proportion of female artists may also have cast an actor as belonging in the margins of art history, leading to my seventh hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 7:* Artists whose exhibition network is largely composed of female peer artists will receive less subsequent coverage in art history textbooks.

4. Data

My main data sources should be familiar by now, given the descriptions of them in previous chapters. For instance, as the hypotheses above show, I continue to track *not* all possible artists active in the US field of modern art (which would be a daunting task) but, rather, the 308 artists that participated in the Amory Show of 1913—that pivotal launching point for the emergent field of modern art in the US (see Chapter One). By "track," I mean that I first follow how these artists fared in the exhibitions of the Museum of Modern Art, the organization that provided the early field with its initial "organizational base" (see Chapter Two). As was the case in Chapter One, I consider all MoMA exhibitions in total from 1929 to 1967, rather than tracking them over specific years, as I did in Chapter Two. What is new here, however, is that I bring nuance to the study of exhibitions, particularly in terms of heeding network patterns for Armory artists involved in group exhibitions (see Section 4.2).

I also track the Armory artists in a second way, by seeing how their respective patterns of MoMA exhibition mattered for subsequent canonization (from 1969 to 2009).

Thus, this chapter fills the temporal gap remaining in the previous chapters, i.e., that occurring between how the Armory artists fared in the early field of US modern art—as curators and textbook authors sifted through which of these artists to emphasize (Chapter Two)—and how the Amory artists fared nearly a century later in textbooks (Chapter One). The forty-year period considered here, then, not only marks the period in which the US field of modern art was now fully established, it also marks the period in which DiMaggio (1991, 2009) suggests that high culture in general faced substantial challenges, such as the erosion of canons in various artistic fields. It remains to be seen, then, whether the ongoing canonization in the established field of modern art will prove problematic for the reputational continuance of Amory artists.

4.2. Dependent variables

4.2.1. Number of pages in textbook editions

I assess this subsequent canonization by way of two dependent variables. The first offers a count of the combined number of pages an artist acquired in the 17 editions of *Gardner's* and *Janson's* textbooks from 1969 to 2009. These textbooks were selected because they are the two longest running and most prestigious introductory textbooks used in college-level courses in the United States. Although the first *Gardner's* textbook was published in 1926 and *Janson's* in 1959 (see Chapter Two), I begin the analysis with textbooks published in 1969 (*Janson*'s) / 1970 (*Gardner's*) for two reasons (discussed below). First, starting in 1969/1970 complements the analysis offered in Chapter Two, which ended with those years. Thus, I use that year as the transitional moment when the early field of modern art gave way to the established field. Not only does that transitional

year coincide with a periodization that DiMaggio (1991) offers for fields of high culture in the US, it also coincides with a shift within the field of modern art. Indeed, my exploratory analysis reveals that during the first half of the century, the canon for those artists introduced at the 1913 Armory Show was materializing. Throughout this development period, the canon was unstable, undergoing large fluctuations mostly regarding the representation of US born Armory artists. By the 1970s, art history's canon for the 1913 Armory Show artists experienced far less fluctuation and, largely, is the canon that is known and taught today.

Second, textbook publishing also changed in the 1970s to resemble what contemporary market. The most noticeable alteration is that textbooks were published far more frequently and contain more pages in the latter half of the 20th and early 21st century than during the first half of the 20th century. For example, *Gardner's* first three textbooks published in 1926, 1936 and 1948 contain 506, 795 and 851 pages respectively, while *Gardner's* most recent editions in 2001, 2005 and 2009 contain 1198, 1088 and 1150 pages respectively. Thus, to bracket these early differences, I begin my analysis in 1969/70 with the stabilization of both the textbook publishing industry and the canon of those artists introduced to the US art world through the 1913 Armory Show.

Heeding the number of pages allows me to gauge the *extent* of inclusion within these textbooks. Of course, there is the possibility that while an artist may have many pages dedicated to him or her early on, he or she may be excluded from several textbooks, which may represent decades in which the artist is not recognized. A count of textbook edition inclusion, my second dependent variable, thereby controls for overloading of pages in certain textbooks.

4.2.2. Inclusion in textbook editions

My second dependent variable is a count of an artist's inclusion within the 17 editions of *Gardner's* and *Janson's* introductory art history textbooks, from 1969 to 2009.[11] This dependent variable offers a comparable measure to that of the first dependent variable, which examined number of textbook pages. By considering the cumulative number of textbook editions in which an Armory artist is included, I can determine the extent to which he or she remains emphasized across the years, thereby giving a dynamic twist to the retrospective consecration demonstrated in Chapter One.

4.3. Independent variables

4.3.1. Centrality

The most basic network measurement is degree centrality, which, in the context of this research, refers to the centrality that occurs among Amory artists featured in MoMA group exhibitions. Because this research focuses on how connections shape differential access to recognition, I incorporate two types of centrality measures: the first captures the *breadth* of exhibition connections. I get at this by counting the number of connections an Armory artist has with other Armory artists—that is, connections that occur when a given artist is featured in the same group exhibition as another artist. The second centrality measure captures the *depth* or strength of these connections. I get at this by documenting the extent to which an artist has a repeat exhibition connection with other Armory artists within his or her given exhibition network. This measure is normalized by using the percentage (opposed to a count) of an artist's exhibition network that is composed of

---

[11] The ten editions for *Gardner's* were published in the following years: 1970, 1975, 1980, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, 2005 and 2009. The seven editions for *Janson's* occurred in 1969, 1977, 1986, 1991, 1995, 1997, 2001 and 2006.

repeat connections in order to isolate and compare the effect of tie repetition for all

MoMA represented Armory artists.

4.3.2. Relativity

This research argues that the Armory Show artists represent a peer cohort. While

the centrality measures address connections *within* that cohort, this measure addresses

connections *beyond* the cohort (i.e., non-Armory artists). An artist's relativity, then, is

measured as percent of an artist's MoMA exhibition without the inclusion of another

Armory artist, minus solo exhibitions. Percentages are again used to isolate relativity's

effect across all artists within the population.

4.3.3. Continuity

To get at the dynamic nature of networks, I include a count of whether an artist

gained or lost exhibition ties with other Armory artists over the approximately 40 year

span of MoMA group exhibitions (from 1929 to 1968). To do this, I split the MoMA

exhibitions into four decades: 1929 to 1938, 1939 to 1948, 1949 to 1958 and 1959 to

1968 and calculated the number of gained or lost ties an artist experienced from decade to

decade.

4.3.4. Alter attributes

My last three hypotheses center on the attributes of an artist's exhibition network

(i.e., those artists that exhibit with a given artist). While each MoMA exhibition has the

potential to be a unique grouping, artists may be continually exhibited with other Armory

artists that possess particular traits—specifically, a certain gender, nationality and/or certain credentials (i.e., prior solo MoMA exhibitions). I test these hypothesizes by specifying the percent of an artist's network that is composed of artists that are female, US born and have prior solo exhibition at the Museum. These measures are given in percentage in order to isolate the effect of alter attributes on an exhibited Armory artists chance at canonization.

4.3.5. Control variables

While the focus in this chapter is on how the exhibition networks of Armory artists shape their subsequent coverage in textbooks, I also acknowledge that the individual accomplishments and traits of these artists may likewise matter. Consequently, I control for both by heeding the same variables featured in Chapters One and Two. Regarding individual accomplishment, I include variables addressing the number of solo and group exhibitions an artist's personally received at MoMA from 1929 to 1968. I also include a variable for an artist's European exhibition success prior to the 1913 Armory Show. Finally, regarding personal traits, I include binary variables for both European born and male artists.

5. Results

5.1. Exhibition and network patterns

Before turning to the regression analysis and the like, it is first helpful to give some sense of the exhibition patterns occurring at MoMA from its opening in 1929 until

1968, particularly with regards to the network connections among Armory artists that MoMA curators created when offering group exhibitions.

As previously mentioned, the dataset includes 996 exhibitions and, out of the 308 Armory artists, 127 artists are featured in MoMA at least once between 1929 and 1968. Matisse and Picasso stand out as by far the most exhibited of the Amory Show artists, with 70 and 97 MoMA exhibitions respectively. The next closest artist, with approximately 30 exhibitions less than Matisse and almost 60 less than Picasso, is Leger with 43 exhibitions, who is followed by the "father of modern art," Cezanne with 39 exhibitions (see Table 3-A).

[TABLE 3-A ABOUT HERE]

However, perhaps counter-intuitively, a large number of exhibitions does not parlay into a larger Armory exhibition network. Those artists with the largest amount of ties to other Armory artists are Sheeler and Marin, both with 110 connections (with 35 and 30 total MoMA exhibitions respectively), closely followed by Bellows with 108 connections and 17 MoMA exhibitions (see Table 3-A). In fact, in examining the top ten artists for both these groups (number of exhibition versus number of ties)—with the exception of Picasso, Matisse and Sheller—those Armory artists with the most MoMA exhibitions do not overlap with artists that have the largest Armory artist exhibition networks. Moreover, there are several patterned differences between the two groups. Note that six out of the ten artists with the largest number of Armory exhibition connections are US born, while only one of the Armory artists with the most MoMA exhibitions is American. In other words, in examining the top ten from each of these

groups, European artists tend to have more MoMA exhibitions, but US born artists tend to have more exhibition connections to other Armory artists.

One explanation for the difference between the two groups (i.e., those who enjoy a large number of MoMA exhibitions versus those artists who are connected to a large number of Armory artists) may be that those with many MoMA exhibitions tend to exhibit with other artists than those at the Armory Show, thus having a large exhibition network not limited to peer artists. Yet, when examining the top ten Armory artists with the largest percentage of exhibitions where no other Armory artist was featured (subtracting an artist's solo exhibitions and, thus, capturing whether an artist may have a large exhibition network outside those artists from the Armory cohort) these artists are generally not the same as those with the most MoMA exhibitions, with the exceptions, again, of Matisse, Picasso and Sheeler (see Table 3-A). Rather, artists with extensive non-peer connections (eight of these ten artists) overlap with the top ten artists having the most peer connections—pointing to the idea that artists that are well connected to those of their own cohort (again, measured here as those artists who exhibited at the Armory Show together) are also well connected to artists from other periods.

Yet another explanation for why artists with a large number of exhibitions are not also those with the largest exhibition networks is that these artists tend to be saved for special highlighting exhibition, such as solo shows and small group exhibits[12], where, given the nature of these special shows, artists are not exhibited with a large "crowd" or network of others, but saved for distinct groupings and singular attention. When

---

[12] I identify "small group exhibits" here as I did in Chapter One. That is, as exhibitions where a small number of artists are listed by name in the exhibition's title, such as "Cezanne, Gauguin, Seurat, Van Gogh" (MoMA Exh. #1, November 7-December 7, 1929). Only six Armory artists have enjoyed more than one small group exhibition (see Table 3-A for a list of these artists).

examining the top ten Armory artists who have enjoyed the highest number of solo

exhibition at the MoMA, we have some overlap: five (Picasso, Matisse, Leger, Cezanne

and Rouault) of the top ten artists have both a large number of MoMA exhibitions in

general, and solo exhibitions in particular (see Table 3-A). Of the artists who have

enjoyed the highest number of small group exhibition, only two (Picasso and Bonnard) of

the six overlap with Armory artists having the highest number of total MoMA exhibitions

(see Table 3-A).

What attribute, then, does overlap with a large amount of exhibitions? At least

within the parameters of this research, the answer is a high percentage of repeat

exhibition ties. In other words, Armory artists who enjoy a lot of representation in

MoMA exhibition also tend to have the highest percentage of exhibitions where they are

featured with another Armory artist with whom they have been featured before. For

example, Picasso who has enjoyed more MoMA exhibitions than any other Armory

artists also has the highest percentage of repeat ties to Armory artists (see Table 3-A)—

with 90% of Picasso's exhibition ties being repeat ties with other Armory artists. Matisse

follows Picasso with both the most MoMA exhibitions and the highest percentage of

repeat ties: 89% of Matisse's MoMA exhibition ties are repeat ties. In fact, nine of the

top ten Armory artists with the most MoMA exhibition are also in the ten artists with the

highest percentage of repeat exhibition ties (see Table 3-A). It is interesting to note with

these two top ten lists (i.e., the artists with largest amount of MoMA exhibition and the

highest percentage of repeat exhibition ties), the nine overlapping artists are all European

born and male; yet, the leading factor in common with high number of MoMA

exhibitions seems to be repeat exhibition ties.

Repeat exhibition ties with artists from one's own cohort (i.e., other artists exhibited at the Armory Show) seem to matter. Consequently, the next logical question is do a certain type of repeat ties matter? In other words, are there patterns within repeat exhibition ties, particularly regarding with whom these ties are repeated? To get at this, I examine what exhibition networks look like. For example, artists with the most repeat ties and the highest number of MoMA exhibitions have approximately 70% of their exhibition network ties with European born Armory artists and 25 to 30% with US born Armory artists (see Table 3-B). At first glance, these numbers seem to indicate that exhibition with mostly European artists corresponds to having a large number of MoMA exhibitions; yet, that is not the case. As Table 3-C shows, those artists whose exhibition network has the highest percentage of European born Armory artists (80 to 95%) do not overlap with those artists with the highest number of MoMA exhibition and highest percentage of repeat ties (see Table 3-A). This lack of overlap likewise applies to artists with a high percentage of exhibition ties with US born Armory artists (compare Table 3-C to Table 3-A). Rather, it seems, it is the network *combination* of US and (slightly more) European born Armory artists that overlap with also having a large number of total MoMA exhibitions.

[TABLE 3-B ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 3-C ABOUT HERE]

Only six of the 53 female Armory artists were exhibited in MoMA from 1929 to 1968: Cassatt, Dreier, Goldthwaite, Gwen John, Laurencin and Marguerite Zorach. Thus, examination of those artists who enjoyed exhibition with a high percentage of female Armory artists is limited, but interesting. Artists with exhibition networks composed of a

high percentage of female Armory artists (6 to 18%) do not coincide with artists with a high number of MoMA exhibitions and repeat ties (see Table 3-D). However, interestingly, the female artists themselves have highly limited exhibition exposure with other female Armory artists. Three of the six female artist's Armory artist exhibition networks are composed completely of male artists. The other three have no more than 2% of their Armory exhibition network composed of female artists.

Finally, much literature on artistic reputation and recognition touts the importance of the "halo effect"—the idea that artists are more likely to receive recognition and rewards if they are highly associated with other artists receiving important recognition and rewards. For this research, I examine the how the halo effect plays out in exhibition connections by examining the percentage of an artist's Armory exhibition network that is composed of artists that have been given a prior solo exhibition at the MoMA. As Table 3-D shows, the top ten Armory artists with the highest percentage of their exhibition network composed of solo exhibited Armory artists (53 to 66%), do not overlap with the top artists regarding number of exhibitions and repeat ties (see Table 3-A). Rather, the artists with the highest number of MoMA exhibitions and percentage of repeat ties have exhibition networks composed of only 30 to 38% of artists with solo MoMA exhibition.

While the above patterns are quite revealing, they are patterns that play out in terms of the entire period of MoMA exhibitions, i.e., those occurring from 1929 to 1968. Sensitive to historical contexts, I also considered how these patterns (e.g., top ten Armory artists with most exhibitions) played out on a decade by decade basis—looking at the artists and MoMA exhibitions, respectively, during 1929 to 1938, 1939 to 1948, 1949 to 1958 and 1959 to 1968. In doing so, I found patterns within these decades mostly

resemble those found across the entire time period. For example, artists with a high level

of repeat exhibition ties are consistently amongst the same artists with the highest number

of exhibitions. Moreover, it is interesting to note that the most exhibited artists are

roughly the same each decade. For example, seven of the top ten exhibited artists from

the Museum's first decade (1929 to 1938) are also in the top ten exhibited artists from

1929 to 1968. Thus, both early establishment (through many exhibitions) and the early

formation of strong ties (through repeat exhibition) seem to translate to consistent

recognition over time.

I did find a few differences in the decade-by-decade analysis versus examining

the entire time period. An interesting example, between 1929 and 1938, the formative

decade of the Museum, the largest number (108) of Armory artists was exhibited. This

number decreased to 83 by the next decade (1939 to 1948)—but then holds steady

between 80 to 86 artists through the next 30 years (1939 to 1968). The second decade of

MoMA, then, seems to be a period of refinement, where the canon for Armory artists is

narrowed and then solidified with on-going representation. This is a particularly

interesting given my finding in Chapter Two that the 1939 to 1948 decade is also a

filtering decade for women Armory artists.

5.2. Descriptive results

Having explored the types of network connections found among MoMA

exhibitions, we can now move to the regression analysis that, in turn, will show the

impact of such connections. Table 3-E presents descriptive statistics for the variables

used in the models, while Table 3-F presents a correlation matrix for the variables.

[TABLE 3-E ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 3-F ABOUT HERE]

5.3. Regression analysis

I attempt to predict which artists introduced to the United States in 1913 at the

Armory Show will be subsequently recognized by two influential US art history

textbooks, published over 17 editions from 1969 to 2009. In the first eight models (see

Table 3-G), the outcome is the total number of textbook pages dedicated to a given

Armory artist throughout *Gardner's* and *Janson's* 17 text editions. This dependent

variable ranges from 0 to 375 pages, with 40 being the median number of pages for

Armory artists. In the last model (Model 9), the dependent variable is the total number of

editions an Armory artist is recognized in over the 17 editions of *Gardner's* and *Janson's*

textbooks (note, Model 9 is on the 2nd page of Table 3-G). This second dependent

variable ranges from 0 (81% or 250 Amory artists) to 17 editions (7% or 22 Armory

artists), with 15 as the median number of editions. Note that the 308 Armory artists are

the focus of the regression analysis—with their group exhibition patterns at MoMA being

of particular interest. Non-peer artists (i.e., those who were not part of the original 1913

Armory Show) figure in the analysis only to the extent that they were included in

exhibition with Armory artists (see the "Relativity" measure in Table 3-E).

[TABLE 3-G ABOUT HERE]

I begin my regression analysis in Table 3-G with a set of models using variables

that gauge the connections between artists that resulted when MoMA curators grouped

artist in exhibition. These network variables, which allow me to test *Hypotheses 1*

through *7*, entail two measures of centrality (percentage of repeat ties and degree

centrality), relativity, continuity and alter attributes. An issue complicating my model is

that my two measures of centrality—repetition of ties and degree centrality—are highly

correlated (.957; see Table 3-F). Though both measures are meant to measure an artist's

centrality within the exhibition network, they do so in different, meaningful ways.

Again, degree centrality measures how many Armory artists in total a given artist is

connected to through exhibition. Repetition of ties is a measure of the percentage of an

artist's exhibition network that is composed to repeat exhibition connections between two

Armory artists. Put another way, one measures an artist's breadth of ties (degree

centrality), while the other, an artist's exhibition network depth (repetition). While this

high correlation shows that, for these Armory artists, high breadth and depth go nearly

hand in hand—to retain the distinct information given by these two measures, I modeled

both measures of centrality separately. The results for both models are robust with

effects maintaining direction and significance across specifications.

Model 1 and Model 2 present the effects of my two centrality measures

separately. The results of Model 1 offer support for *Hyp. 1*, as the effect of this variable

is strong and in the predicted direction. Those artists with many connections to other

Armory artists (centrality) benefit from increased coverage in later textbooks: the more

the connections, the more text representation. Model 2 likewise shows a significant

effect, thereby supporting *Hyp. 2*. Amory artists are also included in more textbook

pages when they have a higher percentage of repeat exhibition ties with other Armory

artists. However, it appears that an artist's percent of repeat ties has a larger effect

(72.141 pages per each percentage point of ties repeated) on the number of textbooks

within which an artist is included than the extent of an artist's exhibition network (.532

pages per each individual connection); that is, Armory artists with more repeat

connections are featured in more text pages than are artists with a large number of

connections. In that regard, the R-squares for these two models are also telling. While

the number of exhibition connections an artist has explains approximately 23% of the

variance in number of textbook pages in which an artist is featured (Model 1), the

percentage of repeat exhibition ties an artist has explains approximately 29% of the

variance in number of textbooks (Model 2). Although highly correlated, connection

repetition is a better predictor of textbook coverage than simply having a large network.

Model 3 offers the effects on textbook recognition of an artist's relativity to other

artists beyond his or her own professional cohort, again, measured here as those who

exhibited at the 1913 Armory Show. The effect is significant and in the predicted

direction—thereby supporting *Hyp. 3*—and is fairly strong (1.281 pages per each

percentage point of non-peer connections). However, the R-square is small: an Amory

artist's strong relativity to other non-Amory artists only explains 6% of the variance in

later textbook coverage.

Model 4 presents the effects of an artist's continuity over the four decades of this

research. While this variable is significant and in the predicted direction—supporting

Hyp. 4—with degree centrality, it has one of the weakest effect of any variable in the

model (.596 pages per each connection gained) and only accounts for 5% of the variance

in subsequent textbook inclusion

Model 5 offers the results for the variables measuring alter attributes. All the variables in this model are significant, but one—percentage of exhibition with female artists—deviates from the predicted direction. First, as predicted in *Hyp. 5*, the larger the percentage of an artist's Armory exhibition network composed of others with solo exhibition at MoMA, the higher the number of textbook pages an artist receives (59.270 pages per percentage point). This is consistent with the notion of a halo effect, whereby associations with high-profile Armory artists are beneficial. Also as predicted— see *Hyp. 6*—the higher the percentage of an artist's Armory exhibition network that is composed of US born artists, the fewer the number of textbook pages that will subsequently recognize that artist (-27.014 pages per percentage point). Here, then, is evidence of a reverse halo effect. Contrary to *Hyp. 7*, however, the larger the percentage of an artist's Armory exhibition network that is composed of female artists, the *more* textbook pages an artist is likely to receive over time. The effect appears to be strong (312.473 pages per percentage point); however, keep in mind the information offered in Section 5.1: exhibitions with women from the Armory Show were extremely limited from 1929 to 1968. Again, the R-square is revealing. All three alter attribute variables only explain about 14% of the variance in long-term textbook coverage.

Model 6 presents the effects of the control variables. Only three of these five measures achieve significance: number of solo and group exhibitions at MoMA and whether an artist is born in Europe. Given the consistent findings of Chapters One and Two, we would expect that MoMA exhibitions, in particular, would have a positive impact on subsequent textbook coverage, while the results of Chapter Two likewise suggest a positive impact afforded by European birth. Indeed, these three measures are

all in the expected direction, with each solo exhibition enjoyed by an artist increasing the number of textbook pages in which the artist is recognized by about 21 pages; each group exhibition increases inclusion by approximately 20 pages; and European birth increases inclusion by about 12 textbook pages. Note that the insignificance of male artists continues a trend from previous chapters, whereby gender of the artists matters only for MoMA exhibition and not textbook coverage. These three variables combined explain about 49% of the variance in subsequent textbook coverage.

Model 7 brings all the variables together, with the exception of repeated ties, which given its high correlation with centrality, is considered in Model 8. Only three of the variables emerge as significant in this comprehensive mode. One of them is a network measure, continuity or the number of connections added for a given Armory artist over subsequent decades, significant at the .01 level. The other two variables are MoMA success variables, measuring the extent of an artist's Museum coverage through solo and small group exhibition. In the presence of these three variables, the once-significant impact of alter attributes disappear. Thus, it is not with whom these Armory artists exhibit that matters for subsequent textbook attention (the "halo" in positive or negative terms), instead, it is the connections themselves—particularly their long-term extent and importance, as highlighted in special small group exhibition at MoMA. Likewise, it is not connections with non-Armory artists that matter (as shown by the insignificance of relativity), but rather the connections between peers. Finally, given that the network variable provides nuanced information on the impact of group exhibitions, it is suggestive of the variables strength and importance that the more basic measure (total number of small group exhibitions) is still significant in this model.

Model 8 is also an all-inclusive model, similar to Model 7, except that it uses the repeated ties variable in place of degree centrality. Here, we see three variables attain significance, with two of them involving network measures. As noted in the descriptive section, artists with a high percentage of repeat exhibition ties with other Armory artists are more likely to be included in more textbook pages. We see that here as well: a greater percentage of repeated ties with peer artists leads to greater coverage in subsequent textbooks for an Armory artist (62.541 pages per percentage point). As was the case for Model 7, continuity remains significant in Model 8 (at the .05 level): for every additional peer exhibition tie an Armory artist garners across subsequent decades, he or she is receives about a half a page of text coverage (.564 pages per additional exhibition connection). One non-network variable again remains significant: solo exhibitions also increase an artist's textbook recognition, where for every solo exhibition an artist acquires about 18 more textbook pages. While the R-squares for both inclusive Model 7 and Model 8 are fairly robust, it is somewhat better for the model with repeat exhibition ties (Model 8), as Model 7 explains about 51% of the variance in subsequent textbook coverage and Model 8 explains approximately 53%. Thus, while both measures of centrality are highly correlated, it again appears that repeated ties offer a slightly better predictor variable (strength of ties) than does the number of ties (breadth).

For the sake of comparison, Model 9 addresses a different outcome than Models 1 through 8: the total number of text editions an Armory artist is featured in out of the 17 textbook editions examined[13]. Given what I find in the previous model (Model 8), for

---

[13] Given that this dependent variable is a "count" whereby fractions are not possible (i.e., the number of textbook editions in which an Armory artist is included), one could argue for using a type of regression that accounts for such a dependent variable, such as Poisson or negative binomial regression (see Dobbin and Dowd, 1997). However, for the sake of comparison and

this final model, I use percentage of repeat ties for the centrality measure rather than degree centrality. Interestingly, almost the same variables that are significant for predicting number of textbook pages are also significant for predicting number of textbook editions—suggesting that a simple count of inclusion within textbooks can be used as a proxy for number of textbook pages (a result also found in Chapter One). Consider first the network variables that attain significance. For every percent increase in repeat exhibition ties, artists subsequently are featured in 17 more text editions. Continuity is also a significant factor: for every exhibition tie that artists gain across the decades (again, those from 1929 to 1968), they obtain .088 extra text edition coverage. Interestingly, within this inclusive model, an artist's high relativity has a significant, negative effect on the number of textbook editions within which an artist is included. Contrary to *Hyp. 4*, for every percent increase of an artist's non-Armory artist network, an artist's textbook representation over time decreases by .175. This now-negative impact could be further indicating the positive benefits of peer connections relative to non-peer connections (see Model 7 and Model 8), or it could result from issues of high correlation that relativity shares with repeat ties (.763). As is the case in Model 7 and Model 8, an artist's number of solo exhibitions—long held as a central indicator of canonization (see, for example, Becker, 1984)—is also a significant predictor of textbook inclusion over time, increasing an artist's representation by about one textbook edition per solo exhibition (.927). The R-square for Model 9 indicates that this model is nearly identical to Model 8 in terms of its predicting subsequent textbook coverage. For subsequent coverage in terms of textbook pages, the variables in Model 8 explain 53% of

symmetry, I use OLS regression for analyzing both the total number of pages and the total number of editions that Armory artists receive.

variance, whereas in terms of inclusion in textbook editions, those in Model 9 explain 52.8%.

6. Discussion and conclusion

Much scholarship argues that networks can play an important role in an artistic career (Becker, 1984; Crane, 1987; de Nooy, 2002; Uzzi and Spiro, 2005). A common focus of this scholarship concerns the implications of networks that the artists themselves make and foster. Artists seek connections to other artists in their field to become better socialized, both in terms of professional instruction (i.e., how to create) and how to navigate their profession's complexities and complications (Craig and DuBois, 2010; Lachmann, 1988). Connections to important others in a given artistic field can also be valuable in terms of prestige (Giuffre, 2009; Lang and Lang, 1988), as well as basic economic benefit (Pinheiro and Dowd, 2009). While such personal, artist-created networks have proven to be significant, in this research I am interested in the connections created between artists by the curatorial hand. That is, I examine connections between artists not made by the artists themselves, but rather by important others in the field, i.e., museum curators. To that end, I tracked how curators treated a particular group of artists—the modern artists introduced to the United States through the 1913 Armory Show. I focus on the Armory artists because the connections that MoMA curators create between them from 1929 to 1968 have the potential to shape their subsequent attention from academic authors via later art history textbooks.

Before turning to those networks created by museum exhibition, I need to first discuss one "non-network" aspect of museums that has a considerable impact on an

artist's recognition over time: solo exhibition. Artists who enjoy solo exhibition are not only better recognized over time, but through time as well. In other words, in Chapter One, I find that solo exhibition during the early years of MoMA (1929 to 1967) matter for inclusion in textbooks approximately a century later. Chapter Two complemented this finding by determining that prior solo exhibition also matter for recognition in early textbooks, from 1926 to 1970. In this chapter, it is not surprising, then, to find that solo exhibition at MoMA is again a consistently significant factor for textbook coverage from 1970 to today—particularly given the list of artistic "super-stars," such as Picasso, Matisse, van Gogh, Cezanne and Brancusi, highlighted by MoMA in its solo exhibitions. All else being equal, receiving a large number of solo exhibition at MoMA is beneficial to the coverage an Armory artist receives from the critical community— in the short term (Chapter Two), medium-term (Chapter Three) and long-term (Chapter One and Three).

While curators choose which artists to extol via solo exhibitions, they also choose which ones to combine in exhibitions that feature a collection of artists, thereby making connections between artists in each exhibition. In the case of Armory artists—a peer cohort that originally included 308 artists—curators at the Museum of Modern Art made such connections on hundreds of occasions, 1,546 times in fact. As a result, gauging how the connections between Armory artists (i.e., the networks constructed by the curatorial hand) matter for subsequent "success" is the focus of this chapter, thereby resonating with those who focus on success by considering artist-created networks (e.g., Anheier and Gerhards, 1991; Craig and DuBois, 2010; Crane, 1987; Giuffre, 1999; Rossman, Esparza and Bonacich, 2010; Uzzi and Spiro, 2005). In my case, however, success is understood as academic attention that can occur decades, if not a century, after the artist

first appeared in the artistic field. Thus, I join those interested in the posthumous portion

of artistic careers (e.g., Corse and Griffin, 1997; Dowd and Kelly, forthcoming; Lang and

Lang, 1988).

This research finds that several network variables are important to an Armory

artist's subsequent attention in textbooks. First, the sheer number of exhibition

connections to other peer artists matters, as does the strength of these connections, as

determined by repeated exhibition ties. By themselves, these centrality measures account

for almost 40% and 50 % (respectively) of the variation in later textbook exposure.

While both measures of peer network centrality have a significant effect on textbook

coverage, an artist's ability to transcend his or her own time and have outside exhibition

connections with non-peer artists also counts; however, it sometimes counts negatively

towards an artist's text representation over time, decreasing it in one inclusive model by

17% of a text page for every percent increase of an artist's non-Armory artist network,

holding all other variables constant. Finally, an artist's continuity, or ability to last

through time, also matters— as indicated by the finding that for every exhibition tie an

Armory artist gained across the decades (again, 1929 to 1968), he or she is included in

nearly one additional text. It must also be noted that such network findings come at the

expense of my "small group" exhibition measure, i.e., the number of small, named group

exhibitions an artist garnered from 1929 to 1968. Small group exhibition proved

important throughout this dissertation, particularly in Chapter One, where group

exhibition made the odds of contemporary textbook inclusion 73 times more likely.

However, whereas small group exhibition was useful for textbook coverage in the short-

term (Chapter Two) and long-term (Chapter One), this research indicates that it is the network patterns within group connections that really matter.

In considering the significance of centrality more in depth, it makes sense that the sheer number of connections is important. As stated earlier, large networks allow for greater options, as found in Giuffre's (1999) work where artists with connections to many galleries are better situated to disconnect and move on if one gallery in their network fails. Artists that have many exhibition ties to peer artists are likewise well positioned, I find. Curators need only disconnect and distance such artists from those others they believe are no longer historically relevant. Having a large network, then, provides many additional connections for artists, even if other connections diminish.

My second centrality measure, repeat exhibition ties, is also significant. Indeed, the robust connection formed when artists are repeatedly shown together is one of the overall factors with the greatest positive effect on later textbook coverage. In considering why this is the case—repeat connections, at the most basic level, can be seen as signifying a successful connection between artists. While curators may attempt to broaden an artist's applicability by exhibiting him or her with many other artists, such attempts are relatively futile if the connections are unsuccessful. Meaningful connections between artists resonate, not only within exhibition, but over time. Consequently, these connections are favored and repeated (for example, see Alexander, 1996). Repetition also signifies organizational approval. A connection between artists takes on an authoritative quality when repeated, as reiterating a connection indicates that the association was not created casually but is endorsed by the museum whose curators intentionally connected the artists (see Alexander, 1996; Peterson, 2003). Over time and

exhibition, such connections become taken-for-granted understandings, at least on the local level. As these understandings are disseminated to the wider public, through touring exhibition, national media and growing audiences, organizational understandings become widespread cultural understandings (Johnson, Dowd and Ridgeway, 2006).

Once an association between two artists is recognized by important actors within the art field, textbooks may be more likely to include the associated artists within the art historical canon (for example, see the work of Gilmore, 1988 regarding "schools" of music). Art history textbooks serve to explicitly connect artists both to one another and to the development of art through time. Artists who are outliers, associated with neither other artists nor artistic movements, are literally difficult to place within the art historical story that textbooks create. Conversely, artists with established associations fit nicely into the flow of art history. Again, such associations need not be created by the artists themselves, but rather by the evaluations, and re-evaluations, of those who have been sanctioned by the organizations responsible for shaping artist confluence (see Alexander, 1996; Peterson, 1997, 2003). Griswold states that "…powerful works allow for a variety of responses and emphases, instead of fitting any formula or pattern too closely…powerful works give critics and readers pleasure by engaging some of their presuppositions while leaving enough slack for nonpredicatable interpretations…" (Griswold, 1987: 1111). Such a statement could also be applied to historical reputations, where successful artists are those who can be interpreted, and re-interpreted, to resonate with new, prevailing ideas. Indeed, "...research on other fields of culture production shows that well-regarded and well-situated artists often span genres" (Pinheiro and

Dowd, 2009: 494). Thus, artists that last may be those that can be evaluated anew—

evaluations that could include new connections.

Such a conclusion is supported by another finding of this research. One inclusive

model showed that, holding all other variables constant, having a large percentage of

exhibitions with artists outside of one's peer cohort *negatively* affects an artist's

likelihood of being recognized by textbooks. I hypothesized exhibiting beyond one's

peer group would both afford additional connections and visibility, as well as serving as

an indicator of an artist's relativity to other artistic movements and times. However, in

the light of the importance of repeat exhibitions, the sometimes negative affect of outside

exhibitions makes certain sense. Artists who have a large percentage of their exhibitions

not with other artists of their own cohort, but instead with "non-peer" artists (i.e., artists

of a different period), suggests that such artists are not rooted in their own time.

Textbooks are written chronologically and artists that do not fit into their time period are

difficult to position and, thus, difficult to include. For example, while it would be simple

to draw a connection between a contemporary artist and an artist already featured in a

previous textbook chapter, it would be far more difficult and confusing to introduce a

long-time past artist alongside current producers. Anachronistic artists do not fit into the

idea of art historical development and progression and, consequently, may simply be left

out of the canon. That said, other research indicates the importance of artists historical

relativity (for example, Craig and Dubois, 2010; Pinheiro and Dowd, 2009). This

finding, then, may indicate that artists need to be firmly established within their own

time, as well as being able to transcend that time and connect to others external to their

cohort.

My last significant network variable is the measure of an artist's continuity over time. While the effect was somewhat small, it is telling that continued curatorial interest in an artist is important for future textbook recognition. While continually exhibiting a given artist with new artists may indicate that curators are struggling to position the artist, I do not think that is what is happening here, as it would contradict the above findings that artists strongly rooted and with robust connections in the field are more likely to be recognized. Rather, I think curators use certain artists as foundational to an exhibition, building and adding other artists to this foundation. For example, the artists with the most gained connections over the four decades of this research are also among the "classical" artists exhibited at the Armory Show. Such artists as Courbet, Ingres, Goya and Rodin straddled the bridge between traditional and modern art during the mid-19th century. Such artists serve to establish a historical foundation for modern art and for the exhibitions in which they are featured. Curators may use these artists as representing the progenitors of the modernist artists that proceeded, consequently, exhibiting—and historically connecting—such foundational artists with an array of later artists, which, again, works to promote the development of art history by creating artist associations through common exhibition.

Also interesting in this research are the measures that lose significance when all network variables were examined, most notably the three alter attribute measures. It is commonly assumed that a straightforward path to success—or, at the very least, historical acknowledgment—is to surround oneself with successful, celebrated others. However, this research did not find evidence either in support or in contradiction of this. Artists are no more likely to achieve textbook recognition even if most of their exhibition

connections are with modern art's elite, i.e., artists awarded a prior solo exhibition at

MoMA. Conversely, artists are not penalized in regards to textbook recognition for

having a high percentage of exhibition with those who have historically less rewarded

characteristics, such as being female and, for early modern art, US born artists. Given the

variables that are significant in this research, it seems less important *who* artists are

associated with, but rather that the artists *are* associated. As indicated in my descriptive

statistics, artists who have an unbalanced exhibition network, where a large percentage of

their connections are to either European or US artists, for example, do not tend to be

those top artists who are well recognized by textbooks. Rather, top exhibited artists have

a relatively balanced and unrestricted MoMA exhibition network. Such networks may

serve to better position an artist within art history as these exhibitions create connections

with both prestigious artists, which can be seen as artistic influences, and lesser known

artists, who are considered those who the artist influenced. In this regard also, a

limitation of this research is that I do not examine the effect of alters in real time, where

personal connections and influences may have an a priori effect on how curator's

understanding of artists and their relevant connections.

In closing, my results point to some general conclusions. First, examining

network connections is important in the study of artistic fields. This research

demonstrates that artists who are not only well connected, but also strongly connected,

are more likely to achieve long-term recognition—even when personal achievements,

such as solo exhibition, are taken into consideration. Second, networks are particularly

important when artistic rewards, such as textbook recognition, necessitate position and

continuity. Art history is fundamentally a progression narrative. To be part of art history

and, thus, to receive long-term recognition and prestige in the art world, artists must be connected to each other in order to establish their historical position and importance. However, such positioning is not solely created by the artist's own endeavors. A successful artistic career can be centuries long. Consequently, an artist's historical position and relation to other artists must, by necessity, be created by important art world others. This research suggests that when these important others are forming the canon, an artist's role in historical progression stories may be as important as his or her artistic contribution.

References for Chapter Three

Alexander, V., 1996. Museums and Money: The Impact of Funding on Exhibitions, Scholarship and Management. Indiana University Press, Indianapolis, IN.

Allen, M., Lincoln, A., 2004. Critical discourse and the cultural consecration of American films. Social Force*s* 82, 871-894.

Anheier, H.K., Gerhards, J., 1991. The acknowledgement of literary influence: a structural analysis of a German literary network. Sociological Forum 6, 137-156.

Anheier, H.K., Gerhards, J., Romo, F.P., 1995. Forms of capital and social structure in cultural fields: examining Bourdieu's social topography. American Journal of Sociology 100, 895-903.

Becker, H., 1984. Art Worlds. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Bonacich, P., 1972. Factoring and weighting approaches to status scores and clique identification. Journal of Mathematical Sociology 2 (1), 113-120.

Bowman, J.S., 1999. Performance appraisal: verisimilitude trumps veracity. Public Personnel Management 28 (4), 557-577.

Corse, S., 1995. Nations and novels: cultural politics and literary use. Social Forces 73, 1279-1308.

Corse, S., Griffin, M., 1997. Cultural valorization and African American literary history: reconstructing the canon. Sociological Forum 12, 173-203.

Craig, A., Dubois, S., 2010. Between art and money: the social space of public readings in contemporary poetry economies and careers. Poetics 38, 441-460.

Crane, D., 1987. The Transformation of the Avant-Garde: The New York Art World, 1940-1985. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Danko, D., 2008. Nathalie Heinich's sociology of art and sociology from art. Cultural Sociology 2, 242-256.

de Nooy, W., 2002. The dynamics of artistic prestige. Poetics 30, 147-167.

Dobbin, F., Dowd, T.J., 1997. How policy shapes competition: early railroad foundings in Massachusetts. Administrative Science Quarterly 42, 501-529.

Dowd, T.J., Kelly, K., forthcoming. Composing a career: the situation of living composers in the repertoires of U.S. orchestras, 2005-06. In: Mathieu C. (Ed.), Careers in Creative Industries. Routledge, London.

Emirbayer, M., Goodwin, J., 1994. Network Analysis, Culture, and the Problem of Agency. American Journal of Sociology 99, 1411-1454.

Faulkner, R.R., Anderson, A.B., 1987. Short-term projects and emergent careers: evidence from Hollywood. American Journal of Sociology 92, 879-909.

Gardner, H., De la Croix, H., Tansey, R.G., 1970. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 5th edition. Harcourt, Brace and World, New York.

Gardner, H., De la Croix, H., Tansey, R.G., 1975. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 6th edition. Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, New York.

Gardner, H., De la Croix, H., Tansey, R.G., 1980. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 7th edition. Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, New York.

Gardner, H., De la Croix, H., Tansey, R.G., 1986. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 8th edition. Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, New York.

Gardner, H., De la Croix, H., Tansey, R.G. Kirkpatrick, D., 1991. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 9th edition. Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, San Diego, CA.

Gardner, H., Tansey, R.G., Kleiner, F.S., 1996. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 10th edition. Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Fort Worth, TX.

Gardner, H., Kleiner, F.S., Mamiya, C.J., Tansey, R.G., 2001. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 11th edition. Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Fort Worth, TX.

Gardner, H., Kleiner, F.S., Mamiya, C.J., 2005. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 12th edition. Thomson/Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.

Gardner, H., Kleiner, F.S., 2009. Gardner's Art through the Ages. 13th edition. Thomson/Wadsworth, Boston.

Gilmore, S., 1988. Schools of activity and innovation. Sociological Quarterly 29, 203-219.

Giuffre, K., 1999. Sandpiles of opportunity: success in the art world. Social Forces 77, 815-32.

Giuffre, K., 2001. Mental maps: social networks and the language of critical reviews. Sociological Inquiry 71, 381-393.

Giuffre, K., 2009. The return of the natives: globalization and negative ties. Poetics 37, 333-347.

Griswold, W., 1987. The fabrication of meaning: literary interpretation in the United States, Great Britain, and the West Indies. American Journal of Sociology 92, 1077-1117.

Hanneman, R. A., Riddle, M., 2005. Introduction to Social Network Methods. University of California, Riverside, CA. http://www.faculty.ucr.edu/~hanneman/nettext/

Janson, H.W., Janson, D.J., 1969. History of Art: A Survey of the Major Visual Arts from the Dawn of History to the Present Day. Revised and enlarged 1st edition. Prentice-Hall, Englewoods Cliffs, N.J.

Janson, H.W., Janson, D.J., 1977. History of Art: A Survey of the Major Visual Arts from the Dawn of History to the Present day. 2nd edition. H. N. Abrams, New York.

Janson, H.W., Janson, A.F., 1986. History of Art. 3rd edition. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Janson, H.W., Janson, A.F., 1991. History of Art. 4th edition. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Janson, H.W., Janson, A.F., 1995. History of Art. 5th edition. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Janson, H.W., Janson, A.F., Cauman, S., 1997. History of Art. 5th revised edition. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Janson, H.W., Janson, A.F., 2001. History of Art. 6th edition. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Janson, H.W., Roberts, A.M., 2006. Janson's History of Art. 7th edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, N.J.

Johnson, C., Dowd, T.J., Ridgeway, C.L., 2006. Legitimacy as a social process. Annual Review of Sociology 32, 53-78.

Lachmann, R., 1988. Graffiti as career and ideology. American Journal of Sociology 94, 229-250.

Lang, G., Lang, K., 1988. Recognition and renown: the survival of artistic reputation. American Journal of Sociology 94, 79-109.

Menger, P.-M., 1999. Artistic labor markets and careers. Annual Review of Sociology 25, 541-574.

Nisbett, R.E., Wilson, T.D., 1977. The halo effect: evidence for unconscious alteration of judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 35, 250-256.

Peterson, K., 1997. The distribution and dynamics of uncertainty in art galleries: a case study of new dealerships in the Parisian art market, 1985-1990. Poetics 25, 241-263.

Peterson, K.E., 2003. Discourse and display: the modern eye, entrepreneurship, and the cultural transformation of the patchwork quilt. Sociological Perspectives 46, 461-490.

Pinheiro, D.L., Dowd, T.J., 2009. All that jazz: the success of jazz musicians in three metropolitan areas. Poetics 37, 490-506.

Princeton University, 2011. Art history. In: WordNet: A Lexical database for English. http://wordnet.princeton.edu/.

Rossman, G., Esparza, N., Bonacich, P., 2010. I'd like to thank the academy, team spillovers, and network centrality. American Sociological Review 75, 31-51.

Torgler, B. Schmidt, S.L., 2007. What shapes player performance in soccer? empirical findings from a panel analysis. Applied Economics 39, 2355-2369.

Uzzi, B., Spiro, J., 2005. Collaboration and creativity: the small world problem. American Journal of Sociology 111, 447-504.

van Venrooij, A., 2009. The aesthetic discourse space of popular music: 1985-86 and 2004-05. Poetics 37, 315-322.

Wellman, B., 1983. Network analysis: some basic principles. Sociological Theory 1, 155-200.

White, H., White, C., 1993. Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Zuckerman, E.W., Kim, T.-Y., Ukanwa, K., von Rittman, J., 2003. Robust identities or nonentities?: typecasting in the feature-film labor market. American Journal of Sociology, 108, 1018-1074.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation began with the career of the best known, most successful artist who exhibited at the Armory Show, Pablo Picasso. So, it is appropriate to also end with him. And, yet, Picasso has received much attention from scholars and critics—maybe even too much. So, I conclude not only with Picasso, but two other Armory artists who have not enjoyed as much historical consideration: Marie Laurencin, a second-tier artist, on the periphery of the artistic canon, and Catherine Nash Rhoades, a marginal or minor artist on the periphery of history. While each had historical trajectories that lead to different career outcomes, I selected these three artists because they have comparable lifetime career trajectories. During their time, each received much contemporary attention and rewards—enjoying long, prosperous careers—yet each differ in certain personal and career attributes, including those I examine in this dissertation. Such attributes, I argue, played an important role in these artist's divergent historical career outcomes. I start with a short overview of the endeavors and achievements these three artists accomplished during their life, then discuss their artistic careers as created through the US' modern art organizations, specifically, MoMA and survey textbooks. I conclude by noting how these artists' historical trajectories highlight some of the larger theoretical findings of this research, and I also note how their current career trajectories point to some of the limitations of this dissertation and, consequently, my possible next research steps.

Pablo Picasso (1881-1973) was born in Spain, but spent most of his life and career in Paris, France. His first artistic training came from his father, who himself was

an artist, professor of art and, occasionally, a museum curator (Walther, 2002). When it came time for Picasso to receive formal artistic training, his entire education took place in the schools and colleges where his father was on staff (Walther, 2002). Indeed, it was his father's knowledge of the art world and strategic planning of his son's artistic career—for example, Picasso had professionally exhibited twice by the age of 16—that obtained Picasso a certain professional recognition, making it easier for the young boy to gain entrance into important artistic circles, as the members likely had already heard his name (Walther, 2002). Belonging to such circles was a good start to Picasso's career. As one of Picasso's several biographers notes: "In the art world, as in any other, talent and energy need personal contacts to help them on their way" (Walther, 2002: 56). Such associations allowed Picasso to move to Paris (specifically Montmartre), the center of the avant-garde art world at the beginning of the 20th century. Surrounded by the practitioners of the ongoing modern art movement, which had been set in motion about forty years before his arrival in Paris, Picasso's work changed, adopting the style of those successful before him (Walther, 2002). His art, previously compared favorably to the realist, historical paintings popular in Spanish academia, was now connected to foundational modernist influences: "Reviewing the work shown in 1901 at the Galerie Vollard, Fèlicien Fagus wrote that Picasso had plainly been influenced by 'Delacroix, Manet, Monet, van Gogh, Pissarro, Toulouse-Lautrec, Degas…' The only thing wrong with this assessment is that is misses out an important name or two, such as that of Gauguin," (Walther, 2002: 77). (This is the first of a frequent aside: Each of the artists listed as influences for Picasso were featured in the 1913 Armory Show, including Paul Gauguin.)

In Paris, Picasso's work drew the attention of his principal patron, the American ex-patriate and writer Gertrude Stein (Giroud, 2007). Stein introduced Picasso to Matisse, who became a life-long friend and professional rival (and, as Chapter Three demonstrates, Picasso's only real rival at MoMA in regards to number of exhibitions). To list all the connections Picasso made in Paris would be creating a virtual who's who in modern art (for a comprehensive listing, see Walther, 2002): connections made through Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler's gallery, including Georges Braque (co-creator of Cubism), André Derain, Fernand Léger, Maurice de Vlaminck (all of which exhibited at the 1913 Armory Show); through his first wife, socialite and ballerina Olga Khokhlova, such as the composer Igor Stravinsky; and through friendship, with Guillaume Apollinaire, Marcel Duchamp, Man Ray and Frances Picaba (all, except Apollinaire, were also featured at the Armory Show in 1913). He also met the artist Marie Laurencin.

Marie Laurencin (1885-1956) was born and lived in Paris most of her life. At age 18, she became a student of porcelain painting in France's renowned national porcelain factory in Sèvres, likely painting the designs that Auguste Rodin had famously created a few decades earlier when he also had worked at the factory (MoMA/Grove, 2009). Laurencin continued her artistic education at the Académie Humbert, where she focused on oil painting and first met Georges Braque, a close, life-long friend (Danchev, 2005). At the same time, i.e., the early years of the 20th century, Laurencin moved to Montmartre and joined the same circles and knew the same people (see artists listed above) as Picasso (MoMA/Grove, 2009). She too had a famous American expatriate writer as her patron, Natalie Clifford Barney (Kahn, 2003). Through Picasso, Laurencin had meet and, subsequently, became romantically attached to the poet Guillaume

Apollinaire, who wrote *Les Peintres cubists,* which helped to define Picasso and Braques'

Cubist movement (Kahn, 2003). Laurencin, herself, was one of the very few female

Cubist painters of the time—responding to the "masculinity" of Cubism's rigid lines and

angles by using curvilinear shapes to express femininity (Kahn, 2003). Such

acquaintances helped Laurencin establish herself early on as a modernist painter and her

marketability flourished as she became an international figure (Kahn, 2003). Like

Picasso, Laurencin also employed her talents in a wide-variety of artistic fields, designing

sets for theatre and ballet, contributing works and articles to modernist art magazines and

illustrating books, most famously an edition of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*

(MoMA/Grove, 2009). Perhaps most telling of Laurencin's revered place within Paris'

modern art community, in 1922, upon Laurencin's return to France after WWI, a book of

love poems, *L'Eventail*, was dedicated to Laurencin as her return was believed to mark

the reconstruction of Paris' art community to its former belle époque (Khan, 2003).

Unlike Picasso and Laurencin, Catherine Nash Rhoades (1895-1938), sometimes

spelled Katherine Rhoads, was an American painter, who became interested in modern

art during a trip to Paris in 1908, when both Picasso and Laurencin were in residence

(Staples, 2003). Rhoades destroyed much of her early work, though that which has

survived has been connected to Cezanne as a primary influence (Staples, 2003). Early

on, she studied under Isabelle Dwight Sprague-Smith in New York and, later, became an

active member of the circle centered about famed photographer, art patron and gallery

owner Alfred Stieglitz (Hoffman, 2004; Staples, 2003). In this circle, she was introduced

and worked with the US' modernist elite, including Marsden Hartley, John Marin,

Abraham Walkowitz, F. William Weber, Arthur Dove and Marion Beckett (all

participants in the Armory Show of 1913; for a full list of Stieglitz's associates, see

Hoffman, 2004; Lowe, 2002). Upon the advocacy of Edward Steichen, subsequently the

Director of Photography at MoMA, Rhoades' work was exhibited in Stieglitz's Little

Galleries of the Photo-Secession, better known by its address, as the *291* gallery, which

placed Rhoades in the company of European artists such as Henri Matisse, Auguste

Rodin, Paul Cézanne, Pablo Picasso and Constantin Brancusi, who also exhibited at *291*.

Under Stieglitz's patronage, Rhoades first contributed work, through articles, artwork and

poetry, to Stieglitz's art magazine, *Camera Work*. Later, she co-produced the *291*

magazine with Stieglitz and others, where she was identified as one of the periodical's

main creative contributors: "[*291* is] a chance for de Zayas, Meyer, and Rhoades to

experiment" (Marsden Hartley, quoted in Leavens, 1983: 128). After the Armory Show,

Rhoades was established as one of the important American modernists, with the *New

York Times* (Carey, 1930) claiming she represented post-Impressionism in the United

States, while the *New York Evening Post* (Watson, 1916) and *New York Herald* (Boswell,

1916) praised her use of color, connecting her to the Fauvist art movement. Over the

course of her approximately 35 year career, Rhoades received much positive critical

attention, with assessments usually admiring her innate talent and acute perception:

"…study reveals the fact that she has seen further or at least differently than we" (Meyer,

[1915] 1978: 8). As a final indication of Rhoades prominence within the US art world at

this time, she was nominated for the president of New York's Independent Artists

Association, the US version of France's Société des Artistes Indépendants, by the

Bulletin of the Dada Movement (Staples, 2003). In this honor, she was among the most

influential movers in the US art world, including Walter Arensberg, Mabel Dodge,

Marcel Duchamp, Mina Loy, John Marin, Walter Pach, Alfred Stieglitz and Abraham

Walkowitz (with the exception of art patrons Walter Arensberg and Mabel Dodge, these

artists were featured in the 1913 Armory Show).

In 1911, Laurencin and Picasso were invited to exhibit in Cologne, Germany at

the Sonderbund westdeutscher Kunstfreunde und Kunstler (the "Separate League of West

German Art Lovers and Artists"). The 1911 "Sonderbund" was a landmark exhibition

that highlighted the great European artists of the early modern art movement and

included works from Paul Cezanne, Paul Gauguin, Edvard Munch, Paul Signac and

Vincent van Gogh as well as, of course, Laurencin and Picasso (Brown, 1988).

Impressed with the exhibition, the organizers of the Armory Show successfully recruited

these artists to exhibit in the United States (Brown, 1988). Picasso (though not

Laurencin) was featured in two other important European modernist survey exhibitions

that were influential for the Armory Show, the 1910 and 1912 Post-Impressionist

exhibitions at the Grafton Galleries in London, England (Brown, 1988). Perhaps because

Laurencin and Picasso had already exhibited on an international level, whereas Rhoades,

as an American artist working in New York, did not have such international exhibition

opportunities, both were allowed seven and eight (respectively) artworks into the Armory

Show to Rhoades' one.

By the time the Museum of Modern Art opened in 1929, Laurencin, Picasso and

Rhoades had progressed to a point in their artistic careers where each had established

themselves not merely as prominent and well exhibited artists, but well regarded among

their professional peers and important players within the modernist movement. Despite

each artist's professional establishment, however, MoMA considered these artists very

differently. Rhoades was never exhibited in the first four decades of the Museum, whereas Laurencin and Picasso were both featured in the Museum more than once every decade. Picasso, as the Museum's most exhibited Armory artist (see Chapter Three), was featured in 92 exhibitions at the Museum between 1929 and 1968, eighteen of which were solo shows and four small group exhibitions. Laurencin received 14 exhibitions at MoMA—two more than the average number of exhibitions amongst those Armory artists shown at the Museum—but was never given a solo or small group exhibit. Laurencin and Picasso both had strong starts at MoMA, with seven and 11 exhibitions respectively during MoMA's first five years (1929 to 1934). However, Picasso quickly outpaced Laurencin when five years later he had been given six more exhibitions to her one. By MoMA's second decade (1939 to 1948), Laurencin had been reduced to three exhibitions, while Picasso increased to 24. Perhaps most tellingly, between the first and second twenty years of MoMA, Picasso gained 19 additional exhibition connections to other Armory artists, while Laurencin lost 28 of her previous Armory exhibition connections.

In the composition of Laurencin and Picasso's exhibition networks, there are more similarities than differences. For having 78 less MoMA exhibitions than Picasso, Laurencin had only about 30 fewer connections to Armory artist peers (Laurencin had exhibition connections to 77 Armory artists to Picasso's 106). During this time (1929 to 1968), Picasso's MoMA exhibition network is composed of 90% repeat connections, 67% European and 30% US born, where Laurencin's is 68% repeats, but also, 67% European and 30% US born. Interestingly, where female Armory artists composed 5% of Picasso's network, females are only 1% of Laurencin's exhibition network. Moreover, about 43% of Laurencin's exhibition connections are with Armory artists that had prior

solo MoMA exhibitions, whereas only 30% of Picasso's peer network were composed of MoMA's elite.

Despite a relatively strong and consistent representation at MoMA, Laurencin is not included in any of the 44 textbooks examined in this dissertation, from *Gardner's* early 1926 edition to the three recent texts students use today (i.e., Janson, 1997; Stokstad, 2005; Hartt, 1989). Not surprisingly, given her absence in MoMA exhibitions, Rhoades is not included in these texts either. Picasso, however, is included in all 44 texts with 541 pages dedicated to him.

The difference in historical recognition between these three artists is profound, particularly considering that during their lifetime each had a high status position within the burgeoning modern art field, numerous successful professional associates and extensive exposure through both important galleries and publications. However, as stated in Chapter Three, an artist's career is not solely created by the artist. Rather, the research in this dissertation indicates that both individual characteristics, such as gender and nationality, and field level factors, such as extent and type of museum exposure, help determine an artist's place within the historical record. In the first half of the 20th century, while both the modern art field and modern art canon were forming, filtering was occurring through academic recognition and museum exhibition. During the first two decades of MoMA, both an artist's European nationality and record of prior European exhibition aided in an artist's selection by the US museum. As MoMA and the modern art field became culturally established, gender became an important factor, with male artists being favored for MoMA exhibition. Thus, though Picasso and Laurencin's nationality and prior European exhibition success may have aided their initial recognition

in MoMA, it was Laurencin whose exhibition presence dwindled over time. Rhoades, with the two strikes of gender and US nationality against her, was altogether ignored by the Museum. While such individual attributes were important for MoMA selection, the Museum, in turn, was crucial for historical recognition. MoMA's early preference for European and male artists affected the choices of early textbooks and, over time, the canonical selections of MoMA and academia coalesced. By the 1970s, artists that had been removed from text's and the Museum's canon were likely removed for good.

In this manner, the dissertation finds that field level factors, influenced by individual attributes, are key to historical recognition. Not only did early selection and exhibition by MoMA increase an artist's chances for long-term recognition, but how and with whom an artist was exhibited by the Museum also mattered. The Museum served to shape the modern art canon by highlighting and connecting specific artists through public display. Armory artists that were repeatedly exhibited with, and consequently connected to, other Armory artists were more likely to be included within the textual account of art history, perhaps because such repeated connections serve to position and arrange artists within art history's chronological progression narrative. During their lifetimes, Laurencin, Picasso and Rhoades each positioned themselves within the modern art movement, surrounded themselves with influential and famous friends and left behind others to advocate for their importance and continued relevance. However, this research indicates that their inclusion within the contemporary cultural canon was influenced more by field level choices and connections than by lifetime initiatives. Thus, while Picasso, well-recognized in both texts and MoMA exhibition, is now a house-hold name within

the United States, Laurencin is known to only a few modern art aficionados, while Rhoades is barely visible in the historical record.

However, this dissertation promoted a view of a canon that is often in flux. By only examining historical MoMA exhibition choices (i.e., those from 1929 to 1968), I did not consider the prospect that these artists, and others from the Armory Show, would be later reconsidered by the Museum (though I did examine the possibility of retrospective consecration in current textbooks in Chapter One). This maybe a next step for this research, particularly as the work of Rhoades was recently shown in the nationally touring exhibition "Georgia O'Keeffe and the Women of the Stieglitz Circle" (co-organized by the Georgia O'Keeffe Museum and Atlanta's High Museum of Art, 2008). Moreover, Laurencin, who once wrote "…*worse than being dead/ even more pathetic/ is being a forgotten woman,*" (Laurencin, 1916: 62) has also experienced a resurgence, not in the US or even much in Europe, but rather in Japan. Her poetry, translated into Japanese by Daigaku Horiguchi, is popular, with her most famous poem "Le Calmant" recently recorded as a song by the contemporary Japanese singer and actress Mari Natsuki (Kahn, 2003; see also Natsuki's album, *13 Chansons*). Perhaps most importantly, in 1983, the Musée Marie Laurencin, a museum dedicated solely to Laurencin's work, was established outside of Tokyo (Kahn, 2003). Such international recognition points to another gap in this dissertation. While I examine the importance of European critical assessment prior to the 1913 Armory Show, as well as artist's nationality, I do not consider the importance of on-going evaluations from other countries, their impact on the US canon and the US canon's bearing on their critical

choices. Cross-national research has proved insightful when examining canons (see, specifically, Janssen, et al., 2008), and is an intriguing direction for this research.

Finally, though this dissertation focuses on the visual arts, other areas of sociological work correspond and can serve to inform this research. For example, in the sociology of literature, several studies have found that the judgments of literary historians, scholars and textbook editors are largely shaped by the selections of "front-line" literary agents, such as book critics and reporters (van Rees, 1983, 1987; Janssen, 1997; Rosengren, 1985, 1987). Such findings complement the results of this dissertation. Much like literary critics, who are among the first evaluators to come in contact with literary products and producers, museum curators are also forerunners, shifting through and narrowing down artistic production for those evaluators that come later in the consecration process, such as scholars and textbook editors. Another direction this research could take, then, is to examine the interplay between critical assessment and curatorial choices.

As a conclusion to this dissertation, I wish to end with the words of another, as I have provided more than enough words of my own. As noted earlier, Catherine Rhoades produced and contributed to several important US modernist art magazines. In one contribution, a poem in response to the statement, "What [the gallery] '291' means to me*,"* Rhoades (1915: 58) describes the empowerment she experienced engaging with the modern art community in the United States, where she was accepted as a peer professional. Her words resonate, not only through this dissertation's findings, but also with me as I emerge into a professional field of my own, aware and thankful to those who have helped me get here: *I touch four walls—I hear voices/ those who have touched its*

world/ I too went gazing, questioning, answering/ I too merged with the voices; and the

walls echoed.

References for Conclusion

Boswell, P., 1916. Untitled. New York Herald. Referenced in Camera Work, 18.

Brown, M.W., 1988. The Story of the Armory Show. Abbeville Press, New York.

Carey, E., 1930. Casual impressions of modernism. American Magazine of Art, 425.

Danchev, A., 2005. George Braque: A Life. Arcade Publishing, New York.

Davies, P., Denny, W.B., Hofrichter, F.F., Jacobs, J.F., Roberts, A.M., Simon, D.L., 2006. Janson's History of Art: The Western Tradition. Revised 7th edition. Pearsons Education, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Hartt, F., 1998. Art: A History of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture. 3rd edition. H.N. Abrams, New York.

Hoffman, K., 2004. Stieglitz: A Beginning Light. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Giroud, V., 2007. Picasso and Gertrude Stein. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Janssen, S., 1997. Reviewing as social practice: Institutional constraints on critics' attention for contemporary fiction. Poetics 24, 275-297.

Janssen, S., Kuipers, G., Verboord, M., 2008. Cultural globalization and arts journalism: the international orientation of arts and cultural coverage in American, Dutch, French, and German newspapers, 1955-2008. American Sociological Review 73, 719-740.

Kahn, E.L., 2003. Marie Laurencin: Une Femme Inadaptée in Feminist Histories of Art. Ashgate Publishing Co., Burlington, VT.

Laurencin, M., 1916. Le calmant. In: Weinreb, R.P. (Ed.), 1998. Premiers Poémes: anthologie avec exercices de vocabulaire, de grammaire et de pronunciation. McGraw-Hill, 62.

Leavens, I.B., 1983. From "291" to Zurich: The Birth of Dada. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, Ann Arbor, MI.

Lowe, D.L. Havinga, A.E., 2002. Stieglitz: A Memoir/Biography. Museum of Fine Arts, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Meyer, S., (1915) 1978. Modern Art: 19th and 20th Centuries: Selected Papers. Braziller, New York.

MoMA/Grove Art Learning Resources, 2009. Marie Laurencin. http://www.moma.org/collection/artist.php?artist_id=3408

Rhoades, K.N., 1915. What '*291*' means to me. Camera Work, 47.

Rosengren, K.E., 1985. Time and literary fame. Poetics 14, 157-172.

Rosengren, K.E., 1987. Literary criticism: Future invented. Poetics 16, 295-325.

Staples, S., 2001. As Avant-Garde as the Rest of Them: An Introduction to the Armory Show. *http://xroads.virginia.edu/~museum/armory/intro.html*

Stokstad, M., 2008. Art History. Revised 3rd edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

van Rees, C.J., 1983. How a literacy work becomes a masterpiece: On the threefold selection practiced by literary criticism. Poetics 12, 397-417.

van Rees, C.J., 1987. How reviewer reach consensus on the value of literary works. Poetics 16, 275-294.

Walther, I.F., 2002. Pablo Picasso 1881-1973. Taschen, New York.

Watson, F., 1916. Untitled. New York Evening Post. Referenced in Camera Work, 19.

Table 1-A. The 58 Armory Show artists featured in at least one of the three textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
BELLOWS	no	male	US	11	no	yes	16	0	0
BONNARD	yes	male	France	6	no	yes	0	1	3
BRANCUSI	no	male	Romania	5	no	yes	0	2	0
BRAQUE	yes	male	France	3	no	yes	0	1	1
CASSATT	no	female	US	2	no	yes	4	0	0
CEZANNE	yes	male	France	27	yes	yes	0	2	1
COROT	no	male	France	2	yes	yes	0	0	2
COURBET	no	male	France	1	yes	yes	3	0	0
DAUMIER	no	male	France	3	yes	yes	0	0	1
DAVIES	no	male	US	6	no	yes	9	0	0
DAVIS	no	male	US	5	no	yes	0	0	1
DEGAS	no	male	France	3	no	yes	27	0	0
DELACROIX	no	male	France	1	yes	yes	6	0	0
DELAUNAY	no	male	France	3	no	yes	9	0	0
DENIS	yes	male	France	8	no	yes	6	0	0
DERAIN	yes	male	France	3	no	yes	0	1	0
DREIER	no	female	US	2	no	yes	4	0	0
DUCHAMP	no	male	France	4	no	yes	12	0	0
DUCHAMP-VILLON	no	male	France	5	no	yes	5	0	0
GAUGUIN	yes	male	France	14	yes	yes	0	1	1
GLEIZES	no	male	France	2	no	yes	2	0	0
VAN GOGH	yes	male	Netherlands	18	yes	yes	0	4	1
GOYA	no	male	Spain	1	yes	yes	2	0	0
HARTLEY	no	male	US	8	no	yes	0	1	0
HENRI	no	male	US	5	no	yes	3	0	0

Table 1-A (cont.). The 58 Armory Show artists featured in at least one of the three textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
HOPPER	no	male	US	1	no	yes	0	1	1
INGRES	no	male	France	2	yes	yes	3	0	0
KANDINSKY	yes	male	Russia	1	no	yes	0	1	0
KIRCHNER	yes	male	Germany	1	no	yes	0	0	1
KUHN	no	male	US	5	no	yes	15	0	0
LEGER	no	male	France	2	no	yes	0	4	0
LEHMBRUCK	yes	male	Germany	3	no	yes	0	1	1
MAILLOL	yes	male	France	8	no	yes	0	1	1
MANET	yes	male	France	4	yes	yes	13	0	0
MARIN	no	male	US	10	no	yes	0	1	1
MATISSE	yes	male	France	17	no	yes	0	10	1
MONET	no	male	France	5	no	yes	0	1	0
MUNCH	yes	male	Norway	2	no	yes	0	2	0
PACH	no	male	US	10	no	yes	2	0	0
PICABIA	no	male	France	4	no	yes	5	0	0
PICASSO	yes	male	Spain	8	no	yes	0	11	4
PISSARRO	no	male	French West Indies	5	yes	yes	8	0	0
PUVIS DE CHAVANNES	no	male	France	15	yes	no	0	0	0
REDON	yes	male	France	62	no	yes	0	1	2
RENOIR	no	male	France	16	no	yes	0	1	0
RODIN	no	male	France	8	no	yes	0	1	0
ROUAULT	yes	male	France	4	no	yes	0	3	0
ROUSSEAU	yes	male	France	10	yes	yes	0	1	0
RYDER	no	male	US	10	no	yes	0	0	2

Table 1-A (cont.). The 58 Armory Show artists featured in at least one of the three textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
SEURAT	yes	male	France	2	yes	yes	0	1	1
SHEELER	no	male	US	6	no	yes	0	1	0
SIGNAC	yes	male	France	17	no	yes	9	0	0
SLOAN	no	male	US	7	no	yes	13	0	0
STELLA	no	male	Italy	2	no	yes	0	1	0
TOULOUSE-LAUTREC	no	male	France	5	yes	yes	0	2	2
VLAMINCK	yes	male	France	4	no	yes	13	0	0
VUILLARD	yes	male	France	22	no	yes	0	1	1
WHISTLER	no	male	US	4	yes	yes	0	1	0

Table 1-B. The top artists with the highest number of pages in each of the three textbooks.

Text 1:	Text 2:	Text 3:
Stokstad (2008)	**Janson (2006)**	**Hartt (1998)**
BRAQUE	DAUMIER	CEZANNE
CASSATT	DELACROIX	COURBET
CEZANNE	DUCHAMP	DEGAS
DAUMIER	GAUGUIN	DELACROIX
GAUGUIN	VAN GOGH	GOYA
VAN GOGH	GOYA	INGRES
GOYA	INGRES	MATISSE
MANET	KANDINSKY	MONET
MATISSE	MATISSE	PICASSO
MONET	MONET	RODIN
PICASSO	PICASSO	
PISSARRO	RODIN	
RENOIR		
TOULOUSE-LAUTREC		
WHISTLER		

Table 1-C. Descriptive statistics.

	% of Armory Artists (N)	Mean	Min	Max	Pearson (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
(1) prior European success	15% (46)	0.149	0	1	1							
(2) male artist	83% (253)	0.829	0	1	0.118	1						
(3) born in Europe	46% (139)	0.457	0	1	0.442	0.277	1					
(4) exhibited posthumously at Armory Show	9% (27)	0.093	0	1	0.121	0.134	0.193	1				
(5) # of Armory Show artworks	N/A	4.104	0	62	0.108	0.146	0.039	-0.038	1			
(6) # of general MoMA Exhibitions	29% (88)	1.583	0	27	0.058	0.111	0.139	-0.004	0.175	1		
(7) # of group MoMA exhibitions	7% (21)	0.098	0	4	0.318	0.107	0.163	0.172	0.12	-0.098	1	
(8) # of solo MoMA exhibitions	10% (32)	0.208	0	11	0.313	0.097	0.201	0.072	0.281	-0.089	0.57	1

$N = 308$ for all correlations, except Male Artist, $N = 305$, Born in Europe, $N = 303$, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, $N = 290$.

Table 1-D. The top five artists with the highest number of artworks displayed at the Armory Show.

Artist	# of artworks
CEZANNE	27
VAN GOGH	18
JOHN	44
REDON	62
VUILLARD	22

Table 1-E. The Armory Show artists with solo and group MoMA exhibition, 1929-1967.

Solo Exhibition	Group Exhibition
BONNARD	BONNARD
BRANCUSI	BRAQUE
BRAQUE	CEZANNE
CEZANNE	COROT
DERAIN	DAUMIER
GAUGUIN	DAVIS
VAN GOGH	EPSTEIN
HARTLEY	GAUGUIN
HOPPER	VAN GOGH
KANDINSKY	HOPPER
LACHAISE	KIRCHNER
LEGER	LEHMBRUCK
LEHMBRUCK	MAILLOL
MAILLOL	MARIN
MARIN	MATISSE
MATISSE	PICASSO
MONET	REDON
MUNCH	RYDER
NADELMAN	SEURAT
PICASSO	TOULOUSE-LAUTREC
REDON	VUILLARD
RENOIR	
RODIN	
ROUAULT	
ROUSSEAU	
SEURAT	
SHEELER	
STELLA	
TOULOUSE-LAUTREC	
VILLON	
VUILLARD	
WHISTLER	

Table 1-F. Logistic regression analyses (odds ratios) for the effects of artist attributes and MoMA exhibition on the likelihood of inclusion in three art history textbooks.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
prior European success	5.729**				2.766*	1.29
male artist		4.633*			3.156	0.964
born in Europe		3.321**			1.692	0.928
# of Armory Show artworks			1.145**		1.108**	1.051
exhibited posthumously at Armory Show			7.857**		6.045**	12.414**
# of general MoMA Exhibitions				1.256**		1.255**
# of group MoMA Exhibitions				69.971**		73.462**
# of solo MoMA Exhibitions				44.239**		46.772**
Intercept	.160**	.030**	.101**	.047**	.026**	0.027
Chi-square	24.478	27.049	42.344	145.591	58.48	156.862
Pseudo-R-square	0.123	0.137	0.215	0.608	0.289	0.662
N	308	303	290	308	288	288

N = 308 for all correlations, except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290. *p<.05, one-tailed. **p<.01, one-tailed.

Table 1-G. Logistic regression analyses (odds ratios) for the effects of artist attributes on the likelihood of exhibiting at MoMA, 1929-1967.

	Model 6	*Model 7*	*Model 8*	*Model 9*
prior European success	4.5896**			2.151*
male artist		5.494**		3.928**
born in Europe		2.047**		1.392
# of Armory Show artworks			1.276**	1.246**
exhibited posthumously at Armory Show			3.584**	2.660*
Intercept	.554**	.114**	.274**	.070**
Chi-square	20.944	34.881	48.559	67.68
Pseudo-R-square	0.089	0.146	0.207	0.28
N	308	303	290	288

N = 308 for all correlations, except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290. *p<.05, one-tailed. **p<.01, one-tailed.

Table 1-H. OLS regression analyses for the effects of artists attributes and a legitimating organization on the aggregate number of pages dedicated to an Armory artist within all three art history textbooks.

	Model 1	*Model 2*	*Model 3*	*Model 4*	*Model 5*	*Model 6*
prior European success	4.834** (1.086)				1.856 (.1.158)	-1.027 (.922)
male artist		1.129 (1.066)			.323 (1.080)	-.320 (.836)
born in Europe		3.883** (.068)			2.195* (.851)	1.451* (.662)
# of Armory Show artworks			.212** (.067)		.152 (.069)	-.007 (.055)
exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show			10.184** (1.298)		9.185** (1.301)	8.731** (1.015)
# of general MoMA exhibitions				.345** (.080)		.317** (.075)
# of group MoMA exhibitions				3.082** (.893)		2.003* (.854)
# of solo MoMA exhibitions				3.728** (.381)		3.782** (.354)
Intercept	1.579** (.420)	-0.386 (.941)	0.599 (.482)	.679* (.342)	-0.672 (.982)	-0.175 (.759)
R-square	0.061	0.089	0.206	0.423	0.249	0.558
N	308	303	290	308	288	288

N = 308 for all correlations, except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290. *p<.05, one-tailed. **p<.01, one-tailed.

Table 1-I. The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	us Armory Show Exhibitio	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
ABENDSCHEIN	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
AITKEN	no	male	US	4	no	no	0	0	0
ALGER	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
ANDERSON	no	male	US	6	no	yes	1	0	0
ARCHIPENKO	no	male	Russia	5	no	yes	9	0	0
ASHE	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
BARKLEY	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
BARNARD	no	male	US	5	no	yes	2	0	0
BEACH	no	male	US	4	no	no	0	0	0
BEAL	no	male	US	2	no	yes	2	0	0
BECHTEJEFF	yes	male	Russia	1	no	no	0	0	0
BECKER	no	male	Russia	1	no	yes	1	0	0
BECKETT	no	female	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
BERNARD	no	male	France	2	no	no	0	0	0
BICKFORD	no	male	Canada	3	no	no	0	0	0
BITTER	no	male	Austria	1	no	no	0	0	0
BJORKMAN	no	male	Sweden	1	no	no	0	0	0
BLANCHET	no	male	Sweden	1	no	no	0	0	0
BLUEMNER	no	male	Germany	5	no	yes	1	0	0
BOLZ	yes	male	Germany	4	no	no	0	0	0
BORGLUM	no	male	US	7	no	no	0	0	0
BOSS	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
BOURDELLE	no	male	France	6	no	yes	5	0	0
BREWER	no	female	Canada	3	no	no	0	0	0
BRINLEY	no	male	US	7	no	no	0	0	0
B-BROWN	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
F-BROWN	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0

Table 1-I (cont.). The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
BRUCE	yes	male	US	4	no	yes	1	0	0
BURLIN	no	male	US	4	no	yes	5	0	0
BURROUGHS	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
BUTLER	no	male	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
CAMOIN	yes	male	France	4	no	yes	1	0	0
CARLES	no	male	US	2	no	yes	4	0	0
CARR	no	female	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
CASARINI	no	male	Italy	1	no	no	0	0	0
CESARE	no	male	Sweden	4	no	yes	1	0	0
CHABAUD	yes	male	France	2	no	no	0	0	0
CHAFFEE	no	male	US	3	no	yes	1	0	0
CHANLER	no	male	US	11	no	no	0	0	0
CHARMY	no	female	France	4	no	no	0	0	0
CHEW	no	male	US	2	.	no	0	0	0
CHURCHILL	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
CIMIOTTI	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
CLYMER	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
COATE	no	male	US	2	.	no	0	0	0
COHEN	no	female	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
COLEMAN	no	male	US	3	no	yes	6	0	0
COLUZZI	no	male	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
CONDER	no	male	England	8	no	no	0	0	0
CORY	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
CRISP	no	male	Canada	1	no	no	0	0	0
CROSS	yes	male	France	4	yes	yes	5	0	0
CROWLEY	no	male	US	2	.	no	0	0	0

Table 1-I (cont.). The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
CURRIER	no	male	US	1	yes	no	0	0	0
CUTLER	no	male	US	2	no	yes	1	0	0
DABO	no	male	France	4	no	no	0	0	0
DASBURG	no	male	France	4	no	yes	1	0	0
DAVEY	no	male	US	1	no	yes	1	0	0
DAVIDSON	no	male	US	10	no	yes	3	0	0
DAVIS	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
DIMOCK	no	female	US	8	no	no	0	0	0
DIRKS	no	male	Germany	2	no	no	0	0	0
DOLINSKY	no	male	Russia	1	no	no	0	0	0
DONOHO	no	male	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
DOUCET	yes	male	France	6	yes	no	0	0	0
A-DRESSER	no	female	US	3	.	no	0	0	0
L-DRESSER	no	male	US	2	.	no	0	0	0
DREYFOUS	no	female	US	2	.	no	0	0	0
DU BOIS	no	male	US	6	no	yes	8	0	0
DUFFY	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
DUFRENOY	no	male	France	2	no	no	0	0	0
DUFY	no	male	France	2	no	yes	21	0	0
EBERLE	no	female	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
EDDY	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
EELS	no	female	US	13	.	no	0	0	0
ENGLE	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
EPSTEIN	no	male	US	1	no	yes	0	0	1
ESTE	no	female	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
EVERETT	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0

Table 1-I (cont.). The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
FLANDRIN	yes	male	France	4	no	no	0	0	0
FOOTE	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
FRASER	no	male	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
FRAZIER	no	male	France	3	no	no	0	0	0
FREUND	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
FRIESZ	yes	male	France	5	no	yes	5	0	0
FRY	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
FUHR	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
GAYLOR	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
GIBB	no	male	England	3	no	no	0	0	0
GIMMI	no	male	Switzerland	1	no	no	0	0	0
GIRIEUD	yes	male	France	3	no	no	0	0	0
GLACKENS	no	male	US	3	no	yes	9	0	0
GLINTENKAMP	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
GOLDTHWAITE	no	female	US	2	no	yes	3	0	0
GUERIN	no	male	France	2	no	no	0	0	0
GUSSOW	no	male	Russia	2	no	no	0	0	0
GUTMAN	no	.		1	.	no	0	0	0
GUTMANN	no	male	Germany	1	no	no	0	0	0
HALE	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
HALPERT	no	male	Russia	2	no	yes	1	0	0
HARLEY	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
HASSAM	no	male	US	12	no	yes	2	0	0
HAWORTH	no	female	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
HELBIG	no	male	Germany	1	no	no	0	0	0
HESS	no	male	Germany	1	.	no	0	0	0

Table 1-I (cont.). The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
HIGGINS	no	male	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
HOARD	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
HODLER	yes	male	Switzerland	2	no	yes	1	0	0
HONE	no	male	Ireland	2	no	no	0	0	0
HOPKINSON	no	male	US	4	no	yes	3	0	0
HOWARD	no	male	Canada	1	no	no	0	0	0
HUMPHREYS	no	male	US	5	no	no	0	0	0
HUNT	no	female	US	1	.	no	0	0	0
HUNTINGTON	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
INNES	no	male	England	7	no	no	0	0	0
JANSEN	yes	female	Germany	13	no	no	0	0	0
A-JOHN	no	male	England	44	no	yes	7	0	0
G-JOHN	no	female	England	2	no	yes	3	0	0
JOHNSON	no	female	US	4	no	no	0	0	0
JUNGHANNS	no	male	Austria	1	no	no	0	0	0
KARFIOL	no	male	Hungary	3	no	yes	9	0	0
KELLER	no	male	US	2	no	yes	3	0	0
KING	no	female	South Africa	5	no	no	0	0	0
KIRSTEIN	no	male		3	no	no	0	0	0
KLEIMINGER	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
KLEINERT	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
KRAMER	no	male	US	17	no	no	0	0	0
KROLL	no	male	US	1	no	yes	3	0	0
LACHAISE	no	male	France	1	no	yes	0	2	0

Table 1-I (cont.). The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
LA FRESNAYE	no	male	France	4	no	yes	15	0	0
LAPRADE	yes	male	France	6	no	yes	1	0	0
LAURENCIN	yes	female	France	7	no	yes	14	0	0
LAWSON	no	male	Canada	3	no	yes	4	0	0
LEE	no	male	Norway	8	no	yes	2	0	0
LEES	no	male	Australia	2	no	no	0	0	0
LEVY	yes	male	Germany	1	no	no	0	0	0
LIE	no	male	Norway	5	no	yes	2	0	0
LONDONER	no	female	US	4	no	no	0	0	0
LUKS	no	male	US	6	no	yes	4	0	0
LUNDBERG	no	male	Denmark	1	no	no	0	0	0
MacKNIGHT	no	male	US	4	no	no	0	0	0
MacRAE	no	male	US	11	no	no	0	0	0
MAGER	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
MANGUIN	yes	male	France	3	no	no	0	0	0
MANIGAULT	no	male	Canada	2	no	no	0	0	0
MANOLO	yes	male	Spain	7	no	yes	3	0	0
MARIS	no	male	Netherlands	4	no	no	0	0	0
MARQUET	yes	male	France	16	no	yes	3	0	0
MARVAL	no	female	France	1	no	no	0	0	0
MASE	no	female	US	1	.	no	0	0	0
MAURER	no	male	US	4	no	yes	3	0	0
MAYRSHOFER	no	male	Germany	6	no	no	0	0	0
McCOMAS	no	male	Australia	3	no	no	0	0	0
McENERY	no	female	US	2	no	no	0	0	0

Table 1-I (cont.). The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of birth	# of artworks at A.S.	Post-humous A. S. exhibit	Featured in MoMA	# of general MoMA exhibits	# of solo MoMA exhibits	# of group MoMA exhibits
McLANE	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
MELTZER	no	female	US	2	.	no	0	0	0
MIESTCHANINOFF	no	male	France	1	no	no	0	0	0
MILLER	no	male	US	4	no	yes	4	0	0
MILNE	no	male	Canada	5	no	yes	2	0	0
MONTICELLI	no	male	France	1	yes	no	0	0	0
MOWBRAY-CLARKE	no	male	Jamaica	11	no	no	0	0	0
MUHRMANN	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
MURPHY	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
E-MYERS	no	female	US	9	no	no	0	0	0
J-MYERS	no	male	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
NADELMAN	no	male	Poland	3	no	yes	0	1	0
NANKIVELL	no	male	Australia	9	no	no	0	0	0
NILES	no	female	US	1	.	no	0	0	0
OPPENHEIMER	yes	female	Germany	1	no	no	0	0	0
ORGAN	no	female	Ireland	1	no	no	0	0	0
PADDOCK	no	female	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
PASCIN	yes	male	Bulgaria	12	no	yes	19	0	0
PELTON	no	female	Germany	2	no	no	0	0	0
PEPPER	no	male	US	5	no	yes	1	0	0
PERRINE	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
PHILLIPS	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
PIETRO (nd.)	no	female	US	1	.	no	0	0	0
PLEUTHNER	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
POPE	no	female	US	1	.	no	0	0	0
POTTER	no	male	US	1	yes	no	0	0	0

Table 1-I (cont.). The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
POWERS	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
PRENDERGAST	no	male	Canada	7	no	yes	14	0	0
M-PRESTON	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
J-PRESTON	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
PRYDE	no	male	England	1	no	no	0	0	0
PUTNAM	no	male	US	4	no	no	0	0	0
RASMUSSEN	no	male	Norway	1	no	no	0	0	0
REUTERDAHL	no	male	Sweden	1	no	no	0	0	0
RHOADES	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
RIMMER	no	male	England	1	yes	no	0	0	0
B-ROBINSON	no	male	Canada	5	no	yes	4	0	0
T-ROBINSON	no	male	US	5	yes	yes	1	0	0
ROGERS	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
ROHLAND	no	male	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
ROINE	no	male	France	3	no	no	0	0	0
ROOK	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
ROUSSEL	no	male	France	1	no	no	0	0	0
RUMSEY	no	male	US	3	no	yes	2	0	0
G-RUSSELL	no	male	Ireland	4	no	no	0	0	0
M-RUSSELL	no	male	US	2	no	yes	1	0	0
SALVATORE	no	male	Italy	2	no	no	0	0	0
SCHAMBERG	no	male	US	5	no	yes	1	0	0
SCHUMACHE	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
SEGONZAC	no	male	France	7	no	yes	17	0	0
SERRET	no	male	France	1	yes	no	0	0	0

Table 1-I (cont.). The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
SEYLER	no	male	Germany	1	no	no	0	0	0
SHANNON	no	male	England	1	no	no	0	0	0
SHAW	no	male	England	3	no	no	0	0	0
SICKERT	no	male	Germany	2	no	yes	6	0	0
SISLEY	no	male	France	3	yes	yes	2	0	0
SLEVOGT	no	male	Bavaria	1	no	yes	2	0	0
SOUSA-CARDOZO	no	male	Portugal	8	no	no	0	0	0
SPRINCHORN	no	male	Sweden	4	no	no	0	0	0
STEER	no	male	England	1	no	yes	2	0	0
STEVENS	no	female	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
STINEMETZ	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
TARKHOFF	no	male	Russia	1	no	no	0	0	0
TAYLOR	no	male	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
TAYLOR	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
TOBEEN	no	male	France	3	no	no	0	0	0
TOUSSAINT	no	male	France	1	no	no	0	0	0
TUCKER	no	male	US	5	no	no	0	0	0
A-TWACHTMAN	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
J-TWACHTMAN	no	male	US	2	yes	yes	1	0	0
VALLOTTON	yes	male	Switzerland	3	no	yes	3	0	0
VILLON	no	male	France	9	no	yes	0	1	0
VONNOH	no	female	US	3	no	no	0	0	0
WAGNER	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
WALKOWITZ	no	male	Siberia	12	no	yes	9	0	0

Table 1-I (cont.). The 250 Armory Show artists omitted from textbooks.

Artist	Prior European success	Gender	Nation of Birth	# of Artworks at A. Show	Posthumous Armory Show Exhibition	Featured in MoMA	# of General MoMA Exhibits	# of Solo MoMA Exhibits	# of Group MoMA Exhibits
WALTS	no	.		4	.	no	0	0	0
WARD	no	female	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
WARSHAWSKY	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
WEBER	no	male	Germany	2	yes	no	0	0	0
WEBSTER	no	male	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
WEINZHEIMER	yes	male	Germany	2	no	no	0	0	0
WEIR	no	male	US	14	no	yes	2	0	0
WEISGERBER	yes	male	Germany	1	no	no	0	0	0
WENTSCHER	no	male	Netherlands	1	no	no	0	0	0
WHITE	no	male	Canada	3	no	no	0	0	0
WILSON	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
WOLF	no	male	US	1	.	no	0	0	0
WORTMAN	no	male	US	1	no	no	0	0	0
YANDELL	no	female	US	2	no	no	0	0	0
YEATS	no	male	Ireland	6	no	no	0	0	0
A-YOUNG	no	male	US	6	no	no	0	0	0
M-YOUNG	no	male	US	7	no	yes	1	0	0
ZAK	yes	male	Poland	2	no	no	0	0	0
M-ZORACH	no	female	US	1	no	yes	6	0	0
W-ZORACH	no	male	Russia	3	no	yes	17	0	0

Table 1-J. Logistic regression analyses (odds ratios) for the effects of artist attributes and a legitimating organization on the likelihood of recognition within the three individual art history textbooks.

	Text 1: Stokstad (2008)	Text 2: Janson (2006)	Text 3: Hartt (1998)
prior European success	0.818	.363*	1.129
male artist	1.227	1.246	0.755
born in Europe	1.33	2.419**	1.761
# of Armory Show artworks	1.015	1.031	1.017
exhibited posthumously at Armory Show	17.533**	14.052**	10.542**
# of general MoMA exhibitions	1.204**	1.166**	1.181**
# of group MoMA exhibitions	3.003**	24.652**	3.764**
# of solo MoMA exhibitions	8.954**	12.258**	30.092**
Intercept	.016**	.015**	.030**
Chi-square	100.198	128.37	125.326
Pseudo-R-square	0.542	0.609	0.589
N	288	288	288

N = 308 for all correlations, except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290. *p<.05, one-tailed. **p<.01, one-tailed.

Table 1-K. OLS regression analyses for the effects of artist attributes and legitimating organization on the number of pages dedicated to an Armory artist within the three individual art history textbooks.

	Text 1: Stokstad (2008)	Text 2: Janson (2006)	Text 3: Hartt (1998)
prior European success	0.043 (.149)	-0.261 (.200)	-0.809 (.654)
male artist	-0.059 (.135)	-0.059 (.181)	-0.261 (.592)
born in Europe	0.059 (.107)	.309* (.143)	1.083* (.469)
# of Armory Show artworks	0.00002026 (.009)	-0.006 (.012)	0 (.039)
exhibited posthumously at Armory Show	1.411** (.164)	1.463** (.220)	5.858** (.719)
# of general MoMA Exhibitions	.054** (.012)	.052** (.016)	.211** (.053)
# of group MoMA Exhibitions	.313* (.138)	.947** (.185)	0.744 (.605)
# of solo MoMA exhibitions	.532** (.057)	.637** (.077)	2.613** (.251)
Intercept	0.013 (.123)	-0.018 (.165)	-0.17 (.538)
R-square	0.516	0.521	0.519
N	288	288	288

N = 308 for all correlations, except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290. *p<.05, one-tailed. **p<.01, one-tailed.

Table 2-A. Summary of independent variables.

Artist variables	**Defintion**
European exhibition success	Artist was recognized in Europe prior to exhibiting in 1913 Armory Show
male artist	Binary, artist is male
born In Europe	Binary, artist born in Europe
posthumous exhibition at Armory	Binary, artist deceased prior to 1913 Armory Show
# of works at Armory	Number of artworks an artist exhibited at 1913 Armory Show
MoMA variables	
# of solo MoMA exhibitions, 1929 to t-2	Number of solo shows artist had in MoMA prior to subsequent textbook edition at time t
# of group MoMA exhibitions, 1929 to t-2	Number of group shows artist had in MoMA prior to subsequent textbook edition at time t
# of general MoMA exhibtions, 1929 to t-2	Number of general shows artist had in MoMA prior to subsequent textbook edition at time t
Textbook variables	
# of pages in *Gardner's* previous edition	Number of pages Armory artist had in previous edition of this textbook
# of pages in *Janson's* previous edition	Number of pages Armory artist had in previous edition of this textbook

Table 2-B. All 89 Armory Show artists featured in the five editions of *Gardner's* text, 1929-1970.

Artist	*Gardner's,* 1st edition, 1926	*Gardner's,* revised edition, 1936	*Gardner's,* 3rd edition, 1948	*Gardner's,* 4th edition, 1959	*Gardner's,* 5th edition, 1970
ARCHIPENKO	*	*	*		*
BARNARD		*	*		
BEAL		*	*	*	
BELLOWS	*		*	*	
BERNARD		*			
BONNARD		*	*		
BOURDELLE	*	*	*	*	
BRANCUSI		*	*	*	*
BRAQUE		*	*	*	*
CASSATT		*	*	*	
CEZANNE	*	*	*	*	*
COLEMAN		*	*		
COROT	*	*	*	*	*
COURBET	*	*	*	*	*
DASBURG		*			
DAUMIER	*	*	*	*	*
DAVIDSON		*			
DAVIES	*	*	*	*	
DAVIS			*	*	
DEGAS		*	*	*	*
DELACROIX	*	*	*	*	*
DELAUNAY				*	
DENIS		*	*	*	*
DERAIN		*	*	*	*
DU BOIS		*	*		
DUCHAMP		*	*	*	*
DUFY		*	*	*	
EPSTEIN		*	*	*	
FRIESZ		*	*	*	
GAUGUIN	*	*	*	*	*
GLACKENS		*	*	*	
GLEIZES		*	*	*	*
VAN GOGH	*	*	*	*	*
GOYA	*	*	*	*	*
HARTLEY		*	*	*	
HASSAM		*	*	*	

Table 2-B (cont.). All 89 Armory Show artists featured in the five editions of Gardner's text, 1929-1970.

Artist	*Gardner's,* 1st edition, 1926	*Gardner's,* revisied edition, 1936	*Gardner's,* 3rd edition, 1948	*Gardner's,* 4th edition, 1959	*Gardner's,* 5th edition, 1970
HENRI		*	*	*	
HOPPER		*	*	*	
INGRES	*	*	*	*	*
KANDINSKY			*	*	*
KARFIOL		*	*		
KIRCHNER			*	*	
KROLL		*	*		
KUHN		*	*		
LACHAISE		*	*	*	*
LA FRESNAYE				*	
LAWSON		*	*	*	
LEGER		*	*	*	*
LEHMBRUCK		*	*	*	*
LIE		*	*	*	
LUKS		*	*	*	
MAILLOL	*	*	*	*	*
MANET		*	*	*	*
MARIN		*	*	*	
MARQUET				*	
MATISSE	*	*	*	*	*
MAURER				*	
MILLER		*	*		
MILNE				*	
MONET	*	*	*	*	*
MUNCH			*		*
PICABIA		*	*	*	
PICASSO	*	*	*	*	*
PISSARRO	*	*	*	*	*
PRENDERGAST		*	*	*	
PUVIS DE CHAVANNES	*	*	*	*	
REDON		*		*	
RENOIR	*	*	*	*	*
B-ROBINSON		*			
RODIN	*	*	*	*	*
ROUAULT		*	*	*	*
ROUSSEAU		*	*	*	*
RYDER		*	*	*	

Table 2-B (cont.). All 89 Armory Show artists featured in the five editions of Gardner's text, 1929-1970.

Artist	*Gardner's,* 1st edition, 1926	*Gardner's,* revisied edition, 1936	*Gardner's,* 3rd edition, 1948	*Gardner's,* 4th edition, 1959	*Gardner's,* 5th edition, 1970
SEGONZAC		*	*		
SEURAT		*	*	*	*
SHEELER		*	*	*	
SIGNAC		*	*		*
SISLEY	*	*	*		
SLOAN		*	*	*	
STELLA				*	
TOULOUSE-LAUTREC		*	*	*	*
J-TWACHTMAN		*	*	*	
VILLON				*	
VLAMINCK		*	*	*	*
VONNOH			*		
VUILLARD		*			
WEIR		*	*	*	
WHISTLER	*	*	*	*	
W-ZORACH		*	*	*	

Table 2-C. All 35 Armory Show artists featured in the three editions of *Janson's* text, 1959-1969.

Artist	*Janson's*, visual survey edition, 1959	*Janson's,* 1st edition, 1962	*Janson's,* revised & enlarged edition, 1969
BRANCUSI	*	*	*
BRAQUE	*	*	*
CEZANNE	*	*	*
COROT	*	*	*
COURBET	*	*	*
DAUMIER	*	*	*
DEGAS	*	*	*
DELACROIX	*	*	*
DENIS			*
DUCHAMP	*	*	*
DUCHAMP-VILLON	*	*	*
GAUGUIN	*	*	*
VAN GOGH	*	*	*
GOYA	*	*	*
INGRES	*	*	*
KANDINSKY	*	*	*
KIRCHNER		*	*
LEGER	*	*	*
LEHMBRUCK	*	*	*
MAILLOL	*	*	*
MANET	*	*	*
MATISSE	*	*	*
MONET	*	*	*
MUNCH	*	*	*
PICASSO	*	*	*
REDON			*
RENOIR	*	*	*
RODIN	*	*	*
ROUAULT	*	*	*
ROUSSEAU	*	*	*
SEURAT	*	*	*
STELLA	*	*	*
TOULOUSE-LAUTREC	*	*	*
VUILLARD			*
WHISTLER	*	*	*

Table 2-D. All 127 Armory Show artists featured in the approximately 40 years of MoMA exhibition, 1929-1968.

Artist	1929-1935, MoMA	1936-1947, MoMA	1948-1958, MoMA	1959-1969, MoMA	Breakdown of 1959 to 1968, for comparision with Janson's editions:	1959-1961, MoMA	1962-1968, MoMA
ANDERSON			*				
ARCHIPENKO	*	*	*	*		*	*
BARNARD	*	*					
BEAL	*	*					
BECKER	*						
BELLOWS	*	*	*	*			*
BLUEMNER				*		*	
BONNARD	*	*	*	*		*	*
BOURDELLE		*		*		*	*
BRANCUSI	*	*	*	*		*	
BRAQUE	*	*	*	*		*	*
BRUCE			*				
BURLIN	*	*	*				
CAMOIN			*				
CARLES	*		*				
CASSATT	*	*	*				
CESARE				*			*
CEZANNE	*	*	*	*		*	*
CHAFFEE	*						
COLEMAN	*	*	*	*			*
COROT	*	*	*	*		*	*
COURBET			*	*			*

Table 2-D (cont.). All 127 Armory Show artists featured in the approximately 40 years of MoMA exhibition, 1929-1968.

Artist	1929-1935, MoMA	1936-1947, MoMA	1948-1958, MoMA	1959-1969, MoMA	*Breakdown of 1959 to 1968, for comparision with Janson's editions:*	1959-1961, MoMA	1962-1968, MoMA
CROSS		*	*				
CUTLER	*						
DASBURG	*						
DAUMIER	*	*	*	*			*
DAVEY	*						
DAVIDSON	*	*					
DAVIES		*	*				
S-DAVIS	*	*	*	*		*	*
DEGAS	*	*	*	*		*	*
DELACROIX	*	*	*	*			*
DELAUNAY	*	*	*	*		*	*
DENIS	*	*	*	*		*	*
DERAIN	*	*	*	*		*	*
DREIER	*	*	*				
DU BOIS	*	*	*	*		*	
DUCHAMP	*	*	*	*		*	*
DUCHAMP-VILLON	*	*	*	*		*	
DUFY	*	*	*	*		*	*
EPSTEIN	*	*	*	*		*	*
FRIESZ	*	*					
GAUGUIN	*	*	*	*		*	*
GLACKENS	*	*		*		*	

Table 2-D (cont.). All 127 Armory Show artists featured in the approximately 40 years of MoMA exhibition, 1929-1968.

Artist	1929-1935, MoMA	1936-1947, MoMA	1948-1958, MoMA	1959-1969, MoMA	Breakdown of 1959 to 1968, for comparision with *Janson's editions:*	1959-1961, MoMA	1962-1968, MoMA
GLEIZES		*	*	*			*
VAN GOGH	*	*	*	*		*	*
GOLDTHWAITE		*					
GOYA		*		*			*
HALPERT	*						
HARTLEY	*	*	*	*			*
HASSAM	*			*			*
HENRI	*	*					
HODLER		*					
HOPKINSON	*	*		*			*
HOPPER	*	*	*	*		*	*
INGRES		*		*			*
A-JOHN	*	*	*	*			*
G-JOHN			*	*		*	
KANDINSKY	*	*	*	*		*	*
KARFIOL	*	*	*				
KELLER	*	*		*			*
KIRCHNER	*	*	*	*		*	*
KROLL	*	*					
KUHN	*	*	*	*			*
LACHAISE	*	*	*				
LA FRESNAYE	*	*	*	*		*	*

Table 2-D (cont.). All 127 Armory Show artists featured in the approximately 40 years of MoMA exhibition, 1929-1968.

Artist	1929-1935, MoMA	1936-1947, MoMA	1948-1958, MoMA	1959-1969, MoMA	*Breakdown of 1959 to 1968, for comparision with Janson's editions:*	1959-1961, MoMA	1962-1968, MoMA
LAPRADE		*					
LAURENCIN	*	*	*	*		*	*
LAWSON	*	*					
LEE		*					
LEGER	*	*	*	*		*	*
LEHMBRUCK	*	*	*				
LIE		*					
LUKS	*	*					
MAILLOL	*	*	*	*		*	
MANET	*	*	*	*		*	*
MANOLO		*		*		*	
MARIN	*	*	*	*		*	*
MARQUET		*	*				
MATISSE	*	*	*	*		*	*
MAURER		*		*		*	
MILLER	*	*					
MILNE		*		*			*
MONET	*		*	*		*	*
MUNCH	*	*	*	*		*	
NADELMAN		*	*	*		*	
PACH			*	*			*
PASCIN	*	*	*	*			*

Table 2-D (cont.). All 127 Armory Show artists featured in the approximately 40 years of MoMA exhibition, 1929-1968.

Artist	1929-1935, MoMA	1936-1947, MoMA	1948-1958, MoMA	1959-1969, MoMA	*Breakdown of 1959 to 1968, for comparision with Janson's editions:*	1959-1961, MoMA	1962-1968, MoMA
PEPPER	*						
PICABIA		*		*		*	*
PICASSO	*	*	*	*		*	*
PISSARRO	*	*	*	*		*	*
PRENDERGAST	*	*	*	*		*	
PRYDE				*			*
REDON	*	*	*	*		*	*
RENOIR	*	*	*	*		*	
B-ROBINSON	*	*					
T-ROBINSON	*						
RODIN		*	*	*		*	*
ROUAULT	*	*	*	*		*	*
ROUSSEAU	*	*	*	*			*
RUMSEY	*	*					
M-RUSSELL			*				
RYDER	*	*	*				
SCHAMBERG			*	*			*
SEGONZAC	*	*	*	*		*	*
SEURAT	*	*	*	*		*	*
SHEELER	*	*	*	*		*	*
SICKERT		*	*	*		*	
SIGNAC	*	*	*	*		*	

Table 2-D (cont.). All 127 Armory Show artists featured in the approximately 40 years of MoMA exhibition, 1929-1968.

Artist	1929-1935, MoMA	1936-1947, MoMA	1948-1958, MoMA	1959-1969, MoMA	*Breakdown of 1959 to 1968, for comparision with Janson's editions:*	1959-1961, MoMA	1962-1968, MoMA
SISLEY			*				
SLEVOGT		*	*				
SLOAN	*	*	*	*		*	*
STEER		*	*				
STELLA	*	*	*	*		*	*
TOULOUSE-LAUTREC	*	*	*	*		*	*
J-TWACHTMAN	*						
VALLOTTON			*	*		*	*
VILLON		*	*	*		*	*
VLAMINCK	*	*	*	*		*	*
VUILLARD	*	*	*	*		*	*
WALKOWITZ	*	*	*				
WEIR	*	*					
WHISTLER	*	*	*	*			*
M-YOUNG		*					
M-ZORACH	*	*	*				
W-ZORACH	*	*	*	*		*	*

Table 2-E. Descriptive statistics.

	% of Armory Artists (N)	Mean	S.E.	Min	Max
prior European success	15% (46)	0.149	.020	0	1
male artist	83% (253)	0.829	.021	0	1
born in Europe	46% (139)	0.457	.028	0	1
posthumous exhibition at Armory	9% (27)	.093	.017	0	1
# of works at Armory	N/A	4.104	.314	0	62
# of general MoMA exhibitions, 1929-1968	29% (88)	1.583	.682	0	27
# of group MoMA exhibitions, 1929-1968	7% (21)	0.098	.023	0	4
# of solo MoMA exhibitions, 1929-1968	10% (32)	0.208	.080	0	11
# of pages for each Armory artist in *Gardner's,* 1926-1970	29% (89)	2.293	.306	0	39
# of pages for each Armory artist in *Janson's,* 1959-1969	11% (35)	1.680	.354	0	70

N = 308 for all correlations, except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290.

Table 2-F. Correlation matrix.

	Pearson correlations									
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(1) prior European success	1									
(2) male artist	0.118	1								
(3) born in Europe	0.442	0.277	1							
(4) posthumous exhibition at Armory	.121	.134	.193	1						
(5) # of works at Armory	.108	.146	.039	-.038	1					
(6) # of general MoMA Exhibitions, 1929-1968	0.058	0.111	0.139	-.004	.175	1				
(7) # of group MoMA Exhibitions, 1929-1968	0.318	0.107	0.163	.172	.120	-.098	1			
(8) # of solo MoMA Exhibitions, 1929-1968	0.313	0.097	0.201	.072	.281	-.089	0.57	1		
(9) # of pages for each Armory artist in *Gardner's*, 1926-1970	.248	.188	.271	.475	.251	.679	0.469	0.515	1	
(10) # of pages for each Armory artist in *Janson's*, 1959-1969	.293	.123	.282	.386	.156	.660	0.553	0.683	0.838	1

N = 308 for all correlations, except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290.

Table 2-G. OLS regression analyses for the effects of artist attributes and type of MoMA exhibition on the number of pages dedicated to Armory Show artist within the five editions of *Gardner's Art through the Ages* , 1926-1970

	1926 Edition	1936 Edition	1948 Edition	1959 Edition	1970 Edition
prior European success	-.200* (.105)	-.291* (.141)	-0.136 (.135)	-0.212 (.294)	0.022 (.183)
male artist	0.018 (.098)	0.186 (.128)	0.189 (.122)	0.071 (.267)	-0.019 (.166)
born in Europe	.156* (.077)	0.018 (.1)	-0.079 (.096)	0.131 (.212)	.299* (.131)
posthumous exhibition at Armory	1.041** (.118)	.955** (.164)	.841** (.156)	2.687** (.326)	1.569** (.201)
# of works at Armory	.016** (.006)	0.015 (.009)	-0.006 (.008)	.041** (.017)	-0.013 (.012)
# solo MoMA exhibition prior to edition		.621* (.3)	1.300** (.102)	1.445** (.241)	1.762** (.179)
# group MoMA exhibition prior to edition		1.947** (.277)	1.715** (.259)	0.266 (.42)	1.668* (.771)
# general MoMA exhibition prior to edition		.248** (.025)	.136** (.013)	.494** (.065)	.131** (.036)
Constant	-.056* (.089)	-0.045 (.116)	0.006 (.11)	-0.15 (.242)	-0.035 (.151)
R-square	0.262	0.499	0.627	0.486	0.435

N = 308 for all correlations, except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290. *p<.05, two-tailed. **p<.01, two-tailed.

Table 2-H. OLS regression analyses for the effects of artist attributes and textbook edition on the number of exhibitions representing an Armory Show artists in the Museum of Modern Art from 1929 to 1968

	1929-1935 (Gardner's)	1936-1947 (Gardner's)	1948-1958 (Gardner's)	1959-1968 (Gardner's)	1959-1961 (Janson's)	1962-1968 (Janson's)
prior European success	.921* (.486)	1.083* (.486)	0.67 (.484)	0.487 (.367)	0.207 (.169)	0.247 (.251)
male artist	0.32 (.451)	.038* (.456)	-0.029 (.449)	-0.142 (.342)	-0.011 (.156)	-0.019 (.23)
born in Europe	.836* (.358)	0.525 (.357)	.857** (.351)	0.498 (.27)	0.222 (.125)	0.316 (.183)
posthumous exhibition at Armory	0.608 (.613)	-0.635 (.59)	-0.466 (.572)	-1.337** (.451)	-0.153 (.199)	-0.518 (.302)
# of works at Armory	0.03 (.029)	0.027 (.03)	-0.008 (.029)	-0.001 (.022)	0.015 (.01)	0.015 (.015)
# of pages in *Gardner's* (most recent previous edition only)	0.387 (.274)	.986** (.174)	1.012** (.153)	.492** (.065)		
# of pages in *Janson's* (most recent previous edition only)					.273** (.066)	.147** (.036)
Constant	0.216 (.41)	0.456 (.412)	0.28 (.405)	0.445 (.31)	0.139 (.142)	0.235 (.21)
R-square	0.105	0.19	0.216	0.232	0.131	0.112

$N = 308$ for all models except Male Artist, $N = 305$, Born in Europe, $N = 303$, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, $N = 290$. *p<.05, two-tailed. **p<.01, two-tailed.

Table 2-I. OLS regression analyses for the effects of artist attributes and type of MoMA exhibition on the number of pages dedicated to Armory Show artist within the three editions of *Janson's History of Art*, 1959-1969

	1959 Edition	*1962 Edition*	*1969 Edition*
prior European success	-0.142	0.116	0.5
	(.114)	(.318)	(.415)
male artist	-0.069	-0.146	-0.112
	(.103)	(.289)	(.377)
born in Europe	0.138	0.287	0.249
	(.082)	(.23)	(.299)
posthumous exhibition at Armory	.948**	3.347**	3.164**
	(.126)	(.353)	(.456)
# of works at Armory	-0.002	-0.019	-0.016
	(.007)	(.019)	(.027)
# solo MoMA exhibition	.942**	2.299**	5.105**
	(.093)	(.261)	(.407)
# group MoMA exhibition	.317*	1.198**	3.459*
	(.162)	(.455)	(1.751)
# general MoMA exhibition	.183*	.414**	.376**
	(.025)	(.07)	(.081)
Constant	-0.033	-0.061	-0.075
	(.093)	(.262)	(343)
R-square	0.58	0.58	0.494

$N = 308$ for all models except Male Artist, $N = 305$, Born in Europe, $N = 303$, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, $N = 290$. *p<.05, two-tailed. **p<.01, two-tailed.

Table 3-A. Leading Armory artists in terms of MoMA exhibitions and connections, 1929-1968.

Top ten Armory artists with the most MoMA exhibition	Top ten Armory artists with the most connections to other Armory artists	Top ten Amory artists with most exhibitions where no other Armory artist was featured (minus solo exhibition)
PICASSO ^	MARIN * ^	CARLES * ^
MATISSE ^	SHEELER * ^	S-DAVIS * ^
LEGER ^	BELLOWS * ^	MARIN * ^
CEZANNE ^	S-DAVIS * ^	SHEELER * ^
ROUAULT ^	PICASSO ^	STELLA ^
BRAQUE ^	SLOAN * ^	PICASSO ^
GAUGUIN ^	MATISSE ^	BELLOWS * ^
DERAIN ^	HARTLEY * ^	SLOAN * ^
SHEELER * ^	REDON ^	KELLER * ^
BONNARD ^	STELLA ^	MATISSE ^

Top ten Armory artists who have enjoyed the highest number of solo exhibition	Top six Armory artists with the highest number of small group exhibition	Top ten Armory artists with the highest percentage of repeat exhibition ties
PICASSO ^	PICASSO ^	PICASSO ^
MATISSE ^	BONNARD ^	MATISSE ^
VAN GOGH ^	COROT ^	GAUGUIN ^
LEGER ^	REDON ^	CEZANNE ^
ROUAULT ^	RYDER * ^	DERAIN ^
BRANCUSI ^	TOULOUSE-LAUTREC ^	LEGER ^
CEZANNE ^		BRAQUE ^
LACHAISE ^		ROUAULT ^
MUNCH ^		SEURAT ^
TOULOUSE-LAUTREC ^		BONNARD ^

Note: ^ symbol next to artist's name denotes artist is male; * symbol denotes artist is US born. Artists are listed from largest to smallest reagrding given attribute.

Table 3-B. Top nine artists with highest number of MoMA exhibitions and highest percetnage of repeat ties, from 1929-1968.

	Percetage of Armory artist network that is European born	Percertage of Armory artist network that is US born
BONNARD	66.67%	30.11%
BRAQUE	70.93%	24.42%
CEZANNE	72.73%	22.73%
DERAIN	67.02%	29.79%
GAUGUIN	71.43%	25.27%
LEGER	67.37%	29.47%
MATISSE	67.31%	28.85%
PICASSO	66.98%	30.19%
ROUAULT	67.02%	29.79%

Table 3-C. Top Armory artists in terms of exhition network and nationality, 1929 to 1968.

Top ten Armory artists whose MoMA exhibition network from 1929 to 1968 has the highest percentage of European born Armory artists

	Percentage of network that is European born
SISLEY	95.24%
BLUEMNER	94.12%
CAMOIN	90.91%
G-JOHN	88.00%
LAPRADE	87.50%
BOURDELLE	87.23%
PICABIA	86.49%
MANOLO	85.71%
MILNE	83.33%
PRYDE	83.33%

Top eleven Armory artists whose MoMA exhibition network from 1929 to 1968 has the highest percentage of US born Armory artists

	Percentage of network that is US born
BECKER	100.00%
CHAFFEE	100.00%
CUTLER	100.00%
DAVEY	100.00%
PEPPER	100.00%
BRUCE	88.89%
M-RUSSELL	88.89%
HALPERT	79.31%
DASBURG	78.57%
T-ROBINSON	75.86%
J-TWACHTMAN	75.86%

Table 3-D. Top Armory artists in terms of MoMA exhibition with female Armory artists and Armory artists with prior solo exhibitions at MoMA, 1929-1968.

Top ten Armory artists with the highest percentage of female Armory artists within their exhibtion network, 1929-1968	**Top ten Armory artists with the highest percentage of solo exhibited Armory artists, 1929-1968**
CAMOIN	BECKER
BRUCE	MILNE
M-RUSSELL	ANDERSON
STEER	G-JOHN
SCHAMBERG	BLUEMNER
BARNARD	SISLEY
RUMSEY	PICABIA
LAWSON	PRYDE
NADELMAN	CAMOIN
KANDINSKY	MANOLO

Table 3-E. Descriptive statistics for network variables of Armory artists exhibiting together at MoMA, 1929-1968 (996 exhibitions).

	Description	Mean	SD	Range
CENTRALITY				
degree centrality	Total number of artists an artist is connected to through at least one exhibition.	25.87 (2.06)	36.201	[0, 110]
repeat exhibition ties	Percentage of an artist's MoMA exhibition connections that are repeated.	.192 (.017)	0.301	[0, 90%]
RELATIVITY	Percentage of an artist's exhibition without another Armory artist (minus solo exhibition).	17.87 (1.01)	11.39	[0, 41.6%]
CONTINUITY	Total gained or lost connections over 4 time periods.	.-1.38 (.880)	15.44	[-62, 57]
ALTER ATTRIBUTES				
% solo exhibited	Percentage of exhibition network with solo exhibited artists.	.156 (.011)	0.201	[0, 67%]
% US born	Percentage of exhibition network with US-born artists.	.154 (.013)	0.23	[0, 100%]
% female	Percentage of exhibition network with female artists.	.017 (.001)	0.026	[0, 18%]
ARTIST'S INDIVIDUAL ATTRIBUTES				
European exhibition success	Artist was recognized in Europe prior to exhibiting in 1913 Armory Show.	.149 (.020)	0.357	[0, 1]
# of solo	Number of solo shows artist had in MoMA.	.207 (.055)	0.973	[0, 11]
# of small group	Number of group shows artist had in MoMA.	.097 (.023)	0.415	[0, 4]
European born	Binary, artist born in Europe.	.455 (.028)	0.498	[0, 1]
male	Binary, artist is male.	.826 (.021)	0.379	[0, 1]

N = 308 for all models except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 3-F. Correlation matrix.

	Pearson correlations											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
(1) degree centrality	1											
(2) repeat exhibition ties	0.957	1										
(3) relativity	0.874	0.763	1									
(4) continuity	-.146	-.143	-.097	1								
(5) % US born	0.552	0.441	-.248	-.274	1							
(6) % female born	0.735	0.674	0.214	-.208	0.643	1						
(7) % solo exhibited	0.774	0.685	-.195	-.005	0.598	0.703	1					
(8) European exhibition success	0.306	0.358	0.055	0.035	0.076	0.338	0.271	1				
(9) # of solo	0.405	0.449	0.349	0.071	0.13	0.285	0.195	0.314	1			
(10) # of small group	0.415	0.473	0.304	0.005	0.136	0.293	0.233	0.319	0.57	1		
(11) European born	0.259	0.309	-.050	0.195	0.001	0.194	0.304	0.442	0.201	0.163	1	
(12) male	0.245	0.225	-.003	-.021	0.237	0.278	0.242	0.12	0.098	0.108	0.281	1

N = 308 for all models except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290.

Table 3-G. Ordinary least squares regression analysis of MoMA exhibition, 1929 through 1968, network variables on art history textbook coverage of the 1913 Armory Show artists.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
DV: number of pages in the 17 editions of Gardner and Janson's textbook from 1969 to 2009							
Centrality							
degree centrality	.532** (.056)						.313 (.332)
repeat exhibition ties		72.141** (6.403)					
Relativity			1.281** (.442)				-0.464 (.779)
Continuity				.596** (.145)			.472** (.185)
Alter							
% solo exhibited					59.270** (15.482)		-34.381 (51.958)
% US born					-27.014** (12.520)		-15.120 (33.213)
% female					312.473** (123.337)		-56.380 (169.419)
Artist's Individual Attributes							
# of solo						20.781** (2.103)	17.994** (3.297)
# of small group						20.134** (4.926)	15.655* (7.500)
European exh. success						.062 (5.425)	-4.296 (10.821)
European born						12.431** (3.849)	16.894 (10.615)
male						2.325 (4.573)	6.860 (19.204)
Constant	-0.964 (2.478)	-1.046 (2.288)	7.932 (9.352)	13.627** (2.243)	2.349 (2.756)	-1.465 (4.016)	13.821 (42.713)
R-square	0.229	0.293	0.063	0.052	0.144	0.494	0.51

N = 308 for all models except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290. Standard errors in parentheses. Because of the perfect prediction problem, I omit degree centrality in Model 7. * p <.05, two-tailed. ** p <.01, two-tailed.

Table 3-G (cont.). Ordinary least squares regression analysis of MoMA exhibition, 1929 through 1969, network variables on art history textbook coverage of the 1913 Armory Show artists.

	DV: number of pages in 17 editions	DV: inclusion in 17 editions
	Model 8	Model 9
Centrality		
degree centrality		
repeat exhibition ties	62.541*	17.318**
	(25.447)	(3.081)
Relativity	-0.894	-.175*
	(.605)	(.073)
Continuity	.564*	.088**
	(.183)	(.022)
Alter attributes		
% solo exhibited	1.315	-14.984
	(6.168)	(50.942)
% US born	1.409	-3.09
	(3.812)	(31.483)
% female	-7.729	-49.708
	(20.04)	(165.509)
Artist's Individual Attributes		
# of solo	17.960**	.927**
	(3.225)	(.391)
# of small group	12.839	0.364
	(7.443)	(.901)
European exh. success	-7.007	0.207
	(10.654)	(1.290)
European born	8.751	0.064
	(10.968)	(1.328)
male	6.903	1.61
	(18.788)	(2.275)
Constant	6.404	-2.146
	(39.693)	(4.806)
R-square	0.531	0.528

N = 308 for all models except Male Artist, N = 305, Born in Europe, N = 303, and Exhibited Posthumously at Armory Show, N = 290. Standard errors in parentheses. Because of the perfect prediction problem, I omit repeat ties in Model 8 and degree centrality in Model 9. ** p <.05, two-tailed. ** p <.01, two-tailed.