

**Persistence and Fashion in Art
Italian Renaissance from Vasari to Berenson and Beyond***

Victor Ginsburgh
ECARES, Université Libre de Bruxelles and
CORE, Université catholique de Louvain

and

Sheila Weyers
Université catholique de Louvain

June 2005

Abstract

The paper looks at the survival of reputations over time. Painters from the Italian Renaissance are a good case, since they were discussed in a systematic way by Vasari some 400 years ago. Their reputation is considered to be represented by the length of entries in seven famous art histories, spread over time from Vasari to the end of the 20th century. Though some artists appear, disappear or reappear, there is a surprisingly large degree of consensus over time: among the first fifty to whom scholars devote space, one half is recognized at all times. This observation is sustained by several statistical tests, which all confirm this view for the 250 artists discussed in the paper: their rankings are strongly correlated over time. However, the dataset does not make it possible to decide whether this is due to the intrinsic or aesthetic quality of artists (or their works), or to the social consensus that has built around them.

Forthcoming in *Poetics*, 2005

* We are grateful to Peter Burke, Christophe Croux, Catherine Dehon, Philippe Junod, Thierry Lenain, François Mairesse, Didier Martens and the late Ignace Vandevivere for preliminary discussions, references and suggestions. Two anonymous referees as well as the editor of the journal made the paper much tighter than it was. They should also be very gratefully thanked.

[David Sylvester] could silence the cheerful gossip at any dinner table by posing with urgent solemnity a question like "But who do you think is greater, Giotto or Matisse?" [Even] as he lay dying, he insisted on having his guests play his favorite game of quantification, listing who are the greatest of the great.

Robert Rosenblum.¹

1. Introduction

We are interested in the survival of artists over time. Painters from the Italian Renaissance, including precursors such as Cimabue, Duccio, Giotto, or Simone Martini, are a good case to explore how fame unfolds, since they were first discussed in a systematic way some 400 years ago by Vasari (1568) in the second edition of his *Vite*,² considered as one of the founding texts in art history. One can therefore try to study whether artists discussed by Vasari remained so afterwards and are still those whom we consider the most important, or how much our views of the Renaissance have changed over time. This is probably the longest possible time period that can be analyzed in a quantitative way.

We examine whether there is consensus in the choices over time, or whether changes are frequent. We find that among the first fifty or so artists to whom art scholars devote time and space, one half is unanimously recognized over the 400 years between 1568 and 2000, while the other half comes and goes. This observation is made more precise by several statistical analyses, which all confirm that there is a strong consensus on the ranking and the critical judgment of some 250 artists. The nature of the process which generates such a consensus has aesthetic as well as sociological and economic components.

Aesthetic theory suggests that beauty lies in the artwork itself. Generalist philosophers claim that there are general standards, or criteria, which make a work good. According to Beardsley (1982), for example, there exist three general properties, unity, intensity and complexity, such that if *one* of them is present in an artwork, the artwork is better. There may be other characteristics, which are "secondary," and which may make a work better in a certain context, or worse in another. Singularists on the other hand sustain that there exist no such general standards, and that every property, or characteristic is contextual.

¹ In his introduction to Sotheby's Catalogue, *David Sylvester: The Private Collection*, London, 26 February 2002.

² Vasari published two versions of his *Vite*, the first in 1550, the second, more complete, in 1568. This is the version that we use. Vasari himself used various sources. On this issue, see W. Kallab, *Vasaristudien*, Vienna, 1908.

The idea of objective aesthetic criteria was found interesting by scientists from other fields than art theory. Birkhoff (1933), a mathematician, devotes a book on aesthetic value and feeling. The various chapters of his 200 pages book discuss polygonal forms, ornaments, tilings or vases but also melody and musical quality in poetry.³ The 20th century famous mathematician Weyl (1952) devotes a large part of his book on symmetry and the feeling of beauty that it generates. Recent experimental research on "beauty" in human beings and attractiveness in animal species also stresses the importance of symmetry, an obviously objective and measurable characteristic, that is even noticed by babies.⁴

Other philosophers, such as Hume (1757, p. 6), believe that "[b]eauty is no quality in things themselves: it exists merely in the mind which contemplates them; and each mind perceives a different beauty," and that the "ground of judgments of taste [is located] not in some object which is the target of the judgment, but in the maker of the judgment."⁵

Maker or makers? Bourdieu (1983, 1996) takes an additional step and argues that value is arbitrary, and constructed by the social structures of cultural hierarchy. It is objective but *only* as a social fact. Accordingly, there are no criteria that allow determining the intrinsic quality of a work, but only professional judges who "possess the socially accepted authority to ascribe specific properties to a work ... and how it should be ranked."⁶ Culture and art result from material production (artists, publishers, art galleries, etc.) and symbolic production (the judgment made by critics, art historians and philosophers, etc.) and consumers are offered this combination. Note, however, that Verdaasdonk (2003) argues that Bourdieu leaves too little room to rationality. He shows that in the specific case of the *New York Times Book Review*, the ranking of books by critics clearly results from rational behavior.

Did Vasari act as one of the "creators of the creator, that is [an agent] producing belief in the value of goods in question" (Van Rees and Dorleijn, 2001, p. 332). Is Vasari the symbolic agent who was authoritative enough to influence art critics and historians during the 400 years that followed his *Vite*? Or should we agree with the idea that history is a proving ground for value, and follow most art philosophers for whom the works of a real genius will endure, while "authority or prejudice may give a temporary vogue to a bad poet or orator, but this reputation will

³ A similar idea is taken up by Simonton (1980, 1998) for whom the properties of musical compositions that form the classical repertoire "can be predicted using variables derived from a computerized content analysis of melodic structure."

⁴ See Etcoff (1999, pp. 161-164, 185-187).

⁵ Shiner (1996, p. 237).

⁶ See Van Rees, 1983, p. 398 and Van Rees, 1987, p. 280. Van Rees (1987), for example, shows that the consensus that was built around the work of Faverey, a Dutch poet whose fame he analyzes, was reached by critics on the basis of extra-textual factors.

never be durable or general."⁷ Is the test of time a necessary or only a sufficient condition for value. According to Levinson (2002, p. 235), many valuable works have failed the test, but passing it is almost always to a work's credit, and, as is pointed out by Coetzee (2002, p. 18) "the criterion of testing and survival is ... a criterion that expresses a certain confidence in the tradition of testing, and a confidence that professionals will not devote labour and attention, generation after generation, to sustaining [artworks] whose life-functions have terminated." This, in a nutshell, expresses the economic "cost minimization" component.⁸

The consensus that is present in our findings can be due to several reasons. First, it may suggest that all historians have a common set of criteria, that may be based on objective characteristics of the works even if these are not properly spelled out, but that may also result from social norms. Secondly, and this is explicitly acknowledged by some, art historians perpetuate what their predecessors have written. This is considered a form of evaluation by Silvers (1991, p. 219) who puts narratives, so much used in art history, as a possible explanation of how "temporal duration contributes to the formation of canons."⁹ Thirdly, and though experts can distinguish themselves from a group by producing dissenting opinions, consensus is more likely once experts are also subject to career concerns. This is analyzed in Janssen (1997) who shows that the process by which critics reach agreement is coercive, since it is difficult for any of them to dissent without putting at risk his reputation.¹⁰ This process is made formal in a model explored by Deschamps (2004).

To analyze whether there is consensus or dissension, we count, and follow over time, the number of pages or citations devoted to some 250 artists from the Italian Quattrocento, including some forerunners, doing what had already been suggested by Teyssèdre (1964, p. 187), the expert of the French art critic de Piles (1635-1709), who writes that "even if ratings are difficult to assess, one could just look at whether artists are quoted or not." Milo (1986) uses the length of entries in encyclopedias and dictionaries over time, to study whether 17th century French painters who are praised today were already so between 1650 and 1750. Landes (2003) looks at some 850 American artists active in the late 19th and early 20th century, whose paintings were shown in three important exhibitions in Paris in 1900,

⁷ Hume (1965, p. 9).

⁸ A similar argument is made by Verdaasdonk (2003, p. 362).

⁹ Note that this goes against Simonton's exponential decay. If evaluations were following a first-order autoregressive process, the influence of past evaluations decreases with time, so that what Vasari had written in 1568 would hardly be taken into account in Grove's 1996 *Dictionary of Art*. Actually, this is not the case. Vasari is present in the bibliography of almost all the artists from the Italian Renaissance to whom the *Dictionary* devotes an entry.

¹⁰ Note that the art historian Milizia (1781) dared expressing a very negative opinion about Michelangelo, accusing him of being harsh, extravagant, small, vulgar and affected. He was obviously not followed by his peers.

and in New York in 1913 and 1939. He tests whether those who were recognized by awards, or elected as members of a distinguished academy have more staying power than others.

Rosengren (1985) applies a similar idea to study how the fame of Swedish writers born between 1825 and 1849 is perceived in two points of time (the 1880s, and the 1960s). Verboord (2003) describes similar procedures to assess the value of some 500 writers, though he also uses other indicators such as awards, the number of academic studies devoted to each author, literary encyclopedias, the literary status of publishers. Verdaasdonk (1983) analyzes contemporary Dutch narrative prose, and finds "masterpieces" to be dependent on commercial success and the position of authors in the literary hierarchy. Attributing their success to artistic criteria is merely an ex post judgment. In his 2003 paper, he analyzes the positions of fiction titles on the *New York Times* bestsellers lists. Simonton (1998) gauges the aesthetic success of 496 operas created between 1607 and 1938. Instead of following their success over time, he looks at their reception when created, and today.¹¹ He finds that the success of an opera in our time is positively correlated with the success it enjoyed when created, but that this consensus exhibits cycles over time. Simonton (1991) shows that the posthumous reputation of American presidents, philosophers and thinkers, painters and sculptors, and classical composers is more likely to be due to genius than to *Zeitgeist*.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes and justifies the choice of art historians that we use as "experts" to evaluate Italian Renaissance artists from 1568 to 1996. Section 3 turns to the quantitative results, which show that there is a quite large consensus in the ranking of artists over time. Section 4 returns to the possible reasons that lead to this consensus.

2. Data

We started with all painters¹² to whom Vasari devotes a *Vita*. To this list, we added all painters to whom Lanzi (1824) devotes at least 20 lines, those quoted at least twice by Berenson (1926) in his well-known book on the Italian Renaissance as well as those whose names appear in the entry on Italian painting in the Grove (1996) *Dictionary of*

¹¹ Simonton bases his success criteria on more indicators than number of lines or citations. He also counts the number of performances, and of languages in which the opera was performed, as well as the number of recordings and videos, and the number of dictionaries in which an opera is cited.

¹² Is also considered as painter an artist who devoted (sometimes a large part of his) time to other forms of art, such as Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo or Giulio Romano. Fresco painting is assimilated to oil-painting.

Art.¹³ This makes for a list of 253 artists¹⁴ for whom we went again through Vasari's *Vite* (1981, [1568]), Félibien's *Entretiens* (1967, [1725]) written between 1659 and 1685, Lanzi's art history of the Quattrocento (1789), Burckhardt's *Cicerone* (1855), Berenson (1926), Chastel (1995, [1956]), and Grove's (1996).¹⁵

Vasari's *Vite* appears as an undisputable choice, though, as has often been pointed out, the work is biased towards Florentine artists, and gives little credit to Venetians, such as Giovanni Bellini or Giorgione.¹⁶ Though at the time of Vasari's writings, Florence had lost its supremacy, it had obviously been the center of the arts, for geographical, political and sociological reasons. It was also one of the largest Italian cities and certainly benefited from the more liberal organization of artists' guilds. As suggested by Gombrich (1972) the competition between artists was fiercer than elsewhere, thus leading them to "surpass themselves." In the color vs drawing debate, Vasari was also supporting the primacy of drawing, as is made obvious in some sentences of the *vita* he devotes to Giorgione whose paintings are described as "hiding with color his clumsiness in drawing."

Félibien (1967, p. 40) who comes one hundred years after Vasari, mentions that "as far as modern painters are concerned, I merely follow what Vasari, Borghini, Ridolfi, the cavaliere Baglione and a few others have amply described, and with whom I agree." Nevertheless, and though he was also a defender of drawing, he discusses at great length Venetians, in particular, Veronese, Tintoretto, Giovanni Bellini and Sebastiano del Piombo. He is considered as the father of art history and art criticism in France.

Under the influence of Winckelmann, Lanzi makes art history into a discipline that does more than describing the lives of artists. His work encompasses Italy as a whole. He classifies artists according to schools, including a large number of local schools that he discusses at great length. Lanzi tries to convey an impartial view of history, putting aside his personal neo-classical tastes.¹⁷

¹³ Of course, our interest centered on the parts of this entry devoted to the following subsections of vol. 16, pp. 654-668: "Late medieval painting, c. 1100-c. 1400," "Early Renaissance painting, c. 1400-c. 1500," "High Renaissance and Mannerist painting, c. 1500-c. 1600."

¹⁴ Since this list is too long, we do not include it in the paper, but it can be obtained from the authors.

¹⁵ This may give the impression of a useless going back and forth. It is in fact a procedure meant to find names of artists first, and then look at what has been written about them in a series of seven important contributions to art history, even if some are not quoted in every contribution. For instance, Jacopo Bassano does not appear in Vasari's *Vite*, but is in our list, since he is quoted eight times by Berenson. Another example is Baldassare Peruzzi, who is ignored by Berenson, though he has a rather long *vita* in Vasari and 220 lines in Lanzi. He will also appear in our list. Lazzaro Vasari who has a *vita* was excluded since he is not cited by any other historian. We also decided to exclude Giorgio Vasari: In the *Vite*, he devotes 31 pages to Raphael's life and 42 to his own.

¹⁶ The same is true for Veronese and Tintoretto, though here one could think that they were too young for Vasari to have known them well.

¹⁷ According to Bazin (1986, p. 91), Lanzi's work contains 3,000 names of artists, and he is proud to claim that he makes no selection but also discusses mediocre artists, who, given their relations with the "great," do also participate.

Burckhardt is almost unanimously considered to be one of the greatest historians of the Italian Renaissance, and is representative of *Kulturgeschichte*, a movement which suggests that art produced in an era cannot be separated from the society by and in which it is produced. He was also deeply influenced by Vasari.¹⁸

By choosing Berenson (1926) to represent the views of the early 20th century, we privilege connoisseurship. As will be seen, however, Berenson's choices were very influential on the whole century.¹⁹ To represent the mid 20th century, we selected the last (posthumous, 1995) edition of Chastel's celebrated work on the Italian Renaissance. Chastel is considered as the most influential art historian in France after World War II.²⁰ The most recent views of the 20th century are those of the *Grove Dictionary of Art*. Thus we end with an art encyclopedia a description of what started with the encyclopedic work of Vasari on the Italian Renaissance.²¹

Scholarship guided our list of art historians and critics. We tried to select undisputed works published at more or less equal time intervals in order to span as best as possible the 430 years between 1568 and the end of the 20th century. The authors were also chosen for their overall coverage of the Italian Renaissance, even if they put forward their own preferences. Though his preferred artists are Florentine, Vasari discusses Venice and Northern Italy. Félibien, Berenson and Chastel are obviously admirers of Florence, but this does not dispense them from ranking very highly Venice's 16th century painters. Nevertheless, in order to check whether other historians would have led to different conclusions, we also study what would have happened if Félibien, Berenson and Chastel were replaced by historians who were their contemporaries: de Piles (1699) for Félibien, Adolfo Venturi (1901) for Berenson and Argan (1968) for Chastel.²²

Note that the 20th century is represented by three art historians or art histories (Berenson, Chastel, Grove), while the three hundred years between Vasari and Berenson are spanned by four names only (Vasari, Félibien, Lanzi and Burckhardt). There are several reasons for this. First, we are obviously more interested in how our era evaluates art. Secondly, if, as suggested by Junod (2002), the past can be rediscovered through contemporary works, it is necessary to examine who and what

¹⁸ In *Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, Burckhardt mentions having copied over 700 excerpts from Vasari's *Vite*, to insert them at the right places in his own book. See Gombrich (1969).

¹⁹ This is quite surprising, since the entry on Berenson in Grove (1996, vol. 3, p. 764) goes as far as saying that "it is nevertheless probable that, by contemporary standards, Berenson would not be considered as an art historian [since] he himself regarded the history of art, in the full sense of the term, as suspect and pedantic." Zeri (1991) portrays him as being a two-faced personality: a snob and an aesthete, but also "a monument of knowledge and thought, of questions and intuitions."

²⁰ See the entry concerning Chastel in Grove (1996).

²¹ See Rouchette (1959, chapter 1) who describes Vasari's "brain-trust" used to write the *Vite*.

²² A different picture may also have emerged if we had considered the writings of more local art historians such as Ridolfi or Boschini, reacting against Vasari's too "parochial" views.

has been rediscovered. It may thus be important to have a finer "grid" for more recent years.

It was easy to retrieve the number of lines devoted to each artist in Vasari, Félibien, Lanzi, and Grove's *Dictionary*, since this is how the works are organized. For Burckhardt, Berenson²³ and Chastel, we collected the number of times each artist was quoted. Table 1 gives a summary view of the database that was set up.

[Table 1 about here]

3. Analysis

To compare the information given by the number of lines in some cases and of citations in others, both are transformed into ranks,²⁴ which offer the advantage of smoothing the effect of excessively long or short entries, and allow using nonparametric statistical tests based on less severe assumptions.²⁵

The analysis may sometimes be slightly misleading, given previous wrong attributions. A well-known example²⁶ is the Madonna Rucellai in the Santa Maria Novella church in Florence that Vasari and many art historians after him had attributed to Cimabue, while it was later and is still today considered to be by Duccio. This results in all historians, until Berenson, to describe in greater length or give more citations to Cimabue, and less to Duccio.²⁷

We consider two different groups of names: (a) a first one that consists of the 56 painters²⁸ ranked highest by each historian (this leads to a total of 132 names, since historians may have different names in their lists of "most preferred painters"), and (b) all 253 artists. Most of our discussion will be in terms of the smaller group of 56 painters, from which we will try to extract the canon, if it exists.

²³ In the edition we had access to, there was no index.

²⁴ Normally, ranks are integer numbers (1, 2, 3, etc.), but when two or more painters are equally ranked, fractional numbers may also appear. For instance, Chastel gives the same number of citations to Giovanni Bellini and to Masaccio. They both get rank 10.5, since there is no reason to give rank 10 to one of them and rank 11 to the other. There is thus no artist ranked 10 or 11 in Chastel. The next artist is ranked 12.

²⁵ See Siegel (1956) and Siegel and Castellan (1988) for details.

²⁶ But there may be others; attributions changed over time between Masaccio and Masolino; in recent times, very little is still attributed to Stefano Fiorentino, etc.

²⁷ This is of course the reason for which Duccio's name appears much later in time.

²⁸ Our goal was a group of 50 painters, but given the ties (identical ranks, because the number of lines, or the number of citations may be identical for several names) that are present in some cases, we were forced to consider 56 names instead of 50. For instance, Burckhardt ranks Raphael first (45 quotations), Michelangelo second (31 quotations), etc. Then we come to rank 40. After rank 40, 15 painters get five quotations each. There is of course no reason to take only ten of these, and all fifteen have to be included. To account for ties, we were led to include the 56 painters ranked first by each historian.

We start with a rough measure of how much all possible pairs of seven historians agree on the ranking.²⁹ The calculations are illustrated in Table 2, in which each cell contains the number of artists ranked among the first 56 by the two historians who appear in the corresponding row and column. Consider for example the row for Grove. Twenty-eight are common between Grove and Vasari, 29 are common between Grove and Félibien, etc. and 46 are common between Chastel and Grove.

[Table 2 about here]

The number of common artists is often larger than 28, that is 50 per cent of the 56, but this does not tell everything since those who are not common may be far apart (for example, Vasari gives Salviati rank 7, while Burckhardt ranks him 139th). A better measure is provided by the simple correlations coefficients³⁰ which appear in Table 3.

[Table 3 about here]

All coefficients are positive and significantly different from zero (with the exception of the Burckhardt-Berenson pair), implying that there is, in general, reasonable agreement on rankings. Note also that correlations between Berenson (roughly 1900), Chastel (roughly 1950) and Grove (1996) are consistently positive and large.

The overall agreement between all seven historians can be assessed by a global measure, the so-called κ -statistic,³¹ which varies between -1 (full disagreement) and 1 (perfect agreement). There are various ways of arranging the data to do this. Here, we assigned a value one if the artist was rated among the first 56 by each of the historians, and zero otherwise. The resulting κ -statistic is equal to 0.240, and is highly significantly different from zero at the 1% probability level (its standard deviation is equal to 0.022). There is thus positive agreement, even if it is not extremely high.

We finally provide some results of tests conducted on the differences in ranking for the whole group of 253 artists, using Spearman's rank correlation

²⁹ It is useful to point out that some artists may be very highly ranked because they were active not only as painters, but also as architects, sculptors, etc. Michel Angelo is of course such a case, and may have received more credit than what is solely due to his talent as painter. In principle, every art historian must have taken this into account, and since we compare rankings over historians, this should have no effect.

³⁰ In this case, we can unfortunately not compute rank correlation coefficients, since the two series of artists ranked by two art historians do not contain all the ranks. Therefore we are led to compute parametric correlation coefficients with the underlying assumption of a linear relation between the two series (even if these are expressed in terms of ranks).

³¹ See Siegel and Castellan (1988, pp. 284-291). Kendall's coefficient of concordance (Siegel, 1956, pp. 229-239) cannot be used here, since some ranks are missing.

coefficient.³² Table 4 gives an overview of the results. All correlations are positive, indicating that taken two by two, art historians agree (with the exception of the Vasari-Lanzi pair, for which the correlation is not significantly different from zero, which should come as no surprise since Lanzi was very critical of Vasari). Note that for the Berenson-Chastel-Grove group, correlations are again very large.

[Table 4 about here]

The information can be summarized even more by computing Kendall's coefficient of concordance between all seven historians. This coefficient is equal to 0.499 and is very significantly different from zero,³³ indicating once more that a very good global agreement exists over time. Note that Kendall's coefficient assumes that the rankings are made independently one from the other. This may not be fully so if art historians base their narratives on what their predecessors had written. Therefore, we also submitted the correlation matrix of Table 4 to a principal components analysis,³⁴ which shows that the two first principal components account for 51 and 16 per cent of the overall variance, again a good empirical proof of a large consensus of art historians over time. Interestingly, the first component is positively correlated with every ranking, which seems to point to an agreement based on common ground or criteria of evaluation. The second component is negatively correlated with the two oldest rankings by Vasari and Félibien, has negative but insignificant correlation with the late 18th and 19th century rankings by Lanzi and Burckhardt, and positive correlation with the three rankings made during the 20th century, which may be the sign of some changes in evaluations.

What happened to Vasari's choices?

Even if there is no large disagreement between historians taken two by two, this does not mean that choices do not change over time. It is easy to construct examples in which no artist who belongs to the group of those who are common between say, Vasari and Félibien is common between Vasari and Grove. It is therefore interesting to go into the details of names of artists who are consistently present, and of those who appear and disappear.

³² This is allowed here since all ranks are present when the whole group of 253 artists is considered. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is a much better measure since it assumes no parametric form for the linear relation between the ranks attributed by two art historians.

³³ The computed value for the χ^2 -test is equal to 880.5, which considerably exceeds the tabulated value with 252 degrees of freedom at a very small probability level. See Siegel (1956, pp. 229-239).

³⁴ Note that the principal components analysis is based on rank correlation coefficients, and not, as is usual, on Pearson correlation coefficients. See Croux and Haesbroeck (2000).

Table 5 lists the artists whom Vasari considered as the most important and shows what happened to them afterwards. Nine names (Michel Angelo, Raphael, Giotto, Titian, Leonardo, del Sarto, Perugino, Mantegna and Piero della Francesca) are present through time and are ranked among the first 56 by all historians. The next group consists of 19 artists present among the top 56 both in Vasari and in Grove, but who disappear in the meantime, though some only very briefly (Fra Angelico, Filippo Lippi and Verrochio, three Florentine artists, are hardly discussed by Lanzi; Bramante and Botticelli are held in low esteem by Félibien; Peruzzi is not even mentioned by Berenson and Giulio Romano is not ranked very high). Others disappear more frequently from the top list, sometimes in consecutive rankings, that is, during much longer periods. Finally, among these, some disappear and reappear several times. It is however remarkable that half of the names appear both in Vasari and in Grove, thus passing the 400 years' test of time, though fluctuations in rankings impact all but very few artists.³⁵

[Table 5 about here]

Twenty-eight of those to whom Vasari devoted an important *vita* disappear from Grove's list. Half of them were obviously given too much importance by Vasari, since eleven already disappear with Félibien at the end of the 17th century. Another group of nine disappear more gradually with and after Lanzi. Finally, the fame of an additional group of eight artists fluctuates over time.

Whom did Vasari ignore

Table 6 considers those painters who are ranked among the top 56 in Grove's Dictionary, and who had been neglected by Vasari. Fifteen of these are from Venice and the North and five are Siense. Though Félibien defended drawing (Florence) against color (Venice and the North), he could not refrain from introducing Tintoretto, Veronese, Giorgione and Corregio among his first choices.

These four painters also passed the test of time since they remained high on each of the lists that followed. The other notable break is due to Berenson who introduces Duccio,³⁶ Domenico Veneziano, Tura, Gentile da Fabriano, Ercole de

³⁵ The case of Botticelli is interesting, since it is often claimed that he was discovered at the end of the 19th century only. See Rosenthal (1897). This is obviously wrong. He was indeed not held in high esteem in Félibien's *Entretiens* (1659-1689) or Lanzi's (1789) work, but was present and ranked 47 in Vasari's *Vite* and 36 in Burckhardt's *Cicerone* in 1855. And so are many artists as can be checked by the reader.

³⁶ This is due to the reattribution of the Madonna Rucellai, which was previously considered to be by Cimabue.

Roberti, Crivelli and Ambrogio Lorenzetti but, quite surprisingly, ignores Jacopo Bellini, Masolino, Lorenzo Monaco, Paolo Veneziano, Cavallini and Sassetta who only appear later.

Though Table 6 contains 28 painters, it should be noted that only six were not considered as important enough by Vasari to be honored by a *vita*: Tura, Crivelli, Paolo Veneziano, Sassetta, Bassano, and Barocci, though three of them are at least quoted in the *Vite*. Thus, only Crivelli (Venice), Paolo Veneziano (Venice) and Sassetta (Siena), seem to have been unknown to Vasari, and can be considered as "late discoveries," or "rediscoveries" as suggested by Haskell (1976), though, following Savile (1982), one can argue that rediscoveries may simply be due to a lack of understanding the work at the time it was produced, and not to the work itself.

[Table 6 about here]

The twentieth century: What happened to Berenson's choices?

In Table 7, we turn to those artists who have been among Berenson's 56 first choices. Sixteen appear among the first 28 in both Chastel's work and Grove's *Dictionary*, while 19 are added if one extends this list to the first 56 choices. There is thus agreement over 35 out of 56 names during the 20th century.

[Table 7 about here]

Table 8 displays the names of those artists who were almost never ranked better than 56th until Berenson "discovered" them,³⁷ and who are still ranked high (among the first 56) in Grove. These include Duccio, Tura, Altichiero, Ambrogio Lorenzetti, Gentile da Fabriano, Crivelli, Domenico Veneziano, Cima da Conegliano and Ercole de Roberti. Altichiero to whom Berenson (and to a lesser degree, Chastel) devotes a large attention is again considered as less important (rank 103) by Grove. This is not a very large number of artists, and, interestingly, only one of them (Domenico Veneziano) is from Florence. This number is even smaller if one performs the same exercise with Grove. The only discoveries are Jacopo Bellini, Paolo Veneziano and Sassetta, again a small number.

[Table 8 about here]

³⁷ They may have been "rediscovered" at some point of time between Burckhardt and Berenson, but only appear with Berenson in our lists.

All these artists were known (though not considered as very important) before they were singled out in the course of the 20th century, with the notable exception of Paolo Veneziano, who is absent from all the full lists (of 253 artists) and appears, but only as 152th in Chastel.³⁸

These various configurations are cast in a statistical framework by Simonton (1998), who offers the following useful classification:

(a) *Transhistorical stability*. Successive generations may disagree over time, but not in a systematic way, suggesting that they apply largely the same set of criteria in evaluating works.

(b) *Exponential decay*. Judgments by a generation take into account judgments of the immediately preceding generation, suggesting that they are governed by a first-order autoregressive process, implying decreasing correlations of evaluations over time.³⁹

(c) *Gradual attrition* or steady decline, in which case correlations between contemporary and subsequent judgments would decline in a linear way.

(d) *Cyclical fashion*, with periodic or quasi-periodic fluctuations in assessments.

(e) *Complete transhistorical instability*, if judgments lack any consistency over time. This leads to zero correlations of assessments over time.

Our analysis shows that (b), (c), (e) obviously do not apply to the Italian Renaissance. Correlations between evaluation do not go to zero over time as would be implied by exponential decay in (b). They do not decline in a linear way either as suggested by gradual attrition in (c). And there obviously is absence of transhistorical instability suggested in (e). There are however indications that some assessments are cyclical as in (d), but to a low degree. Therefore, criterion (a) of transhistorical stability is the one that seems most likely to be of some relevance here. Whether this is the result of artistic genius that is recognized over and over, or of a socio-cultural consensus that is perpetuated may be considered an open question, though it is hard to believe that such consensus can be maintained over four centuries.

³⁸ This seems to be due to the recent realization that Paolo Veneziano (like, long before him, Cimabue, Duccio and Giotto) was instrumental in merging Gothic and Byzantine art by quoting from both. This is what Grove *Dictionary's* entry says about Paolo: "Understanding Paolo's art and that of Venice as a whole in this period has been hampered by a *false* [our italics] dichotomy between Gothic and Byzantine influences and by the failure to appreciate the progressive role of Byzantine painting...[Paolo's] influence on later Venetian painters of the 14th century seems to have been *fundamental and almost universal* [our italics]." In the bibliography which is quoted in support of this entry, one finds 13 references, out of which 11 are articles or books written after 1950 only.

³⁹ Note that this needs the coefficient of the autoregressive process to be smaller than 1. If this coefficient is equal to one, the correlations over time are all equal to 1.

On the views of other art historians

A pervasive question is whether we made the right choices of art historians to represent the 400 years between Vasari and the end of the 20th century. Given the approach taken in this paper, we cannot consider historical works that are devoted to specific regions or painters, since this would make comparisons at one point in time impossible.⁴⁰ Therefore what we need is works that encompass the Italian Renaissance as a whole. Vasari is the obvious starting point and so is the *Grove Dictionary*, the latest comprehensive art history. Lanzi's art history of the Quattrocento (1824) and Burckhardt's *Cicerone* (1855) also seem undisputable. But Félibien (late 17th century), Berenson (early 20th century) and Chastel (mid 1950s) may have had a Florentine bias. Félibien was a supporter of drawing (Florence) against color (Venice and Northern Italy), while de Piles, who lived at the same time, supported color against drawing. Though Berenson covers all Italian regions, he spent most of his active life in Florence, and willing or not, may have been influenced by this. Therefore, Venturi's history of Italian art published during the first years of the 20th century may give a different view on the likes and dislikes in the early 20th century. Chastel, finally, wrote his dissertation on the Florentine Renaissance, and may also be suspected of a biased view, that may be offset by Argan's (1968) *Storia dell'Arte Italiana*, known for its North-Italian and Venetian preferences. Clearly if the pairs Félibien-de Piles, Berenson-Venturi and Chastel-Argan had very different views, the approach taken in this paper, and its conclusions, would be worth very little.

This is fortunately not the case and is documented in Table 9, in which, for the sake of easy comparisons, we show the agreement on the ten, 28 and 56 first artists. One can verify that Félibien and de Piles, on the one hand, and Chastel and Argan on the other, have very close views, since almost 80 percent (44 and 45) of the top 56 artists are common in their lists. Berenson and Venturi agree on 32 artists only, but this is still a very large number.

[Table 9 about here]

This analysis shows that the detailed results discussed earlier would be altered, since the names given in the various tables for artists appearing, or disappearing, would not be the same if Félibien, Berenson and Chastel were replaced by de Piles, Venturi and Argan. But the qualitative arguments that are the object of the conclusions that follow would hardly be affected.

⁴⁰ How can one compare in a quantitative meaningful way what Roberto Longhi wrote on painters from Ferrara in his *Officina Ferrarese* with what Giuseppe Fiocco writes on Carpaccio.

4. Concluding Remarks

Some painters obviously pass the test of time and obtain canonical status, even if, as pointed out by Silvers (1991, pp. 212-213) this may be reached by several paths. For a work (or an artist) to be canonized it may qualify by:

- (a) acquiring valuable properties sufficient to qualify it, or
- (b) failing, despite systematic scrutiny, to reveal defects or disagreeableness sufficient to disqualify it, or
- (c) revealing previously unnoticed meritorious or agreeable properties sufficient to qualify it.

Silvers suggests that (a) accounts for the process of canonization in terms of *events* which change the view with which the artist or the works are looked at, while (b) and (c) account for this process in terms of changes (or permanence) in the *opinions of art scholars*.

Nine artists from the Italian Renaissance (Michel Angelo, Raphael, Giotto, Titian, Vinci, del Sarto, Perugino, Mantegna and Piero della Francesca) are always present among the top 56 painters (see Table 6), though even Raphael and Michel Angelo may have spent moments in Inferno.⁴¹ These are canonized in terms of Silvers' (b) criterion.

Among the 56 artists ranked first by Berenson, 35 are still among the first 56 in Chastel and 38 are common to Berenson and Grove. The additions are consistent with criterion (c) proposed by Silvers, according to which previously unnoticed meritorious properties were revealed. Moreover, previous cycles have come to more stability during the last century. This may seem to go against the idea that standards are being abandoned in contemporary art.⁴² But, it may, at the same time, be felt that some standards are needed and agreeing on Old Masters is certainly less risky. In a comparison between Michel Angelo and Picasso, Silvers (1991, p. 212) suggests that

"it is unremarkable to be far more assured of the continuation of Michel Angelo's reputation than that Picasso will enjoy as bright a future. This is not to pronounce on how Picasso's reputation will fare in future. It is only to recognize how much more securely we can prognosticate about the reputation

⁴¹ Note that even Berenson criticizes Michel Angelo, though he eventually ranks him very high. See Berenson (1926, vol. 2, p. 112 et sq.).

⁴² Michaud (1999), for instance, writes that "the artworld keeps pretending to unify the diversity of contemporary productions; this merely leads to a contemporary concept of art that is incredibly heterogeneous. The very concept of an art without definition is now becoming the focal point of its very definition."

of artists and works that have enjoyed success for centuries than about recent works for which no cumulatively successful history exists. Works with no history face overwhelming difficulty in achieving the kind of security of reputation in which canonicity consists, at least until they can acquire a past."

A very similar argument is made by Verdaasdonk (2003, p. 366) for literary works:

"...works that have remained part of a nation's literary heritage for centuries are considered to be more valuable than works that just entered this repertoire."

But it is also remarkable that there is more consensus than dissension among historians, as shown by the large value of Kendall's coefficient of concordance, by principal components analysis, as well as by the paired correlation coefficients which do not decrease over time (and are constant over space). Thus evaluations cannot result from random choices and there is, in terms of Simonton's classification, transhistorical (and transnational) stability. However, the analysis and the data are not suited to decide whether this is due to intrinsic value (which has only very seldom been represented by objective characteristics⁴³) or to social consensus.

Is genius possible and recognizable (objective characteristics) or is art dominated by social field theory and subjectivity? Or is, as Becker (1982) suggests, the staying power of some artworks or artists due to their historical importance? All three reasons may lead to the consensus that we observe, but one can wonder whether it is reasonable to believe that a consensus can last as much as 400 years if *Zeitgeist* and social contracts only were at work. Is it thinkable that the hundreds of critics and art historians who have written the entries on Italian Renaissance artists in the 34 volumes *Grove Dictionary of Art* published in 1996, still feel compelled to follow the 1568 "opinion leader" Giorgio Vasari? Or is Vasari's influence merely working indirectly through historians who kept discussing the same artists, and even copying as in the case of Burkhardt, from previous historians?⁴⁴

Some artists who were celebrated in their time, came nevertheless to be forgotten and were eventually rediscovered: Salviati was ranked 7 by Vasari, fully ignored between 1850 and 1960, and back as 27th in the late 20th century. This is in agreement with Milo (1986) who finds that there is no resurrection: those who are there today, were already there when alive.

There are also examples of artists ignored in their time, and discovered somewhat later (criterion (c) of Silvers' canonization process). Vasari hardly

⁴³ For an exception, see de Piles' *Balance des Peintres* in de Piles (1708), and its analysis by Ginsburgh and Weyers (2005).

⁴⁴ It is however worth mentioning that Vasari's *Vite* are quoted in almost every entry in the *Grove Dictionary of Art*.

discussed Venetians and North Italians, but many of them found their way into Félibien's *Entretiens* (and even earlier than that, into Ridolfi's (1684) *Maraviglie dell'arte*) and remained there since. As Silvers writes, "no one can know at a work's point of origin, before it had time to demonstrate its influence, whether it possesses this power."

Botticelli who was somewhat forgotten during the 17th and 18th centuries reappears with Berenson, and the ascent of Art Nouveau, Piero della Francesca's appreciation increases in the age of abstraction,⁴⁵ thus in the light of new approaches. This is consistent with Junod's (2002) observation about looking at the past through our contemporary "rear-view mirror," as well as with disjunct (a) of Silvers' canonization process in terms of *events* which change the view with which the artist is looked at.

But there are also more surprising and unexplainable sudden changes. Morone, who was praised by Berenson in the late 19th century, is ranked 212 in Grove's late 20th century *Dictionary*. Giulio Romano is almost ignored by Berenson though he was 9th in Vasari's *Vite*, is 13th in Grove but, very surprisingly, has no entry in the Italian *Enciclopedia Universale dell'Arte*, published in 1967.

Changes may be related to some transitory debates, which are not the result of underlying properties of works, but of changing social values. *Colore* and *disegno*, the relative importance of which has considerably varied over time, is obviously one of the most important dimensions. Ethical, political as well as ideological aspects were all intertwined in this debate. At times, color had to yield to drawing, just as the senses had to surrender to reason.⁴⁶ Epic painting (featuring noblemen, battles and the clergy) was supposed to need drawing more than color.⁴⁷ In the times of Louis XIV, drawing was even used as an instrument of political power by the Académie des Beaux Arts. Félibien was a supporter of drawing, as was Vasari more than 100 years before, but Félibien gives much credit to Venice. The dispute between Félibien (Poussinism and drawing) and de Piles (Rubenism and color) turned temporarily in favor of de Piles, but the baton was handed over to supporters of Delacroix versus Ingres and is still alive nowadays.⁴⁸ Cycles of discoveries and disappearances of painters may be linked to this, but there may also be other reasons, such as iconographic factor, subject, genre, etc. During the Renaissance, *gusto* was gradually

⁴⁵ This was suggested to us by Peter Burke in a private communication. See also Burke (1986).

⁴⁶ The most extreme opinion can be found in (the not so old) *Grammaire des arts du dessin* (1876) by Charles Blanc, for whom "drawing is male and color is female. [C]olor will destroy painting in the same way as Eve destroyed humanity." For more on this sexist issue, see the discussion by Junod (1976).

⁴⁷ See Teyssède (1957, p. 164).

⁴⁸ See Junod (1976, pp. 126-127).

substituted to *giudizio*,⁴⁹ as well as pleasure to comprehension, and a certain absence of rationality to intellectualism. But *gusto* will, at some point in time, take a normative character and the years that followed will hesitate between *taste* and *good taste* that used to be thought by "academies."

⁴⁹ See Klein (1970).

References

- Argan, Giulio Carlo (1968), *Storia dell'Arte Italiana*, Firenze: Sansoni.
- Bazin, Germain (1986), *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art. De Vasari à nos jours*, Paris: Albin Michel.
- Bec, C. (1983), Lo statuto socio-professionale degli scrittori, *Litteratura Italiana 2: Produzione e Consumo*, Torino: A. Asor Rosa.
- Becker, Howard (1982), *Artworlds*, Berkeley: The University of California Press.
- Berenson, Bernard (1926), *Les peintres italiens de la Renaissance*, 4 vol., Paris: Editions de la Pléiade.
- Bourdieu, P. (1983), The field of cultural production, or the economic world reversed, *Poetics* 12, 311-356.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996), *The Rules of Art*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burckhardt, Jacob (1855), *Le Cicerone: Guide de l'art antique et de l'art moderne en Italie*, 2 vol., Paris: Firmin-Didot.
- Burke, Peter (1986), *The Italian Renaissance. Culture and Society in Italy*, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.
- Caprio, V. de (1983), Aristocrazia e clero dalla crisi dell'umanesimo alla controriforma, *Litteratura Italiana 2: Produzione e Consumo*, Torino: A. Asor Rosa.
- Chastel, André (1995, [1956]), *L'art italien*, 1956, Paris: Flammarion.
- Coetzee, John Maxwell (2002), "What Is a Classic?" in *Stranger Shores. Essays 1986-1999*, London: Vintage.
- Croux, C. and G. Haesbroeck (2000), Principal component analysis based on robust estimators of the covariance or correlation matrix: Influence functions and efficiencies, *Biometrika* 87, 603-618.
- De Piles, Roger (1708), *Cours de peinture par principes*, edited by Jacques Thuillier, Paris: Gallimard.
- Deschamps, Bruno (2004), Strategic forecasting and overconfidence, manuscript, 2004.
- Enciclopedia (1967), *Enciclopedia Universale dell'Arte*, 15 vol., Roma: Istituto per la Collaborazione Culturale.
- Etcoff, N. (1999), *Survival of the Prettiest*, New York: Anchor Books.

- Félibien des Avaux, André (1967, [1725]), *Entretiens sur les vies et sur les ouvrages des plus excellents peintres anciens et modernes; avec la vie des architectes*, 1725, edited by Sir Anthony Blunt, Farnborough: Gregg Press.
- Ginsburgh, Victor and Sheila Weyers (2005), On the contemporaneousness of Roger de Piles' Balance des Peintres, in J. Amariglio, S. Cullenberg and J. Childers, eds., *The Aesthetics of Value*, London: Routledge, forthcoming.
- Gombrich, Ernst H. (1969), *In Search of Cultural History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gombrich, Ernst H. (1972), *The Story of Art*, Oxford: Phaidon.
- Grove (1996), *The Dictionary of Art*, 34 vol., edited by Jane Turner, New York: Grove, 1996.
- Haskell, Francis (1976), *Rediscoveries in Art. Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion and Collecting in England and France*, London: Phaidon Press.
- Hume, David (1965 [1757]), "Of the standard of taste," in *On the Standard of Taste and Other Essays*, Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Janssen, Susanne (1997), Reviewing as a social practice: Institutional constraints on critics' attention for contemporary fiction, *Poetics* 24 (1997), 275-297.
- Junod, Philippe (1976), *Transparence et opacité*, Lausanne: L'Age d'Homme.
- Junod, Philippe (2002), Dans l'oeil du rétroviseur. Pour une histoire relativiste, *Artibus et Historiae* 45, 205-221.
- King, M. L. (1986), *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Klein, Robert (1970), *La forme et l'intelligible. Ecrits sur la Renaissance et l'art moderne*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Landes, William (2003), The test of time: Does 20th century American art survive? in Victor Ginsburgh, ed., *Economics of Art and Culture*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Lanzi, Abbé (1824, [1789]), *Histoire de la peinture en Italie depuis la Renaissance des beaux-arts jusque vers la fin du 18e siècle*, 5 vol., Paris: Seguin/Dufart.
- Levinson, J. (2002), Hume's standard of taste: The real problem, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 60, 227-238.
- Michaud, Yves (1999), *Critères esthétiques et jugement de goût*, Nîmes: Jacqueline Chambon.
- Milizia, Francesco (1983, [1781]), *Dell'arte di vedere nelle belle arti del disegno*, Forni: Sala Bolognese.

- Milo, Daniel (1986), Le phénix culturel: De la résurrection dans l'histoire de l'art, *Revue Française de Sociologie* 27, 481-503.
- Piles, Roger de (1699), *Abrégé de la vie des peintres*, Paris.
- Ridolfi, Carlo (1648), *Le maraviglie dell'arte, ovvero, le vite degli illustri pittori veneti e dello stato*, Venice.
- Rosengren, K. (1985), Time and literary fame, *Poetics* 14, 157-172.
- Rosenthal, Leon (1897), *Sandro Botticelli et sa réputation à l'heure présente*, Dijon.
- Rouchette, Jean (1959), *La Renaissance que nous a léguée Vasari*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Savile, Anthony (1982), *The Test of Time. An Essay in Philosophical Aesthetics*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Shiner, Roger (1996), Hume and the causal history of taste, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 54, 237-249.
- Siegel, Sidney (1956), *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Siegel, Sidney and John Castellan Jr. (1988), *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Silvers, A. (1991), The story of art is the test of time, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 49, 211-224.
- Simonton, D. (1980), Thematic fame, melodic originality, and musical Zeitgeist: A biographical and transhistorical content analysis, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 38, 972-983.
- Simonton, D. (1991), Latent-variable models of posthumous reputation: A quest for Galton's G, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 60, 607-619.
- Simonton, D. (1998), Fickle fashion versus immortal fame: Transhistorical assessments of creative products in the opera house, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 75, 198-210.
- Teyssèdre, Bernard (1957), *Roger de Piles et le débat sur le coloris*, Paris: Bibliothèque des Arts.
- Teyssèdre, Bernard (1964), *L'histoire de l'art vue du Grand-Siècle*, Paris: Julliard.
- Van Rees, C. J. (1983), How a literary work becomes a masterpiece: On the threefold selection practised by literary criticism, *Poetics* 12, 397-417.

- Van Rees, C. J. (1987), How reviewers reach consensus on the value of literary works, *Poetics* 16, 275-294.
- Van Rees, K. and G. Dorleijn (2001), The eighteenth-century literary field in Western Europe: The interdependence of material and symbolic production and consumption, *Poetics* 28, 331-348.
- Vasari, Giorgio (1981, [1568]), *Les vies des meilleurs peintres, sculpteurs et architectes*, 1568, edited by André Chastel, Paris: Berger Levrault.
- Venturi, Adolfo (1967, [1901]), *Storia dell'arte Italiana*, Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1901. Reprinted by Kraus Reprints, Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1967. Artists index compiled by Jacqueline D. Sisson, Nendeln, Liechtenstein, Kraus-Thompson Organization, 1975.
- Verboord, Marc (2003), Classification of authors by literary prestige, *Poetics* 31, 259-281.
- Verdaasdonk, Hugo (1983), Social and economic factors in the attribution of literary works, *Poetics* 12, 383-395.
- Verdaasdonk, Hugo (2003), Valuation as rational decision-making: a critique of Bourdieu's analysis of cultural value, *Poetics* 31, 357-374.
- Zeri, Federico (1991), *Dans le jardin de l'art. Essai sur l'art, de l'Antiquité à nos jours*, Paris: Rivages.

Table 1
Overview of the data

Approximate period	Historian (author)	Life of historian	Publication date of book	Form of data used	Number of artists
1550	Vasari	1511-1574	1550, 1568	No. of lines	178
1650	Félibien	1619-1695	1659 to 1689	No. of lines	138
1775	Lanzi	1732-1810	1789	No. of lines	237
1850	Burckhardt	1818-1897	1855	No. of citations	216
1900	Berenson	1865-1959	1926	No. of citations	120
1950	Chastel	1912-1990	1956	No. of citations	172
2000	Grove		1996	No. of lines	239
All					253

Table 2
Number of artists among the first 56
common between all pairs of historians

	Vasari 1550	Félibien 1650	Lanzi 1775	Burckhardt 1850	Berenson 1900	Chastel 1950	Grove 2000
Vasari	-	34	23	29	22	28	28
Félibien	34	-	29	33	28	30	29
Lanzi	23	29	-	25	26	23	24
Burckhardt	29	33	25	-	34	32	28
Berenson	22	28	26	34	-	38	37
Chastel	28	30	23	32	38	-	46
Grove	28	29	24	28	37	46	-

Table 3
Correlation coefficients between ranks
given by all pairs of historians to the 56 first artists

	Vasari 1550	Félibien 1650	Lanzi 1775	Burckhardt 1850	Berenson 1900	Chastel 1950	Grove 2000
Vasari	-	0.34	0.40	0.29	0.16	0.17	0.21
Félibien	0.24	-	0.17	0.16	0.22	0.37	0.28
Lanzi	0.25	0.45	-	0.40	0.42	0.56	0.59
Burckhardt	0.41	0.35	0.17	-	0.12	0.44	0.49
Berenson	0.29	0.28	0.22	0.21	-	0.63	0.52
Chastel	0.38	0.56	0.45	0.45	0.40	-	0.64
Grove	0.45	0.48	0.50	0.59	0.55	0.55	-

Notes. Every row considers the 56 artists ranked first by the art historian whose name appears in the row and gives the correlation with the ranking of the historian whose name appears in the column. Therefore, the table of correlation coefficients is not symmetric.

Table 4
Spearman rank correlation coefficients between rankings
of all 253 artists made by all pairs of historians

	Vasari 1550	Félibien 1650	Lanzi 1775	Burckhardt 1850	Berenson 1900	Chastel 1950	Grove 2000
Vasari	-	0.63	0.16	0.40	0.25	0.34	0.35
Félibien	0.63	-	0.33	0.43	0.30	0.38	0.39
Lanzi	0.16	0.33	-	0.34	0.23	0.33	0.31
Burckhardt	0.40	0.43	0.34	-	0.48	0.50	0.52
Berenson	0.25	0.30	0.23	0.48	-	0.64	0.62
Chastel	0.34	0.38	0.33	0.50	0.64	-	0.81
Grove	0.35	0.39	0.31	0.52	0.62	0.81	-

Note: The correlation table is symmetric, since all artists are taken into account. All correlation coefficients are significantly different from zero at the 0.001 probability level since, with the exception of one (Vasari-Lanzi), all t-values that can be computed are larger than the threshold value of 3.29 (with 251 degrees of freedom).

Table 5
Painters present among the first 56 in Vasari
and in Grove's Dictionary (Ranks)

	Region	Vasari 1550	Félibien 1650	Lanzi 1775	Burckhardt 1850	Berenson 1900	Chastel 1950	Grove 2000
Always present among the first 56								
Michel Angelo	Florence	1	3	3	2	3.5	1	1
Raphael	Center	5	2	1	1	2	2	4
del Sarto	Florence	6	5	9	21	37.5	32.5	28
Giotto	Florence	10	9	6	4	1	3	3
Titian	Venice	11	8	5	7	6	5	5
Leonardo	Florence	13	6	4	28	5	4	2
Perugino	Center	17	36	18	21	9	28.5	21
Mantegna	North	41.5	46	8	36	3.5	8	7
Piero d. Francesca	Center	52	41	27	48	15.5	7	16
Present among the first 56 in Vasari and Grove, but possibly not always								
Salviati	Florence	7	37	44	139.5	abs	abs	27
Giulio Romano	Center	9	1	25	5	71	17.5	13
Ghirlandaio	Florence	15	71.5	94	28	58.5	40	24
Sebastiano d. Piombo	Venice	16	13.5	64.5	28	85	45.5	33
Fra Angelico	Florence	19	18	131.5	48	24.5	28.5	15
Uccello	Florence	22	58	154	68	15.5	22.5	32
Carpaccio	Venice	25	abs	71	96.5	30	71.5	41
Parmigianino	North	26	31	227.5	abs	71	22.5	46
Lippi (Filippo)	Florence	29	48	119.5	36	30	40	31
Bramante	North	31	128	50	3	43.5	6	12
Peruzzi	Center	33.5	20	13	6	abs	14.5	37.5
Bartolomeo d. Porta	Florence	35	196	14	96.5	71	61	34
Verrocchio	Florence	36	44	215	8	22.5	17.5	20
Bronzino	Florence	43	94	104.5	28	71	40	43
Masaccio	Florence	44	32.5	58.5	96.5	8	10.5	14
Botticelli	Florence	45	128	102	36	13.5	22.5	11
Lippi (Filippino)	Florence	47	38.5	159	36	85	36	25
Cimabue	Florence	50	27	24	96.5	85	14.5	50
Signorelli	Center	54	88	169	28	17.5	45.5	39

Note. "abs" means that the name does not appear in the author's list. Entries in the table are ranks. For instance, Vasari ranks Bramante number 31.

Table 6
Painters present among the first 56 in Grove
but not in Vasari (Ranks)

	Region	Vasari 1550	Félibien 1650	Lanzi 1775	Burckhardt 1850	Berenson 1900	Chastel 1950	Grove 2000
Appear with Félibien								
Tintoretto	Venice	67	7	12	21	12	20	6
Veronese	Venice	121	4	7	10	11	17.5	9
Giorgione	Venice	58	34	32	48	10	12	10
Correggio	North	75.5	43	2	21	13.5	9	18
Appear with Burckhardt								
Pollaiuolo	Florence	97.5	abs	175.5	12	20.5	13	53
Appear with Berenson								
Duccio	Siena	125.5	128	112	191.5	7	32.5	17
Domenico Veneziano	Florence	80.5	abs	175.5	139.5	50	52.5	26
Tura	North	abs	abs	138.5	139.5	20.5	52.5	36
Gentile da Fabriano	North	107.5	69.5	62	139.5	43.5	36	37.5
Ercole de Roberti	North	83	128	58.5	abs	50	36	45
Crivelli	Venice	abs	abs	156	139.5	43.5	52.5	48
A. Lorenzetti	Siena	116	128	127.5	68	33.5	32.5	56
Appear with Chastel								
Masolino	Florence	113	71.5	175.5	139.5	106.5	25.5	30
Lorenzo Monaco	Florence	82	128	abs	139.5	106.5	52.5	44
Cavallini	Center	94	61.5	117	139.5	abs	32.5	54
Appear with Grove								
J. Bellini	Venice	149.5	66	195	96.5	106.5	61	23
Paolo Veneziano	Venice	abs	abs	abs	abs	abs	152	51.5
Sassetta	Siena	abs	abs	abs	139.5	106.5	86	55
Fluctuate								
Gi. Bellini	Venice	149.5	19	68	21	19	10.5	8
Francesco Maurizio	Siena	135	abs	211.5	15.5	106.5	17.5	19
Martini	Siena	88	30	21	191.5	26	25.5	22
Lotto	Venice	124	84	39.5	96.5	43.5	22.5	29
Antonello	Center	69	42	44	139.5	106.5	28.5	35
Cima da Conegliano	Venice	175	abs	175.5	139.5	50	86	40
J. Bassano	Venice	abs	88	10	139.5	33.5	61	42
A. del Castagno	Florence	80.5	17	200.5	191.5	43.5	45.5	47
Barocci	Center	abs	58	16	139.5	abs	86	49
Pisanello	North	107.5	53.5	81.5	139.5	17.5	28.5	52

Note. "abs" means that the name does not appear in the author's list. "Appear" means that the painter appears in the top group of 56 painters. Entries in the table are ranks. For instance, Vasari ranks Veronese number 121.

Table 7
Painters present among the first 56 in Berenson
and in Grove's Dictionary (Ranks)

	Region	Berenson	Chastel	Grove
Always present among the first 56				
Giotto	Florence	1	3	3
Raphael	Center	2	2	4
Michel Angelo	Florence	3.5	1	1
Mantegna	North	3.5	8	7
Leonardo	Florence	5	4	2
Titian	Venice	6	5	5
Duccio	Siena	7	32.5	17
Masaccio	Florence	8	10.5	14
Perugino	Center	9	28.5	21
Giorgione	Venice	10	12	10
Veronese	Venice	11	17.5	9
Tintoretto	Venice	12	20	6
Corregio	North	13.5	9	18
Botticelli	Florence	13.5	22.5	11
Piero della Francesca	Center	15.5	7	16
Uccello	Florence	15.5	22.5	32
Pisanello	North	17.5	28.5	52
Signorelli	Center	17.5	45.5	39
Gi. Bellini	Venice	19	10.5	8
Pollaiuolo	Florence	20.5	13	53
Tura	North	20.5	52.5	36
Verrocchio	Florence	22.5	17	20
Angelico	Florence	24.5	28.5	15
Martini	Siena	26	25.5	22
Lippi (Filippo)	Florence	30	40	31
A. Lorenzetti	Siena	33.5	32.5	56
del Sarto	Florence	37.5	32.5	28
A. del Castagno	Florence	43.5	45.5	47
Gentile da Fabriano	North	43.5	36	37.5
Lotto	Venice	43.5	22.5	29
Bramante	North	43.5	6	12
Crivelli	Venice	43.5	52.5	48
Ercole de Roberti	North	50	36	45
Domenico Veneziano	Florence	50	52.5	26
Ghirlandaio	Florence	58.5	40	24
Present among the first 56 in Berenson and Grove, but not in Chastel				
Carpaccio	Venice	30	71.5	41
J. Bassano	Venice	33.5	61	42
Cima da Conegliano	Venice	50	86	40

Note. Ghirlandaio is 56th tied with others, and has therefore a mean rank of 58.5. Entries in the table are ranks. For instance, Berenson ranks Tintoretto number 12.

Table 8
Berenson's, Chastel's and Grove's discoveries (Ranks)

	Region	Vasari	Félibien	Lanzi	Burckhardt	Berenson	Chastel	Grove
Discovered by Berenson								
Duccio	Siena	125.5	128	112	191.5	7	32.5	17
Tura	North	abs	abs	138.5	139.5	20.5	52.5	36
Altichiero	North	161	abs	abs	abs	24.5	86	103
A. Lorenzetti	Siena	116	128	127.5	68	33.5	32.5	56
Gentile da Fabriano	North	107.5	69.5	62	139.5	43.5	36	37.5
Crivelli	Venice	abs	abs	156	139.5	43.5	52.5	48
Domenico Veneziano	Florence	80.5	196	175.5	139.5	50	52.5	26
Cima da Conegliano	Venice	175	abs	175.5	139.5	50	86	40
Ercole de Roberti	North	83	128	58.5	ans	50	36	45
Discovered by Chastel								
Masolino	Florence	113	71.5	175.5	139.5	106.5	25.5	30
Cavallini	Center	94	61.5	117	139.5	abs	32.5	54
Lorenzo Monaco	Florence	82	128	abs	139.5	106.5	52.5	44
Tibaldi	North	116	abs	58.5	96.5	106.5	52.5	59
Pollai(u)olo	Florence	97.5	abs	200.5	96.5	abs	52.5	63
Discovered by Grove								
J. Bellini	Venice	149.5	66	195	96.5	106.5	61	23
Paolo Veneziano	Venice	abs	abs	abs	abs	abs	152	51.5
Sassetta	Siena	abs	abs	abs	139.5	106.5	86	55

Note. "abs" means that the name does not appear in the author's list. Entries in the table are ranks. For instance, Vasari ranks Altichiero number 161.

Table 9
First ten, 28 and 56 artists ranked by pairs
of "competing" historians

	Félibien	de Piles	Berenson	Venturi	Chastel	Argan
Total no. of artists discussed	138	77	120	244	172	153
Number of artists common among the						
First ten	7		6		10	
First 28	17		12		23	
First 56	44		32		45	