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Preface

Few artists are more popular today than the late-nineteenth-century French master, Paul Gauguin. Yet, Gauguin is a mysterious figure. His subjects are frequently a puzzle, for his scenes are based upon a highly personal synthesis of reality, while his juxtaposition of colors is remarkably opulent. It is not by chance that his works have such a curious and often disturbing impact upon the viewer.

Gauguin is quite as mysterious a figure to scholars. In studying his life, the specific facts that are so essential for the reconstruction of an artist’s career are, if not totally missing, too often a matter of conjecture. Any piece of information about the artist becomes, therefore, only that much more precious for the student. When Richard Field proposed that the Museum create an exhibition studying Gauguin’s monotypes—still too rarely recognized for their importance—it was quickly agreed that this would be an exhibition which would be as aesthetically rewarding as it would be an academic contribution. As one considers the material and studies the catalogue one discovers with satisfaction that indeed the exhibition adds a significant dimension to the understanding of this complicated genius. A staggering amount of information is gathered together; but even as one appreciates this compilation one is repeatedly tantalized by how much is lost. Known works are destroyed, and questions are raised that cannot be answered—and, in all likelihood, never will be. Richard Field has attacked the subject with a characteristic method. Particularly rewarding is the perception with which he analyzes the craft of a monotype, always relating the artist’s achievement in his treatment of the subject to the implications of his technical exploration.

Dr. Field undertook this exhibition when he was in the Museum’s Department of Prints, Drawings, and Photographs. Since then he has assumed new responsibilities at Wesleyan University, as Curator of the Davison Art Center. Thus, many final details of organization have fallen on the staff of Kneeland McNulty’s department, most notably Stephanie Maiter and Susan London.

Everyone involved has rejoiced as each new loan was granted because breadth of representation was essential to achieve a proper understanding of the subject. We are proud to have gained agreement to show more than 60 of the 139 monotypes the artist is known to have created. Again and again the fortunate owners of these intimate works have generously acceded to the Museum’s request. We can only hope that the broader awareness of this phase of Gauguin’s achievement will be their reward.

Inevitably as a museum studies a particular subject with method and in great depth it would wish to take advantage of its studies by extending its collections. When the Philadelphia Museum of Art learned recently that a monotype as important and as beautiful as Two Marquesans (no. 87) was to be auctioned publicly there was great interest. Fortunately, the Museum was able to acquire the piece—it serves as the cover of this catalogue—and we were able to do so because of a generous contribution from the Alice Newton Osborn Trust. That some of the funds from the Trust established by a long-standing friend of the Museum’s Department of Prints, Drawings, and Photographs should thus be spent is a great satisfaction to the Museum; through this Trust she continues even today an active participant in that department’s excitement.

Evan H. Turner, Director
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Chronology
1848
Birth of Paul Gauguin in Paris, June 7
1871
Begins to paint; employed on the stock exchange
1873
Marries Mette-Sophie Gad of Denmark
1874
Paints with Pissarro
1880–86
Exhibits with the Impressionists
1882–83
Fired from the stock exchange
1886
First trip to Brittany; meets Van Gogh; first ceramics
1887
Voyages to Panama; paints in Martinique
1888
Second stay in Brittany; meets Sérusier and Emile Bernard; visits Van Gogh in Arles
1889
Gauguin and his friends exhibit at the Café Volpini in conjunction with the Exposition Universelle; executes suite of 11 zincographs; visits Pont-Aven and Le Pouldu, Brittany
1891
Arrives in Tahiti in June
1893
Returns to France in August; begins first draft of Noa Noa and probably his first woodcuts
1894
Finishes suite of ten woodcuts in Paris; small editions of the woodcuts printed by his friend, Louis Roy; May to November in Brittany; executes another group of woodcuts and begins experiments with watercolor monotypes; these works are shown in Gauguin’s studio in Paris in December; works on Noa Noa with Charles Morice
1895
Departs for Tahiti
1896–97
Works on Noa Noa and Diverses Choses
1898
Attempts suicide after completing his major work, D’où venons-nous? Qui sommes-nous? Où allons-nous?
1898–99
Begins new series of woodcuts
1899
In June begins writing for Les Guèpes; in August starts to publish his own satirical journal, Le Sourire; probably makes his first traced monotypes
1900
In March or April sends Vollard ten large monotypes
1901
In September moves to Hivaoa in the Marquesas
1902
Copies L’Esprit Moderne et le Catholicisme and composes Avant et Après.
1903
Death of Paul Gauguin in Atuana, Hivaoa, May 8
Introduction
Gauguin’s concern with the monotype has been neglected, largely because the evidence has been scattered or lost.\(^1\) Only once have more than a dozen monotypes been exhibited together—and that was in 1942. Excluding those inserted in the *Noa Noa* and *Avant et Après* manuscripts, the number gathered for the present exhibition represents about half of the monotypes which have survived. All of these are listed in the Catalogue, but many have not been on public view for years while others have been lost since being photographed by the Druet and Vizzavona firms around 1910. Naturally it is suspected that many more perished in Tahiti and Hivaoa, where Gauguin passed his last years. For instance, in one letter Gauguin complained to his dealer, Ambroise Vollard, that a box of twenty-three “careful drawings” (possibly monotypes) had been destroyed by a family of rats.\(^2\)

An entirely different barrier to a proper study of Gauguin’s monotypes is their unorthodox nature. Since none conforms to the conventional dark- or light-manner techniques of the monotype, a great number have not been recognized as monotypes. In fact, until many works can be re-examined closely there will remain a group of drawings and watercolors whose exact nature is undetermined. It is hoped that the present exhibition will establish criteria for further research, will bring to light unknown and unlocated works, and, above all, will make public yet another facet of Gauguin’s fascinating and diverse creativity.

Evidence for structuring Gauguin’s corpus of monotypes has been culled from many sources—old photographs and reproductions; exhibition and auction catalogues; dealers’ records; and published documents, such as letters, writings, diaries, and witness accounts. My purpose has been to bring order to these scattered bits of information, to group the monotypes into a plausible chronological sequence, to describe the various techniques Gauguin employed, and finally to offer some explanations for the artist’s involvement with the medium.

The basic conclusions of this study are: 1) that Gauguin did not begin to make his monotypes until the summer of 1894—that is, in Brittany, between his voyages to Tahiti; 2) that there are roughly three groups of monotypes which require chronological, technical, and even iconographic discussion; 3) that Gauguin developed his own procedures and that neither his means nor his ends can be traced to contacts with other artists; 4) that much of Gauguin’s technique grew out of his experiments in woodcuts as well as his desire to find new methods for multiplying images in small editions without elaborate equipment; and 5) that the monotypes can be regarded as the artist’s final attempt to reconcile and unify the opposites of painting and drawing. They are the last, though not necessarily the most successful, in a long chain of attempts to find a mode that would encompass the impressionistic and decorative (or abstract) styles of the last decade of the nineteenth century.
The Monotype

The monotype is a special hybrid of print and drawing. It shares with printmaking the transfer of an image from one surface to another. But, as in a drawing or watercolor, this image is carried only by the pigment and not by physical or chemical structures that form part of the printing surface. For this reason the act of printing usually transfers the total image and creates a single, unique, printed drawing. Second and even third impressions are sometimes possible, although they are weaker; invariably they differ from one another and are but rarely utilized. The monotype owes its appeal to its double nature: it preserves the spontaneity and freedom of drawing while adding, in the act of printing, an element of chance—an uncertainty born of the pressurized interaction of pigment and paper. This interaction makes a linear passage more painterly, a flat area more textured and illusionistic, and an architectonic structure more organic. The easy fleshing out of relatively simple drawings or watercolors by the monotype process accounts for its popularity among lesser masters and its cautious handling by major artists.

Historically, the monotype derives from the practice of wiping an etched or engraved plate prior to printing so that discrete amounts of ink remain on the surface. The impression picks up this “plate tone” which heightened and structured the chiaroscuro passages so beloved by artists of the seventeenth century. Rembrandt’s etchings of the 1650s owe almost as much to wiping as they do to the etched, engraved, and drypoint lines; many of the finest impressions were carelessly metamorphosed into unique, expressive works in this manner. But the acknowledged father of the process was Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione, who began printing pure monotypes, that is, works completely independent of any structure or etched design, at the same time that Rembrandt was manipulating ink on his copper surfaces. Castiglione’s procedure has become the classical one. A copperplate, identical to that employed in etching, is covered with printing ink, and the design is wiped into the inked surface by means of a brush, a rag, a stick, or fingers. The plate is then run through the etching press and the design is transferred to a piece of moist paper. Obviously this procedure consists of creating highlights and of working from dark to light; it also parallels the mezzotint, which was gaining a foothold in the repertoire of seventeenth-century printmaking. The attraction of the monotype was precisely in this “dark-manner” style, which caused the wiped-out highlights to glow with mystery and drama, and, even more important, organized the entire composition in flowing rhythms of tone.

The eighteenth century, however, with its love of crisp detail and brilliant light, preferred to perfect tonal processes of printmaking and avoided the fuzzier, more generalizing effects of wiping and monotypes. It was an age of reproduction which valued the duplicate far more than the unique (despite the craving for unique states on the part of snobbish collectors). Only William Blake experimented with the monotype, although the precise role of transferring pigment in his so-called color-printed drawings has yet to be fully determined. The early nineteenth century also eschewed the monotype, although a romantic approach to watercolor, especially by Fuseli, Delacroix, Daumier, Constable, and a host of mid-century romantic realists, made visual preparation for experiments by Degas, Gauguin, Lautrec, Prendergast, and others. But the reason for the monotype revival lay more in the personalized approach to printmaking, which was
Plate 2. *The Angelus*, 1894, watercolor monotype (no. 25). Josefowitz Collection, Switzerland
a natural outgrowth of both romanticism and a renewed interest in seventeenth-century prints. Artists of the mid-to-late nineteenth century, such as Appian, Buhot, Jacques, Meryon, and even Whistler, were increasingly responsive to the varying effects ink tone and paper had upon their prints. It was this new sense of subtle variation and participation that probably accounted for the interest in monotype, which persists down to our own day.

The monotype was not limited to the printing of a white design on a black ground. Degas explored other monotype possibilities, taking advantage of the light second impressions that could be pulled from the classical dark-manner monotype. These "cognates" served as a base for elaborate overworking in pastels. They were not only finished works in themselves, but further bridged the gap between drawing and painting. At the same time, Degas also began to draw directly on the copperplate; the positive image could still be wiped and manipulated, but this "light-manner" procedure favored quick recording of the intimate toilette and brothel scenes rather than the organization of larger groups such as ballet rehearsals. Even more personal and less finished were the landscape monotypes of 1890-91, in which Degas finally experimented with color in order to synthesize the linear and tonal approaches of the preceding fifteen years. The monotype provided Degas with an alternative to the relatively additive and linear approach he had used in his painting prior to 1875.8

Of all his work, Degas' landscape monotypes come closest to the watercolor monotypes Gauguin made in Brittany during the summer and fall of 1894. Yet there is still no evidence that Gauguin either admired or was inspired by Degas' experiments.9 Rather, Gauguin's technical developments appear to have been conditioned by his own physical involvement with printmaking. It was antipathetic to Gauguin's nature to accept readymade procedures from any quarter; his craft by necessity had to grow from within for he knew all too well that imitation on any level would lead to dilution and impotence.

The Watercolor Transfer Monotypes of 1894
Gauguin arrived in Brittany early in May of 1894, hoping to renew his contact with the area that had proved so fertile for his earlier painting and sculpture; he was returning to a wild and primitive landscape and to the strongly traditional Breton peasantry. But his thoughts and the legend with which he had clothed himself centered on Tahiti, with the result that the majority of the work executed during his May to November sojourn continued to recapitulate Tahitian imagery, just like the book Noa Noa, which he had begun, and the woodcuts he had executed in Paris during the previous winter and spring.10 Perhaps Gauguin's Breton consciousness would have awakened more fully had he not been confined with a broken ankle received in a brawl in Concarneau. It is then that he must have taken up his brushes and, continuing to draw upon his Tahitian subjects, eventually evolved his methods of printing watercolor monotypes.

The period of Gauguin's watercolor monotypes is in part fixed by several which bear dedications. The most famous (no. 25) is inscribed "for my friend O'Connor/one man of Samoa/P. Gauguin 1894"; another (no. 16) is dedicated "à l'ami Baven [sic]/PGO-1894-." Both the Irish artist Roderick O'Connor and the English painter Robert
Bevan were in Pont-Aven during the summer of 1894, providing secure datings for the monotypes dedicated to them. Many others of exactly the same technique and style were given to such friends as Edgar Degas, Aristide Maillol, Alexis Rouart, and Francisco Durrio. Indeed, the entire group of known watercolor monotypes is singularly cohesive. Many are signed with a woodcut cachet or seal fashioned by Gauguin (indicating that he was carving as well as painting in Brittany). Moreover, there was an exhibition in Gauguin’s studio during the early weeks of December 1894 in which the artist showed the woodcuts and monotypes he had executed during the past months. It was reviewed by Charles Morice and Julien Leclercq.

Leclercq described the woodcuts Gauguin exhibited as follows:

His woodcuts, partaking of the style already apparent in his reliefs, reveal a very personal harmony between sculpture and painting. . . . Imagine very low reliefs, rich in design, printed with a thick ink and, in order to relieve the monotony of black and white, punctuated with a sober accent of red or yellow. There results those powerful effects which are the secret of the artist’s temperament.11

Gauguin had already finished the set of ten large woodcuts which were intended to illustrate Noa Noa, and, from Leclercq’s description, it seems quite likely that Gauguin’s friend, Louis Roy, had finished printing his edition of approximately thirty impressions from each block. Rather than emphasizing the subtle qualities of cutting and printing achieved by Gauguin in his trial proofs, the Roy prints are blatantly decorative and bold.12 Printed in heavy blacks, which obscure and flood the fine areas, the impressions were colored with stencils or a second block. Some were mounted on a gray cardboard, possibly for the December exhibition, but in any case the same board was occasionally used to mount a monotype. One of these is Arearea no Varua Ino (no. 8). It is mounted on gray cardboard cut down to fit the monotype; on the verso, however, is a fragment of a Roy impression of Auti te Pape, which was irreverently sliced in order to accommodate the monotype. There are numerous other instances of Gauguin’s use of cardboard to mount monotypes or woodcuts, all of which help to fix their date to 1894.

It is not clear whether or not Gauguin continued to make monotypes after his return to Paris late in November of 1894. Whereas the Reclining Tahitian (no. 11), dedicated to Amedée Schuffenecker, is dated 1895, a fragment of a similar monotype of the same motif (no. 12), would suggest a date of 1894 for both. This dating seems the more probable, for the latter monotype predates the impression of Oviri (a woodcut from the summer or fall of 1894) printed on its verso. Since Gauguin’s working habits alternate periods of concentrated attention with periods of inactivity or a different focus of interest, it is quite probable that all of the watercolor monotypes date from 1894.

The precise methods used by Gauguin for his watercolor monotypes cannot be described with absolute certainty. It was Leclercq who, in his review of the December exhibition, gave the first descriptive hint of Gauguin’s experiments with the monotype:
By a process of printing with water, he imparts to the watercolor the gravity, sumptuosity, and depth which are for him, no matter what subject he chooses, the necessary conditions of art. In these studies, as in his woodcuts, he is not concerned with inventing new compositions; he has simply transposed into another medium motifs from his Tahitian works.

The most likely procedure was the simple transfer of a wet watercolor from one sheet of paper to another. The Mme Schuffenecker monotype, for example, clearly reveals the chain and wire lines of a second piece of paper; the Tahitian Girl in a Pink Pareo (no. 22) seems to retain the impression of the edges of the original sheet. Curiously, this same monotype is the only one for which the original reversed watercolor may survive (see no. 21), and it is also one of the few for which a genuine cognate or second impression might exist.\textsuperscript{13}

Although many of the 1894 monotypes come in pairs, each seems to differ slightly from its correlate. It is unlikely that this may be explained by Gauguin’s habit of retouching his monotypes, for there is no case of coincident designs beneath subsequent additions, and, in fact, the whole matter of retouching has been exaggerated. Most of the watercolor washes were transferred and not brushed on. In other words, each motif had to be repeated and copied each time Gauguin sought a duplicate. This suggests that there may very well have been other methods involved besides the simple transfer of an image.

For one of these methods there is only scant evidence. In Noa Noa there is at least one “watercolor” which looks like a monotype (no. 128) because it presents a somewhat diffuse appearance. Careful inspection has shown that it was actually composed of two sheets of paper, the upper a very thin Japan. The main concentration of pigment was on the bottom sheet, although much has permeated the top one. This implies that Gauguin had simply laid the thin sheet over the finished watercolor in order to obtain the desired diffuse effects. One might then speculate whether other Gauguin monotypes were executed in this fashion, but unfortunately the search for other double sheets has proved almost fruitless. One would also expect to find reversed pairs of monotypes wherever two sheets were separated, but not one of these has come to light.\textsuperscript{14}

Another monotype-like method—one that would account for the frequent contrast between sharp, blue contours (cernes) and diffuse watercolor washes—is suggested by an experiment Gauguin attempted on page 124 in Noa Noa (no. 125). It is possible that these blue contours, which some observers have thought to be printed in woodcut,\textsuperscript{15} could have been laid down by hand or even traced from previous work. The “monotype” might then have been finished by the application of watercolor through a thin sheet of tissue.\textsuperscript{16} There would have been no problem of registering the washes through the thin paper, and they would exhibit the diffuse effects seen in other monotypes. Nonetheless, the scarcity of double sheets points to the predominance of the transfer process, a conclusion supported by the nature of the washes themselves. Most of the monotypes are characterized—even recognized—by the unique striations of the washes. These must have been produced not by brush but by the interaction of two surfaces of paper as they were being pressed and rubbed together during the act of transferring the image.
There are two groups of works of 1894, many bearing Gauguin’s woodcut seal, which display neither the monotype striations nor the textures of the printing surface. The first is a group of watercolors, reinforced with pen and charcoal. Most are on a rough watercolor paper, very similar to that on which Gauguin mounted the Bevan monotype, and these may be the granular illustrations of which Charles Morice complained in his letter to Gauguin of March 5, 1897. The roughness of the paper imparts to these the appearance of some of the monotypes, but they are not monotypes. A similar situation seems to exist in the second group, typified by an image of Oviri formerly in the Frank Perls Gallery (no. 31). Since all of these works of 1894 have dropped out of public view, it must remain uncertain whether they are, as Ronald Pickvance has maintained, really monotypes.

The distinctions between monotype and watercolor are extremely subtle. Perhaps the most telling factor is the imposition of an optical surface between the image and the physical pigment—that is, the indeterminate textures imparted by the original sheet on which the monotype was drawn, or the striations or mottled surfaces resulting from the transfer. These tend to render the image less obvious and add to the expected diffusion of the watercolor.

The watercolor monotypes of 1894 seem to be on a variety of papers and mountings, but Gauguin obviously preferred the absorbent and smooth qualities of Japan papers. Since most of the monotypes of this period are mounted, I have made no serious effort to group the papers. However, such a study might indicate whether Gauguin continued making monotypes after his return to Paris.

Gauguin’s experiments with the monotype came at a time when he was reacting against the incipient decorative tendencies appearing not only in his woodcuts (especially the Roy edition) but also in some of his paintings, such as the quite abstract Mahana no Atua (W. 513). The deliberate introduction of unclarity was not new; Gauguin had made many conscious attempts to mute the harsh effects of the gouge in the printing techniques of the Noa Noa suite. He often printed the blocks two or three times each, deliberately off register; inks were hand-applied and blended on the blocks before printing; and color was added to the printed impressions by monotype methods. Marcel Guérin has reported: “Using impressions already proved in black, he pulled additional trial proofs with a second block on which he had applied fine touches of oil colors.”

The woodcuts subsequent to the Noa Noa suite and contemporaneous with the monotypes of the summer and fall of 1894 manifest further experimentation with monotype inking. A proof of Manao Tupapau (third version, Guérin 40) pasted onto page 61 of Noa Noa reflects or anticipates the watercolor monotypes; it was printed on a thin tissue and then laid over a second watercolored sheet. The results may well represent Gauguin’s first attempt to diffuse watercolor through paper; it certainly presaged the procedure that he employed about 1898–99 to print several of the later woodcuts. The interplay between monotype and woodcut is typical of Gauguin’s pattern of creativity. Just as the monotypes of 1894 were a part of and a reaction against the woodcut experiments that preceded them, so those of 1899–1903 followed right on the heels of a concentrated period of making woodcuts. It is not only that technical innovations were carried over from one medium to another, but that a softer, more painterly style tends
to have followed a hard-edged and decorative one. This shift parallels the alternations between abstraction and impressionism observable in Gauguin’s paintings and in the woodcuts of 1893–94 themselves, where there is an attempt to coalesce the decorative and optical alternatives inherent in the methods of cutting and printing the blocks.

The Traced Monotypes of 1899–1903
The monotypes of the second voyage to Tahiti (and the Marquesas) fall into two main groups: a small number of gouache transfers and a rather large number of drawn or traced works. Once studied, the latter are easily detected. Despite this, failure to recognize the monotypes has persisted since the first group was exhibited at the Salon d’Automne in 1906, a situation compounded by Gauguin himself, who often referred to them simply as “dessins.” Like Gauguin’s drawings, the traced monotypes, or “printed drawings” as he also called them, vary from literal tracings and sketches to highly finished and even painterly studies. But no matter how slight, these works are endowed with a veil of atmosphere and a patina of age unique to their medium. Before their method of execution is described, however, the surviving documentation will be presented, followed by an attempt to divide the existing body of work into chronological groups.

DOCUMENTATION
Gauguin returned to Tahiti in July of 1895. He took with him some of the blocks he had worked on in France, including Te Faruru (Guérin 21) and Mahana Atua (Guérin 42), but his work with woodcuts during the first twenty months seems to have amounted to five or six minor pieces. Four of these he sent to France with a letter of April 1897 to his closest friend and staunchest ally, Georges Daniel de Monfreid. About a year later Gauguin mentions the unavoidable loss of spontaneity involved in the process of copying his own drawings; there is no way one could construe this passing comment as referring to anything other than normal drawing, and no particular group of repetitive drawings is known aside from a portfolio of monotypes and sketches, most of which are considerably later. It was not until December 1899 that Gauguin was actively working on woodcuts, and publishing a little journal of his own, Le Sourire, which was decorated with woodcut mastheads. It seems, then, that the entire period, beginning with Gauguin’s suicide attempt early in January 1898, was filled with considerable activity in painting, making woodcuts, and drawing. Gauguin’s letters of January 1900 reveal that the young Parisian dealer Ambroise Vollard was sending Gauguin drawing paper (laid, Ingres paper which the artist found unsuitable for his purposes), and that Gauguin, for his part, was shipping Vollard a series of 475 woodcuts (which the dealer found unmarketable). It is in the January 1900 letter to Vollard that Gauguin makes his first reference to monotypes: “I have just done a series of experiments in drawings with which I am fairly well pleased, and I am sending you a tiny sample. It looks like a print, but it isn’t. I used a thick ink instead of pencil, that’s all.”

Support for Gauguin’s assertion that he had only recently been experimenting with printed drawings comes from the group of Tahitian works pasted in the Louvre
manuscript of Noa Noa. The manuscript was begun in France, but some text and many illustrations were added in Tahiti, especially after December 1897, when Gauguin received the first installment of Noa Noa as published by Charles Morice in La Revue Blanche. Even after Gauguin had copied some of Morice’s additions into Noa Noa, many blank pages still remained between the last chapters. Most of these Gauguin filled with recent works, especially woodcuts of 1898–99. Since there is not one traced monotype among them, it seems likely that, until rather late in 1899, he had attempted little, if anything, in that medium. The date also suggests a possible origin for Gauguin’s monotypes. They might have been motivated by the search for a simpler means of printing small editions than that afforded by either the woodcut or the Edison system for preparing stencils, which Gauguin was then utilizing for the production of Le Sourire (August 1899–April 1900). This conjecture is supported by the small group of monotyped caricatures which must date a few months on either side of January 1900.

The 1899–1900 dating of the first traced monotypes is further supported by Gauguin’s allusions to his new “researches in printing” in a letter of late January 1900 to Monfreid. So far had Gauguin progressed, in fact, that in response to Vollard’s renewed call for drawings and watercolors, he executed a series of at least ten major monotypes of quite large dimensions. These were sent off in March of 1900, according to a letter to Monfreid of that date. Nowhere does Gauguin use the word monotype, of course, but on receiving this shipment, Vollard mentioned that he intended to forward to Monfreid “about ten printed drawings which have reached me.…” The fact that so many of the important monotypes can be traced back to two southern French collections, those of the Monfreid and Fayet families, is clearly attributable to Vollard’s cool reception and indifference to this shipment.

Except for a request for drawing pins included in a letter to Vollard of April 1900, Gauguin makes no further mention of drawings until the loss, in August 1901, of twenty-three “careful drawings.” Whether or not these were monotypes cannot be ascertained. In August 1901, Gauguin also asked Vollard to send him some Japan paper, which arrived in March 1902. It was just at this moment that Gauguin decided to describe his monotype process to his patron, Gustave Fayet, and to send him two examples, at least one of these was inscribed and can be identified today (no. 95). During the same year Gauguin transcribed his tract on the Church, L’Esprit Moderne et le Catholicisme, pasting monotypes of the Nativity theme on the covers (no. 82), while in February 1903 he sent André Fontainas his long manuscript of opinions, recollections, and anecdotes, Avant et Après, into which he had pasted eighteen monotypes (nos. 106–123). Gauguin’s last possible reference to monotypes came in a March 1903 letter to Vollard announcing that there were a dozen more drawings awaiting shipment. These were sent on the first of May and received in Paris sometime in September.

The scanty evidence available reveals that Gauguin valued his printed drawings and felt that many were sufficiently finished to sell; others he used for more personal purposes. Whether he was of the habit of shipping drawings with each batch of canvases cannot be ascertained, but we can assume that such was probably the case with the four shipments subsequent to Gauguin’s contractual arrangements with Vollard in 1900.


**TECHNIQUES**

The requirements for the classical monotype are quite simple: a copperplate, ink, rags, a brush, an etching press, and paper. Yet even these few necessities were not available to Gauguin in Tahiti around 1899, when he first began experimenting with his own method of printing drawings. For the copperplate he substituted paper, harking back to his Breton experiments with watercolor monotypes. And for a press he substituted direct transference of his drawing—the act of drawing was also the act of printing. The basics are described in a letter of March 1902 written by Gauguin to Gustave Fayet:

First you roll out printer’s ink on a sheet of paper of any sort; then lay a second sheet on top of it and draw whatever pleases you. The harder and thinner your pencil (as well as your paper), the finer will be the resulting line.

If the paper were covered with lithographic ink, would one be able to find a rapid way to make lithographs? We shall see.

I forgot to tell you that if too many spots of ink are deposited on the paper, you have only to see that the ink surface is a bit drier.46

Gauguin’s words contain most, but not all, of what one would like to know about traced monotypes. It seems obvious that the range of effects achieved reflects considerable experimentation. Several of the monotypes reveal that the character of the ink-bearing paper could be quite important. Sometimes the ink was offset from a very coarse surface, but there is no indication that either cloth or tiles were used (see nos. 81, 95, and 96); at other times the artist used the laid paper sent by Vollard (no. 69). Most monotypes were printed on an inexpensive machine-made, wove paper, but occasionally Gauguin used laid paper (nos. 79 and 105), or even imitation Japan paper (nos. 84, 86–88, 133, 134, etc.). The various granular textures present in many of the monotypes are a function not only of the surface of the paper but also of the degree of pressure and the wetness of the ink. Very light pressure may pick up less ink and thus emphasize the finer structure of the wove paper. The stylus size and pressure were also critical. Gauguin often used two drawing instruments, sometimes more. The thin pencil, employed heavily, achieved thin, relatively sharp lines; a softer, blue, crayon-pencil was used for thicker and darker shading (see Plate 6). Additional means of pressuring the surface probably included the artist’s fingers, a spoon, and the edge of a piece of cardboard. The resulting areas of tone play an important role in the modeling and over-all chiaroscuro, and were consciously exploited by Gauguin in his more ambitious works.

Normally, Gauguin’s monotype procedure commenced with a sketch in pencil; this might be freely drawn, although it certainly could be traced. No evidence exists that Gauguin used a carbon-paper arrangement (that is, drawing on a sheet whose verso had been inked), but it cannot be ruled out. Once the design had been formulated, the sheet of paper was laid onto the inked sheet and the drawing continued, probably in pencil. At this point the entire work could be halted, and the ink picked up so far could be allowed to dry. There was rarely a problem of registration upon resumption of work because of the presence, in most cases, of the drawing on the verso of the monotype, which would act as a guide.
The next stage offered several choices. A heavier drawing object could be used for the shading and tonal passages, or a new color could be introduced. This new ink could be either blended on top of the old or carried on a new sheet of paper. There are monotypes which unmistakably reveal two entirely different inks (nos. 75, 82, 85, 99, and 103); others, however, do not exhibit such clear distinctions, and other possibilities must be entertained. For example, if the colors seem to dissolve and emerge within the same passage or line, the inks might have been blended before printing; the same phenomenon, however, could be explained by the use of oil or solvents or both to extend warm black ink into a more obviously brown tone. Several monotypes show considerable staining on their versos, which might be accounted for by the latter technique. L’Esprit veille (no. 71), for example, clearly shows that the brownish areas of "wash" resulted from a deliberate manipulation of some substance from the verso, that is, from the side of the paper with the pencil drawing.

GROUPING THE TRACED MONOTYPES
Although it is very likely that dozens of monotypes of all kinds were lost in Tahiti and Hiva—thus limiting existing evidence—there are several unusual tools with which one can attempt to organize the traced monotypes. The first of these is size. Because Gauguin tacked or taped down a given sheet (or sheets) of paper to bear the printing ink, a number of the monotypes are of similar size—that is, printed on a paper which would completely cover the inked surface. The evidence for identifying the ten works sent to Vollard in 1900 is strengthened by the fact that there seem to be ten monotypes of a similar size which manifest an identical split in the inked surface where two pieces of paper joined and overlapped each other (nos. 64–73).

Although I have made every effort to examine the paper of as many of the monotypes as possible, I have handled fewer than half of them; many are mounted down, so an adequate description of the paper cannot be guaranteed. The earliest of these works, even the very large monotypes that Gauguin sent to Vollard in 1900, seem to be on a machine-made wove paper of a relatively modest quality. Today this paper has tanned slightly; it is rather uneven in thickness, and the wove pattern is very distinct when the sheet is held to the light. Apparently this paper came in quite large sheets and was available to Gauguin in Tahiti, probably from the printer Germain Coulon, who also worked on Les Guêpes and may have provided the artist with the Edison duplicating machine for Le Sourire. In fact, the paper Gauguin used for Le Sourire corresponds in every particular with that used for many of the monotypes.

What Gauguin really wanted was a relatively smooth surface, and he asked Vollard at least twice to send Japan paper. What Vollard did send was a European machine-made paper with a laid pattern; one side was decidedly smoother than the other, and the thickness varied enormously. At first glance it seems to be Japan paper, but more likely it is an imitation Japan of European origin. Since none of the papers examined has a watermark, their place of manufacture remains uncertain. The monotypes on this paper include some of the series of heads which must date from 1902 (Gauguin acknowledged receipt of the Japan in March of 1902) and the gouache monotypes. The very last groups of monotypes again show Gauguin using sheets of rather thin wove paper, very similar to, but more uneven than, the Sourire papers.
Plate 3. Oviri, 1894, watercolor monotype (no. 30). Private collection, U.S.A.
A virtually unique kind of internal evidence in many of the monotypes is the presence of uninked passages, which take the form of white lines. These are invariably traces of other monotypes which were pulled from the same ink-bearing surface. Whenever a particularly heavy line was required, whenever Gauguin bore down on his pencil, the ink-bearing surface (paper) not only relinquished a good deal of its ink, but also became considerably indented. The effect showed up in subsequent monotypes as a lack of ink, as a white line where no ink had been transferred to the next monotype. Usually these lines appear only in lightly shaded passages, areas produced by a spread-out, but gentle pressure; if a restricted and heavy pressure had been used, the indentation would have been overcome and there would have been enough ink remaining to make its mark on the new monotype. Some of the white lines are persistent enough to appear in three or four monotypes. What this affords is the opportunity to gather chains of monotypes which presumably were executed within a short period of time.

No such historical gift horse, however, is without its mulish characteristics. Not every white line can be traced to a surviving monotype, most likely because so many never found their way back from the South Seas. In addition, other monotypes which might throw light on the interrelationship of two or more works have not always been available for close examination. In several cases the nexus of white lines is so complex that the eye cannot pick out sensible gestals. A marvelous but totally frustrating example is the Nativity now in Chicago (no. 84), and its counterpart in Paris (no. 85); from among all the white-line evidence, I have not been able to relate one other work to them. There is considerable chronological refinement of Gauguin’s monotypes awaiting a more patient and opportune study, which would be particularly enriched by the return to public view of the eighteen monotypes Gauguin pasted into Avant et Après.

A. "Documents Tahiti: 1891–1892–1893" and Other Small Monotypes
Gauguin’s own words, already cited, indicate that his first experiments with traced monotypes should be dated to 1899 or 1900. It would be folly to dismiss this evidence, especially since not one traced monotype can be grouped with the earlier watercolor monotypes of 1894. Yet, doubts are raised by the portfolio of drawings, monotypes, and watercolors shown at the Galerie Marcel Guiot in 1942, Documents Tahiti: 1891–1892–1893. Despite the undeniable fact that this portfolio contained works from the late 1880s as well as the early 1900s, it also included sufficient examples related to the paintings and drawings of the first trip to Tahiti (1891–93) to suggest that in some small way Gauguin may have begun to make monotypes at that time. But, although the entire contents of Documents have not been examined, it is possible to show that none of the monotypes can claim greater likelihood of being from the first voyage to Tahiti than from the second.

One of the most fundamental principles in Gauguin’s creative process was the repetition of figures, poses, motifs, and even entire compositions. This does not mean, however, that new motifs were not added, either from actual observation and sketches, or from the great variety of secondhand sources which Gauguin was so fond of consulting. But the painted works of 1899–1903 are so rife with reprises of figures and groups from earlier years that one can scarcely avoid reconstructing some kind of repertoire to which Gauguin most probably kept returning. For instance, he combined and recom-
bined seemingly obvious and normal symbols in such a way that, within his work, they took on private significance and evoked a personal vision, Gauguin’s “dream.” Thus he took to Tahiti trunkloads of sketchbooks, drawings, photographs, manuscripts, reproductions, and books from which to feed his “dream-day.”\textsuperscript{50} Surely one of the most important of these was the portfolio Documents Tahiti: 1891–1892–1893. Characteristically, the drawing Aux roches noires, which Gauguin pasted on its cover, was a work of 1889. It indicates so well how favorite works of earlier years were used again, for in 1898 or 1899 this drawing was transformed into a woodcut.\textsuperscript{51}

Documents must have been brought back from Tahiti after Gauguin’s death, very likely by Dr. Victor Segalen, who visited Gauguin’s house in Atuana and attended the sale of his effects which took place in Papeete, Tahiti, in September 1903. At some time, the portfolio passed to the dealer Ambroise Vollard, who offered it to Guiot in 1942. Guiot’s catalogue, though lacking measurements and a complete photographic record, does make possible a reconstruction of the contents of the portfolio as of 1942. Of the 108 items, approximately 15 drawings date prior to Gauguin’s first voyage to Tahiti. A minimum of 6 other drawings can be safely connected with 1891–93, while at least 10 more belong to the second voyage (2 of these are squared for transfer). Of the remaining 77 items, some 53 are drawings, many of which are so slight that they cannot be assigned to either trip.

This leaves 24 monotypes, if we accept as monotypes those items Guiot and Guérin describe as having, “on the back, a tracing probably made on a ceramic surface.”\textsuperscript{52} Of these, only 2 (nos. 35 and 36) are related to paintings of 1891–93 and cannot be linked with later works. It is my contention that Gauguin turned to the earlier drawings and often made monotypes from them, either directly on their versos or on a second piece of paper by copying or tracing with a stylus. These “new” works served as studies for paintings of the moment, supplied exercises or sources without specific intent, or were considered finished drawings sufficient unto themselves. It may be argued, therefore, that all of the monotypes which refer to works of earlier periods were reprises of 1899–1903.

There are many instances where a study repeats a figure of 1892 in preparation for incorporation in a work of 1902. For example, the ochre monotype now in Toronto (no. 39) could be associated with the first voyage since it relates to the painting of the summer of 1892, La Sieste (W. 515).\textsuperscript{53} But, in fact, it was used in a monotype of about 1900 (no. 69), indicating a probable date during the second voyage. Similarly, a repeated study of a heavy, seated woman that occurs as a monotype (no. 43) first appears in Deux Femmes sur la plage of 1891 (W. 434); then in a painting of 1896, No te Aha Oe Riri (W. 550); and finally in La Soeur de charité of 1902 (W. 617). Exactly parallel is the pencil study, probably monotyped on the recto (no. 41), for Et l’or de leur corps of 1901 (W. 596), which is a study related to the same Deux Femmes sur la plage.

One of the most convincing examples of a study which repeats an earlier motif is the Études de vaches—Tahiti in the Bibliothèque Nationale (no. 77), which not only precisely repeats a watercolor of 1889, Vaches dans un paysage (W. 343 bis), but probably dates from 1902 because it is physically linked through white lines with another monotype. Finally, one might consider a monotype not found in the Guiot catalogue of 1942, but possibly originally part of the portfolio, Three Tahitians (no. 44). All three figures in
the monotype relate to a painting of 1891, *Les Parau Parau* (W. 435). It is logical to see the monotype as a study for the painting, especially since it is squared in pencil. Yet, only one figure is squared, and he appears in *La Soeur de charité* of 1902, posed in the same direction as in the monotype, but in reverse to his counterpart of 1891. Gauguin simply used the monotype to reverse his drawing. In the later painting the figure is made consonant with the later style and his hat has been removed for the indoor setting. A final argument that unifies virtually all of these rather modest studies is their appearance on the already described off-white, wove paper that is characteristically of modest weight and uneven thickness and associated with the year 1899 and after.

Although it is doubtful that all the monotypes which belonged to the *Documents* portfolio were executed at the same time, the majority seem to postdate 1899. Of the three works (two drawings and one monotype) associated with *D'où venons-nous*? of 1897–98 (W. 561), the monotype (no. 38) clearly dates from 1899 or later. It bears the inscription, “Le Sourire,” the title of the journal that Gauguin did not begin publishing until August 1899; the subject was repeated in another monotype in *Avant et Après* of 1902, and it was executed on the wove paper of the late years. Furthermore, all of the animal studies and most of the figure studies may be assigned to 1901 or 1902, as the Catalogue entries show in detail. Unfortunately, I have not been able to discover any white-line traces which would incontrovertibly link any of the smaller studies to the larger monotypes or those for *Avant et Après*, that is, to works from the last two years of Gauguin’s life. But even this has its rationale, since Gauguin tailored his monotypes to the ink surface he had prepared. Smaller monotypes would be made from a small ink area, larger ones from a proportionately larger surface, while distinct groups, such as those for *Avant et Après*, were prepared in a short time span, probably one after the other.

**B. Caricatures**

The problem of identifying Gauguin’s first traced monotypes remains to be discussed. Although one cannot rule out some of the very simple sketches from the *Documents* portfolio, the most likely candidates are the few caricatural monotypes which almost surely were executed in 1899 or early 1900. In the same category exist at least three contemporaneous drawings. One is a watercolor accompanied by a woodcut from *Le Sourire* (*Le Singe*, not in Guérin54), while another appears on a sheet with the imprint of *Les Guêpes*.55 The demonstrable date of these drawings and the relative crudity of the monotypes (nos. 60–63) support the thesis that Gauguin began to experiment with cheaper and quicker means of reproduction while working on his own newspaper, *Le Sourire*, and that of the Catholic Party of Tahiti, *Les Guêpes*.

*Le Sourire* was printed in very small numbers (perhaps as few as thirty to fifty) from August 1899 until April 1901. Gauguin illustrated it with woodcuts while printing the text with a mimeograph machine; the words themselves were written with a vibrating electric pen which punctured the stencil.56 Although Gauguin did manage to make a few drawings in this manner, they were light, clumsy, and not really suitable for political satire. Thus it might have been natural for Gauguin to have sought a way to multiply the caricatures he was already making—a concern he raises in the same letter to Monfreid in which he first describes his monotype experiments.57

That Gauguin was mistaken about the multiplication potentials of the monotype
did not prevent him from making experiments. One of these survives in the hitherto unknown double monotype, *The Consultation* (no. 60), which was kindly called to my attention by Mr. Gaillard F. Ravenel. It appears that Gauguin intended either to transfer lithographic ink by the monotype method, using the resulting surface to multiply his drawings, or to produce several monotypes simultaneously. Unfortunately, no more than one impression of any of the four known caricatures exists, but each seems experimental.

_Etude de force* (no. 61) is full of accidental blotches which obscure passages of drawing and even part of the inscription. More successful is *Vendredi* (no. 62), which the artist retouched with watercolor, but the drawing is still hesitant and there is none of the textural development that begins to show itself in *Cave Canis* (no. 63). Here Gauguin has become confident enough of his medium to begin using considerable hatching. From this moment onward, progress was rapid. The strides made between these sketches and the large monotypes sent off to Vollard are rather remarkable.

C. *The Ten Major Monotypes Sent to Vollard*

The identification of the shipment of monotypes to Vollard in March or April of 1900 is facilitated by the existence of ten monotypes which may easily be gathered into one or two unified groups (nos. 64–73). While many of the other monotypes are associated with works of 1901–1903, not one of these ten may be linked with a painting of 1899 or later. In fact, only one small detail provides some assurance that they were executed around 1900 at all. This bit of evidence consists of the light pencil sketches on *Vendredi* (no. 62), one of the four caricatural monotypes of late 1899 or early 1900. The sketches are almost certainly preliminary ideas for the *Tahitian Nativity* (no. 68), which can be placed among the large monotypes sent to Vollard.

Each of the ten works assigned to about 1900 was printed from an ink surface composed of two sheets of paper joined together by overlapping. The joint exacted considerable disruption of the drawing because of the sensitivity of the monotype printing process; in most of these monotypes it appears as an irregular half-inch band through the middle of the image. By the same token the size of most of the images is relatively constant; the original sheets in each case must have measured approximately 650 by 450 millimeters (about 25⅞ by 17⅞ inches). As already noted, the paper I have examined is all from the same stock—a medium-weight, somewhat uneven, off-white wove paper of European or American manufacture without watermark. It is very similar if not identical to most of the paper Gauguin used for his traced monotypes. Most of these monotypes are signed in pencil: "P. Gauguin"; on only three did he attempt a signature in monotype, as was his later habit. They are clearly finished products rather than studies for projected paintings or sculpture, and they were destined to be offered to an appreciative audience. But the fact that such an audience did not exist in Paris explains why virtually every one of these monotypes can be either traced back to the Fayet family collection or is still there, for there is good evidence that Vollard sent them to Monfreid, who turned them over (or sold them) to Fayet, who at that time was curator of the Museé des Beaux-Arts at Béziers.

Most important, all of the monotypes relate to each other stylistically and/or technically. Of the ten, at least eight were printed in two tones of ink, usually black and brown. Admittedly, certain technical questions have not yet been definitely resolved:
whether one or two ink surfaces were employed to provide some accidental blending, or how often the lighter brown tones resulted from thinning the warm, black inks. The versos of Two Tahitians Gathering Fruit (no. 64), Tahitian Shore (no. 72), and the two versions of L'Esprit veille (nos. 66 and 71) manifest an identical drawing procedure. In all Gauguin utilized black and blue pencils to effect the monotype printing (Plate 6); in addition, the verso carries some kind of brown wash, which may be diluted pigment seeping through from the recto. Gauguin’s process was careful and deliberate, building up the image from sketch to contour, from hatching to tone. These monotypes display the same graphic conscientiousness of the best of the woodcuts of 1898–99, such as Soyez amoureuses (Guérin 58), Te Atua (Guérin 60), and Changement de résidence (Guérin 66).

The series has been arranged chronologically in the Catalogue according to the white-line evidence, which serves as the basis for the following discussion but will not be repeated here. What appears to be the first large monotype is Two Tahitians Gathering Fruit (no. 64). It lacks the clarity of subsequent efforts, and is composed of relatively pedestrian linear rhythms and forms. The next work, la Orana Maria (no. 65), although still simple in its graphic vocabulary, is far more compact and plastic; at the same time it begins to show a decorative play of line and space. The richness implicit in one work was applied to the next. In L’Esprit veille (no. 66) the insistent repetition of lines plays against the volumetric drawing of the figure. A similar balance is maintained between the newly introduced spatial setting and its interaction with the white paper, while the little flowered motifs add a touch of color and help to establish both the plane of the skirt and the entire image. The second version of the theme (no. 67) is rather stark, but here the drawing is more sensitive and alive, incorporating decorative shape into every form and tightening the tensile strength of every line. A unifying sense of volume results from Gauguin’s ever-growing and increasing power to create flat shading in the monotype medium.

Because some monotypes have not been examined firsthand, a work like Tahitians Ironing (no. 69) cannot be firmly associated with the group. Nonetheless, it was doubtlessly executed at approximately the same moment as Tahitian Nativity (no. 68), a beautiful and powerful composition which one might be justified in associating with Christmas of 1899 (as one would la Orana Maria, no. 65). Gauguin appears to have been attracted by an uneven, worn, inked surface, with traces of earlier line and tone, suggesting the age and tradition of an old fresco. The same look of aged indefiniteness characterizes The Nightmare (no. 70), which is a reprise of one of the most beautiful paintings of 1892, Parau na te Varua Ino (W. 458). These works have a painterly quality that provides a stark contrast with the two heads of the Städel monotype (no. 71). The presence of layers of work (like a palimpsest) and the increasing painterliness made possible—and even may have suggested—the unique landscape, Tahitian Shore (no. 72), which has a most unusual suggestion of transparency and depth. At the end of the series comes the Crouching Tahitian (no. 73), bizarre and threatening.59 One might well wonder whether Gauguin, consciously or not, intended to balance this kind of suggestive, dark subject against the peace and domesticity of the other works. Stylistically, there is a loss of volumetric and linear tension in favor of a more thoroughly going decorative approach. Whether this would serve to place this work more toward
the beginning of the series is open to debate, but the figure’s similarity to the woodcut *Le Singe* might also favor such an argument.

If the monotypes just described were done about 1900, how should we apportion the remaining works among the last three years of Gauguin’s life? The documentary evidence does not allow much speculation about Gauguin’s drawings between April 1900 and late 1901. In the face of Volland’s rejection of both woodcuts and drawings in the fall of 1901, and the artist’s other preoccupations—such as the sculpture commission from Fayet, making arrangements to settle his affairs in Tahiti, the move to the Marquesas, and the loss of the twenty-three “careful drawings”—we may only conclude that, until Gauguin had settled in the Marquesas, his draughtsmanly activities were curtailed or simply did not survive. On the other hand, there are many drawings and monotypes which may be dated after Gauguin’s move to the Marquesas in 1901. Even here, though, one encounters critical difficulties because no one has yet attempted a precise chronology for the paintings of the second voyage to the South Seas, as has been done for the first. A chronology would be particularly difficult for 1901 and 1902 since Gauguin fails to mention his paintings in his letters, nor has anyone yet unearthed Volland’s (or Monfreid’s) inventories of the yearly shipments of paintings. Such a chronology would afford an opportunity to date many of the late monotypes by association. But even this would be a hazardous procedure, given Gauguin’s tendency to take up themes both before and after committing them to canvas.

For lack of other evidence, it can be assumed that virtually all of the remaining monotypes date after November 1901, when Gauguin was well established in Atuana; and also that the two major paintings of 1901, *Et l’or de leur corps* (W. 596) and *Le Gué* (W. 597), were executed in the Marquesas rather than Tahiti. But even if it is further hypothesized that the two major paintings of 1902, *Contes barbares* (W. 625) and *L’Appel* (W. 612), were painted in February and early fall, respectively, and that Gauguin’s Nativity and religious themes come to the fore around Christmas of 1902 (especially since it was at this time that he was copying his thesis on the Catholic Church), a rigid chronology of the monotypes is unobtainable.

The only hard facts we possess concern the two monotypes Gauguin sent to Fayet in March 1902 (of which only *Changement de résidence*, no. 95, is easily identified) and those of *Avant et Après* of late 1902 and early 1903. Through white lines, *Changement de résidence* may be linked to *Tahitian Family* (no. 97), which was perhaps the second work sent to Fayet (and is still in his family). By further extrapolation, a chain of technical and stylistic links may be forged which, in effect, unites almost all of the major monotypes of 1902. But it provides no further clue how to date each group (if, in fact, they were created in groups). The use of Japan paper, a shipment of which arrived in March of 1902, is of some help, especially in dating the gouache monotypes, but their exact chronological position is impossible to specify.

Because of the problems inherent in the material, it will be best to consider the monotypes of late 1901 through May 1903 as a single body of work divisible into several series of thematic and technically definable groups. About a dozen come from the Documents portfolio, seven form a chain of works dealing with animal studies, five more depict variations of a Nativity theme, eight are heads, twelve are large works related to the major paintings of 1902, and three are miscellaneous studies for unidenti-
fiable works. Finally, there is the group of eighteen moderate-sized works Gauguin pasted into Avant et Après, a few of which continue the themes of the above groups.

D. Animal Studies

Six rather decorative sheets of animal studies and one figure study seem to fit into a definite chain. Their precise order of execution is paralleled by their arrangement in the Catalogue (nos. 74–80). Among the white lines of the Crouching Tahitian Women Seen from the Back (no. 75) an additional work can be detected that has been tentatively identified as a recently lost monotype (no. 74). The Crouching Tahitian itself figures prominently in two or three of the subsequent animal studies, and must have been executed in their midst as a final study for the painting then in progress, Femme accroupie (W. 613). This intermingling of figure and animals is not exactly surprising, but is not often encountered in Gauguin’s monotypes.

Why all the animal studies were taken up in 1901–1902 may be partly explained by their inclusion in paintings of this period, as has been detailed in the Catalogue entries. But the lifting and reworking of older drawings may be one of those creative phenomena which derive their impetus from the chance convergence of technical and motivational factors. Given Gauguin’s penchant for recapitulating past motifs—as he did on a literary level in Avant et Après—the monotype permitted the artist to make endless and somewhat unpredictable variations on the drawings he had saved from previous years. Several of the monotyped sheets of animal studies, in fact, are subtly metamorphosed into a playful species of decorative drawings. There is a wonderful interweaving of texture and design which interacts constantly with the white lines and their accompanying ridges of ink. The same ambiguous and decorative combination of line and space can be noted in some of the late figure studies, such as the Tahitian Family in Paris (no. 99). Still, none of the animal studies was signed, and it is dubious that Gauguin seriously entertained thoughts of their finding a public market through Vollard. They were to remain his own private entertainment.

E. Nativity Series

One may only speculate upon the order of execution of these monotypes. Even if the Nativity canvas of 1902 is to be associated on both thematic and stylistic grounds with December, there are insufficient grounds for doing so with all seven of the Nativity monotypes (nos. 81-85, 122, and 123). Nonetheless, the largest of these (no. 81), which is rather sparsely drawn, could well belong to December 1901. The style has strong bonds with the Tahitian Family (no. 97) of early 1902. Both are relatively open drawings with an economic and desultory use of hatching; neither employs broad areas of tonal shading. They avoid that density of spatial and linear ambiguity which characterizes many of the other monotypes of 1901–1902. Of course, links with other works of 1902 abound. For example, the background of the Tahitian Family manifests a tendency toward decorative foliage, which appears fully developed in later monotype studies, such as the Tahitian Family in Paris (no. 99) and L’Appel (no. 100). Both manifest a fondness for a rough surface, and there are striking similarities among the simplified facial types, especially the almost spectral visages at the far right of each. No white lines unite these two works, and their connection must remain based on stylistic observations.
Many similar technical features are shared by the Nativity monotypes that adorn the covers of the manuscript, *L'Esprit Moderne et le Catholicisme*, completed sometime in the fall of 1902 (no. 82). These monotypes, although smaller, are close adaptations of the first Nativity and might date between December 1901 and the spring of 1902. Even more difficult to place in sequence is the worked, rough-textured, and dry rendition of the subject (no. 83).

The remaining four Nativities (yet another version is a gouache monotype from the spring or summer of 1902, no. 139) could be associated with December of 1902. The two sheets inserted in *Avant et Après* (nos. 122 and 123) are presumed to date late in the year. Not only were they executed specifically for the manuscript, which was finished in February 1903, but, if they are taken as one composition, it will be seen that they are closest of all to the painted version. They share with many other *Avant et Après* monotypes an avoidance of almost all decorative handling of line, the very pedestrian contours, a thick, watery hatching, and a generalized coalescence of tone. The same qualities can be found in the two other larger and more accomplished Nativity monotypes in black and brown (nos. 84 and 85). Despite the rich endowment of their surfaces with white lines, attempts to link these two with each other—or with monotypes of different subjects, for that matter—have failed completely. I believe they should be compared with the two large, dark studies for the painting *L'Appel* and dated to the fall or winter of 1902. The presence of so many white lines—lines which uniformly find no concrete embodiment in any surviving monotype—is strong evidence of Gauguin’s deep involvement with the monotype process; unfortunately, many of his efforts must have been lost.

**F. Heads**

As was the case with the animal studies, there are good grounds for grouping together at least six of the ten monotypes of various heads. The four double portraits (nos. 86–89) are interwoven by traces of each other’s fabrication through white lines, while two single heads (nos. 90 and 92) are studies for the same group of paintings of 1902. Of the remaining four, three are clearly later (nos. 91, 108, and 115).

It is safe to assume that the four large double heads were made for Vollard. They are all signed, and are quite self-consciously decorative and carefully worked. Furthermore, they were produced in March of 1902, almost immediately after Gauguin received the Japan paper, on which they are executed. It is not easy to specify, however, their role in the creative process; Gauguin was fully capable of turning out work for Vollard by repeating images and compositions with which he was already satisfied. It may well be, therefore, that these fine heads were not studies for paintings but were derived from them. The largest and most beautiful of these monotypes is the *Two Marquesans* in the British Museum (no. 86). The heads embody a new flare and intensity almost never seen in the faces of Gauguin’s usually impassive men and women. Although not reacting to any external stimulus, they are imbued with a beauty and grace, of which one is particularly aware in the works of 1902, such as the painting *Contes barbares* (W. 625). The left head derives from the same red-headed model who makes her appearance in *Contes barbares* and other canvases. Their romantic intensity is indebted both to the new Marquesan models and to Delacroix, for, since 1899, Gauguin had been paraphras-
ing several heads from photographs of at least two of Delacroix’s paintings, *Le Naufrage de Don Juan* (1840) and *Le Barque de Dante* (1822). A all of the other heads, sometimes reversed, sometimes not, find counterparts in canvases completed in 1902.

There seems to be a gradual detente in size and concentration of the series of four double heads. The British Museum monotype, which came first, is the most powerful. Of course, there is no way of knowing whether such series were products of one sitting or whether days or weeks intervened. It is not impossible that the indentations that produced the white lines held their form for some time, even when re-inked. But a short time span between successive works is more probable. Otherwise a deterioration of the working ink surface by the action of temperature, humidity, and insects would have set in.

The hypothesis that 1902 saw a gradual weakening of Gauguin’s draughtsmanship is supported by occasional remarks from the artist concerning his ever-weakening eyesight and generally deteriorating health. Additional support derives from a chronology of the paintings—if correct—beginning with a work such as *Contes barbares* (February–March 1902), passing through the group of works surrounding *L’Appel* (late summer to early fall 1902), and ending with such small and admittedly weak paintings as *Changement de résidence* and *Nativité*. Although the canvases of 1903 do little to indicate a revitalization before Gauguin’s death in May, there are other factors which must be considered. In a letter of March 1903 Gauguin complained that he was virtually out of supplies at a time he wanted to work. That he had been energetic at this time is substantiated by his steadfast and prolific efforts to complete his literary endeavors. And even granting that the eighteen monotypes pasted into *Avant et Après* do show a loss of concentration, the drawings (at least one of which is dated 1903) are remarkably disciplined and decorative. Some period or periods of renewal, therefore, may not be ruled out. It would follow, then, that a work such as the *Head of a Young Maori Girl* (no. 90) could be placed at a decidedly earlier moment of 1902 than the broader, almost liquid evocations represented by the *Head of a Marquesan Girl* (no. 91) or the virtually scumbled study related to *Les Amants* (no. 92). The last two have stylistic parallels with the Chicago *Nativity* (no. 84) and the Boston study for *L’Appel* (no. 102), which are also assigned to late 1902. Whether any of the monotypes may be assigned to 1903 remains moot.

G. Other Major Monotypes
The foregoing considerations are touchstones for ordering some of the remaining larger works of 1902. As I have already hypothesized, the beginning of the year is marked by Gauguin’s gift of *Changement de résidence* (no. 95)—possibly accompanied by the sketchy *Tahitian Family* (no. 97)—to Gustave Fayet. To the same moment might belong the *Return from the Hunt* (no. 96). *Changement* is unique among Gauguin’s monotypes for its dark, obscuring tonality. The drawing itself is quick and sketchy, but not as devoid of structure as the later version in *Avant et Après* (no. 116). It might belong to a minor stylistic excursus, including a second rendition of *Changement* (no. 58) and the peculiar study of a horse and a kneeling woman (no. 57), whose date is still open to question. All of these manifest an unusual linear fluidity and a corresponding lessening of structured pictorial space. The fact that *Changement* reverses the paint-
ing of 1902 (W. 623) suggests that the monotype was not used as a study but that the drawing for the monotype was executed after the oil (unfortunately, the verso is not visible at present).

Belonging to the same group as Changement de résidence and the Tahitian Family is another study, one that relates to several works of late 1901 and early 1902. It is the subtle Female Torso (deceptively simple in reproduction) in the Galerie de l’Ile de France, Paris (no. 94). At first it appears to have been executed exclusively for Jeune Fille a l’éventail of early 1902 (W. 609), itself deriving in part from a photograph. But close comparison reveals that it (or a very similar, now lost study) was used for a painting of late 1901 with which several monotypes and drawings have already been associated, Et l’or de leur corps (W. 596). The torso study was then employed in the formulation of the large Tahitian Family monotype (no. 97) already assigned to early 1902, where it became the figure seated in the right background.

There exists another sophisticated monotype (no. 98) which was also a study for Famille tahitienne (W. 618) as well as for La Soeur de charité (W. 617). Its sensitivity to positive and negative forms, and its heavy, bolder line argue for a more developed stage than the torso. Comparison shows it to be closer in detail to the Fayet monotype of the Tahitian Family (no. 97) than to that in Paris (no. 99), and thus dating rather early in 1902. It was squared during the process of drawing, that is, the verso was squared in pencil, with the consequence that the recto appears squared in the monotype. Is there any evidence to warrant the conclusion that a figure study such as this could have been executed after, rather than before, a more finished work—in other words, after the Fayet Tahitian Family? An examination of the roles of the squared monotypes should clarify this problem:

1) A monotype whose verso (drawn side) alone is squared was probably used to effect an enlargement, ending in a second monotype in the same direction as, or a painting in the opposite direction to, the original monotype, for example, the study for Tahitians Ironing in Toronto (no. 39).

2) A monotype squared on both sides (in pencil and in monotype) was almost certainly derived from one of the foregoing monotypes or from a drawing. As examples one may cite the finished Tahitians Ironing (La Case, no. 69) and probably the large Adam and Eve (no. 105). The second study for Tahitian Family (no. 98) is another fine instance. It is not a final version, only a mid-point in the creative process whose beginnings are not known, unless they lie in a still-unrevealed drawing on the verso of the Fayet version. This study was further developed in the highly finished Paris monotype (no. 99), and was also incorporated, directly from the squared recto, into La Soeur de charité of 1902 (W. 617). Of the six figures that comprise the painting, five derive from known studies, of which four are monotypes!

3) A monotype whose recto is squared in pencil rather than in monotype was probably developed in monotype, and only then considered worthy of incorporation into another work, usually a painting in the same direction. Examples are the Three Tahitians (no. 44), one figure of which was used for La Soeur de charité, and the final version of Tahitian Family (no. 99), which was used for the 1902 painting of the subject.

This finished monotype of Tahitian Family was squared in pencil after the ink had dried. Gauguin then decided to incorporate it into the series of beach paintings of the
second half of 1902. All of the figures were rendered in the same direction, as one would expect, but the standing background figure was transposed from left to right. The same standing figure—the one which had been taken over for La Soeur de charité from the intermediate monotype study (no. 98)—also found a place in another beach scene, Cavaliers sur la plage II (W. 620). As a function of the shift in medium—the monotypes submitted to the stylistic trend of the moment which emphasized an almost irrational flow of colored surfaces—the linear elements of the monotype experienced considerable loosening.

To the same moment of 1902 as the final Tahitian Family belongs the finished monotype for L’Appel (no. 101). Similarly rich in drawing, shading, tone, and decorative foliage, it is also closer to the painted image than any of the other monotypes and drawings—it even includes the foreground still life, albeit reversed. But, unlike the final Tahitian Family monotype, it is not squared and it omits a figure from the background (for which, however, another separate monotype study exists, no. 75).

Another study for the painting is the simpler Boston monotype, L’Appel (no. 102), which has all the earmarks of being the final figure study. Although it is squared in monotype, Gauguin took additional pains to complete the grid in pencil in order to facilitate its transfer to canvas. The head with lowered handkerchief, derived from Delacroix, appears just as it does in Gauguin’s painting.

The development of this motif is worth exploring; rarely can one follow so closely the genesis of a Gauguin image through the drawing process. The two Delacroix heads were first incorporated into the Gauguin repertoire in the Louvre’s Carnet Walter on folios 47r and 47v. These were then copied in pencil onto a sheet surviving as Guiot 71 verso (no. 46). But the recto, a monotype that has remained unphotographed, must have pleased Gauguin more. The drawing was squared and used for development of the final images: three large monotypes and one drawing (Rewald 113), all of which are the reverse of the original Carnet Walter studies. The monotype side of Guiot 71 must have been used directly in another painting of 1902, L’Enchanteur (W. 616), whose main figure was also prepared in the Carnet Walter, on folio 44v.

A study of the works of 1901 and 1902 reveals more and more how much thought and synthesis of motifs, old and new, Gauguin poured into his creative process. In fact, the figures for L’Appel were not solely adaptations from Delacroix. At least the right-hand figure is derived from one of the friezes of the Parthenon, photolithographs of which Gauguin had taken to Tahiti. This is hardly a surprise, since several of the horses in the beach paintings of 1902 derive from the same source, and, as I have shown elsewhere, considerable use of the frieze occurs in paintings of 1896 and 1897. The same complexity of development was widespread and works were often generated in concert and over a considerable period of time. Gauguin himself provided a kind of pictorial witness to the simultaneous evolution of Tahitian Family and L’Appel. On pages 169 and 175 of Avant et Après (nos. 114 and 117) he repeated motifs from both works, and on page 165 (no. 112) he actually combined one figure from each—both reversed. In other words, by late 1902 he had keyed his drawings (versos of the monotypes) to the direction of the paintings, and this resulted in a final reversal of the themes.

La Fuite (no. 104) must date from the same moment as the finished studies for
Plate 5. *L'Esprit veille*, c. 1900, traced monotype (no. 66). Collection Swiss Credit Bank, Zürich
Plate 6. Verso of Plate 5. Pencil drawing
L'Appel (no. 101) and Tahitian Family (no. 99). It is totally consonant in its handling of areas of tone and in its unique interest in setting. There is nothing to be gained by placing it closer to the painting of 1901 (W. 597), which it reverses, because there are no documented large-scale drawings or monotypes from that year. And the gouache monotype (no. 134, in the same direction as the painting) can most reasonably be assigned to 1902 as well.

But it is a difficult leap from these works to a final monotyped version of L'Appel (no. 100), and from there to Adam and Eve (no. 105). Gauguin’s chronology is constantly obscured because of an inherent tendency to alternate between various stylistic polarities. Thus it is quite possible that works like L'Appel and Adam and Eve may be quite closely associated in time, but considerably divergent in style. The latter is carefully executed, abounding in details, small hatchings, and decorative shapes; it is rather dry in appearance. L'Appel, on the other hand, is broad, fluid, and loose. Its figures are large, flat, and motionless, far more typical of Gauguin’s Tahitian work than those of Adam and Eve, which are rhythmically striding, flowing, and spatially conceived beings. Even the heads contrast in their degree of humanity, those of Adam and Eve being particularly ingratiating and imbued with a sense of inner life. Yet, just these contrasts characterize the differences between the 1902–1903 monotypes and drawings in Avant et Après. It is to late 1902 or early 1903, therefore, that Adam and Eve and L’Appel are provisionally assigned. Adam and Eve may well be the last major monotype Gauguin executed. Together with the two versions of L’Esprit veille of 1900 (nos. 66 and 67) and La Fuite of 1902, it must be reckoned as one of Gauguin’s most impressive drawings.

The Watercolor and Gouache Monotypes of the Second Tahitian Voyage

Under this heading belongs a tentative group of sixteen works, but only eight or nine have been sufficiently examined to justify the conclusions which follow. Taken as a whole, they contrast with the traced monotypes of 1899–1903 in their lack of participation in the creation of new images. Rather, they are end products—works of art that repeat established subjects and are merely variations on a theme in a different medium. In this they are similar to the watercolor monotypes of 1894.

The first group, which may be dated 1896–99, comprises five possible monotypes pasted into the Louvre manuscript of Noa Noa (nos. 124–128). Two other monotypes, one lost and the other unexamined (nos. 129 and 130), may belong with these, for they draw their imagery from works of about 1896. And by technical association, two additional examples, the so-called Oriental Head (no. 131) and the Still Life with Pitcher and Fruits (no. 132), might date from about 1899 and be associated with the frontispiece of Noa Noa (no. 124). Judging only by the richness of the Noa Noa frontispiece, these last three works form a surprising, jewel-like corner of Gauguin’s oeuvre.

Conceivably, it was from these works that Gauguin took his cue when he began working on a series of gouache monotypes in 1902. At present only seven are known (nos. 133–139, of which three were not available for examination). They are all executed on the Japan paper which I believe was received from Vollard in March of 1902. In other words, not only do the themes date the set to 1902, but also the fact that the same paper was employed for some of the traced monotypes (e.g., nos. 86–88) which must date from 1902. It is not clear why Gauguin limited his production of gouache
monotypes. At least four are of generous proportions; they are almost small paintings, so worked are the surfaces. We do know, however, that it was the absorbent character of the paper that allowed their production, and that Gauguin had run out of this paper sometime around the fall of 1902.\textsuperscript{70} Aside from the obvious fact that a rather opaque watercolor was transferred from one paper surface to another, these works do not easily lend themselves to technical analysis. Gauguin felt free to retouch them, especially in the reinforcement of contours, which are the invariable blue cernes, and in the addition of body white. Those that I have been able to examine (and, from the photograph, the \textit{Seated Marquesan}, no. 138) present a surface which varies from thick and crusty to one that is inseparable from the paper; some passages contain a gum or varnish which has subsequently imparted an unexpected crackling.

The gouache monotypes embody on paper the same stylistic direction as the small, coloristic oils of 1902. A canvas such as the \textit{Nativité} (W. 621), in spite of its multitude of figures, works only by dint of the magical color which undulates from warm to cool over the entire surface, anticipating Kandinsky, the Blue Rider group, and the French Orphists. A work such as the \textit{Crouching Marquesan} (no. 133) is a tour-de-force of color composition. The well-defined plastic contours of the figure encase a color flow from orange to olive brown that evokes both light and mass without breaking the tapestry-like surface of variegated background colors. And all of this, in turn, is allowed to float over a pool of water formed only by blue ripples, blank paper, and white body color. Depth is created in sufficient potency to support the far greater pigmentation of the upper two-thirds of the picture, and yet the whole is subsumed in a marvelous play of surface texture, shape, and color. The broad, painterly qualities of the gouache monotypes evoke comparisons with the late landscapes of Rembrandt, who abandoned the line of pen and needle for the brush, and of Claude and Turner, who were both striving for painting of pure color.

\textbf{Conclusions}

The Catalogue confirms the contention that the watercolor and gouache monotypes of 1894 and 1902 were end products—self-sufficient works that did not lead to further iconographic or stylistic evolution. They were, moreover, recapitulations of older themes; even the new images were probably conceived first in oil, wood, or ceramic. But by the same measure that the watercolor monotypes were an outgrowth of the woodcuts of 1893–94, they were a reaction against them. The woodcuts, as printed by Gauguin, were a unique combination of hard and soft surfaces; as printed by Louis Roy, however, they became hardened into shaped color areas. The monotypes reversed this trend and achieved a far greater formal integration. Their color was soft and unshaped, a continuous flow that often penetrated over and under the contours, which in other media had acted as restraining limits. Thus the process of monotype printing, which yielded this softness, was used to subdue the tyranny of line in general, and of flat color shapes specifically. By suspending the image in the medium, spatial ambiguities were introduced and illusionism was reduced.

Yet, none of the monotypes lost the sense of surface, principally because the printing paper left its own texture as a reference plane. But more important were the \textit{cernes}, which no longer were heavy blue outlines, but most often thin, flat planes. We
still cannot be sure that they were not printed first; often they were strengthened after the monotype had been printed and left to dry. They provided a soft design that insisted on being part of the surface plane while allowing the colors to disintegrate and reform according to the chance vagaries of the printing process.

In these works Gauguin effectively repudiates a perceptual fallacy that has dogged him to this day, namely, that he painted in terms of flat color planes. The situation can be compared with the initial reactions to Andy Warhol’s canvases of 1962–66, which appeared to be composed of exactly repeated photo-mechanical images. In fact, both Gauguin and Warhol—despite some of their own propaganda—took pains to vary the visual and textural consistencies of their surfaces. And both relied on the chance elements inherent in their printing methods to do it. One is reminded of Merete Bodelsen’s astute analysis of Gauguin’s attitude toward the firing of his glazed ceramics, where, as in the monotypes, Gauguin was completely in favor of encouraging “natural process” (that is, chance) to produce the harmonies of color he loved so much.

Of all the works executed after 1891, the monotypes of 1894 came closest to reviving the cloisonné style of 1888, with its emphasis on heavy, decorative, blue cernes. At the same time it is their diffuseness that ultimately removes them from the earlier Brittany style and links them to the mid-nineties. Thus the watercolor monotypes join the woodcuts in Gauguin’s struggle with color-line duality. The watercolor monotypes exploit the conflict between the astructural, textured color and the more disciplined design of the flat cernes. Gauguin might have likened the watercolor monotype to musical interludes, each with its own range of color, texture, and mood. Their light, pastel tonality places them among the least searching but most delightful evocations in Gauguin’s oeuvre.

The traced monotypes of 1899–1903 carry with them an entirely new range of roles, subjects, and of course media. Unlike the watercolor monotypes, they fill many of the functions normally associated with drawings. The one exception is that none seems to be a study made from nature; no matter how slight or finished, the monotypes always derive from previous studies or facilitate imaginative developments. They run the gamut from formative sketches and large squared studies to finished works that Gauguin found worthy of offering to the public.

Begun as a cheap and easy method for the duplication of drawings, the monotype all but replaced charcoal and pencil drawing during the last four years of Gauguin’s life. Almost immediately Gauguin seized upon its potential as a means to vary and reverse his motifs. He even poked fun at himself in a passage in Avant et Après: “Concerning this seeker [Gauguin], a lover of art has said: ‘He traces a drawing, then he traces this tracing, and so on till the moment when, like the ostrich, with his head in the sand, he decides that it does not resemble the original any longer. Then!! he signs.’”

It is not so much that Gauguin sought to disguise his figures so they could be used another time, but that the process of tracing, repeating, reversing, and changing scale was essentially a process of transformation. The monotype encouraged chance thematic variations; the printing produced accidental graphic changes; and the process even led to a progressive abstraction of a given motif. In essence, the monotype permitted the grafting of new ideas to older forms.

Examples of this process abound in Gauguin’s work: the magical conjoining of
motifs was at the heart of his creative process, as the many articles on his borrowings have demonstrated. Although it is beyond the scope of the present study to discuss Gauguin’s sources, the footnotes will lead the curious to them. Still, it should be borne in mind that Gauguin’s interminable borrowings are not a sign of poverty of invention. Instead, they are part of his essential working method, a parallel to the free-wheeling Symbolist process of forging unexpected links among disparate and dissociated elements. The same experimentation is evident in Gauguin’s constant use of other media. Of all the artists of the nineteenth century, he was surely the most multi-media oriented.

Examples of Gauguin’s transformations can be found early in his career, such as the grafting of his 1887 Martinique imagery onto a Brittany drawing of 1886 to produce the ceramic Bathing Girl of 1887–88 (Bodelsen 38). There are also the numerous Tahitian fusions—figures derived both from the Borobudur friezes and Gauguin’s observation of the Tahitian visage and figure, the most obvious of which occurs in the painting Te Nave Nave Fenua (W. 455). A more speculative, but documentable, example began with a photograph of a figure from the Theater of Dionysus in Athens which was step-by-step transformed into a crouching Tahitian girl and finally into a spectral, monkey-like animal a few years later in Poèmes barbares (W. 547). L’Esprit veille (no. 66) is really a pastiche of two photographs and a motif that was developed not just four years earlier (in Te Arii Vahine of 1896, W. 542), but in a perfectly authentic piece of sculpture of 1890 (Gray 74), which itself was derived from a painting by Lucas Cranach the Elder! The subtly monotyped Female Torso (no. 94) inexplicably seems to be at one and the same time a study both from a photograph and from life. Finally, the ongoing process of the monotype allowed the emergence of such works as L’Appel (W. 612), which combines disparate elements from the Parthenon and Delacroix. Quite obviously these syntheses of thematic materials did not depend upon the monotype, but they were enhanced by it. Most important, the monotype was an integral part of Gauguin’s natural working habits.

It is not, therefore, fanciful to see in Gauguin’s working methods a mixture of the rational and the irrational. How often have we found multiple monotype studies for the works of 1902, evidence of a methodical approach to creativity! The number of squared studies—even the rare compositional sketches like those for D’où venons-nous? (Rewald 101) and Te Pape Nave Nave (Rewald 105)—attest to a slow compilation of data, much of which developed in single works in turn derived from photographs and sketchbooks. But frequently Gauguin turned to the most unexpected sources for his images. He seems to have anticipated the surrealist convention of beginning a painting with a photograph and elaborating it by free, subconscious associations. Of course, Gauguin never went so far as to incorporate the photograph (or reproduction) physically in the final work, but he did encourage his unconscious to work for him. That, in part, was what he meant by the oft-cited statement given in 1895 to the critic Eugène Tardieu:

I obtain by arrangements of lines and colors, using as pretext some subject borrowed from human life or nature, symphonies, harmonies that represent nothing absolutely real in the vulgar sense of the word; they express no idea directly but they should make one think as music does, without the aid of ideas or images,
simply by the mysterious relationships existing between our brains and such arrangements of colors and lines.72

A similar idea is expressed in the words of another critic, admired and recorded by Gauguin, Achille Delaroche: "Art . . . includes in itself the connecting link between the conscious and the unconscious. . . . Painting is the art that [resolves] the antinomy between the sensible and the intellectual worlds."73 And Gauguin expressed his own contentment with the process of association, which, with pre-Freudian insight, he called "dreaming": "Here the poetry is released all by itself and it is enough to allow oneself to dream while elaborating its suggestions,"74 and, "Art is an abstraction, derived from nature while dreaming before it. . . ."75

As much as the process of change through repetition appealed to Gauguin, it must have been the inherent, formal qualities of the medium that attracted him to the monotype. Some of these features may be seen in comparisons of two or three drawings. The pencil drawing, L'Appel (Rewald 113), is one of Gauguin's most relaxed compositional studies; the pencil seems laconic in both its movement and dynamics; only the feet show the artist's concern for carefully defined shape. And yet, compared to the monotyped study for L'Appel in Boston (no. 102), there is a starkness and a greater specificity. The monotype demands more forceful and repeated strokes, sacrificing thereby some of the variety and flexibility of a drawing. As a result, all repeated contours or shaded areas stand out with a graphic insistence absent from pencil or charcoal studies. At the same time these are muted by the inked surface that has left all manner of accidental imprints on the monotype, either as part of the execution (resulting from direct pressure) or as unrelated, chance depositions. Whereas the drawing seems to be on the paper because there is no separation between the image and the drawn lines, the monotype manifests a distinct, ambiguous character because the image floats in its own medium. In other words, it is not so much the image but the chance deposits which relate to the flat surface of the paper.

More intense, attractive, and modeled than the drawing after L'Appel is a charcoal head (Pickvance 72) related to another painting of 1902, Deux Femmes (W. 626). The head also appears in the upper left of the monotype Two Marquesans (no. 88), but with far less personal characterization. Gauguin used the charcoal to give sharp features, and deftly rubbed the contours to suggest considerable plasticity and powerful, simplified volumes. The line verges on being self-consciously decorative, which generally counters three-dimensional illusion. But the monotype manifests fewer of these conflicts. Although creating a more generalized image, it has a more specific graphic structure, and is more abstract because of it. The drawing is dry and opaque; the monotype is fluid and opaque, and the viewer is always aware of the medium. In the drawing there is the given subject, and we reflect on its significance; in the monotype there is an emphasis on visual content and less opportunity for narrative interpretation. Although one may find the drawing more successful, it is reasonably clear that Gauguin enjoyed the balance between generalization and decoration of the monotype.

But not all of the major monotypes obscure the image. L'Esprit veille (no. 66) is an exceedingly assertive image, which deserves comparison with the large 1892 pastel for Nafea Faa Ipoipo (W. 454 and Rewald 47). The precise curves, heavy volumes, and
tonal contrasts are typical of the powerful, compact drawing of Gauguin’s first voyage to Tahiti. All that is Tahitian about the girl—her massive limbs and turgid contours, her large extremities, and even her pose—is subsumed by the decorative, basically planar rhythms that encapsulate her whole body and reform the shape of her feet and arms. By comparison, it is the monotype that exhibits open form, greater breadth, and humanity, and the woman is far less constrained by the picture plane, as her body cants back into the undetermined picture space. The fact that the monotype line frequently calls for repetitive parallelisms and hatchings, easily avoided by the broad strokes of pastel, permits a break with the disciplined frontalism and earthy ponderousness so characteristic of Gauguin between 1888 and 1898. Abandoning the “primitivistic,” archaizing tendencies, and relying less and less on abstract schema, the later work introduces new complexities of setting, pose, characterization, and linear vocabulary. The decorative aspects are no longer congruent with, nor do they control, the major forms; instead, they are inherent in the drawing medium itself. This shift from a manipulation of the subject to an emphasis on the means—the language of drawing—was crucial and inevitable.

Curiously, it is extremely difficult to ferret out the essence of Gauguin’s later drawing style. Just when one detects a development in the direction of broadened treatment of plane, looser line, or even open form, as in many of the late monotypes for _Avant et Après_, one realizes that Gauguin’s most tightly worked drawings were done in 1903 for the same book. To find a graphic parallel to these drawings one must retreat thirteen years to Gauguin’s etching of Mallarmé (Guérin 14). As Gauguin became more and more interested in drawing toward the end of his life (one cannot assess how much this was due to Vollard’s willingness to pay thirty francs per drawing), he moved away from pastels and charcoal, and adopted media which called for the development of graphic systems or vocabularies. The monotype pleased him most because it prevented a regression to purely decorative solutions. In fact, it encouraged far more elaborate pictorial experiments, simply because, in monotype, the making of line was simultaneously the creation of tone.

In such detailed monotypes as the _Tahitian Nativity_ (no. 68) and _La Fuite_ (no. 104), each line has a fibrous, tonal quality that unites it with the over-all flow of light and dark. The compositions seem permeated by a mysterious light and activity completely different from the usual qualities of drawing. Like Degas, Gauguin seems to have needed the virtually automatic unifying accidents of the monotype to organize ambitious compositions. When one looks back through his major drawings, one is suddenly struck that, until the traced monotypes, none embodies more than a single figure in a setting. The 1890 study for _Loss of Virginity_ (Rewald 27) is Gauguin’s closest approach to a finished compositional study except for considerably smaller watercolors. Only at the end of his life could Gauguin begin to confront such problems and to confess to his inability to combine line and tone in his drawings: “I have never known how to make what they call a proper drawing—or a bonnet either, or a roll of bread. It always seems to me that there is something lacking—Colour.” And about Renoir he tellingly remarked: “With Renoir nothing is in place; do not search for line, it does not exist; as by magic, a pretty touch of color, a caressing light speak sufficiently—Divine Renoir, who does not know how to draw.”
Why, then, when Gauguin began to create his large monotypes, did he confine himself to two or three tones of black and brown, as he had previously done in his woodcuts of 1893–94 and 1898–99? Was it the fundamental discovery (which Dürer also made, about 1510) that the most intense illusion of color and light could be obtained by playing black ink and white paper against a middle tone? Was it a variation of Cézanne’s restricted palette which sought by the most marvelous economy of color planes to structure picture, object, and space simultaneously? Or was it that Gauguin instinctively limited his color scheme because literal color was too disruptive of the picture plane? In any case, the significance of the black-and-brown tonality resides in Gauguin’s central concern with drawing rather than painting, and the reconciliation of the several functions of line with the demands of the pictorial space and surface.

Running through all of Gauguin’s statements on Synthetism—from the letters of 1885 and 1888 to Schuffenecker,78 the Notes Synthétiques of about 1884–85,79 to the so-called Turkish Painter’s Manual of the same period,80 and even down to Maurice Denis’ formulations of 190981—is a focus on line. The period was burdened with the conflict between the roles of line as a representational agent and as an emotional carrier with “inner” qualities.82 The critical literature of the time trumpeted the necessity to break away from the conventions of academic drawing. Draughtsmanship had become so exoteric as to have undergone complete “stylistic leveling” (Solzhenitsyn described the process in literature as “slicing off the verbal contours”). What was communicated by the watered-down facility of academic drawing was only an agreed-upon mapping of readily recognizable external, superficial characteristics. The new drawing had to penetrate beyond these convenient positivistic limits of knowledge into a realm less definite but more significant. The artist could take two basic paths. He could try to express his feelings about an image through the abstract qualities of line and color, or he could distort the conventional expectations. These were the major roads to twentieth-century abstraction and expressionism. But with the exception of Gauguin’s synthetic style of 1888–90, Lautrec’s witty and personal decorativeness of 1893–99, and Munch’s expressionistic breakthrough in the mid-nineties, the art of the 1890s could not grow in the directions already signaled.

The explanations for this stylistic hiatus cannot be easily formulated. If the basic concern of the late 1880s centered on line and plane rather than mass and volume—on “decoration” rather than “imitation”—the entire concept of easel painting was, for the first time, severely challenged. That is why the 1890s witnessed a kind of retrenchment in painting before new paths were found during the first decade of this century. The character of the retrenchment was dictated by Puvis de Chavannes and followed by such disparate artists as Gauguin, Bonnard, Maillol, Denis, Bernard, and a horde of followers. The traditional mode of classical allegory, of fitting figures with substance into a setting with space, had to be integrated with the expressionistic-abstract advances in drawing. Painting had to be once more united with drawing. And this explains so much of Gauguin’s Tahitian style—not the specifics, which depend on a myriad of sources and personal affinities, but the general retreat from the formulations of 1889 and Gauguin’s continued search for a unity of line and tone, plane and space. Coupled with the enormous iconological and iconographical complexities of Gauguin’s work (his literary side), this stylistic regression explains why art historians have been almost
totally unable to include the last twelve years of Gauguin’s career in their continuous narrative of the development of modernism.

It is now more plausible to speak of the monotypes of 1899–1903 as partaking of this retrenchment. They are an attempt to regain contact with the volumetric and tonal qualities of academic drawing without sacrificing all of the gains of the Symbolist innovations. Thus it is that Gauguin finally attacked the figure-ground problem, because now the means were available to draw simultaneously in line and tone. In a minor way, Gauguin was addressing himself to the problems Cézanne, Seurat, Degas, Monet, and even Renoir had foreseen. (Even Pissarro did a series of bather compositions—mostly prints—in the early 1890s.)

I am not overlooking the fact that for Gauguin painting (and image making in general) was entangled with his own personal struggles—externalized in his portrayals of exotic, archaizing, pan-religious themes—but what I am emphasizing is his general inability to free himself from the dominant styles of his own time. Similarly his personal, mythological preoccupations kept him from a continuing dialogue with the materials of art. Only in the late monotypes and in the fluid color paintings of 1901–1903 is there a hint of new possibilities.

At the root of Gauguin’s style and mythology was the great nineteenth-century schism, one that still persists, between the body and the soul, the male and the female, the conscious and the unconscious. The notion of a bifurcated nature, of mind and matter, was at the heart of Delaroche’s description of Gauguin’s art. It was the concept underlying Denis’ stylistic categories of objective and subjective deformation. The first operation assumed a separate material world, objective and detached, but which could be organized to conform with objective emotions. This was the root of abstraction and decorative Synthetism. The second operation began with the artist’s feelings, which could be projected onto an object, distorting it in a personal, subjective manner; this was the root of expressionism. It was the fate of the nineteenth century and of Gauguin to try to force these elements into a unity. In the last analysis, it was up to Cézanne and the twentieth century to discard this bifurcation and its inherent literary tendencies in favor of a new, unified-field approach. The new painting would follow Gauguin’s abstract, color tendencies in Fauvism and its successor, abstraction, while Cubism, never abandoning the French love of an ordered, objective world, resynthesized Impressionism in terms of the structure of the canvas.
NOTES

1. Aside from the studies by Guérin (introduction to Guiot), Rewald, and Pickvance, Gauguin’s monotypes have received virtually no attention. Gauguin’s concern with the process has been difficult to isolate because the works are so scattered, but it should be borne in mind that scholarly research into the drawings has likewise remained almost untouched. Merete Bodelsen’s remarks on the drawings are the most considered, documented, and penetrating, but they are oriented toward stylistic problems of 1886–89, and do not lead to the catalogue raisonné that is badly needed.


3. Henry Rasmussen, Printmaking with Monotype (Philadelphia and New York, 1960), also struggles to find an inclusive definition. He finally arrives at “four points of distinction between a monotype and other kinds of prints: (a) the completion of painting first, (b) on a plain (uncinced) surface, (c) the transference to another surface, and (d) its singularity” (p. 4). For Gauguin this definition is not entirely adequate; he was fascinated more by results than by techniques. Thus his monotypes, especially the traced ones, fall outside such a technical definition but inside an aesthetic one.

4. See Christopher White, Rembrandt as an Etcher (2 vols., University Park, Pa., 1969, esp. vol. 1, pp. 66–103). It has been claimed that Albrecht Dürer also used “plate tone.” Recent studies tend to isolate most of the examples cited as clever attempts by later printers to hide plate wear. A few of the last engravings, however, do show some intentional wiping.


6. On Blake’s monotypes, which are usually called “color-printed drawings,” see Martin Butlin, William Blake (1757–1827): A Catalogue of the Works of William Blake in the Tate Gallery (London, The Tate Gallery, 1957, pp. 38–39). Blake’s procedure seems to have been very similar to that of Gauguin’s watercolor monotypes, the differences being that Blake used a heavy millboard instead of paper and relied far more on reworking the printed image with pen and watercolor.


8. See Janis, op. cit.; also by the same author, “The Role of the Monotype in the Working Method of Degas,” The Burlington Magazine, Part I, vol. 109, no. 766 (January 1967), pp. 20–27; Part II, vol. 109, no. 767 (February 1967), pp. 71–81. Degas learned the monotype process from Vicomte Lepic, whose press and instruction were such important contributions to Degas’ formation as an etcher. Lepic himself began making monotypes as a result of ever-more complicated experiments in inking and wiping his own etchings.

9. That Degas admired Gauguin’s monotypes is attested by the fact that he owned at least three (nos. 3, 8, and 9). There is no evidence that Gauguin possessed a Degas monotype (see Bodelsen, “Collector”). On the other hand, Degas’ practice of making counterproofs of drawings—very close indeed to the method of Gauguin’s watercolor monotypes—might have had some influence.

10. Gauguin’s lack of contact with the South Seas revealed itself through the abstract
character of the paintings which continued to use Tahitian subject matter. Only in the nonfigurative landscapes of the fall of 1894 was he able to turn back to nature for new inspiration and so loosen his brush.

11. Cited in Bibliography (Leclercq, and Morice). Morice, in his review of the exhibition, wrote: "From the standpoint of technique—if I may get into that in this paper—I would say that what Gauguin is attempting to do today will bring about nothing less than a revolution tomorrow in the arts of printmaking and watercolor; that through the disciplined exercise of his tireless penchant to invent—or to rediscover if you prefer to think of it that way—he has taken these two arts, degraded by their acknowledged 'masters,' back to their fertile origins; that in this matter then, as in so many others, it is by him that the aesthetic moment of our time will remain marked."

12. My article (Field, "Noa Noa") gives arguments for the precise dating of the ten large woodcuts; the means of cutting and printing are related to stylistic dichotomies imbedded in Gauguin's artistic personality.

13. "Cognate" is the term used by Janis to designate second or third impressions of Degas' monotypes. Although Gauguin did repeat his watercolor monotypes, no efforts have heretofore been made to compare these pairs in order to determine if they are true cognates or just repetitions.

14. A thin sheet of Japan, however, would not by itself exhibit a clear recto and verso, so the problem of reversed pairs might require further study. For example, the monotype Two Standing Tahitian Women (no. 16) is on thin Japan which, in turn, is mounted onto another, heavy paper. It is not impossible that it was originally the reverse of no. 17. Direct comparison of the monotypes in the exhibition may provide answers.

15. For example, see Campbell Dodgson's comment on the verso of the watercolor monotype he bequeathed to the British Museum (no. 19).

16. This procedure was suggested to me by Jacob Kainen. Despite my inability to find incontestable examples of Gauguin's use of such a method, it seems totally within the range of his experiments (see nos. 125-127).

17. Published in my article (Field, "Noa Noa," p. 510, note 21); Morice repeats his point in a letter to Gauguin dated May 22, 1901 (Segalen, Lettres, p. 217). Some of these "granular" watercolors appeared in a sale at Sotheby's, April 24, 1963. I believe they are genuine, for they conform in style and technique to the Pape Moe watercolor in the Art Institute of Chicago.

18. Pickvance 86. A similar work, also deemed a monotype by Pickvance, is the watercolor of Hina Te Fatou (Pickvance 85). Almost unknown is a very beautiful watercolor(?) of Ia Orana Maria, reproduced in the Bulletin of the Art Institute of Chicago, vol. 19, no. 7 (October 1925), p. 85.

19. I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Harold Joachim, Curator of Prints and Drawings at the Art Institute of Chicago, for allowing the watercolor, Pape Moe, to travel to Philadelphia to facilitate a first-hand comparison between one of Gauguin's watercolors and his watercolor monotypes. After careful examination of this work, Dr. Joachim, Mrs. Marigene Butler, Conservator, and I decided there was insufficient evidence to consider Pape Moe a monotype, as has often been suggested. The contours were, without doubt, drawn directly on the paper; they are very sharp, and the watercolor clearly invades both the hills and valleys of the coarse paper, whereas in a monotype the pigment would tend to be transferred only onto the high points of this type of paper. Microscopic examination revealed that the washes were similarly worked into the paper, that the greatest concentrations of pigment are in the valleys. The usual transfer monotype betrays a gathering of pigment on the heights, as these have made strongest contact with the printing sheet. A further characteristic of monotype printing results from the manner of drying. Under magnification, pure watercolor washes and lines appear to have dried with a watery edge and a fringe of concentrated pigment; this effect is almost totally absent from a monotype, which is basically a drier process. To the naked eye, a watercolor exhibits a crispness and a "focus" that is decidedly missing from a monotype such as the Reclining Tahitian (no. 11), which has the look of a blotted watercolor or even of a pastel.
20. Only one watercolor monotype is dated 1895, and that only in the dedicatory inscription (no. 11). Among the woodcuts, there are two impressions of Oviri (Guérin 48) in the Art Institute of Chicago which I also assign to 1894, and which bear an 1895 inscription to Mallarmé.


22. Proofs of Guérin 37–48 are commonly found pasted on the cardboard which I have associated with the exhibition of 1894 (see Field, "Noa Noa," p. 510). Several are also on the versos of Louis Roy proofs of the suite. These two factors narrow the period of their execution to Gauguin’s stay in Brittany.

23. In these later woodcuts, such as Soyez amoureuses (Guérin 58), a second state, printed on a very thin Japan, was pasted over a first state. Not only did this method allow color prints to be obtained from a single block, but the impressions are softer and diffused and they possess an unusual depth.

24. This alternation of focus or style is one of the general conclusions of my doctoral thesis (Field, "Paintings").

25. The block for Mahana Atua belongs to the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (Rosenwald Collection), and a fragment of Te Faruru is in the National Gallery, Prague (see Sykorova, no. 1a and b).


27. Ibid., xli (March 1898).

28. Ibid., lxi.

29. See the facsimile edition, Bouge, Le Sourire. This facsimile was made from the examples Gauguin sent to Monfreid; the set was sold at Sotheby’s, July 3, 1972, no. 167.


31. Malingue, Lettres, clxxiii. This letter is wrongly described by Malingue as having been written to the collector Emanuel Bibesco in July 1900. It is correctly described as a letter to Vollard in Rewald, Letters, pp. 31–35.

32. Vollard eventually sent many of the woodcuts to Monfreid and wrote that Gauguin had sent him "ce paquet de gravures qui pour moi n’a aucune valeur . . .” (Vollard to Monfreid, September 1901; Segalen, Lettres, pp. 223–225).


34. October 15, 1897. Reported by Gauguin to Monfreid in December 1897 (Segalen, Lettres, xxxix).

35. On the stages of work on the Louvre Noa Noa manuscript (RF 7259), see Loize, Noa Noa.

36. Segalen, Lettres, lxii. "Another thing: lately, I have devoted myself quite a bit to the investigation of printing. I made a discovery which, in due time, will completely upset current notions of printmaking, especially the making of editions, because of its great economy and beauty. I need a chemist for perfecting the primary idea, and there is here an old captain of artillery . . . We have no way of knowing who this man was or what his role might have been in the development of Gauguin’s monotypes.

37. Ibid., lxii.


39. Ibid., lxiii.

40. See note 2.

41. Gauguin to Vollard (Rewald, Letters, pp. 51–52).

42. Gauguin to Fayet (Segalen, Lettres, pp. 202–203).

43. Rewald, Letters, pp. 61–62. One cannot claim that all or any of these were monotypes. In April Gauguin wrote that he had been waiting eight months for paper (Gauguin to Vollard, pp. 63–64), which might indicate that the "drawings" were executed some time prior to March 1903.

44. See Loize, Les Amitiés; under entry 399 Vollard writes Monfreid that he expects a new shipment of paintings (September 17, 1903), while in entry 424, which contains some of Gauguin’s own accounts, appears this seemingly related note: “Sent the first of May, 14 paintings and drawings.”
45. Before Gauguin formalized his relationship with Vollard, he made the following major shipments to Monfreid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1896</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1897</td>
<td>7 paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1898</td>
<td>9 paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1899</td>
<td>10 paintings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The shipments to Vollard were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1900</td>
<td>10 paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1901</td>
<td>5 paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1902</td>
<td>21 paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1903</td>
<td>14 paintings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


47. See Danielsson, Chapter 9.

48. See the persistent ox eye in nos. 68 and 70–72, and the contour of the seated woman in nos. 75, 76, and 79.

49. It is not unusual to encounter a few white lines whose meaning or prototype cannot be found (see nos. 73, 85, 104), but the plethora of white lines in the two Nativities is extremely frustrating. Perhaps there are simply so many lines that no satisfactory gestalts can be formulated; on the other hand, there is a great likelihood that some do, in fact, come from lost works, such as the heavy lines which appear to traverse both images.

50. Most of the important bibliography dealing with Gauguin’s sources may be found in my article of 1969 (Field, “Woodcuts”). Also see Andersen.

51. Guérin 71. The drawing was reproduced in 1889 on the cover of the catalogue for the exhibition of the *Groupe Impressioniste et Synthétiste*, which Gauguin organized at Volpini’s Café des Arts in Paris. Andersen (p. 297) has incorrectly dated the woodcut of 1898 or 1899 to 1889. I might add here that Andersen’s association of the Peruvian mummy with one of the figures in these and in several works in other media is totally correct. For those whose doubts persist, one need only cite Gauguin’s sketches on pp. 64v and 65r of the *Album Walter* in the Louvre (RF 30569), which are indisputably from the very mummy in the Trocadero (Musée de l’Homme) that Andersen reproduces (Andersen, “Mummy,” p. 239, fig. 78).

52. Marcel Guérin was responsible for most of Guiot’s 1942 catalogue. Curiously, he did not link any of the monotype processes to those of the woodcuts, although he was the first to recognize the traced-monotype procedure.

53. Without any justification this painting is assigned by Wildenstein to 1894; in my dissertation (Field, “Paintings”), I give several arguments for a date in the summer of 1892.

54. The Art Institute of Chicago (49.605), a watercolor caricature of Governor Gallet (“Marlborough s’en va t’en guerre”). The woodcut is reproduced in Bouge, *Le Sourire*, pl. B, III.

55. Reproduced in Danielsson and O’Reilly, pl. IV (but not in the collection of John Rewald as there reported). The third drawing is reproduced in pl. V.
56. The Edison pen was awarded United States Patent No. 196,747 in 1877, and Nos. 203,329 and 205,370 in 1878 (information courtesy Mr. Gaillard F. Ravenel).

57. See note 36.

58. Gauguin’s own impressions of the woodcuts of 1894 reveal a constant experimentation with blending black and brown inks on the blocks before printing. For examples, see Field, “Noa Noa.”

59. There are some white-line traces which tie together Crouching Tahitian (no. 73), L’Esprit veille (no. 71), and The Nightmare (no. 70). Intriguingly, these lines may represent a lost monotype.

60. See note 54.

61. La Guerre et la paix (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Gray 127).

62. See Field, “Paintings”

63. In the entire correspondence for 1902, Gauguin mentions only one canvas, and this merely by its size (“format 50”); see Segalen, Lettres, lxxii and lxxiii. The work is probably Contes barbares (W. 625).

64. Gauguin seems to have been fond of creating Christian subjects during the Christmas season. Ia Orana Maria of 1891, Te Tamari no Atua of 1896, and the monotypes Ia Orana Maria (no. 65) and Tahitian Nativity (no. 68) of 1899 were all executed late in their respective years.


66. Gauguin to Vollard: “At the present moment my health would permit me to work hard, and I have nothing to work with” (Rewald, Letters, pp. 63–64; the French text has not been published).

67. Guiot’s entry specifically mentions the monotype, although in this case it is the “verso”: “Au dos du dessin, le décalque inversé du même sujet . . . .”

68. See Kane. Gauguin’s source was a series of photolithographs made by his guardian, Gustave Arosa, and used in Charles Yriarte, Les Frises du Parthénon par Phidias (Paris, 1868). Kane’s source was my dissertation (Field, “Paintings”), Chapter 3, note 40.

69. Field, “Créateur.”

70. In the April 1903 letter cited in note 66, Gauguin claimed he had asked for Japan paper eight months previously.

71. Translated in Intimate Journals, p. 75.


74. Gauguin to Monfreid, November 1901 (Segalen, Lettres, lxxviii).

75. Gauguin to Emile Schuffenecker, Autumn 1888 (Malingue, Lettres, lxvii).

76. Intimate Journals, p. 204.


78. Malingue, Lettres, xi and lxvii.


Notes to the Catalogue

What follows must be regarded only as a provisional catalogue raisonné. There can be no assurance that all of the surviving monotypes by Gauguin have been discovered, and, on the technical side, there is no guarantee that all works described as being transferred or somehow diffused were actually executed in that manner. Its justification merely resides in an attempt to isolate a corner of Gauguin's activity, hoping, as one inevitably does, that future scholars will find it useful and will be able to refine its contents.

The order of the Catalogue follows that of the text, and is roughly chronological. Those works which have not been seen are indicated by an asterisk placed after the title. The titles are those imposed by usage or the author, since Gauguin rarely dignified his monotypes with inscriptions. The Tahitian or French title has been used when the image repeats a work in oil. Dimensions, height preceding width, are those of the sheet of paper on which the monotype was executed. The verso has been cited only when it is definitely known whether or not an image is present. With few exceptions, these images are in pencil and relate to the process of creating the monotype; for that reason, no attempt has been made to describe more than the medium employed.

The provisional nature of the Catalogue has precluded the listing of every reference available; primarily books in which a work is not only reproduced but also discussed and catalogued, and catalogues of the major exhibitions which have included the work are cited. The provenance of the monotypes is often sketchy, and in the case of many lost works their existence has only been adduced from old Vizzavona photographs, whose numbers have been supplied. (The negatives are now under the care of the Service de Documentation Photographique de la Réunion des Musées Nationaux, Paris.)

With intent to relieve the reader of wearisome repetition, iconological notes have been omitted. Gauguin literature is sufficiently accessible so that with the citation of the majority of the images relating to a given monotype, further explication was not demanded and, in fact, would only repeat what has already been published.

All reproductions show the recto, unless otherwise indicated.
1. *Ia Orana Maria*
   We Greet Thee, Mary
1894
Watercolor monotype, printed in black, blue, browns, and ochres
Japan paper, 222 x 142 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Blank

*References*: Pickvance 58; Rewald 50
San Francisco 1936, no. 23; New York 1946, no. 62; Houston 1954, no. 94

*Provenance*: Given by Gauguin to Alexis Rouart

*Collection*: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Estate of W. G. Russell Allen (60.365)

Repeats the Virgin and Child from the painting of 1891, *Ia Orana Maria* (W. 428); the figures were the subject of several other works, including two monotypes (nos. 2 and 65); a charcoal drawing (Rewald 51); and a zincograph of 1894 (Guérin 51), published as number 33 in *L'Epreuve*, March 1895. A watercolor, formerly in the Birch-Bartlett collection, comes very close to the present study, line by line; nevertheless, detailed comparison rules out the possibility that the contours were printed from the same surface.
2. *Ia Orana Maria*  
We Greet Thee, Mary  
1894  
Watercolor monotype, printed in blue, black, red, and pale red  
Japan paper (imitation), mounted down; 430 x 180 mm.  
Unsigned  
*Provenance:* H. P. Rahrosen, Amsterdam  
*Collection:* Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam (Inv. 70:96)  
Although this work relates to the painting of 1891 (see nos. 1 and 65), it is quite unusual in the spectrum of Gauguin’s monotypes. Distinctive are the thin vertical format, the columnar figures, the bits of decorative brushwork, and the very schematic layering of the space.
3. **Te Fare Maorie***
The Tahitian Hut
1894
Watercolor monotype
350 x 290 mm.
Signed with woodcut seal, lower right: PGO

*Provenance:* Edgar Degas; Hôtel Drouot, November 6-7, 1918, no. 126 (reproduced);
Galerie Lucien Blanc, Aix-en-Provence

*Collection:* Whereabouts unknown

This is one of a group of works of 1894 that repeats Tahitian scenes. The two figures appear frequently, for example, in *Te Fare Maorie* (W. 436), and *Te Raau Rahi* (W. 437) of 1891.
4. Scène tahitienne
Tahitian Landscape with a Dog
1894
Watercolor monotype, printed in pale blues, greens, red, and yellow; retouched with watercolor
Fine wove paper, light stained, mounted down; 265 x 175 mm.
Signed in monotype, lower right: OGP
Provenance: Thadée Natanson
Collection: Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris, Bequest of Mme Veuve Thadée Natanson (RF 30256)

This monotype is very similar to one now lost (no. 34) and repeats much of a Tahitian work of 1892, Fatata te Moua (W. 481). The ubiquitous red dog, representing Gauguin himself, appears in several works, including Arearea of 1892 (W. 468).

5. Te Faruru
La Danse du feu (The Dance of Fire)
1894 (?)
Watercolor monotype (?)
Thin Japan paper over a laid paper (?), 325 x 225 mm.
Unsigned
Provenance: Gustave Fayet
Collection: Wildenstein & Co., New York

The original development of the Te Faruru theme dates to La Danse du feu of 1891 (W. 433). It was then used in woodcuts (Guérin 22 and 32); in at least one drawing of 1894 (watercolor and charcoal, Rewald 78); and again during the second voyage, in relief panels which do not survive but which appear in Te Rerioa of 1897 (W. 557).
6. **Nave Nave Fenua**

Delightful Land, Femme tahitienne; Standing Woman

1894

Watercolor monotype, printed and probably retouched with watercolors in black, gray-blue, red, orange, yellow, and greens

Japan paper, mounted down on gray cardboard on whose verso is a Roy impression of the woodcut *Te Faruru* (Guérin 21); 397 x 242 mm.

Signed with woodcut seal, lower right: PGO

References: Pickvance 60; Rewald 57

Cambridge, Mass., Fogg Art Museum, *Exhibition of French Painting of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, March–April, 1929; San Francisco 1936, no. 22; New York 1946, no. 47; Houston 1954, no. 85

Collection: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Bequest of W. G. Russell Allen (60.368)

This pose, the most often repeated in Gauguin’s repertoire, has been amply discussed in the literature, where it has been associated with Gauguin’s photographs of the Temple of Borobudur in Java. Gauguin must have come by these photographs in the mid-eighties; their impact on his work was sporadic until 1892, when the present figure crystallized as the image par excellence of the exotic (Tahitian) Eve before the Fall. Her last appearance seems to have been in a woodcut of 1898–1900, *Femme, animaux et feuillages* (Guérin 59). The image appears in numerous paintings, drawings, and woodcuts, as well as in ceramic and at least one other monotype (no. 7). The significance of the mounting is discussed in the essay, p. 16. See Plate I
7. **Nave Nave Fenua**
   Delightful Land
   1894
   Watercolor monotype
   380 x 235 mm.
   Signed with woodcut seal, lower left: PGO
   Collection: Mr. and Mrs. John Hunt, Ireland

   Comparison with this monotype's counterpart in Boston (no. 6) reveals that Gauguin's "cognates" are hand copies and not second impressions retouched and strengthened.

8. **Arearea no Varua Ino**
   Words of the Devil
   1894
   Watercolor monotype, printed in blues, green, brown, ochre, black, flesh tone, and gray; seal printed in magenta
   Japan paper, mounted down on a gray cardboard on whose verso is a fragment of an impression of the Roy edition of *Auiti te Pape* (Guérin 35); 243 x 165 mm.
   Signed with woodcut seal, lower right: PGO
   References: Pickvance 89
   Paris 1927, no. 41; New York, 1939, no. 21; Palm Beach 1956, no. 59; Chicago–New York 1959, no. 193; Munich 1960, no. 121; Vienna 1960, no. 60
   Provenance: Edgar Degas; Hôtel Drouot, November 6–7, 1918, no. 127; Marcel Guérin; Richard Zinser; Lessing J. Rosenwald
   Collection: National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Rosenwald Collection (B-11, 145)

   Another very similar monotype was also formerly in the Degas collection (no. 9). Along with a watercolor (Rewald 87), all three works
derive from the painting of the same title (W. 514) given to Mme Gloanec in the summer or fall of 1894. The mounting probably indicates Gauguin exhibited this work in his atelier in December 1894.

9. **Parau no Varua**

**Words of the Devil**

1894

Watercolor monotype, printed and retouched in blue, orange, lavender, green, gray; seal printed in magenta

Japan paper, mounted down; 232 x 224 mm. (sight)

Signed with woodcut seal, upper left: PGO

Inscribed, upper left: Parau no Varua

**Reference:** Paris 1936, no. 123

**Provenance:** Edgar Degas; Hôtel Drouot, November 6–7, 1918, no. 127 (2 items); Sotheby’s, March 23, 1926, no. 45 (reproduced); Maurice Gobin

**Collection:** Mr. Harold Diamond, New York

This is one of the monotypes which could have been made by laying a piece of Japan tissue over an ordinary piece of Japan paper. The evidence consists of the obvious appearance of two layers of paper at the lower right corner, and the extensive retouching in watercolor. It is impossible to determine which pigments rest on top of the surface of the monotype and which are beneath it. (See no. 8.)

*See Frontispiece*

10. **Aha Oe Fei?**

**Why Are You Jealous?**

1894

Watercolor monotype

185 x 230 mm.

Unsigned

**Reference:** Paris 1926, no. 21 (?)

**Provenance:** Roderick O’Conor; Hôtel Drouot, February 6–7, 1956, no. 125; Wildenstein & Co., New York

**Collection:** Mr. and Mrs. O. Roy Chalk, New York

A reversed version of the painting of 1892 (W. 461), the monotype is in no sense as brilliant or as crisp. Aside from the unusually hard outlines (or cernes), the effect is diffused and relaxed almost to the point of limpidity and unclarity.
11. Reclining Tahitian
(Study after Manao Tupapau)
1894
Watercolor monotype, printed in blue-gray, blue, red, and flesh color from laid paper; retouched with gray and flesh
Double sheet of Japan paper, 240 x 400 mm. (irregular)
Inscribed in ink, lower center: à Amedée Schuffenecker/Paul Gauguin—1895—
Verso: Blank
Provenance: Hugo Perls, New York(?)
Collection: Private collection, U.S.A.

A large charcoal drawing of 1892(?) is reproduced in John Rewald, Post-Impressionism, from Van Gogh to Gauguin (New York, 1956), p. 527. Either this drawing or the monotype was exhibited at the Basel Kunsthalle, Meisterzeichnungen französischer Künstler von Ingres bis Cézanne, June 20–August 18, 1935, no. 238 (Liegende Tahitianerin; Coll. M. le Baron N. Gourgaud, Paris). A much more highly colored version of this monotype exists as a fragment in Chicago (no. 12). Tempting as it is to conclude that these are first and second impressions, the visual evidence does not support this. Several problems are raised by this monotype, including the first-glance impression that it (and its Chicago counterpart) are pastels. The microscope negates such a conclusion but does not explain the dry, smooth surface from which the error stems. This appearance is probably caused by the deposition of the majority of the watercolor pigment on the uppermost fibers of the paper as well as their transfer from a laid rather than a smooth-wove or Japan paper. The resulting dispersal of pigment rather than saturation of the paper creates the optical equivalent of a rather abraded pastel.
12. **Reclining Tahitian** (fragment)  
(Study after *Manaio Tupapau*)  
1894  
Watercolor monotype, printed in blue, gray, and magenta  
Japan paper (imitation), 203 x 118 mm.  
Unsigned  
*Verso:* An impression of the woodcut of 1894, *Oviri* (Guérin 48).  
*Collection:* The Art Institute of Chicago, The Clarence Buckingham Collection  
(48.273 [verso])  

The monotype was printed first and then cut down in order to accommodate the size of the subsequently printed woodcut. Some kind of dissatisfaction with the former is implied; perhaps the garish colors of the monotype, unusual for Gauguin, led him to value the woodcut more. See *Reclining Tahitian* (no. 11).

13. **Pape Moe**  
Mysterious Water  
1894  
Watercolor monotype  
Japan paper, 270 x 155 mm. (sight)  
Unsigned  
*References:* Pickvance 84; Rewald 52  
Paris 1936, no. 117  
*Provenance:* Purchased in 1894–95 from Gauguin by Alexis Rouart  
*Collection:* Private collection  

Beginning with a photograph (discovered by the present author but identified by Bengt Danielsson [p. 134] as being from the camera of Charles Spitz of Tahiti), Gauguin fashioned an oil (W. 498); a wood panel (Gray 107); a watercolor (Rewald 53), which is included in the present exhibition; and eventually a series of images cited at no. 38.
14. **Reclining Tahitian**  
(Study for *Mahana no Atua*)  
1894  
Watercolor monotype, printed in blue, gray, and red-orange  
Japan paper, 230 x 333 mm. (sight)  
Unsigned  
Verso: Blank  
*References*: Basel 1928, no. 224; Berlin 1928, no. 220; London 1931, no. 22  
*Provenance*: Francisco Durrio; Gutekunst and Klipstein, May 29, 1953, no. 208  
*Collection*: Dr. W. A. Bechtler, Zollikon, Switzerland  

The pose relates to figures in *Mahana no Atua* of 1894 (W. 513), a drawing (Vizzavona 4396), a woodcut (Guérin 42), and another monotype (no. 15).

15. **Reclining Tahitian**  
(Study for *Mahana no Atua*)  
1894  
Watercolor monotype, printed in brown, gray, and turquoise  
Japan paper, 235 x 355 mm. (sight)  
Signed with woodcut seal, lower right: PGO  
*Reference*: Chicago–New York 1959, no. 189  
*Provenance*: Ambroise Vollard; Ludwig Charell; The New Gallery, New York  
*Collection*: Private collection, New York  

Although this work repeats the previous monotype, there are basic divergences which rule out the possibility that they were printed from the same sheet. Not only are the contours different graphically, but one is printed in blue, the other in brown.
16. **Two Standing Tahitian Women**
1894
Watercolor monotype, printed in blue, terracotta, black, pink, and gray
Thin Japan paper, mounted on rough, watercolor paper; 185 x 165 mm. (Japan sheet)
Inscribed on mount in pencil, lower right: à l’ami Baven [sic]/PGO—1894—
*References:* Pickvance 90
London 1966, no. 64; Zürich 1966, no. 51
*Provenance:* Given by Gauguin to Robert Bevan
*Collection:* R. A. Bevan, Esq., Colchester, England

Two other versions exist in monotype (nos. 17 and 18); similar figures appear in a relief, *La Paix et la guerre* (Gray 128).
17. Two Standing Tahitian Women
1894
Watercolor monotype, printed in blue, rose, gray, red, and black
Japan paper, 185 x 145 mm.
Signed at right: PGO
Provenance: Aristide Maillol
Collection: Dina Vierny, Paris
Besides two other monotypes (nos. 16 and 18), a watercolor-and-charcoal version was sold at Sotheby’s, April 24, 1963, no. 18. The figures were probably borrowed from the fifteenth-century Crucifixion tapestry at Angers, from which Gauguin borrowed a few other motifs (see Field, “Woodcuts,” passim).

18. Two Standing Tahitian Women*
1894
Watercolor monotype
260 x 200 mm.
Signed in monotype (?), lower left: PGO
Reference: Rewald 86
Provenance: M. Exsteens; Knoedler & Co., New York; Mr. and Mrs. R. Crosby Kemper
Collection: Cynthia Warrick Kemper, Malibu, California
See nos. 16 and 17.
19. Sheet of Studies with Self-Portrait
1894
Watercolor monotype, printed and retouched in light grays, brown, rose, blue, and flesh color; seal printed in maroon
Japan paper, 240 x 200 mm.
Signed with woodcut seal and in monotype, lower left: PGO
Inscribed bottom center: mon portrait
Verso: Blank except for note in Campbell Dodgson’s hand stating that the sheet was called a monotype in 1924 but is now (1940s?) considered to be a colored woodcut in the Japanese manner
Reference: London 1924, no. 21
Collection: The British Museum, London, Bequest of Campbell Dodgson (1949.4.11.3675)
The bust of Gauguin may be compared to an unpublished drawing in a Minneapolis private collection; another in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Reims; a sketch in Diverses Choses (Louvre Noa Noa manuscript, p. 228); and a lost monotype (no. 20).

20. Sheet of Studies with Self-Portrait*
1894
Watercolor monotype
Signed in monotype, lower left: PGO
Reference: Vizzavona 4459
Collection: Whereabouts unknown
This work may be a true “cognate” or second impression of that belonging to the British Museum (no. 19). The additions to the latter are all in watercolor after the monotype was printed.
21. Tahitian Girl in a Pink Pareo*
   Tahitienne au pagne rose

1894
Watercolor monotype
229 x 140 mm.
Unsigned
References: Paris 1926, no. 27; Basel 1928, no. 225; Berlin 1928, no. 221
Provenance: Francisco Durrio(?); Marcel Gobin
Collection: Vincent Tovell, Toronto

Together with its pair in Chicago (no. 22) this monotype should be compared with the watercolor on cardboard in the Paley collection (W. 425).

22. Tahitian Girl in a Pink Pareo

1894
Watercolor monotype, retouched
Cream, laid paper (machine-made), 275 x 266 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Blank, but shows signs of having been rubbed
References: San Francisco 1936, no. 17; Munich 1960, no. 135; Vienna 1960, no. 58
Collection: The Art Institute of Chicago, Gift of Walter S. Brewster (49.606)

This monotype should be compared with the similar one in the Tovell collection (no. 21). At this writing the precise relationship between these two is uncertain. The monotype was printed from a similar piece of laid paper whose chain lines are slightly offset from those of the present sheet. It is worth noting that the original sheet left an indentation which measures 265 x 230 mm.
23. Head of a Tahitian*
1894
Watercolor monotype
Thin Japan paper, mounted down on cardboard; 235 x 195 mm.
Signed in ink, lower left: PGO
*Reference: Vizzavona 41426
*Collection: Whereabouts unknown

24. Head of a Tahitian Woman*
1894
Watercolor monotype
295 x 215 mm.
Signed with woodcut seal, lower left: PGO
Collection: Private collection, Paris

A very similar watercolor exists (Rewald 94).
25. **The Angelus**  
*L’Angelus en Bretagne*

1894

Watercolor monotype

Heavy, wove paper with pronounced clothlike texture, mounted down on cardboard; 275 x 300 mm. (irregular)

Signed on monotype in ink, lower right: PGO

Inscribed on mount in ink, lower right: for my friend O’Conor/one man of Samoa/P. Gauguin 1894

*References*: Wladyslawa Jaworska, *Gauguin and the Pont-Aven School*, Greenwich, Conn., 1972, p. 225; Pickvance 91

London 1966, no. 65; New York 1966 (without number)

*Provenance*: Given by Gauguin to Roderick O’Conor; Hôtel Drouot, February 6–7, 1956, no. 17; Marvin Small; Ira Gale

*Collection*: Josefowitz Collection, Switzerland

The monotype repeats (but in reverse) the painting of the fall of 1894, *Bretonne en prière* (W. 518) and utilizes a landscape similar to a monotype now lost (no. 28).

*See Plate 2*

---

26. **The Penitent Magdalene*  

1894

Watercolor monotype, printed in black, red, and blue; retouched with red watercolor and white

191 x 191 mm.

Signed, lower left: PGO


*Provenance*: Francisco Durrio; Slatkin Galleries, New York; Phyllis B. Lambert

*Collection*: Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Walker, Detroit

Reproduced as a wood engraving in *L’Ymagier*, no. 3, April 1895. A pencil drawing, in reverse, also exists. Both as a subject and in its rather mannered style, this work is unique in Gauguin’s oeuvre.
27. Les Chaumières*
Breton Landscape
1894
Watercolor monotype
322 x 209 mm.
Signed in monotype, lower left: PGO
References: Basel 1928, no. 223; Berlin 1928, no. 219; London 1931, no. 24(?)
Provenance: Francisco Durrio(?); Private collection, New York
Collection: Whereabouts unknown
A typical work of the fall of 1894, this monotype should be compared to works such as Ferme en Bretagne I (W. 526) and II (W. 527) and Le Moulin David (W. 528).
Not illustrated

28. Breton Landscape*
1894
Watercolor monotype
Unsigned
Reference: Vizzavona 4451
Collection: Whereabouts unknown
The motif is used as a background in the painting Deux Bretonnes sur la route of fall 1894 (W. 521), while the decorative nature of the monotype is echoed in the handling of such works as Bretonne en prière of fall 1894 (W. 518).

29. Two Breton Women*
1894
Watercolor monotype
250 x 210 mm.(?)
Signed with woodcut seal, lower right: PGO
Provenance: Gutekunst and Klipstein, May 29, 1953, no. 207; Galerie Beyeler, Basel
Collection: Whereabouts unknown
The women are found in at least two works of 1889, Enfance de Bretagne (W. 346) and Le Saule (W. 347); the monotype reverses their direction, as would be expected in the repetition of an earlier motif.
30. **Oviri**  
The Savage  
1894  
Watercolor monotype  
Japan paper, mounted down; 282 x 222 mm.  
(sight)  
Signed with woodcut seal, lower left: PGO  

*Provenance:* Stefan von Licht, Vienna; H. Helbing, Frankfurt-am-Main, December 7, 1927, no. 32; Collection Meder, Vienna; Kleeman Galleries, New York; Hammer Galleries, New York  

*Collection:* Private collection, U.S.A.  

There exists at least one other monotype (no. 31) of this famous Gauguin image, one which evolved in a painting of 1892, *E Haere Oe I Hia* (W. 478), and was turned into a sumptuous ceramic of 1894–95 (Bodelsen 57 and Gray 113), two woodcuts (Guérin 48 and 49), and at least one other drawing (reproduced in Guérin, p. xxvii). In 1898, *Oviri* appears once more in *Rave te Hititi Ramu* (W. 570).  

*See Plate 3*

---

31. **Oviri***  
The Savage  
1894  
Watercolor monotype(?)  
295 x 209 mm.  
Signed with woodcut seal, upper right: PGO  

*References:* Pickvance 86; Rewald 77  

*Provenance:* Frank Perls Gallery, Beverly Hills, California  

*Collection:* Whereabouts unknown  

*See no. 30.*
32. **Seated Figure***
(Variation on Puvis de Chavannes' *Hope*)
c. 1894–95
Watercolor monotype(?)
Unsigned
Reference: Vizzavona 41428
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

Early in 1895 Gauguin supplied the French bi-weekly periodical *Mercure de France* (vol. 13, February 1895, pp. 128–29) with a monotype(?) and a holograph poem by Charles Morice, both dedicated to the influential, late-nineteenth-century classical muralist, Pierre Puvis de Chavannes (1824–1898). Gauguin’s drawing was a variation of Puvis’ *L’Espérance* (a photograph of which appears in the background of *Nature morte à “L’Espérance”* of 1901, W. 604). The present monotype is far cruder and would normally be rejected from the artist’s oeuvre. Factors in its favor include the existence of old Druet photographs (1910–25) and the apparent monotype technique. A few indubitable Gauguin works manifest similar weaknesses of draughtsmanship, for example, the very interesting *Penitent Magdalene* (no. 26). Nevertheless, there have been some questionable or outright fake monotypes, including ones after *I Raro te Oviri* and *Aha Oe Feii*.

33. **The Fox and the Geese***
*Aimez-vous les uns les autres (Love Each Other)*
1894
Watercolor monotype(?)
140 x 250 mm.
Signed at left: PGO
Inscribed at bottom: Aimez vous les uns les Autres
Reference: Paris 1936, no. 69
Provenance: Mme Clouet-Warot, Paris
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

The remarks of Wayne Andersen (p. 101) on the fox and geese symbolism in Gauguin are both fascinating and revealing; they also help to authenticate what might otherwise seem a dubious Gauguin.
The Traced Monotypes of 1899–1903

34. Tahitian Landscape*
1894
Watercolor monotype(?)
170 x 180 mm.
Signed, lower left: PGO
Reference: Paris 1936, no. 125
Provenance: Mme Clouet-Waroit, Paris
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

This seems to be a second version of no. 4.

35. Studies of Arms, Legs, and a Head
(After La Orana Maria)
1899–1902
Traced monotype, printed twice, in brown and in black
Wove paper, 306 x 247 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil
Reference: Guiot 88
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Although this work has always been regarded as studies for La Orana Maria of 1891 (W. 428), it seems far more probable that it dates from Gauguin’s second trip to Oceania.
36. Seated Woman, Turned to the Left*
(Study after Les Parau Parau)
1899–1902
Traced monotype
140 x 105 mm. (irregular, cut out)
Unsigned
References: Guiot 50
   Basel 1949, no. 100; Paris 1949, no. 70;
   Lausanne 1950, no. 65
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot;
   Jean Ribault-Menetière
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

This monotype relates to Les Parau Parau of 1891 (W. 435; see comments at no. 44), but the woman appears in reverse in both the painting and in a watercolor of c. 1896–98 drawn in Noa Noa, p. 173.

37. Studies of Feet, Legs, and an Arm
(After Te Tamari no Atua)
1899–1902
Traced monotype, printed in brown, probably
   from laid paper
Off-white, wove paper; 285 x 245 mm. (sight)
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil
References: Guiot 89
   Tokyo 1969, no. 100 (1897)
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Yves Renaudin, Paris

The arm and the large feet are definitely studies
after Te Tamari no Atua of 1896 (W. 541); they appear the right way around in the pencil
drawing, but not in the monotype. The remaining
studies may possibly be associated with
Contes barbares (W. 459), an undated work,
assigned to 1892 by Wildenstein and Field
(“Paintings”), but correctly dated to 1896 by
Danielsson (verbal comment to author, July
1967). Although the evidence is not absolutely
conclusive, this monotype seems to be one of a
group of studies Gauguin derived from earlier
drawings.
38. Study after “D’où venons-nous?”
Monsieur Gauguin
1899–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black
Off-white, wove paper; 170 x 205 mm. (maximum)
[with other fragments]
Verso: Pencil
References: Guiot 44
Munich 1960, no. 127; Paris 1960, no. 147;
Tokyo 1969, no. 102
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Yves Renaudin, Paris

One of Gauguin’s most utilized figure types, the pose (reversed) stems from the Pape Moe theme of 1893 (W. 498). During the second Tahitian trip it was metamorphosed into the present seated version, becoming “une figure énorme volontairement et malgré la perspective, accroupie, lève les bras en l’air et regarde, étonnée, ces deux personnages qui ose penser a leur destinée” (Gauguin to Monfreid, February 1898; Segalen, Lettres, xxxix). As such, the figure was incorporated into Gauguin’s largest and most important statement in oils, D’où venons-nous? Que sommes-nous? Où allons-nous? of 1897–98 (W. 561). The figure had been associated with the “source” theme since its inception, and it is no wonder to find Gauguin repeating it in a woodcut of 1899 (Guérin 78), in a drawing on p. 92 of Noa Noa, as well as in a monotype in Avant et Après, p. 167 (no. 113). In the present monotype, the artist has explicitly identified himself with both the dog (PEGO) and the “source” figure who still does not comprehend the meaning of life. One is confronted with yet another portrayal of the dualism of the savage and sensitive man that pervaded so much of Gauguin’s views of the world and himself.
39. **Femme assise, vue de dos**  
(Study for *Tahitians Ironing*)
c. 1900  
Traced monotype, printed in ochre  
Off-white, wove paper; 152 x 195 mm.  
Unsigned  
Verso: Pencil drawing, reinforced, squared; stained with printing ink(?)  
References: Guiot 32  
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot; Samuel J. Zacks  
Collection: The Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto, Gift of Sam and Ayala Zacks, 1970  
There is only one other work which incorporates this figure: the monotype *La Case* (no. 69) of c. 1900. The fact that the verso is squared indicates that Gauguin used it directly for drawing on the verso of *La Case*, if indeed a drawing is present (it is always possible that a painting of the same subject was contemplated).
40. **Head of a Tahitian Girl with Flowers in Her Hair***

(Study for *Contes barbares*)

c. 1900–1902
Traced monotype
120 x 86 mm.
Signed on verso in pencil, lower left: Paul  
Verso: Black and blue pencil; all known reproductions show the drawing on the verso

References: Guiot 63; Rewald 75
Paris 1949, no. 74

Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot; Slatkin Galleries, New York

Collection: Whereabouts unknown

The style and type are decidedly not that of 1902, and the drawing must have been made from the woman standing to the left in the Leningrad version of *Maternité* of 1899 (W. 581). The reversed image relates far more to the red-haired model of the Marquesas who appears in *Contes barbares* of 1902 (W. 625). Not having a photograph of the monotyped recto (Guiot wrote: “Au dos, décalque probablement sur terre”), one cannot give an exact date to this work. The technique of the drawing suggests 1899–1900 rather than 1902; in that case the monotype may have been fused with Gauguin’s real-life model in 1902, a process he often practiced, especially when arriving in a new land.

41. **Sur la plage**

(Study for *Et l’or de leur corps*)

c. 1902
Traced monotype, printed in black(?)
Off-white, wove paper, mounted down; 190 x 110 mm. (irregular)
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil

References: Guiot 90
Tokyo 1969, no. 54

Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot

Collection: Yves Renaudin, Paris

The basic pose appeared in at least four works from the first voyage to Tahiti: *Deux Femmes sur la plage* (W. 434) and *Te Raau Rahi I* (W. 437) of 1891 and *Te Fare Hymenee* (W. 477) and *Parau Api* (W. 466) of 1892. It was taken up again in 1896 for *Eiaha Ohipa* (W. 538), for a woodcut of 1898–99 (Guérin 59), and finally in 1901 for *Et l’or de leur corps* (W. 596). As with no. 40, only the pencil drawing on the verso has been seen and reproduced, but Guiot’s notes indicate a monotype on the recto.
42. Study for "Et l'or de leur corps"*
1899–1902
Traced monotype
Unsigned
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

The right-hand figure reverses the foreground figure from *Aha Oe Feii?* of 1892 (W. 461). Other works utilizing the same pose are discussed at nos. 10 and 94. Gauguin drew upon this source late in his career, and the present monotype may definitely be regarded as one of several studies preparatory for the work of 1901, *Et l'or de leur corps* (W. 596). Stylistically the sheet fits among several of 1901–1902 which were included in the *Documents* portfolio, and it manifests the same continuous contours and confined areas of hatching as the study of c. 1902 for *La Soeur de charité* (no. 98). No corresponding image from any period has been discovered for the left-hand figure.

43. Studies for "Et l'or de leur corps" and "La Soeur de charité"*
1901–1902
Traced monotype
138 x 214 mm.
Unsigned
References: Guiot 39; Rewald 38
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot; Hôtel Drouot, December 4, 1963, no. 37
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

This monotype utilizes a favorite pose of 1891 (see no. 41). This model was repeated several times, in two pen drawings (Guiot 37 and 38) and a monotype for *Avant et Après* (no. 119). The first two may date to 1896 and be studies for *No te Aha Oe Riri* (W. 550). The present monotype is reversed; it was not executed by tracing from either drawing, but was a close copy. Undoubtedly it is preparatory for *La Soeur de charité* of 1902 (W. 617), in which the figure appears in the same direction. The act of copying loosened the signification of each line and area, since the final version in *Avant et Après*, reversed again, is quite abstract. The floral patterns on the pareo have become all but meaningless, the face almost totally devoid of character. On the other hand, there is a decorative gain as line and shape become more assertive than plastic form. The drawing of two seated figures also connects 1896 and 1901, being related to *Eiaha Ohipa* (W. 538) as well as to *Et l'or de leur corps* of 1901 (W. 596).
44. Three Tahitians
(Study for *La Soeur de charité*)
1899–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black; squared in pencil
Wove paper, 172 x 124 mm. (irregular)
Unsigned
*Verso*: Blank
*References*: Chicago–New York 1959, no. 199;
Munich 1960, no. 129; Paris 1960, no. 153d
*Provenance*: Henri Petiet; Lessing J. Rosenwald
*Collection*: National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Rosenwald Collection (B-24, 274)

These three figures derive from *Les Paraou Paraou* of 1891 (W. 435). The arguments against dating this monotype to the first voyage to Tahiti (1891–93) are in the essay, pp. 25–27. Other figures related to the painting appear in watercolors on p. 173 of *Noa Noa*, an unpublished drawing, and no. 36. Since no pencil drawing is on the verso, it must be assumed that Gauguin traced over another work to achieve this one.

45. Study for "Adam et Eve"*
c. 1902
Traced monotype
Unsigned
*Verso*: Pencil
*Reference*: Guiot 69
*Provenance*: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
*Collection*: Whereabouts unknown

This work was probably preparatory for the painting of 1902 (W. 628); it was repeated in pen on p. 127 of *Avant et Après*.

46. Study for "L'Enchanteur"*
c. 1902
Traced monotype, squared
Unsigned
*Verso*: Pencil
*Reference*: Guiot 71
*Provenance*: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
*Collection*: Whereabouts unknown

Along with no. 47, this study was used for the painting of 1902, *L'Enchanteur* (W. 616); it also relates to *L'Appel* (W. 612). The same heads appear in a monotype on p. 175 of *Avant et Après* (no. 117). They derive from the Delacroix studies already detailed in the essay, p. 35. Guiot's notes indicate that a monotype is on the recto, although this work is known only from a photograph of its verso. (See also nos. 40 and 41.)
47. **Study of Legs**  
(For *L’Apparition* and *Adam and Eve*)

c. 1902
Traced monotype, printed in brown
Off-white, wove paper; 163 x 118 mm. (sight)
Unsigned
*Verso*: Monotype of same image, reversed, printed in brown

*Reference*: Guiot 92

*Provenance*: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot; Yves Renaudin

*Collection*: Private collection, Paris

The same heavy legs appear in a monotype from *Avant et Après* (no. 118). The right pair is quite probably a study for the nude girl in *L’Apparition* of 1902 (W. 615), the left, for Eve in *Adam et Eve* of the same year (W. 628).
48. **Seated Female Nude, Facing Left; and Head*  
(Study for Nativité)

c. 1902  
Traced monotype  
Unsigned  
*Reference: Guiot 28  
*Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot  
*Collection: Whereabouts unknown

Guiot incorrectly reports that this monotype was made from a drawing that was also included in the Documents portfolio and is now in the Louvre (Guiot 27; illustrated in Maltingue, *Lettres*, fig. 27). It seems probable that the drawing was done after the monotype in preparation for the figure at the far right in the Nativité of 1902 (W. 621).

---

49. **Return from the Hunt***  
*Homme nu tenant une baguette*

c. 1902  
Traced monotype(?), printed in black(?)

Off-white, wove paper, mounted monotype-side down; 165 x 145 mm.

Unsigned  
*Verso: Pencil and conté crayon, squared  
*Reference: Guiot 22  
*Tokyo 1969, no. 53  
*Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot  
*Collection: Yves Renaudin, Paris
In a kind of free adaptation of the theme of Raro te Oviri of 1891 (W. 431 and 432), Gauguin has utilized the present figure in two further monotypes (nos. 96 and 107). This example was probably the earliest. Guiot catalogued both sides as monotypes, but the present owner suggests that the verso is only a conté crayon and pencil drawing. It is my conjecture that only the verso has been visible since 1942, that the true recto does carry a monotype. Furthermore, the conté crayon was probably used to create the monotype (there is a passage in conté crayon on the verso of the Two Marquesans, no. 87). Corresponding to this monotype are white lines on the right side of no. 96.

50. Eve or Venus*
1899–1902
Traced monotype
Irregular size, cut out
Unsigned
Reference: Guiot 48
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

51. Seated Man, Turned to the Left
1899–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black
Thin, wove paper, mounted down; 107 x 84 mm.
Unsigned
Reference: Guiot 51
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot;
          Hôtel Drouot, May 15, 1972, no. 39
Collection: Maitre Henri Galland, Paris
52. Standing Man, Facing Three-Quarters to the Right*
1989–1902
Traced monotype
Irregular size
Unsigned
Reference: Guiot 53
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

53. Tahitian Carrying an Urn on Her Shoulder*
1899–1902
Traced monotype
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil
Reference: Guiot 70
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

Although no photograph of this work is available, the motif has been repeated in a monotype pasted onto p. 175 of Avant et Après (no. 117). Not illustrated

54. Studies of the Nude*
1899–1902
Traced monotype
Signed (?)
Verso: Pencil
Reference: Guiot 74
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

Since a photograph is not available, the role of this unusual monotype cannot be assessed. According to the Guiot catalogue it carries studies of four figures: two standing, seen from the back; one stretched out; and one wearing a pareo and presumably standing. Additionally, there are sketches of arms and draperies. Not illustrated
55. Studies of a Torso and Two Hands
1899–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black
Off-white, wove paper; 146 x 155 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil
Reference: Tokyo 1969, no. 45 (1886)
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot(?)
Collection: Yves Renaudin, Paris

Unless this study is linked to one of the left foreground figures of Fa ‘aara of 1898 (W. 575), it must repeat a drawing which Gauguin did not incorporate in any other work.

56. Marquesan Landscape
1901–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black
Off-white, wove paper; 235 x 125 mm.
Unsigned
References: Guiot 77
Basel 1949, no. 101 (Martinique); Paris 1949, no. 71 (Tahiti); Lausanne 1950, no. 66
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot; Paul Prouté (Lugt 2103c)
Collection: Grunwald Graphic Arts Foundation, University of California, Los Angeles 1957.5.17

This work may be compared to the undated oil, Cavalier devant la case (W. 627, assigned to 1902). In its use of loose systems of rather languid strokes, the monotype resembles three others (nos. 57–59), which are similarly difficult to date.
57. Studies of a Horse and a Kneeling Woman
1901–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black
Medium weight, wove paper; 210/213 x 162 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil
Collection: Private collection, France
Was this study related to Le Cheval blanc of 1898 (W. 571)? And does it not bear some relationship to the canvas by Edgar Degas of Mlle Fiocre (Lemoisne 146)? The simplicity of execution and the lack of any kind of decorative line could indicate an early date. The technique and its granular and curvilinear rhythms also relate it to three other monotypes whose date is difficult to establish (nos. 56, 58, and 59). Despite these observations, I prefer to place all four in the winter of 1901–1902, associating them with some of the more specifically datable monotypes, especially Changement de résidence (no. 95).

58. Changement de résidence
Change of Residence
1901–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black
Off-white, wove paper; 134/140 x 218/220 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil (two hardnesses)
Collection: Private collection, France
Although this monotype finds counterparts in a painting (W. 623) and two monotypes of 1902 (nos. 95 and 116), it bears some similarity to monotypes which might date earlier (see no. 57). Since the subject was also engraved in wood c. 1898–99 (Guérin 66), the earlier date cannot be ruled out. Nevertheless, comparison with the Changement monotype dedicated to Gustave Fayet and sent to him early in 1902 (no. 95) strengthens its assignment to the later date. The pose of the rider is decidedly that of the last years of Gauguin’s life, culminating in the oil of 1903, Femmes et cheval blanc (W. 636). It appears that in early 1902 Gauguin passed through one of his not infrequent “mannered” periods in which his draughtsmanship became less plastic, less flowing, and even rather uninformed. The large, related monotype, Return from the Hunt (no. 96), most probably dates from early 1902 as well.
59. Tahitian Child
Buste de tahitien
1901–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black
Medium weight, wove paper; 125 x 75 mm.
Signed in monotype twice, below: Paul Gauguin
[The second appears on the recto only]
Verso: Pencil
Collection: Paul Prouté S.A., Paris

In this monotype Gauguin appears to be experimenting with controlling his line, as is seen in the signatures and the varying widths of line produced by two or more pencils (verso). Whether this indicates an early date cannot be settled (see nos. 57 and 58).
60. The Consultation
1899–1900
Traced monotype, printed in black; retouched with pen and ink, and rose, blue, gray, brown, and orange watercolor
Wove paper, 281 x 196 mm.
Signed in ink, lower left: P. Gauguin
Inscribed in ink, below: Dédie à Sa majesté detoutes les majestés—/Eh bien comment trouvez-vous notre cher malade?/Oh!! la tete est perdue, mais le corps restera; donnez lui/ un lavement au piperment toutes les heures, mais/surtout ne lui donnez pas d'autre Journal à lire que/les Guêpes ou le Sourire.
Verso: Monotype of same image, reversed, printed in black only
Collection: The William Hayes Ackland Memorial Art Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Burton Emmett Collection (58.1.233)

The reversed monotype on the verso shows white lines that are in the same direction as the verso, but do not precisely correspond to either recto or verso. One can devise an explanation for these peculiarities by postulating the existence, at one time, of another closely related monotype. Assume that Gauguin was attempting to make more than one impression of his drawing. He used two separate operations involving four sheets of paper (see illustrations below). First, Gauguin made a monotype (1B) in the usual way, utilizing an inked surface (2A). Then, in Step 2, Gauguin placed a new piece of paper (3) on a new inked surface (4A), turning the original inked surface (2A) face down on sheet 3. On top of this, Gauguin placed the first mono-
61. **Etude de force***

A Study of Strength

1899–1900

Traced monotype

230 x 170 mm.

Signed in monotype, center left: P. Gauguin

Inscribed in monotype, top: *Etude de Force/
Dedié à Monsieur/le Ministre*; bottom: *Ne
pensez pas que c’était aussi lourd; on the
bucket: Haine Publique*

Reference: Danielsson and O'Reilly, pl. VI

Collection: Mlle Anna Lagarde, Papeete, Tahiti
62. Vendredi
1899–1900
Traced monotype, printed in black; some touches of watercolor added
Discolored, uneven wove paper, mounted down on cardboard; 267 x 211 mm.
Signed in ink, lower right: P. Gauguin
Inscribed in monotype, top: Arrivé[?] de Vendredi et de long [remainder illegible]
Inscribed in ink, bottom: Vendredi fin comme l’ambre débouche les tuyaux/Long comme son nom ramasse la poussière
Provenance: Sullivan Collection Sale, New York, December 7, 1939, no. 119; James Stern; Sotheby’s, July 10, 1961, no. 76
Collection: The Viscountess Ward of Witley
There are slight pencil sketches on this monotype: a head, a seated figure, and a study of a mother and child, which relate to the monotype, Tahitian Nativity (no. 68).

63. Cave Canis and Title for “Le Sourire”
1899–1900
Traced monotype, printed in black; and woodcut
Wove paper, in poor condition (completely backed; restored at lower- and upper-right corners); 396 x 301 mm.
Inscribed in monotype, left center: à Monsieur Coulon/Paul Gauguin; lower left: Cave Canis
Reference: Guérin 76
Provenance: Mme Huguette Berès; Sotheby’s, July 5, 1966, no. 98; Paul Prouté, Catalogue “Primatice,” 1968, no. 192
Collection: The Honorable Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., Boston
It was not by accident that Gauguin used the title of Le Sourire to top off an image entitled Cave Canis. The main character with the colonial casque is Governor Gallet, while above, to the right, is the Procureur-General Charlier. The sheet is dedicated to Germain Coulon, editor of the newspaper Le Tahitien and printer of the organ of the Catholic Party, Les Guêpes, to which Gauguin made many contributions.
64. Two Tahitians Gathering Fruit
c. 1900
Traced monotype, printed twice, in dark brown and brown
Off-white, wove paper, probably washed; 630 x 515 mm. (sight)
Signed in pencil, lower right: P. Gauguin
Verso: Pencil, blue pencil, and brown wash (?)
Reference: Paris 1906, no. 43
Provenance: Gustave Fayet; Mme Huguette Berès; Sotheby’s, March 30, 1966, no. 36
Collection: Private collection, U.S.A.

I have provisionally identified this and the following nine monotypes (nos. 64-73) as the ten Gauguin sent to Vollard in February or March of 1900 (see essay, pp. 28-31). The drawing on the verso was first outlined in blue pencil, accounting for the dark-brown parts of the monotype on the recto. A hard pencil was employed to complete the design, picking up the lighter brown ink. The ink was rolled out on two sheets of wove paper whose joint is clearly visible in this entire series of large monotypes. The motif used here, not repeated in any other surviving work, may derive from a lithograph by Eugène Delacroix, Femne de Tangier étendant du linge (Delteil 95).
65. **La Orana Maria**
   We Greet Thee, Mary
   c. 1900
   Traced monotype, printed in black
   595 x 433 mm.
   Signed in pencil, lower right: P. Gauguin
   References: Rewald 48
   Paris 1906, no. 46
   Provenance: Gustave Fayet
   Collection: Private collection, France
   This is the only traced-monotype rendition of what is, perhaps, the most famous of all Gauguin's images of 1891 (see nos. 1 and 2).
66. L’Esprit veille
Tahitian Woman with Evil Spirit

C. 1900
Traced monotype, printed twice, in black and in brown
Off-white, wove paper; 561 x 453 mm. (sight)
Signed in pencil, lower right: P. Gauguin
Verso: Pencil, blue pencil, and brown wash (?)
References: Rewald 121
Munich 1960, no. 124; Paris 1960, no. 139 (and 138); Tokyo 1969, no. 67 (1896)
Provenance: Gustave Fayet; Galerie Wertheimer, Paris
Collection: Swiss Credit Bank, Zürich

Two photographs pasted on p. 56 of Noa Noa served as the model for the Spirit in this and no. 67 as well as in the woodcut, Planche au diable cornu of 1898–99 (Guérin 67; see Field, “Woodcuts,” passim). Bodelsen (“Studies,” pp. 221–225) and Gray (A-13) have proposed that Gauguin carved this piece. The source adduced by Mrs. Bodelsen seems dubious, just as others may doubt Gauguin’s derivation of the girl (a Tongan native, not Tahitian) from a photograph he may have bought on his way from Auckland to Papeete in 1895. Mrs. Bodelsen notes that the monotypes derive from the photographs rather than from the carved object. The drawing for this example closely conforms to the position as well as to the general features of light and shadow in the photograph. Gauguin’s two monotypes make use of the two available poses in the photographs; one wonders whether he did not also have two separate photographs of the girl. Here we encounter yet another instance of Gauguin’s marvelous ability to fuse various sources, for if the girl derived from a photograph, her pose was made to echo a favorite of 1896, Te Arii Vahine (W. 542).

Gauguin’s approach to this highly finished and powerful work may be recapitulated by studying the verso; it shows a careful and deliberate use of materials. The first idea was set down in light pencil (see the fan handle) before the sheet had been laid on top of the inked surface. The entire design was then gone over in blue pencil, the sheet being placed on a ground of brown ink. At this stage, tone was added by the action of both the thick pencil and broader instruments. Finally the definite design was executed with a hard pencil against a black inked surface (see the lower flower).

See Plates 5 and 6
67. **L’Esprit veille***

Tahitian Woman with Evil Spirit
c. 1900
Traced monotype, probably printed in brown and black
650 x 460 mm.
Signed in pencil, lower right: P. Gauguin
*References:* Rewald 120; Vizzavona 2160
Paris 1936, no. 116
*Provenance:* Galerie Druet, Paris
*Collection:* Whereabouts unknown

See comments at no. 66. Traces of the first version appear as white lines upside down on the present work, while its own mark has been left, right side up, on the *Tahitian Nativity* (no. 68).
68. Tahitian Nativity

c. 1900
Traced monotype, printed twice, in black and brown
Off-white, wove paper; 585 x 450 mm.
Signed in pencil, lower right: P. Gauguin

References: Rewald 49
Paris 1906, no. 36(?)

Provenance: Gustave Fayet; P. Bacou
Collection: Private collection, France

Preparatory sketches may be seen in pencil on the recto of Vendredi (no. 62). The oxen appear in Nuit de Noël (W. 519), a painting whose date has been disputed (I prefer a date of 1899–1902, based on the surface and palette). A woodcut of 1898–99, Le Char à boeufs (Guérin 70), shows the same oxen. The white lines are almost entirely from the lost L'Esprit veille (no. 67), but an earlike shape above the Madonna's right shoulder may be the trace of another lost monotype.
69. **Tahitians Ironing**  
La Case  
c. 1900  
Traced monotype, printed twice, in black and brown; squared in monotype and pencil  
Off-white, wove paper; 580 x 444 mm.  
Signed in pencil, lower right: P. Gauguin  
*Reference:* Paris 1906, no. 45 or 49  
*Provenance:* Gustave Fayet; P. Bacou  
*Collection:* Private collection, France  
A preliminary sketch and monotype is in Toronto (no. 39). The woman ironing has her predecessor in *La Sieste* of 1892 (W. 515), while the cat with her kittens appear in two other monotypes (nos. 76 and 119).
70. The Nightmare*
Le Cauchemar

c. 1900
Traced monotype, probably printed in two tones 584 x 430 mm.
Signed in pencil, lower right: P. Gauguin
Verso: Pencil
References: Rewald 106
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Wildenstein & Co., New York
Collection: Private collection, Paris

Eve is one of Gauguin's archetypal figures, germinated in 1892 (see Parau na te Varua Ino, W. 458) from a combination of Tahitian and Breton influences (see Field, "Woodcuts," passim). She was repeated in a large pastel of the same year, now in Basel (Rewald 55), a photograph of which (?) was pasted on p. 51 of Noa Noa and taken back to the South Seas in 1895. There it was subsequently used in a woodcut of 1898–99 (Guérin 57), and in other works. In the woodcut, as well as in the monotype, she is reversed. Similarly, the Evil Spirit is the tupapau type found in works of 1892, such as Manao Tupapau (W. 457); while the figure with upraised arms was developed in 1889 in the Ondine images (W. 336, 337, and 338) as well as in Nirvana (W. 320). It, too, was often repeated, for example, as a woodcut of 1898–99, Aux roches noires (Guérin 71). Only the horse remains outside the realm of earlier motifs.
71. L’Esprit veille
Tahitian Woman with Evil Spirit
c. 1900
Traced monotype, printed in black and brown; possibly some brown watercolor
Off-white, wove paper; 638 x 512 mm.
Signed in monotype, left center: P. Gauguin
Verso: Pencil, blue pencil, and brown wash(?)
Provenance: Purchased by Georg Swarzenski in 1930 or earlier
Collection: Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt-am-Main, Property of the Städelische Museumverein

The image is unique but obviously draws upon its predecessors, whose white-line traces remain (nos. 66 and 67). Gauguin began this work with a sketch in blue pencil, filling in details with a harder and sharper black pencil. A blunt instrument was employed for the large areas of tone or shading. The brown wash on the verso may be gouache or solvent; it is difficult to account for, but it was also used in several other monotypes from the same series, including Tahitian Shore (no. 72) and Two Tahitians Gathering Fruit (no. 64).
72. *Tahitian Shore*

c. 1900

Traced monotype, printed once in warm black and brown

Off-white, wove paper; 332 x 509 mm.

Signed in monotype and pencil, lower left: P. Gauguin

*Verso:* Pencil, blue pencil, and brown wash(?)

*References:* Pickvance 81 (1894); Rewald 97

Chicago–New York 1959, no. 190; Munich 1960, no. 130; Paris 1960, no. 153c; New York 1966 (without number)

*Collection:* National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Rosenwald Collection (B-24, 273)

The white lines relate this monotype to three of the foregoing works of similar technique (rather soft combinations of black and brown) but seemingly disparate styles (nos. 67, 68, and 71).
73. Crouching Tahitian*
c. 1900
Traced monotype, probably printed in two tones 290 x 445 mm.
Signed in monotype, at top: Paul Gauguin
Reference: Vizzavona 20630
Provenance: Gustave Fayet
Collection: Private collection, France

Gray has hypothesized that the motif might derive from a Tahitian spear rest, an example of which is in the British Museum. On the other hand, the obsequious pose may be of Gauguin's own invention, especially in the form it takes in the woodcuts Te Atua (Guérin 60), a Sourire title (not in Guérin), and the sculptured panel Te Fare Amu (Gray 122). Some of the smaller figures behind the crouching figure derive from Gauguin's photographs of the reliefs from the Javanese temple at Borobudur, in particular, The Assault on Mara. Since some of these same archers appeared in Fayet's commissioned panels, La Guerre et la paix (Gray 127), the rather sinister and threatening character of this monotype may well have been intentional. The crouching figure is reminiscent of Oviri as it grasps (and strangles?) some kind of long-tailed animal (a Tahitian rat?).

74. Studies of Dogs and a Horse*
1901–1902
Traced monotype
Reference: Guiot 103
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

It is quite possible that the white-line dog that appears in the middle of Crouching Tahitian Woman Seen from the Back (no. 75) is a residual image from this monotype, of which no photograph is available. According to Guiot's catalogue the dogs derive from drawings (Guiot 102; Rewald 71 and 72). These are of the type which appear in Paysan et son chien près d'une barrière of 1894 (W. 522).

Not illustrated
75. Crouching Tahitian Woman Seen from the Back*
1901–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black and brown
317 x 266 mm.
Unsigned

References: Pickvance 107; Rewald 112
Los Angeles 1940, no. 45; Houston 1954, no. 39; New York 1956, no. 75; Munich 1960, no. 138

Provenance: Galerie Druet, Paris; Aristide Maillol; John Rewald; Sotheby’s, July 7, 1960, no. 144

Collection: M. J. Spreiregen, Cannes

The generic pose refers to Tahitiennes sur la plage of 1892 (W. 462). In its present form, however, it represents an idea that crystallized in 1902, in Femme accroupie (W. 613) and L’Appel (W. 612). It is possible that the present work is a study for these paintings. A gouache monotype of 1902 (no. 133) repeats the motif. Careful examination reveals the white lines of the hind quarters of a dog; this is a trace of a lost monotype which derived from a group of drawings that included Guiot 102 (see no. 74). Maillol, who owned this monotype, modeled his terracotta Woman with a Crab of c. 1905 after this pose.
76. Animal Studies

1901–1902
Traced monotype, printed in warm black and brown, probably in two printings from the same surface
Off-white, wove paper, mounted down; 312 x 245 mm.
Unsigned
Reference: Paris 1949, no. 77
Collection: Private collection, Paris

Like most of the monotype sheets of animal studies, this one cannot be regarded as a preparatory study. It repeats works which have preceded and may anticipate one or two. Much of it was directly derived (or traced) from a drawing reproduced as Rewald 73. The white lines are crucial to dating this and a group of other works to 1901–1902. Clearly filling the entire sheet are traces of the Crouching Tahitian Woman Seen from the Back (no. 75), which is probably a work of 1901–1902. In the same series, as evidenced by additional lines, are several other sheets of animal studies (nos. 74, 77, and 79).

The horse at the upper left is similar to that in Le Rendez-vous of 1891 (W. 443). The cow at the upper left should be compared to those in Les Meules of 1890 (W. 397), that at the center right to one in Te Tamari no Atua of 1896 (W. 541), which was re-employed in the Nativité of 1902 (W. 621). The cats relate to the nursing dog in Le Grand Bouddha of 1897 (not 1899, W. 579), and appear again in other monotypes (nos. 69 and 119).
77. Studies of Cows
   Etudes de vaches—Tahiti
1901–1902
Traced monotype
155 x 250 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil and oil stain (?)
Reference: Guiot 100
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

The two cows closely relate to a watercolor in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Guiot 101), and repeat a finished watercolor of 1889, Vaches dans un paysage (W. 343 bis).
78. Studies of Horses
1901–1902
Traced monotype, printed in warm black
Thin, wove (?) paper; 315 x 260 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Blank
Reference: Guiot 106
Collection: Private collection, France

The white lines relate to the previous monotype of cows (no. 77) and to another monotype (lost?), also visible through white lines in that monotype. The allusions to earlier canvases are so numerous as to positively suggest Gauguin was indulging in some kind of whimsical, pictorial reminiscing. The horse at the lower left relates to those in Rue de Tahiti of 1891 (W. 441) and Paysage avec cochon et cheval of 1903 (W. 637). The horse at the upper left may be paralleled by those in Cheval au pâturage of 1891 (W. 442), Mau Taporo of 1892 (W. 475), Apatara of 1893 (W. 505), Le Cheval sur le chemin of 1899 (W. 589), and Paysage aux chevaux of 1901 (W. 599). Further, the horse at the upper center is similar to one in the right background of Cavaliers sur la plage II of 1902 (W. 620). In contrast to such late incorporations, the dog at the lower center appears close to one in Les Trois Petits Chiens of 1888 (W. 293).
79. Animal Studies
1901–1902
Traced monotype, printed in black
Thin, laid paper, mounted down; 319 x 251 mm.
Unsigned
References: Palm Beach 1956, no. 65; Chicago–New York 1959, no. 197; Munich 1960, no. 131; Paris 1960, no. 153b
Provenance: Henri Petiet; Lessing J. Rosenwald
Collection: National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Rosenwald Collection (B-24, 272)
Along with no. 76, this is a key work for dating the animal studies to 1901–1902 rather than 1892. Both have a white-line trace of the Crouching Tahitian Woman, which in all probability dates from 1901–1902 (see no. 75). The white lines through the lower cow have not yet been identified. The cow at the upper right relates to one found in Les Lavandières à Arles II of 1888 (W. 303), that at the lower left to La Vache rouge of 1889 (W. 365), while the cow at the upper left should be compared with one in Te Tamari no Atua of 1896 (W. 541).

80. Reclining Cow and Pigs*
1901–1902
Traced monotype
Unsigned
Reference: Guiot 93
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Marcel Guiot
Collection: Whereabouts unknown
One of the series of animal studies of 1901–1902, this work clearly fits at the end of the chain of monotypes linked by white-line traces. The pigs appear in Avant et Après, p. 179 (no. 119), and in paintings as separate as Paysage aux cochons noirs of 1891 (W. 445) and Paysage avec cochon et cheval of 1903 (W. 637). Curiously, the cow derives from entirely different sources—perhaps even a lost Breton sketch—such as Bé Bé (W. 540) and Te Tamari no Atua (W. 541) of 1896.
81. Nativity*
1901–1902
Traced monotype
530 x 480 mm.
Signed in monotype, lower right: P. Gauguin
Reference: Paris 1936, no. 120 (?)
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; M. de la Palme
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

This is the largest of all the Nativity drawings and monotypes, and a distinct variant of the painting of late 1902 (W. 621).
82. L’Esprit Moderne et le Catholicisme

This manuscript contains a revised version of the long tract that appears in *Diverses Choses*, the second part of the *Noa Noa* manuscript in the Louvre (see nos. 124–128). It is illustrated with two monotypes and two woodcuts, mounted down on the outside and inside covers respectively, and is inscribed and dated on folio 92v: “ouvrage 1897 et 98/Transcrit à Atuana 1902/ Paul Gauguin.”


Provenance: Mme Claude Rivière (found manuscript in Tahiti c. 1923); Dr. Arthur B. Cecil Collection: The St. Louis Art Museum, Gift of Vincent Price in memory of his parents (287–48)

82a. Nativity (right half)

Front cover

1902
Traced monotype, printed in black and brown; shellacked
Japan paper(?), mounted down; 242 x 164 mm.
Unsigned
*Reference*: Rewald 103

82b. Nativity (left half)

Back cover

1902
Traced monotype, printed in black and brown; shellacked
Japan paper(?), mounted down; 280 x 190 mm.
Unsigned
*Reference*: Rewald 104

Together these sheets correspond to the large *Nativity*, formerly in Paris (no. 81).
83. Nativity*
c. 1902
Traced monotype
Signed in ink, lower right: Paul Gauguin
Verso: Pencil
References: Klaus Berger (ed.), French Master Drawings of the Nineteenth Century, New York, 1950, no. 52; Vizzavona 41424 and 41425
Collection: Whereabouts unknown
84. Nativity
1902
Traced monotype, printed in brown over black Uneven, moderately heavy, wove paper (imita-
tion Japan); 243 x 220 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil
References: New York 1946, no. 60; New York
1956, no. 73; Chicago–New York 1959, no. 191
Collection: The Art Institute of Chicago, Gift of
Robert Allerton (22.4137)
Although the white-line traces of other mono-
types are unusually numerous, correspondences
with existing examples remain to be found. One
would expect to find these among the other
Nativity monotypes (nos. 81-83, 85, 122, and
123), which would confirm the hypothesis that
Gauguin used the monotype to repeat and vary
similar themes within a short time span.
85. Nativity
c. 1902
Traced monotype, printed twice (?) in black and brown; retouched with blue watercolor
Wove paper, mounted down; 225 x 225 mm. (sight)
Unsigned
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Lucien Vollard
Collection: Musée des Arts Africains et Océaniens, Paris
A closely related charcoal drawing, Etude pour la nativité tahitienne, was sold at Sotheby's, April 27, 1967, no. 81. Some of the lines of this monotype are distinctly in black; others are in brown. This would lead one to conclude that the monotype was laid down twice, on the two separate colors. Yet in other passages black blends into brown, raising at least two possibilities: 1) that changes in color resulted from blending ink on the printing surface (in this case a piece of laid paper), although this seems unlikely since there are seemingly overlapping colors; or 2) that Gauguin used oil and spirits to thin out his inks, which yielded the brown tones.
86. **Two Marquesans**

Deux Têtes tahitiennes (Two Tahitian Heads)

(Study related to *Les Amants*)

c. 1902

Traced monotype, printed in black-brown, with lighter brown areas

Off-white, machine-made, laid paper (imitation Japan?); 321 x 510 mm.

Signed in monotype and pencil, lower right: P. Go.

*Verso*: Pencil; with much staining (possibly from application of oil or other solvents)

*References*: Pickvance 110; Rewald 115

Paris 1906, no. 42; Paris 1927, no 43; Paris 1936, no. 115

*Provenance*: Gustave Fayet(?), Victor Segalen

*Collection*: The British Museum, London, Bequest of César M. de Hauke (1968.2.10)

The heads relate to a painting of 1902, *Les Amants* (W. 614), and derive from sketches made after Delacroix's *Naufrage de Don Juan* in the Louvre (see Gauguin's sketchbook of c. 1889, the so-called *Album Walter*, pp. 46v and 47r).

*See Plate 4*
87. Two Marquesans
c. 1902
Traced monotype, printed in black, thinning to olive-black; retouched slightly with yellow-green, white, blue, gray, and brown
Off-white, machine-made, laid paper (imitation Japan?); 372 x 312/325 mm.
Signed in monotype, lower right: P. Gauguin
Verso: Pencil and conté crayon
Reference: Rewald 116
Provenance: Lee Ault; Christie's, June 24, 1966, no. 88; Private collection, New York; Sotheby Parke-Bernet, November 21–22, 1972, no. 93 (reproduced)
Collection: Philadelphia Museum of Art, Purchased, Alice Newton Osborn Fund (72-255-1)
The upper head is practically identical with its counterpart in the Two Marquesans in the National Gallery (no. 88), and relates to the painting, Deux Femmes of 1902 (W. 626). The lower head is nearly identical to the Nakagawa monotype (no. 90), as well as to a drawing on p. 129 of Avant et Après; it was used in an oil, also of 1902, L'Offrande (W. 624). The light sketch on the verso was reinforced with considerable pressure over the contours, a difference that is clearly manifested in the monotype. Shading was accomplished with the flat side of the pencil; a conté crayon was tried over one contour.
88. Two Marquesans

c. 1902
Traced monotype, printed in warm black; retouched slightly with an olive pigment
Off-white, machine-made, laid paper (imitation Japan?); 459 x 346 mm.
Signed in monotype, lower left: PGO
Verso: Pencil and crayon
References: Pickvance 111; Rewald 117
Palm Beach 1956, no. 56; Paris 1956, no 40;
Chicago–New York 1959, no. 196; Munich 1960, no. 137; Paris 1960, no. 153a
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard(?); Henri Petiet;
Lessing J. Rosenwald
Collection: National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Rosenwald Collection (B-24, 275)

Four compositions of two heads (nos. 86–89) were created at the same time, as is proven by
the white-line traces linking them together.
Curiously, the monotype closest to the present example, Causeries sans paroles (no. 108), cannot be associated in this manner, and may be a free copy of it. The monotypes in this group relate to paintings of 1902; compare Two Marquesans with the oil Deux Femmes (W. 626). The same paper was used for many other works, including The Pony (no. 134) and the Marquesan Landscape with a Figure (no. 136).

89. Two Marquesans*

c. 1902
Traced monotype
370 x 310 mm.
Signed in monotype, lower right: P. Gauguin
References: Vizzavona 3136
Paris 1906, no. 88(?); Paris 1927, no. 45;
Paris 1936, no. 122(?)
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

The woman is probably identical to one in the canvas, L'Offrande of 1902 (W. 624). The girl in the background with the slanted eyes, with which Gauguin so often endowed his sexually tempted Breton girls of 1888–89, is similar to the rear figure in Deux Femmes of 1902 (W. 626) and the two preceding monotypes. At the left, perhaps balancing Evil, are the angel and two adoring attendants from the Nativity monotype in Paris (no. 85).
90. Head of a Young Maori Girl*
1901–1902
Traced monotype
120 x 135 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil
Provenance: Paul Prouté, Catalogue “Primatice,”
1968, no. 191; Sotheby’s at Mitsukoshi,
Tokyo, October 3, 1969, no. 375
Collection: R. Nakagawa Collection, Japan

This study also relates to the painting of 1902,
L’Offrande (W. 624), but one cannot be certain
if it is before or after the oil. A drawing in re-
verse appears on p. 129 of Avant et Après, and
a similar monotype is in the Philadelphia
Museum of Art (no. 87).

91. Head of a Marquesan Girl
C. 1902
Traced monotype, probably printed from one ink
Tan wove paper, 133 x 115 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil and red pencil
References: New York 1946, no. 54; Houston
1954, no. 36
Provenance: Winthrop Newman; Christie’s, De-
cember 16, 1938; Hugo Perls; Sotheby’s, May
5, 1965, no. 144
Collection: Collection Gross, London
This is a clear example of the successive application to the verso of two drawing hardesses. At some point oil or solvent was probably added to the ink in order to obtain thicker lines and alter the color by dilution.

92. Head of a Marquesan  
(Study related to Les Amants)  
c. 1902  
Traced monotype, printed in black and brown  
Imitation Japan(?); 317 x 300 mm.  
Signed in monotype, upper right: P. Gauguin  
References: Paris 1936, no. 118(?); Palm Beach 1956, no. 66  
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Wildenstein & Co., New York  
Collection: Private collection, New York  
Either a study for or after Les Amants of 1902 (W. 614), this monotype also relates to the Two Marquesans in the British Museum (no. 86). The foot in the upper-right corner recalls Gauguin’s pictorialization of his own martyrdom (the injury suffered in Concarneau in May 1894), depicted on a carved cylinder often dated to 1896, but perhaps considerably later (Gray 125).
93. Marquesan Head*
c. 1902
Traced monotype
Unsigned
Collection: Whereabouts unknown

94. Female Torso
(Study for Jeune Fille à l'éventail and
Et l'or de leur corps)
c. 1901
Traced monotype, printed in black
Tan wove paper, 360 x 270 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Pencil
References: Guiot 40(?)
    Paris 1906, no. 87(?); Tokyo 1969, no. 70
Provenance: Olivier Sainsère
Collection: Galerie de l'Île de France, Paris

This monotype assuredly is a study for Jeune Fille à l'éventail of 1902 (W. 609), but also functioned as a study for both Et l'or de leur corps of 1901 (W. 596) and the monotype, Tahitian Family (no. 97). The pose goes back to a work of 1892, Aha oe Feii? (W. 461). Another monotype for the 1901 painting (no. 41) may also be related to works of 1891 and 1892. The design was first drawn in chalk or soft pencil and then gone over (to achieve the monotype) with a hard pencil.
95. **Changement de résidence***

Change of Residence

c. March 1902

Traced monotype

Inscribed in ink, bottom center: à Monsieur Fayet amicalement ceci/Paul Gauguin

*Reference: Vizzavona 20647*

*Provenance: Gustave Fayet*

*Collection: Whereabouts unknown*

Gauguin was particularly fond of this subject during his last years, beginning with the materialization of his plans to move from Tahiti to La Dominique in 1898-99, when the image was embodied in a woodcut (Guérin 66). Other related works are discussed at no. 58.
96. Return from the Hunt

C. 1902

Traced monotype, printed in black from an unusually rough surface

Off-white, machine-made, laid paper (imitation Japan?); 322 x 418 mm. (irregular)

Signed in monotype, lower left: P. Gauguin

Verso: Pencil

Provenance: Acquired prior to 1933 by Georg Swarzenski

Collection: Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt-am-Main

The man with the stick (here, bearing a wild pig) returns to a figure of 1891 which appeared in several works, including I Raro te Oviri (W. 431 and 432), and was subsequently incorporated into a monotype of 1894–1902 (no. 124). Typically, Gauguin searched his repertoire in 1902 and came up with the same pose in at least one other monotype, one of the works pasted into Avant et Après (no. 107). The white-line design at the right of the present monotype repeats the man with a stick and may correspond to another monotype (whether this is the “drawing” in the Renaudin collection [no. 49] will only be determined by further study). Although the horse and rider do not have any exact counterparts, they are very similar to the figures of the two Cavaliers sur la plage of 1902 (W. 619 and 620); a close study for the horse exists in a drawing (Rewald 73). The rough printing surface serves to link this work with two others, datable to c. March 1902 (nos. 95 and 97).
97. Tahitian Family*
c. March 1902
Traced monotype, printed in black; retouched in pink, yellow, and green
Signed in monotype, lower right: P. Gauguin
References: Rewald 110; Vizzavona 20645
Provenance: Gustave Fayet
Collection: Private collection, France
See no. 99, which is another version of the same subject.
98. Tahitian Family
(Study for La Soeur de charité)
c. 1902
Traced monotype, printed in black; squared, mostly in monotype
Cream Japan paper, 420 x 260 mm.
Signed in pencil, lower left: PGO
Inscribed in another hand, lower left: Epreuve unique de Gauguin/AC[?]
Verso: Unseen; an old photograph reveals a drawing in pencil, squared
Collection: Private collection, U.S.A.

The figure seen in profile appears in the same direction in La Soeur de charité (W. 617) and Cavaliers sur la plage II (W. 620), both of 1902, and reversed in Famille tahitienne of the same year (W. 618). The photograph of the verso reveals far fewer squaring lines than the recto, implying that these lines were blindly inscribed on the verso so that they would show up in the monotype. From this one may infer that the monotype was in fact a study for La Soeur de charité (see essay, pp. 34–35).
99. Tahitian Family

Tahitien debout

c. 1902
Traced monotype, printed in black and warm gray; squared in pencil
Wove paper, mounted down; 467 x 277 mm. (sight)
Signed in monotype (and retouched), lower right: Paul Gauguin

References: Pickvance 104; Rewald 109

Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Lucien Vollard
Collection: Musée des Arts Africains et Océaniens, Paris

I have retained the title which refers to Tahiti because of its widespread usage in connection with the monotypes and the oil. There is little doubt, however, that the work was executed in the Marquesas Islands. There are at least four other monotypes which repeat all or part of this work (nos. 94, 97, 98, and 114). These are all studies related to the 1902 paintings, La Soeur de charité (W. 617), Famille tahitienne (W. 618), and Cavaliers sur la plage II (W. 620). For comments on the problems posed by squared monotypes, see essay, pp. 34–35.
100. L’Appel*  
The Call  
c. 1902  
Traced monotype  
Japan paper(?), 450 x 280 mm.  
Unsigned  
References: Paris 1906, no. 90; Paris, Musée de la France d’Outre-Mer, 1947, no. 4  
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Lucien Vollard  
Collection: Musée Léon-Dierx, Saint-Denis, Réunion, Gift of Lucien Vollard  
See nos. 101 and 102.

101. L’Appel*  
The Call  
c. 1902  
Traced monotype  
Signed in monotype, lower left: Paul Gauguin  
Reference: Vizzavona 3133  
Collection: Whereabouts unknown  
See no. 102. The dark and granular character of the surface and the over-all finish relate this monotype to the large monotype, La Fuite (no. 104).
102. L'Appel
The Call; Three Native Women
c. 1902–1903
Traced monotype, printed in black; squared in pencil and in monotype
Uneven, moderately heavy, wove paper (imita-
tion Japan?); 425 x 297 mm. (sight)
Unsigned
References: Pickvance 109, Rewald 114
Paris 1906, no. 89(?); Chicago–New York
1959, no. 195
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Slatkin Gal-
leries, New York
Collection: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Otis
Norcross Fund (56.106)

For other versions see the painting L'Appel of
1902 (W. 612), three monotypes (nos. 100, 101,
and 112), and at least one drawing (Rewald 113).
This monotype poses two technical problems
which elude entirely satisfactory explanations.
First, the work is squared, partly in pencil as one
might expect, but partly in monotype itself. Was
Gauguin tracing from an already squared study
or was he fond of making monotypes which
gave the appearance of being careful studies
from the middle of an orderly creative process?
In this case I believe that this is the final study
for the painting and that it may well have been
derived from an earlier stage represented by
the previous monotype. (See also discussion in
essay, pp. 34–35). Second, this is a good example
of the two-toned monotypes, which were prob-
ably printed only once, and from only one inked
sheet, the different tones being produced by the
addition of solvents.
103. **Natives and Peacock**
c. 1902
Traced monotype, printed in brown over black
Thin wove tissue, mounted down on Japan paper; 242/245 x 295/298 mm.
Unsigned

*References:*, Rewald 102
New York 1946, no. 61; New York 1956, no. 74; Chicago–New York 1959, no. 192; Munich 1960, no. 136; Vienna 1960, no. 59

*Collection:*, The Art Institute of Chicago, Gift of Emily Crane Chadbourne (26.1535)

The motif was utilized in two pen drawings on pp. 119 and 123 of *Avant et Après* entitled *En route pour le festin* and *Les Ailes sont lourdes*—*Le Tout est primitif*. A gouache monotype of 1902 repeats the group at the right (no. 137).

104. **La Fuite**
Flight; Le Gué (The Ford); Tahitian à cheval (Tahitian on Horseback)
c. 1902
Traced monotype, printed twice in black and gray, with oil thinning the black to tan
Medium weight, slightly uneven, wove paper, mounted down; 530 x 420 mm.
Signed in monotype, lower left: Paul Gauguin

*References:*, Pickvance 102; Rewald 107

*Provenance:*, Ambroise Vollard; Lucien Vollard

*Collection:*, Musée des Arts Africains et Océaniens, Paris

This work, perhaps after a painting of 1901, *La Fuite* (or *Le Gué*, W. 597), exists in at least two other versions, a watercolor in the Lithauer collection (cited by Wildenstein) and another watercolor (or monotype) reproduced as Rewald 108. Kane has derived the motif of the spectral rider, horse, and dog from Dürer’s *Knight, Death and Devil* (Meder 74), a facsimile of which Gauguin pasted on the rear cover of *Avant et Après*. 
105. **Adam and Eve**  
*La Fuite (Flight)*; Tahitian Couple Walking  
1902–1903  
Traced monotype, printed twice(?) in black and brown; squared in pencil  
Laid paper  
Signed in pencil, lower right: Paul Gauguin  
*References*: Rewald 125  
Paris 1906, no. 38  
*Provenance*: Gustave Fayet; P. Bacou  
*Collection*: Private collection, France

The derivation of both figures from nineteenth-century photolithographs of Trajan’s Column was discovered by Samuel Wagstaff and published by Gray. First used in a painting of 1896, *Scène de la vie tahitienne* (W. 537) and then in a woodcut of 1898–99, *Le Porteur de fei* (Guérin 64), they finally found their way (in a more primitive form which curiously relates to *Return from the Hunt*, no. 96) into the relief panels, *La Guerre et la paix* (Gray 127), commissioned by Gustave Fayet late in 1900. The striding figure of Eve was adapted from the left-hand warrior, that of Adam from the right-hand warrior, in the photograph Gauguin had taken to Tahiti.
106–123. **Avant et Après***

The manuscript, which measures approximately 305 x 225 mm., was completed in February 1903, as the drawing on the front cover attests. Consisting of 213 numbered pages, it includes 18 monotypes and 2 small and 8 full-page drawings in addition to the one on the front cover. The inside front cover is adorned with a little-known Gauguin zincograph of 1894, *Parao Hano Hano*, and a late-nineteenth-century Japanese woodcut. The inside rear cover contains two Japanese woodcuts, and the rear cover bears a facsimile of Dürer's engraving of 1513, *Knight, Death and Devil*. The manuscript was sent off to the critic André Fontainas, who failed to publish it as Gauguin had hoped. During the next decade the manuscript passed into the hands of Mette Gauguin, who apparently sold it. In 1918 a small facsimile edition of 100 was published by the Kurt Wolff Verlag in Leipzig; at that time the book belonged to Erik Ernst Schwabach. A second facsimile edition was published in 1957 (from that of 1918!), and it is from these two that *Avant et Après* is known, for the original has never been on public view. The present cataloguing, therefore, can specify only the sizes of the sheets tipped into the 1918 facsimile; similarly other data must remain in doubt. It is hoped that one day the manuscript will emerge, for it does exist.

106. **Two Women Conversing in a Landscape**

(*Avant et Après*, p. 151)

Traced monotype

217 x 176 mm.

Signed, lower left: P.G.

The white lines are probably traces of the monotype on p. 153 (no. 107). Both figures relate to those of the 1899 canvases *Maternité* (W. 581 and 582).
107. **Return from the Hunt**  
*Homme avec une baguette*  
(*Avant et Après*, p. 153)  
Traced monotype  
224 x 171 mm.  
Signed, lower left: P.G.  
See nos. 49 and 96.

108. **Causeries sans paroles**  
*Conversation without Words*  
(*Avant et Après*, p. 155)  
Traced monotype  
212 x 156 mm.  
Signed, lower left: P. Gauguin  
Inscribed in ink, upper center: *Causeries sans paroles*  
Together with the larger monotype in the National Gallery (no. 88), this work has inspired a rather suspicious variant which was sold in Versailles in 1969.

109. **Two Women Gathering Fruit**  
(*Avant et Après*, p. 157)  
Traced monotype  
221 x 162 mm.  
Signed, lower left: PG.  
Inscribed, lower left: *On en mange*.  
See nos. 125, 128, 129, and 137, all of which derive from the painting *Nave Nave Mahana* of 1896 (W. 548).
110. An Angel Supporting a Nude Man  
*(Avant et Après, p. 161)*  
Traced monotype  
161 x 217 mm.  
Signed, lower left: PG  
Inscribed, lower right: Les anges à tout le monde—  
A similar drawing was executed in 1897-98 on p. 259 of the *Noa Noa* manuscript (*Diverses Choses*).

111. A Flying Horse  
*(Avant et Après, p. 163)*  
Traced monotype  
166 x 216 mm.  
Signed, lower right: P.G.  
Inscribed, upper center: [?] Coco; lower center: En course.  
It is not known from what source Gauguin derived this Redonesque theme or what its significance might have been.

112. L’Appel  
The Call  
*(Avant et Après, p. 165)*  
Traced monotype  
203 x 128 mm.  
Signed, lower left: PG.  
In its angularity and awkwardness, this monotype typifies the late evolution of figures from *L’Appel* and *Tahitian Family*, works executed in several media during 1902.
113. Bonjour Monsieur Gauguin  
*(Avant et Après, p. 167)*  
Traced monotype  
220 x 166 mm.  
Inscribed, upper right: Bonjour/Monsieur/Gauguin; lower center: Ia Orana  
See no. 38. The white lines are traces of *Changement de résidence*, p. 173 (no. 116).

114. Woman and Child  
*(Avant et Après, p. 169)*  
Traced monotype  
232 x 178 mm.  
Signed, lower right: PG.  
Inscribed, lower right: Te Tamari  
The handling and figures recall the monotype *Tahitian Family* (no. 99).

115. Marquesan Head  
*(Avant et Après, p. 171)*  
Traced monotype  
200 x 152 mm.  
Signed and inscribed, lower right: Etude. PG  
Despite its being one of Gauguin’s most mature and interesting heads, this study found no place in any of the paintings. Conceivably, the woman is the one who posed for the right-hand figure in *L’Offrande* of 1902 (W. 624). The white lines trace the group of cat and kittens on p. 179 (no. 119).
116. Chagement de résidence
Change of Residence
(Avant et Après, p. 173)
Traced monotype
169 x 221 mm.
Signed, lower right: P.G.
Inscribed, lower center: Changement de résidence.
See nos. 58 and 95.

117. Woman Carrying an Urn on Her Shoulder and Two Heads from “L’Appel”
(Avant et Après, p. 175)
Traced monotype
116 x 209 mm.
Signed, lower right: PG.
Inscribed, lower center: Foire de bricoler.
See nos. 46 and 53.

118. Study of Legs
(Avant et Après, p. 177)
Traced monotype
222 x 146 mm.
Signed and inscribed, lower right: PG./Etude
Compare with the double monotype of the same subject (no. 47).
119. **Seated Figure, Cat with Kittens, and a Pig**  
*(Avant et Après, p. 179)*  
Traced monotype  
163 x 219 mm.  
Signed and inscribed, lower center: En famille  
P.G.  
This sheet utilizes three separate studies from 1900-1902 (nos. 43, 69, and 80).

120. **Landscape**  
*(Avant et Après, p. 199)*  
Traced monotype  
131 x 200 mm.  
Signed, lower right: P.G.

121. **Woman and Child**  
*(Avant et Après, p. 201)*  
Traced monotype  
200 x 128 mm.  
Signed, lower left: P.G.  
A free, reversed adoption of Guiot 56.
122. Nativity (fragment)
(Avant et Après, p. 203)
Traced monotype
127 x 192 mm.
Signed, upper left: P.G.
Inscribed, upper center: Rengaines classiques

Together with p. 203 (no. 122), the two monotypes repeat the painting of late 1902 (W. 621). The presence of the white-line traces from the Woman and Child on p. 201 (no. 121) gives a good idea of the range of style and technique present in contemporaneous monotypes. (See nos. 81–85.)

123. Nativity (fragment)
(Avant et Après, p. 205)
Traced monotype
230 x 191 mm.
Signed, lower left: P.G.
Inscribed, lower center: Fantaisies religieuses
The Watercolor and
Gouache Monotypes of the
Second Tahitian Voyage

124-128. Noa Noa

The history of *Noa Noa* is complicated and not yet fully presented, despite the thorough and sensible studies by Jean Loize. The first draft, published in facsimile only in 1954, was written in the fall of 1893 and was limited to a few rough sketches and a woodcut on the cover. The other extant manuscript, now in the Louvre, was copied by Gauguin before leaving France in 1895 from a manuscript he and Charles Morice had jointly edited. Nevertheless other changes were forthcoming, so that the text versions which Morice published in 1897 and 1901 were considerably more stamped by the poet than appealed to the painter.

When Gauguin copied the manuscript in 1895, he left many pages blank for poems and other pieces Morice was to supply. After the appearance, in October 1897, of the *Revue Blanche* version, Gauguin began to write in some of the poems with a violet ink (which he was using in letters of 1896-98). At the same time he began inserting woodcuts, reproductions, drawings, watercolors, etc., on the blank pages. One cannot analyze here the exact dating of each piece, but suffice it to say that Gauguin paralleled the recapitulatory aspects of the narrative with a selection of his work over several years.

The actual notebook contains 365 pages, but only the first 204 are known as *Noa Noa*, and only these have been published in facsimile or in a complete text version. The second part of the manuscript, called *Diverses Choses*, contains the long tract, copied and revised in the St. Louis manuscript of 1902, *L’Esprit Moderne et le Catholicisme* (no. 82). *Diverses Choses* contains a handful of interesting drawings and reproductions, two of which are referred to at nos. 19 and 110. On the front cover of the entire manuscript Gauguin placed a small watercolor atop a now-disappeared design (watercolor or monotype?), and, significantly, the woodcut "PGO" seal of 1894. Despite the number and variety of the works painted and pasted into the manuscript, only one is definitely a monotype. Three or four others may be considered monotype-like experiments in which watercolors are diffused by the application of a second sheet of tissue. None of these is easily dated; the internal evidence suggests 1896-99 rather than 1894-95.

*Collection*: Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris, Gift of Georges Daniel de Monfreid (RF 7529)
124. **I Raro te Oviri**  
*Under the Pandanus Tree*  
(*Noa Noa*, frontispiece)  
1896–99  
Watercolor monotype, printed in blue, purple, green, yellow, oranges, roses, and browns  
Machine-made wove or laid paper, mounted on the page; 217 x 307 mm.  
Unsigned  
In normal monotype fashion, this monotype reverses the composition of two oils of 1891 (W. 431 and 432). The two little figures in black are cutouts from a woodcut of 1893-94 depicting essentially the same motif but entitled *Noa Noa* (Guérin 17). The heavy pigment was deposited from a rather coarse wove paper whose grain is clearly imprinted (on a bias) on the monotype. Comparison with the only other work of this kind, a *Still Life with Pitcher and Fruits* (no. 132), which may date as late as 1899, could support a date other than 1894, the one usually associated with the watercolor monotypes.

125. **Four Seated Tahitian Women**  
(*Noa Noa*, p. 124)  
1896–99  
Watercolor monotype, diffused type, in blue, blue-gray, rose, carmine, yellow, green, flesh, etc.  
Thin laid paper, covered with very thin tissue, mounted on the page; 180/230 x 308/200 mm.  
Unsigned  
The exaggerated proportions and types can be associated almost exclusively with 1896. From *Te Vaa* (W. 544) comes the figure at the lower right as well as the woman at the far left, who closely resembles the kneeling fisherman (see also *Pauvre Pêcheur* of 1896, W. 545). Neither of these is reversed—evidence that the so-called monotype was not printed, only diffused. The seated woman at the right is a free variant of her counterpart at the far left of *Nave Nave Mahana* of 1896 (W. 548).  
Although strictly speaking this work should not be called a monotype, its outward look and textures stem from the same intent to unify and suggest. The visible laid texture resulted from the thin laid sheet and not from a printing surface, as was the case with the preceding monotype. There remains the possibility that
Gauguin could have removed the tissue, reversed it, and mounted it down; in such an event he would have created a monotype because he would have exploited the transfer of ink (or pigment) from one surface to another.

126. **Seated Tahitian**  
*(Noa Noa, p. 171)*  
1896–99  
Watercolor monotype, diffused type  
Wove paper covered with thin tissue, mounted on the page; 185 × 180 mm. (irregular)  
Unsigned  
This figure was copied in a pen drawing on p. 159 of *Avant et Après*.

127. **Seated Tahitian**  
*(Noa Noa, p. 172)*  
1896–99  
Watercolor monotype, diffused type(?), in deep roses, blues, greens, etc.; considerably strengthened with watercolor  
Wove paper, mounted on the page; 200 × 172 mm. (irregular)  
Unsigned  
The question here is whether Gauguin removed a covering tissue. If not, this work is simply a well-worked watercolor.
128. Two Women Gathering Fruit
*(Noa Noa, p. 175)*

1896–99

Watercolor monotype, diffused type, in light blues, greens, yellows, lavender; retouched Wove paper covered with thin tissue, mounted on the page; 185 x 195 mm. (over-all)

Unsigned

See nos. 109 and 129 for the iconographic significance of this image and its association with 1896. This is the only monotype examined which has separated at the edges, allowing closer inspection. In many areas the bottom piece of paper decidedly carries more pigment, such as the orange at the lower right. At the upper left, however, the blue contours appear only on the bottom sheet. This could indicate that Gauguin began with the blue cernes and later placed watercolor over them and/or painted through the subsequently laid-down sheet of tissue paper.

129. Two Women Gathering Fruit*

1896–1902

Gouache monotype(?)

Unsigned

*Collection: Whereabouts unknown*

Particularly close to the motif discussed at no. 103, this group traces its psychological origins back to 1890. At that time Gauguin wrote to his Danish friend, J. F. Willumsen, that in order to eat, the Tahitian had only to raise his arms, a notion later embodied in *D'ou venons-nous?* of 1897–98 (W. 561). The present version has a separate iconographic history, beginning with *Nave Nave Mahana* of 1896 (W. 548). A traced monotype was pasted onto p. 157 of *Avant et Après* (no. 109), while a watercolor-monotype version exists on p. 175 of *Noa Noa* (no. 128).
130. Marquesan Scene*
1896–1902
Gouache or watercolor monotype, made with two sheets of paper
Japan tissue over a second sheet, 250 x 324 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Blank

References: Eber Művészeti, Lexikon/Encyclopedia of Art, Budapest, 1926, p. 112
Budapest, Mücsarnok Art Gallery, Government-Owned Art Treasures, 1919, no 63;
Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, Modern Drawings in the Dr. Pál Majovszky Collection, 1921, no. 124;
Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, French Drawings, 1933, no. 228;
Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, The Majovszky Collection, 1935, no. 104

Provenance: Pál Majovszky
Collection: The Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest (1935-2716)

If it were not for the provenance and technique, one might be suspicious of the kind of pastiche this work appears to be. The seated child comes from Nave Nave Mahana (W. 548), the central standing figure relates to one in Scène de la vie tahitienne (W. 537), the setting and background figure from Te Arii Vahine (W. 542)—all of 1896. The horse is not so easily compared with any specific prototype, but incorporates features which appear in the monotype, The Nightmare (no. 70), and in a woodcut for Le Sourire (Guérin 74). This is one of two certain examples of the two-sheet method of producing monotypes in which the two sheets remain together. The second is in Noa Noa, p. 175 (no. 128).
131. Oriental Head*
1896–1902
Gouache or watercolor monotype
250 x 160 mm.
Unsigned
References: Copenhagen 1956, no. 79(?); Paris 1960, no. 118(?)
Provenance: Victor Segalen
Collection: Whereabouts unknown
No other such visage is known in Gauguin’s Tahitian oeuvre.

132. Still Life with Pitcher and Fruits*
c. 1899
Gouache or watercolor monotype
Signed, upper left: PGO
Provenance: Gustave Fayet
Collection: Whereabouts unknown
This still life seems to be unique among Gauguin’s monotypes. It must have been created in 1899 at the same time as a painting, Théière, cruche et fruits (W. 591), which was one of many sumptuous still lifes the artist was turning out for Vollard. Judging from only the photograph, one has to remark on the similarities this work bears to the frontispiece of Noa Noa, I Raro te Oviri (no. 124). Both appear to be heavily pigmented and extremely textural.
133. Crouching Marquesan Woman Seen from the Back

c. 1902
Gouache monotype, printed in blue, purple, magenta, greens, reds, orange, olive, and brown; retouched in gray and white
Buff, machine-made, laid paper (imitation Japan?) 532 x 283 mm. (sight)
Signed in pencil, upper right: P. Gauguin
References: Rewald 111
Paris 1936, no. 124; New York 1946, no. 63; New York 1956, no. 76; Palm Beach 1956, no. 68; Chicago-New York 1959, no. 194
Provenance: Ambroise Vollard; Wildenstein & Co., New York; Richard S. Davis
Collection: Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Victor Thaw, New York

See no. 75.

134. The Pony
La Fuite (Flight); Le Gué (The Ford)
c. 1902
Gouache monotype, with addition of gum or varnish, printed in blues, purples, ochres, flesh, and white
Off-white, machine-made, laid paper (imitation Japan?) 331 x 587/590 mm.
Signed in pencil, upper left: P. Gauguin
Verso: Blank
References: Palm Beach 1956, no. 55; Chicago-New York 1959, no. 198; Munich 1960, no. 134
Provenance: Richard Zinser; Lessing J. Rosenwald
Collection: National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Rosenwald Collection (B-14, 104)
The Pony derives from one of Gauguin's most exquisitely colored paintings, dated 1901 (W. 597). Both another monotype (no. 104) and a watercolor (Rewald 108) of this subject are known. This work seems to be printed from a piece of laid paper, but the chain lines which
appear are actually those of the monotype paper; the paper, colors, technique, and general appearance are virtually identical to the Marquesan Landscape with a Figure (no. 136). See Plate 7

135. Marquesan Landscape*
c. 1902
Gouache monotype
Japan paper(?), 300 x 550 mm.
Unsigned
References: Copenhagen 1956, no. 77; Tokyo 1969, no. 101
Provenance: Daniel de Monfreid; Mme Hue de Monfreid
Collection: Private collection, Toulouse

A second version of this monotype exists (no. 136). The single figure may be found in two late paintings, Changement de résidence of 1902 (W. 623) and Femmes et cheval blanc of 1903 (W. 636). This landscape may bear some relation to two watercolors pasted onto pp. 177 and 179 of Noa Noa, which do resemble Paysage aux chevaux, dated 1901 (W. 599); Femmes et cheval blanc; and Paysage avec cochon et cheval of 1903 (W. 637).

136. Marquesan Landscape with a Figure
c. 1902
Gouache monotype, printed in blue, greens, purples, and reds
Off-white, machine-made, laid paper (imitation Japan?); 295 x 545 mm.
Unsigned
Collection: Private collection, New York

See no. 135. The figure may be compared to one in Femmes et cheval blanc of 1903 (W. 636). The "laid" texture in the pigment is a result of the subtle contact between the two sheets of paper during the process of transferring the image; the laid lines are an echo of the slight laid pattern in the present paper rather than the printing surface. Several passages manifest the same crackling visible in The Pony (no. 134) and Crouching Marquesan Woman Seen from the Back (no. 133).
137. Natives and Peacock
c. 1902
Gouache monotype(?)
Japan paper, 288 x 213 mm.
Unsigned
Provenance: Marcel Guiot; Edith Halpert; Abby Aldrich Rockefeller; Museum of Modern Art, New York; unknown sale, Stuttgart, November 29, 1955, no. 511
Collection: Mrs. William B. Jaffe, New York

The group of three figures relates to a theme Gauguin had been using since 1896, beginning with the idyll *Nave Nave Mahana* (W. 548), renewed in *Faa Iheihe* of 1898 (W. 569), and *Rupe Rupe* of 1899 (W. 585). The girl bearing the tray appears in *Le Grand Bouddha* of 1897 (W. 579, 1899). This particular group crystallized in 1902 in *Groupe avec un ange* (W. 622), in a Chicago monotype (no. 103), and in a drawing on p. 119 of *Avant et Après*.

138. Seated Marquesan*
1896–1902
Gouache or watercolor monotype
162 x 173 mm.
Unsigned
Verso: Blank
Provenance: Pál Majovszky
Collection: The Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest (1935-2715)

The figure, though hardly typical of Gauguin in facial type, strongly resembles the male in *Eiaha Ohipa* of 1896 (W. 538). This is significant because the other monotype in Budapest (no. 130) also relates to works of the same year. Perhaps both are forerunners of later experiments as well as isolated instances of a continuation of the monotypes Gauguin executed in Brittany. They also suggest that the monotypes included in *Noa Noa* may have been done c. 1896.
139. **Nativity (fragment)**

c. 1902
Gouache monotype(?)
350 x 260 mm.(?)
Unsigned

*Verso:* Monotype of a *Head of a Marquesan(?)*

*Provenance:* Perpessac Family, Paris

*Collection:* Whereabouts unknown

This is a rather large version of the angel and two adoring natives which appear in several of the 1902 monotypes. The *Head of a Marquesan*, which may be on the verso, is difficult to relate to any painting of the entire second voyage.
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