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Director's foreword

The contents of this year's *Van Gogh Museum Journal* are in large measure related to the exhibition *Van Gogh and Gauguin*. At the time of writing, this spectacular exhibition had just opened at the Art Institute of Chicago and it moves to our museum in February 2002. The show consists of some 120 works by Van Gogh and Gauguin, all of which have been selected to recreate their complex artistic relationship. It begins with their initial awareness of each other's art in the mid-1880s before moving on to their brief period of frenetic collaboration in Arles, following their interaction in sequences of works, some familiar some not. An extended postscript to the show takes the story through to the end of their respective careers.

One might think that there is little left to tell about the relationship between Van Gogh and Gauguin, a theme which has attracted generations of historians, writers and filmmakers. Surprisingly, the exhibition in Chicago and Amsterdam is the first time this story has been told using the pictures themselves. The result is in no way a dry art-historical exercise but retains a sense of excitement in its unfolding narrative. The accompanying exhibition catalogue draws a substantial body of information together and provides a platform for further research on both artists.

Several of the articles in this *Journal* either develop aspects of the catalogue research or approach similar issues from different perspectives. Alongside material on Van Gogh and Gauguin, however, there are also articles on other aspects of the permanent collection and on our recent acquisitions. Of particular note this year is the purchase of two works by Monet, both of Dutch subjects. There is also a complete list of the recently acquired Nabis print collection, announced in the *Journal* of 2000.

I am grateful to all the authors both from within and from outside our museum for their contributions. Particular thanks are also due to our managing editor, Rachel Esner, who has guided this volume to completion with her customary skill and patience. I should also like to thank Head of Research Chris Stolwijk, Leo Jansen of the Van Gogh Letters Project and Head of Collections Sjraar van Heugten for their work on the editorial board.

In an article published in *Le Monde* on 18 August 2001 the writer John Berger asked whether it was still possible to add anything to all the words that have already been written on Van Gogh. His answer was a resounding ‘no.’ We beg to differ. The exhibition *Van Gogh and Gauguin* and the related publications - including this issue of the *Van Gogh Museum Journal* - demonstrate that Van Gogh's art can indeed stimulate new and worthwhile research. And, while the body of literature continues to grow, there are enough reminders that we still have much to learn about the painter and his art.

*John Leighton*

*Director*
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Claude Monet, *Mills at Westzijderveld near Zaandam*, 1871, Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum
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Introduction

The year 2000 brought a new record in the number of visits to the Van Gogh Museum. A total of 1,312,204 visitors made their way through our doors last year, an increase of almost 30 percent from the previous record year in 1997 (the Museum was closed for renovation during part of 1998 and 1999). While elsewhere in the Netherlands visitor numbers to museums have either remained stable or in some cases even decreased, the Van Gogh Museum has witnessed a pattern of steady growth.

The museum has of course benefited from the general trends in tourism, and Amsterdam has maintained its popularity with overseas visitors. The seemingly unremitting publicity surrounding various aspects of Van Gogh's life and art has also helped attract attention to our activities. But, setting the cloak of modesty to one side for a moment, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that the increasing popularity of the museum results in large measure from the appeal of our programmes and our success in bringing them to a wider audience. With the new wing, opened in 1999, we have been able to further develop our exhibition programme. Our surveys show that an increasing number of visitors are not restricting their visit to the permanent collection but are also coming for the temporary shows. Our educational service has also expanded, with a resulting increase in schools visits, while new acquisitions have also helped to generate interest, especially among the local public.

Needless to say, the increasing number of visitors has brought with it challenging logistical problems and added to the pressure of work for our staff. In recent years our organisation has become steadily more professional in its approach to running a modern, public-friendly facility. In February 2001 the management team was further strengthened with the appointment of Ruth Kervezee as Director of Internal Affairs. Previously one of the directors of the Dutch section of Médecins sans Frontières, Ms Kervezee brings her considerable administrative experience in the not-for-profit sector to the Van Gogh Museum. Our former Deputy Director, Ton Boxma, has been appointed Director of Van Gogh Museum Enterprises Ltd., a new company established in 2000 to develop the museum's commercial activities.

The Van Gogh Museum, like so many other museums across the world, has had to respond to the shifting economic, social and political environment. However, as the contents of this issue of the Van Gogh Museum Journal demonstrate, our focus remains firmly on the time-honoured activities of a museum: caring for and developing the collection; pursuing scholarship of the highest standards; and using the collection to inform and inspire a broad public both here in the Netherlands and abroad. The continuing popularity of the museum suggests that our public is happy to endorse this approach.

The collection

In recent years our acquisitions policy has become more focused on filling specific gaps in the museum's presentation of 19th- and early 20th-century art. Whereas for many years the emphasis was on marking out new areas of collecting - such as
symbolism or academic art - our aim now is to build upon what has already been achieved and, wherever possible, to marshal our resources towards acquiring major works. In contrast to the high quality of the Van Gogh collection, our representation of 19th-century art remains uneven. Our biggest challenge is now to redress this balance.

One of the major failings of our displays has always been its lack of a satisfactory overview of impressionism. This year, however, we were fortunate to be able to acquire our first significant impressionist paintings. For some time we had been looking for a good example of Monet's work from the 1870s, preferably depicting a Dutch subject. When by coincidence two such pictures became available we decided to make an effort to acquire both. One is an important canvas from the artist's first trip to Holland in 1871, when he stayed at Zaandam; the other is a view of Amsterdam painted a few years later. Both reproduce subjects
many local residents will recognise, and they well illustrate Monet's fascination with Holland's particular light and atmosphere (see also pp. 140-43). Together the two paintings make a compelling pair, showing the development of Monet's style and approach in the crucial early years of impressionism.

The purchase of two pictures by Monet in one fell swoop was only possible thanks to important developments in the funding of museum purchases in the Netherlands. Until recently, the Van Gogh Museum had only relatively modest sums at its disposal when adding new works to the collection. In 1998, however, the Van Gogh Museum - along with the Rijksmuseum, the Mauritshuis and the Kröller-Müller Museum - became a beneficiary of the Dutch Sponsor Lottery (now renamed the Sponsor Bingo Lottery). Funds provided by the lottery had already contributed to the purchase of a major work by Kees van Dongen, *The blue dress* (see *Van Gogh Museum Journal 1999*).

Several other trusted supporters of the museum world helped in making these acquisitions possible, including the Vereniging Rembrandt (supported by the Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds and a donation from VNU), the Mondriaan Stichting and the VSB-Fonds. The state also did its part with a donation from the National Acquisitions Fund. But it was a relative newcomer that played the key role in raising the capital for the purchases, the Nationaal Fonds Kunstbezit. A total of seven major Dutch companies donated monies for the works through this national fund: ABN AMRO, ING, Fortis, Shell, Unilever, Heineken and Philips Electronics. This is the first time in recent history that heavyweights from the Dutch business world have joined together to support a purchase for a museum's permanent collection. It is to be hoped that this initiative will be the start of a new phase in the enrichment of museum collections across the country.

Alongside our acquisitions we rely heavily on loans from museums and private collections to bolster our displays. At present we have works on loan from the Rijksmuseum, the Stedelijk and Amsterdams Historisch Museum, the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston and the National Gallery in London. The most significant new loan in the past year was of a magnificent work by Alfred Sisley from a private collection, *Effet de neige à Argenteuil*. As in previous years we have ourselves lent generously to exhibitions both here in the Netherlands and abroad.

**Exhibitions**
Exhibitions play a major role in our efforts to attract a broad public and in particular to reach a local and national audience. In October 2000 we opened what was possibly the most ambitious exhibition ever held at the Van Gogh Museum, and certainly one of the largest and most successful: Light! The Industrial age, 1750-1900. Art and science.
technology and society. The response both in the Netherlands and abroad was enthusiastic; it seems that the multidisciplinary approach of the show appealed to visitors both young and old, attracting a wider audience than one would normally expect for an art exhibition.

In his review of *Light!* in *The Burlington Magazine*, John Gage commented: ‘ [...] it is difficult to summarise the scope and excitement of this extraordinary exhibition [...]’ The show followed developments in the technology of light and the science of optics in the crucial period from the beginning of the industrial revolution to the end of the 19th century. Using over 300 exhibits and a number of specially constructed experiments, the curators set out to show how changes in the use of both real and artificial light had a dramatic affect on all aspects of life: from street lighting to warfare and from medicine to home entertainment. Central to the show, of course, was an exploration of the impact of new technology on art and artists, whether it was the increasing fascination with light apparent in the work of 18th- and early 19th-century artists from Wright of Derby to Turner, or the developing sensitivity to different kinds of outdoor light evident in the work of the pre-Raphaelites or the impressionists.

The show itself made full use of modern technology with a number of imaginative displays. On the way into the main rooms visitors were guided through a ‘time tunnel,’ in which sound and projection was used to recreate an Amsterdam street as it would have been lit at different moments in its history, from 1780 until the present. Elsewhere, Van Gogh's *Gauguin's chair* was displayed under four different kinds of illumination: daylight, an open gas flame, gaslight with mantle, and an arc light. Displays like this clearly demonstrated that 18th- and 19th-century artists experienced their works in quite a different light from the modern viewer. Perhaps most important, however, the exhibition challenged the public to open their eyes and appreciate a phenomenon that is normally taken for granted.

*Light!* was a collaborative effort between the Van Gogh Museum and the Carnegie Museum of art in Pittsburgh. A catalogue, written by the exhibition's curators Andreas Blühm, Head of Exhibitions at the Van Gogh
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*fig. 3*

*Light!* Installation in the new wing
It was only appropriate that Light! should have been followed by *Impression: painting quickly in France, 1860-1890*. This exhibition aimed to restore something of its original visual shock and excitement to impressionist art. It focused on a type of painting which, curiously enough, has often been overlooked in recent surveys of the movement, but which was at the heart of the impressionist venture: those rapidly painted works, arrogant in their casualness and directness, which Monet, Renoir and others nonetheless considered worthy of exhibition and sale.

The main protagonists of the show were Manet, Monet, Morisot, Sisley and Renoir. A few experiments in ‘painting quickly’ by Degas and Pissarro were also included. The exhibition highlighted the deliberate rawness, speed and dramatic gestures of these artists' works as they strove to capture a world in a state of flux. There were paintings of sunsets, of trains, of gusts of wind, of freshly cut flowers - all subjects that were short-lived and demanded the artist work in a form of pictorial shorthand, evolving a new painterly language of slashing, smearing and dotting with paint. The exhibition was organised by the Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute in collaboration with the Van Gogh Museum and the National Gallery in London. The catalogue was written by guest curator Richard R. Brettell and published by Yale University Press.

The Van Gogh Museum continued its series of exhibitions exploring aspects of 19th-century photography with a show devoted to the American Fred Holland Day (1864-1933). Although hailed as a leading talent during his own lifetime, Day's work has only rarely appeared in exhibitions or been featured in publications. The photographs are remarkable enough in terms of technique, with their striking manipulations of light, tone and texture. But it is the subject matter that singles Day out as an extraordinary figure of the *fin de siècle*. His pictures include naked youths in an array of introverted, dream-like poses, and a series in which he depicts himself as Jesus Christ. The exhibition was organised with the Royal Photographic Society in Bath and was also shown at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston and the Museum Villa Stuck in Munich. The show was accompanied by a handsomely designed and produced book entitled *F. Holland Day*, compiled by the exhibition's curator at the Van Gogh Museum, Edwin Becker, in collaboration with Pam Roberts, Verna Posever Curtis and Anne E. Havinga.

The summer exhibition at the Van Gogh Museum was a major retrospective of the work of Paul Signac. Along with Georges Seurat, Signac was a leading figure in the development of neo-impressionism, one of the most influential movements in avant-garde art in the last decades of the 19th century. Signac played a central role in ensuring that the style took hold not just in France but also in several European countries, including Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany.

The exhibition was the first major retrospective of the artist's work in almost 40 years and was organised in collaboration with the Musée d'Orsay in Paris and The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. The show followed Signac's development from his first tentative exercises in outdoor painting, closely modelled on the impressionists, to the amazing colouristic fireworks of his last paintings, which verge
on abstraction. An impressive array of neo-impressionist landscapes formed a
centre-piece of the show. The artist's later oeuvre was also well represented. A group
of works on paper from the impressive collection donated by to the Arkansas Arts
Center in Little Rock by James Dyke helped create a superb display of Signac's
achievements as a watercolorist. The catalogue is available in two versions, in French
published by the Réunion des Musées de France, and in English by The Metropolitan
Museum of Art; it includes contributions by myself, Anne Distel, Sjraar van Heugten,
Susan Stein and Marina Ferretti.

**Future project: Van Gogh 150**

The year 2003 will mark the 150th anniversary of the birth of Vincent van Gogh.
Among the activities planned to celebrate this occasion is a special exhibition entitled
*Vincent's taste*. It will explore Van Gogh's preferences in art and literature, using a
thematic approach to reveal the development of his highly individual likes and
dislikes. Works that were of special significance for the painter will be shown
alongside major pieces by Van Gogh himself, illustrating how his taste for the art of
others came to be reflected in his own oeuvre. An extensive catalogue written by
experts at the Van Gogh Museum will accompany the show.
Research

Since 1 April 2001 Chris Stolwijk has been Head of Research at the Van Gogh Museum. All scholarly research within the collections department is now carried out under his supervision, with the aim of increasing collaboration and contact between the various research projects now underway. One of the major tasks of the Head of Research to foster links with museums, universities and other outside institutions active in our subject area.

There are two long-term projects that are central to the museum's research programme: the production of a series of catalogues of our Van Gogh collection, and a new edition of the artist's letters. Work began on the eight collection catalogues in 1995 and three have since been published: two volumes on the drawings (until 1885) and one on the early paintings. The second volume of paintings, from Antwerp and Paris periods, will be published in 2003. The third volume of drawings, covering the same time-frame, was published in September of this year, coinciding with an exhibition of the museum's entire holdings in this area. The authors, Marije Vellekoop and Sjraar van Heugten, have produced extensive entries for 120 drawings. While there is detailed information on each individual sheet, the authors have also paid special attention to the evolving style and thematic developments in Van Gogh's drawings during his sojourn at the Antwerp academy and at the studio of Fernand Cormon in Paris. They have also addressed the problems of dating and attribution - a number of works in the collection have now been re-attributed to other artists.

This cataloguing project is supported by Shell Netherlands. Shell has provided invaluable assistance with the technical analysis of paintings and the project has benefited enormously from the time and expertise of specialist staff at this company.

Our second major undertaking is the creation of a new scholarly edition of Van Gogh's complete correspondence, with revised texts, new English translations and comprehensive annotations. This project began in 1994 in cooperation with the Constantijn Huygens Institute in The Hague. Originally, it was hoped the venture would be completed within five years, but the work involved has been much more time-consuming than anticipated and the publication date has now been pushed back to 2008. New and fully accurate transcriptions of all the Van Gogh correspondence housed at the museum have now been completed and annotations have been prepared for over 300 letters. Over the following years work will continue on the annotations and the English translation. The research carried out by the ‘letters team’ continues to provide a steady stream of new insights into the work of Van Gogh. The deciphered fragment of a letter published in last year's Van Gogh Museum Journal was one of the centrepieces in a small display in the Rietveld building in the summer of 2001.

Over the years the museum has produced a series of publications entitled Cahier Vincent, devoted to various aspects of the research into Van Gogh's life and oeuvre. Work has now been completed on the eighth volume in the series, on the so-called ‘account book’ kept by Theo van Gogh and his wife Johanna van Gogh-Bonger. This ledger offers valuable glimpses into their dealings and includes information about the sales of certain works. The volume will be published in 2002.
Education

Education remains a high priority at the Van Gogh Museum and we now offer a wide range of information and explanatory material to meet the varying demands of our public. In recent years particular emphasis has been placed on developing an imaginative and stimulating programme for schools. The education department has made great progress in evolving material and activities that match the needs of particular levels in the primary and secondary school curricula, working in close consultation with teachers and experts in the field. Demand has risen as the word spread about the museum's new services and visits from schools have almost doubled in over the last year. For the first time, the Van Gogh Museum participated in the biennial Educational Fair in Utrecht, a national event that helped raise the profile of the education department and to draw attention to its activities.

The exhibition *Light!* provided the stimulus for one of the museum's most extensive educational projects to date. Teacher's packs, a special newspaper and a diversity of course material was developed in cooperation with the local educational foundation, Kunstweb. The interdisciplinary nature of the show - with its emphasis on the links between art, science and technology - made a superb starting point for tours and workshops. The demonstrations of 19th-century lamps and lights provided by Stichting EnergeticA (a museum of energy technology in Amsterdam) proved particularly popular.
Alongside the more familiar teaching aids, there have also been some striking innovations. The painting *The blue dress* by Kees van Dongen (a portrait of the artist's wife, Augusta) was the starting point for a project aimed at children between the ages of six and eight. Following an introductory lesson at their school, pupils arrived at the museum to be greeted by Augusta herself, dramatically clad in the costume in which she appears in the painting. Having accidentally stepped out of her picture, Augusta is now lost and the children are asked to help her regain the safety of her frame before the museum opens to the public. Along the way she stops to tell them about various works of art. The response to this presentation was hugely enthusiastic and the programme will be extended into 2002.

The museum has also responded to government initiatives designed to encourage closer cooperation between schools and cultural institutions, as well as to reach out to new, multicultural audiences. The Van Gogh Museum is currently participating in a joint project with the Stedelijk Museum, the Amsterdams Historisch Museum and the Rijksmuseum to develop a programme for students in the new VMBO course (pre-vocational secondary education with an emphasis on such fields as technology, agriculture and engineering). These are pupils who might otherwise be less exposed to culture in general and museums in particular, and the venture presents numerous challenges. This is the first time Amsterdam's art museums have joined forces to provide a special educational service.

In addition to these continuing programmes the museum organises intermittent special events. In the period under review two such occasions are worthy of particular mention. On 11 November 2000 the Van Gogh Museum participated in Amsterdam's first ‘Museum Night.’ All the museums in the city remained open until late in the night, offering a host of special activities. A flood of visitors came to the Van Gogh Museum to visit the collections, the special exhibition *Light!* and to hear live jazz music. Another popular event was a special lecture given by British artist David Hockney on 2 February 2001. Hockney talked on what he describes as ‘secret knowledge,’ proposing that in the past, artists made far greater use of lenses and mirrors in their art than has previously been acknowledged.

Van Gogh Museum website
The museum's website (www.vangogh museum.nl) has been further expanded to include information on more works from the collection. The most spectacular recent addition, however, was the inclusion of a virtual tour. Visitors can now wander through a three-dimensional reconstruction of the Van Gogh displays at the museum, zooming in on particular works and examining them in detail. The visual experience is backed up with plenty of written material, while two works, *The yellow house* and *The bedroom* are
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Visitors during Museum Night, 11 November 2000, being photographed by Dutch photographer Erwin Olaf
the subject of detailed study. Thanks to the wonder of the new technology, it is even possible to step inside the artist's bedroom and to contemplate aspects of this work, as it were, from inside out.

**Museum Mesdag**

The Van Gogh Museum took over the management of the Museum Mesdag in 1990 and, after a major renovation, our sister museum in The Hague reopened to the public in 1996. This important collection of paintings and drawings (mainly of the Barbizon and Hague Schools) has been described as one of the best-kept secrets in the Dutch museum world. Visitors are generally enthusiastic about the presentation of the collection in the authentic atmosphere of a late 19th-century town house, with paintings vying for attention with decorative art objects, tapestries and Japanese sculptures. It would be fair to say, however, that visitor numbers have been disappointing and that this gem of a museum deserves a wider audience.

In May 2001 Maartje de Haan was appointed to the new post of Curator/Manager of the Museum Mesdag. Formerly a curator in the print room at the Museum Boijmans van Beuningen in Rotterdam, Ms De Haan now has the task of developing a new programme of activities for the Museum Mesdag, centred upon a number of small temporary exhibitions each year. The first aim is to build up a loyal audience within the local area. More will be done to attract school visits and to increase cooperation with the other museums in The Hague, particularly the popular Panorama Mesdag, housed in a neighbouring street. The first such display, featuring photographs by Hans van de Boogaard of the interiors of various artist's houses and studios, opened in June 2001 and the exhibition *Summer in Mesdag*, featuring sun-filled paintings by Hague school artists, opened on 17 August.

**Attendance figures**

In the year 2000 the Van Gogh Museum attracted 1,312,204 visitors. From 1 January to 26 August 2001 the museum has received 925,524 visitors. A total of 6,208 people
visited the Museum Mesdag in 2000 and from 1 January to 26 August 2001 it has received 4,433 visitors.

*John Leighton*

*Director*
[Van Gogh and Gauguin]

Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers* (F 457 JH 1666), 1888, Tokyo, Seiji Togo Memorial Yasuda Kasai Museum of Art (on permanent loan from the Yasuda Fire & Marine Insurance Company, Ltd)
**The Tokyo Sunflowers: a genuine repetition by Van Gogh or a Schuffenecker forgery?**

*Louis van Tilborgh and Ella Hendriks*

In recent years considerable publicity has been given to the idea that Van Gogh's officially accepted oeuvre might include more forgeries or erroneous attributions than had previously been suspected. Doubts were cast on the authenticity of several paintings. Among them is the work acquired in 1987 at Christie's of London by the Yasuda Fire & Marine Insurance Company of Tokyo for a then record-breaking sum, a still life with sunflowers (colour ill. at left and fig. 5), which traditionally had been dated to the beginning of 1889.

The debate surrounding this work was initiated in 1997 by Benoît Landais, who declared in *Le Journal des Arts* that he regarded the authorship to be highly dubious. He contended that the work was a later copy, based on one of two other, authentic versions. ‘Des incompréhensions manifestes, présentes dans cette toile très faible, témoignent d'un travail de copyiste.’¹ Landais further supported his contention by noting that the work was not mentioned in Vincent's correspondence, nor had it come from the Van Gogh family collection. This was a daring standpoint, which provoked an immediate response from experts and journalists alike.²

+ Many people kindly helped us with our research. In particular we would like to thank our colleagues at The Art Institute of Chicago - Douglas W. Druick, Inge Fielder, Kristin Hoermann Lister, Mary Weaver and Peter Kort Zegers - as well as Cornelia Peres in Rome, for all their advice, valuable discussions and assistance. Similarly we are grateful to our colleagues in Amsterdam, and especially to Sjraar van Heugten and Chris Stolwijk. For assistance in the examinations of the paintings *in situ* we extend our warm thanks to Toshi Ishii and Masa Igarashi (Tokyo, Seiji Togo Memorial Yasuda Kasai Museum of Art), Joseph J. Rishel and Mark Tucker (Philadelphia Museum of Art), Christian Lenz and Konrad Laudenbacher (Munich, Neue Pinakothek) and Christopher Riopelle (London, National Gallery). Concerning the botany of the sunflowers we were very grateful to draw upon the generous knowledge and time of Hans C.M. de Nijs (Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam, Institute for Biodiversity & Ecosystem Dynamics IBED, Experimental Plant Systematics). Our colleague Nienke Bakker carried out valuable research for us at the Vollard Archives in Paris (Musée d’Orsay). In investigating the jute fabric we consulted Jennifer Barnett (Amsterdam), D.M. Catling (University of Durham, U.K., Department of Biological Sciences), Janneke Escher (Amsterdam), Rob Korving and Erwin van Asbeck (Delft, Technical University Museum), Margriet Winkelmolen (Tilburg, Dutch Textile Museum) and H.F. Zwart (Oldenzaal). Further we would like to thank Henrik Bjerre Hans Buijs, Anne Distel, Roland Dorn, Walter Feilchenfeldt, René Gerritsen, Charlotte Hale, Jlsbrand Hummelen, Peter Kropmanns, Monique Nonne, Susan Stein, Marja Supinen, Han Veenenbos, Bogomila Welsh-Ovcharov and Renate Woudhuysen-Keller for their help and advice. In addition to the standard abbreviations for Van Gogh's letters, we also use b and GAC-numbers in the text. The former refers to archive material belonging to the Vincent van Gogh Foundation and kept at the Van Gogh Museum; the latter to the letters of Paul Gauguin, published in *Paul Gauguin: 45 Lettres à Vincent, Théo et Jo van Gogh*, ed. Douglas Cooper, The Hague & Lausanne 1983.


² See for example Matthias Arnold, ‘Die Leinwand ist der Schlüssel zur Fälschung,’ *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (17 November 1997) and Hanspeter Born, ‘Van Gogh oder Schuffenecker?’
It was not, however, without precedent. The Paris art dealer Alain Tarica claimed to have doubted the painting's authenticity immediately after seeing the auction catalogue in 1987, but his view was not published at the time. He believed the still life was 'not Van Gogh at all but a fine example of the work of [Emile] Schouffenecker [sic].' In 1994 Antonio De Robertis took a similar stance. Although unlike Tarica he did seek publicity, his suspicions, which were published in the *Corriere della Sera*, provoked less of an immediate response than Landais's article three years later - probably because they involved such a sensationalist scenario (according to him, fakes
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fig. 1
Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers* (F 453 JH 1559), 1888, Private collection

fig. 2
Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers* (F 459 JH 1560), 1888 (destroyed in 1945)

fig. 3
Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers* (F 456 JH 1561), 1888, Munich, Neue Pinakothek
fig. 4

Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers* (F 454 JH 1562), 1888, London, National Gallery
fig. 5
Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers* (F 457 JH 1666), 1888, Tokyo, Seiji Togo Memorial Yasuda Kasai Museum of Art (on permanent loan from the Yasuda Fire & Marine Insurance Company, Ltd)

fig. 6
Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers* (F 458 JH 1667), 1889, Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum (Vincent van Gogh Foundation) (photograph by René Gerritsen)

fig. 7
Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers* (F 455 JH 1668), 1889, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Mr and Mrs Carroll S. Tyson Collection
fig. 8
Numbering of the flowers as depicted in the Munich and Philadelphia versions (photograph of the Munich version)

fig. 9
Numbering of the flowers as depicted in the London, Tokyo and Amsterdam versions (photograph of the London version)
were produced in order to take the place of authentic works).\(^5\)

On 26 October 1997 the parties challenging the authenticity of the Tokyo Still life with sunflowers received a boost from The fake Van Goghs, a documentary by the British journalist Geraldine Norman for Channel 4 in England. In the programme the work was described as ‘inferior’ and its provenance as ‘unclear.’ Tarica, like Landais, now pointed to errors of interpretation that he claimed were evident when the work was compared with its original, and to what he regarded as the clumsy brushwork that he alleged was inconsistent with Van Gogh's masterly hand. This view was also supported by Thomas Hoving, former director of The Metropolitan Museum and author of False impressions: the hunt for big time art fakes (1996), who at the end of the programme laconically summed up the objections to the work: ‘It is a very funny, muddy picture, and Van Gogh was not muddy. [...] It does not have that snap.’

Although Bogomila Welsh-Ovcharov and Roland Dorn both came to the defence of the traditional attribution - in 1998 and 2000 respectively - their contributions failed to put an end to the debate.\(^6\) Welsh-Ovcharov's arguments, which mainly concerned the work's provenance, were immediately contested by Landais.\(^7\) Dorn produced a more comprehensive rejoinder, which considered all the versions of the sunflowers, but like Welsh-Ovcharov he did not deal with the opposition's main arguments concerning perceived errors of interpretation and the anomalous brushwork. Thus opponents and supporters of the work partly talked at cross-purposes, and outsiders came to have the impression that the question of the Tokyo still life's authenticity was a matter of faith rather than of evidence.

This article presents the authors' own research into the Tokyo painting's provenance, style and technique, at the same time considering the arguments of opponents and supporters alike. To date, the owner has been unwilling to subject the picture to a full physical and scientific test. However, permission was granted for an extensive visual examination in situ, while an x-ray of the work was also made available for study. Moreover, direct comparison with other versions of the Sunflowers was made possible when the painting was lent to the exhibition Van Gogh and Gauguin: the studio of the south in Chicago, where we were able to examine the Amsterdam and Tokyo works side by side.\(^8\)

\(^5\) Carlo Bertelli and Flavia Florentino, “‘Ma questi Girasoli non sono di Van Gogh,’” Corriere della Sera (27 January 1994). De Robertis later expounded his views on his website; see also idem, ‘Il falso Van Gogh,’ Quadri & Sculture 5 (September 1997), no. 27, pp. 52-54 and idem, ‘Il falso Van Gogh dispersi,’ Quadri & Sculture, 6 (May 1998), no. 30, pp. 54-57, esp. 56-57. For a brief summary of his viewpoint, see note 72.


\(^8\) All five paintings were also studied by the authors in situ, i.e. separately. Although three versions will be displayed together at the Amsterdam exhibition venue in 2002, this
Prior to this exhibition Van Gogh's Arles ‘Sunflower’ paintings were subjected to individual technical examination in a joint campaign of undertaken by The Art Institute of Chicago and the Van Gogh Museum, carried out by Kristin Hoermann Lister, Inge Fiedler and Cornelia Peres. Some of their findings concerning the Tokyo version were published in the catalogue accompanying the exhibition, and our own research builds upon their pioneering work. We also drew great profit from our consultation of their examination reports of the different versions.  

**Correspondence and identification**

Scepticism about the authenticity of the Yasuda painting was fed, if not created, by the fact that although a
total of five ‘Sunflower’ paintings on size 30 (92 × 73 cm) canvas are known (figs. 3-7), the artist only mentions four in his correspondence. The first size 30 version of this subject is reported in a letter from the final week of August 1888, when Van Gogh conceived the plan for decorating his studio with still lifes of sunflowers. Alongside two smaller still lifes with a small bouquet of flowers, he had commenced work on a painting with ‘douze fleurs & boutons dans un vase jaune (toile 30)’ [670/526]. This painting was ‘clair sur clair’ [670/526] and ‘sur fond bleu vert’ [674/W18]. Shortly afterwards he produced ‘un nouveau bouquet de 14 fleurs,’ as well as a ‘toile de 30’ [673/528]. According to Van Gogh’s description, this still life also included a yellow vase, although the background was not blue-green but yellow, a colour he elsewhere described (just once) as ‘jaune vert’ [673/528]. Some three weeks later the artist indirectly indicated that these two larger works had been completed [680/534].

He had hung them in the spare bedroom - not in the studio - where Gauguin would have seen them in late October.

After Gauguin had broken off his collaboration with Van Gogh, he informed his former companion in a letter sent from Paris in mid January that he would like to receive ‘un tableau de tournesols’ [740/571], apparently ‘les tournesols à fond jaune’ [743/-]. Vincent seems to have been unsure whether Gauguin was proposing an exchange or a gift, and he did not really want to part with his paintings of this subject, as he told Theo. However, he did feel honoured by Gauguin’s request. The latter had recognised the significance of the sunflower paintings for his oeuvre, he wrote in his reply, and he was thus willing to accede to his friend’s wish, even to reward him: ‘comme j’approuve votre intelligence dans le choix de cette toile je ferai un effort pour en peindre deux exactement pareils’ [743/-]. By this he meant not two new versions of the coveted still life with a yellow background, but rather repetitions of both that work and the still life with a blue background. In late January he informed Theo that he was in the process ‘de mettre les dernières touches aux répétitions absolument équivalentes & pareilles’ [747/574]. These repetitions appear to have been just completed when Joseph Roulin visited him at the end of January [748/575].

As Van Gogh had now conceived the idea of displaying his still lifes of sunflowers in a triptych together with La berceuse (see p. 74) his friend saw ‘deux exemplaires de la Berceuse entre ces quatre bouquets-là’ [748/575]. A later sketch in a letter

10 For this plan see letter 669/B15; the first works are mentioned in letter 670/526.
11 See further letters 671/W6, 672/527 and 674/W18. The letters 672/527 and 673/528 greatly resemble each other. For this reason Jan Hulsker (‘De nooit verzonden brieven van Vincent van Gogh: de paradox van de publicatie,’ Jong Holland 14 [1998], no. 4, pp. 49-50) has contended that letter 672/527 was never sent; but Dorn (op cit. [note 6], p. 44 [note 8]) disputes this.
12 See letter 680/534.
13 Ibid. and letter 747/574.
14 See letter GAC 34 (which has only been partially preserved) and 740/571.
15 See letter 740/571.
16 In a letter to Theo that followed shortly afterwards, however, he talked of a one-off repetition of Gauguin’s choice, ‘celle qu’il désire’; 744/573.
17 See letter 748/575.
shows that the triptych comprised a portrait of Madame Roulin flanked by a still life with yellow background to her right and its blue pendant to her left (see p. 59). 18 It has traditionally been thought that the still lifes painted in late August 1888 are the works now in London and Munich, a hypothesis supported by a comparative study of style and technique in the five works. 19 Compared with the other three paintings, these two display looser, descriptive brushwork, a more elaborate modelling of form, and a more specific rendering of detail. The repetitions now in Tokyo, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, however, exhibit a logical trend towards increasing schematisation of the motif. 20

18 The still life to the left can be identified by the drooping flower (left), flower 14 in the London or Amsterdam painting (fig. 9). The still life to the right can be identified from the central flower right, flower 7 in the works now in Munich and Philadelphia (fig. 8).

19 Only Landais thinks that the Amsterdam still life was the first version; see ‘Pour le rejet,’ cit. (note 7), p. 42. He bases his opinion mainly on Van Gogh’s description of the original’s background as ‘greenish yellow.’ Although this seems to match the Amsterdam work better than the one in London, the artist in fact defined the background in his first version both as ‘greenish yellow’ and as ‘yellow’ (see main text and note 11) - which corresponds very well with the London work, whose background is (light) yellow with a barely perceptible greenish-yellow overlay.

20 See Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 8), p. 271. Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 49-50, contends that the London version must have been the first painting, as one flower was later added over the background, whereas its counterpart was held in reserve in the backgrounds of both the Tokyo and Amsterdam versions. Examination of the Philadelphia painting has shown that not all the flowers in this version were planned as an integral part of the composition. Although most of flower 14 has been left in reserve in the Munich original, in the Philadelphia repetition it has been painted entirely over the background colour.

(Information from the examination reports by Lister, et al.)
Oddly, however, Van Gogh's descriptions of the bouquets in his letters do not match the actual number of flowers in the London and Munich paintings. According to his correspondence, the still life with a blue background contained 12 sunflowers; the Munich work, though, has 14 (figs. 3 and 8). To err is human, of course, and in the case of the Munich picture it seems indeed that Van Gogh simply miscounted. The lower areas of the bouquet are rather tightly arranged, and sunflowers 5 and 9 are eclipsed by their more prominent neighbours (even taking into account that this effect may have been exaggerated by subsequent discolouration and loss of nuance). The London bouquet, however, is less compact, and it seems unlikely Van Gogh could have miscounted the flowers in this work. One possible explanation for the discrepancy is that flower 14, which was painted over the second and final layer of the background, had not yet been added when he described the still life in his letter.

Van Gogh's correspondence does not provide us with an immediate answer to the question as to which of the three remaining still lifes should now be identified with the two repetitions painted in January 1889. Although Van Gogh described his two versions as ‘répétitions absolument équivalentes & pareilles’ [747/574], all three repetitions display clear differences of both detail and colour in relation to their originals, so that this passage is of little help. Apparently his choice of phrase referred only to the subject, which did indeed remain the same. However, shortly after completing the two repetitions, Van Gogh incorporated these new versions of the sunflower motif into the above-mentioned triptych with La berceuse. For this reason it may be conjectured that the works created in January are the paintings now in Amsterdam and Philadelphia (figs. 6 and 7), since, unlike the Tokyo canvas, they are signed, as is the central work from the triptych - with which, moreover, they form a stylistic unity. Like La berceuse - but not the Tokyo still life - both paintings

21 Letters 669/B15, 671/W6, 674/W18 and 680/534.  
22 Letters 672/527, 673/528, 674/W18 and 680/534.  
23 Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), p. 49, counted 13 flowers, apparently thinking that flower 9 should not be considered a real bloom. It is, however, as proven by the yellow petals (actually ray flowers, as sunflowers have composite blooms made up of tubular flowers in the central disc and ray flowers around the edge) to the left of flower 9, which do not belong to flower 8, but instead point to the presence of another, separate bloom. Dorn also believes that head 14 had been added at a late stage in the creative process, but this has been proven incorrect; see Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 8), p. 381 (note 159).  
24 Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 8), p. 240, suggest that the overblown flowers are so-called double sunflowers, which have a double row of petals, or ray flowers, but this is difficult to establish as these are past their peak.  
25 Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), p. 49, believes that only this flower was added at a later stage, but this view is incorrect. Two other flowers, 12 and 15, were also later introductions, painted over the first layer of the light yellow background rather than held in reserve, as were the other 12. The explanation cited above for the discrepancy in numbering is, however, contradicted by the fact that Van Gogh continued to mention the number 14, even after the painting had been completed (see note 22). It is also possible that he did not consider the number of flowers in the painted bouquet when describing the still life, but rather in the real bunch that he seems to have placed in a vase to simulate the work.  
26 In his promise to Gauguin he spoke of ‘deux exactement pareils’; see letter 743/-.  
27 The main candidates for the central work in the two triptychs created by Van Gogh in this period are F 505 JH 1669 and F 506 JH 1670, which bear both a signature and the inscription Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001
incorporate a flat, decorative structure as well as a more full-bodied application of paint, although the latter predominates in the *Sunflowers*. 28

From this it may be concluded that the work in Tokyo is not mentioned in the artist's correspondence. Although this absence could be interpreted as ‘un certificat de nonréalisation,’ as Landais has claimed, there are other, equally plausible explanations. 29 For example, Van Gogh may have produced the painting with the intention of giving it to someone in Arles, thus seeing no reason to mention it to Theo. He may also have regarded it as a less successful version of the

‘Arles 89’. The latter was added to the first of these pictures when it was still incomplete; see the article by Kristin Hoermann Lister in this volume of the *Van Gogh Museum Journal*, note 30.

28 Moreover, the lower section of the vase in the Amsterdam version is not painted yellow, as in the London picture, but pink; Van Gogh was apparently attempting to achieve a unity with its predominantly purple-hued counterpart in the Philadelphia painting.

29 Landais, op. cit. (note 1).
motif, or as an experimental study that similarly required no description. A further possibility is that he produced the work during a period of ‘little correspondence,’ as suggested by Dorn, and by Druick and Kort Zegers. Finally, one could also imagine that he simply failed to mention the work, for whatever reasons. While everything is possible one thing is certain: the letters do not provide any clues as to which of these options is the most plausible.

Provenance

Although the correspondence cannot therefore help us to solve the problem of the painting’s authenticity, the provenance may provide an indication. If it could be proven that the work came from Theo's estate, the case for considering the painting a forgery would, of course, be nullified. What is required is an examination of the provenance of all five pieces.

The works in Munich, London and Amsterdam are irrefutably from the family collection. Johanna van Gogh-Bonger sold the first to Hugo von Tschudi in 1905; the second to the Tate Gallery in London in 1924. Following this second sale, only the Amsterdam canvas remained in the family's possession. It is not known if the painting in Philadelphia was among the works Jo administered. It is first documented in 1896, when the Paris art dealer Ambroise Vollard sold it as ‘soleils d[an]s pot’ to Comte Antoine de la Rochefoucauld on 21 December for 400 francs.

Opinions differ regarding the provenance of the Tokyo version. However, opponents and supporters of the work's authenticity all agree that in the spring of 1901 it was included in the Van Gogh exhibition at the gallery of the Paris art dealers Bernheim Jeune, under the title Tournesols sur fond vert très pale. The painting came from the collection of artist Claude-Emile Schuffenecker, whom the exhibition's

30 Dorn op. cit. (note 6), p. 45 and Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 8), p. 240. They differ, however, in their opinion as to when this was.
31 For the provenance details see Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), p. 60.
32 Paris, Musée d’Orsay, Vollard Archive, ‘MS 421 (4.2). Registre des ventes avec les sommes dues par les différents acheteurs ou peintres,’ 1894-97. Thanks to the watercolour copy made by the new owner in the same year, the work in question is known to have been the repetition after the painting in Munich; see Jill-Elyse Grossvogel, Claude-Emile Schuffenecker, San Francisco 2000, pp. xlvii-xlvi.
33 Exhib. cat., Exposition d’oeuvres de Vincent van Gogh, Paris (Galerie Bernheim Jeune) 1901, no. 5. Lacking the annotated catalogue by Julien Leclercq (b 5737), which contains crucial information, in 1987 Dorn erroneously believed the work should be identified as the version in Philadelphia; see London (Christie’s), 30 March 1987, lot 43. Thanks to Ronald Pickvance, however, this mistake was quickly rectified; see ‘Van Gogh’s Sunflowers,’ in Mark Wrey and Susanna Spicer (eds.), Christie’s: review of the season 1987, Oxford 1988, pp. 70-73. Several pieces of additional information were subsequently supplied by Roland Dorn, Décoration: Vincent van Goghs Werkreihe für das Gelbe Haus in Arles, Hildesheim, Zurich & New York 1990, pp. 459-60. The painting, which at one point was transferred from Emile’s collection to that of his brother Amedée, was loaned to the Internationale Kunst- und grosse Gartenbau-Ausstellung in Mannheim (Städtische Kunsthalle) in 1907, where a photographer recorded it; see the Christie's auction catalogue cited above, pp. 21, 29. For Schuffenecker's collection see also Jean de Rotonchamp, Paul Gauguin, 1843-1903, Paris 1925 (1906), p. 77.
organiser - art critic, man of letters and Schuffenecker's friend, Julien Leclercq - had already described as its owner in a letter dated 16 February 1901.\footnote{Letter from Julien Leclercq to Jo van Gogh-Bonger, 16 February 1901 (b 4134).}

For many years the history of the work before 1901 was a mystery. In 1988, however, Walter Feilchenfeldt pointed to a family document from which it could be inferred that Schuffenecker had acquired his still life from Jo van Gogh-Bonger in 1894.\footnote{See Walter Feilchenfeldt, 	extit{Vincent van Gogh and Paul Cassirer; Berlin: the reception of Van Gogh in Germany from 1901 to 1914}, Zwolle, Amsterdam & Zurich 1988, p. 96, who based his information on Dorn's (then unpublished) dissertation (see Dorn, op. cit. [note 33]).} In March of that year she accepted his offer of 300 francs ‘pour les fleurs’ - a work she had left at the shop of the recently deceased Père Tanguy.\footnote{See letter from Claude-Emile Schuffenecker to Jo van Gogh-Bonger, c. March 1894 (b 1427), which indicates that he bought the still life together with a landscape. He offered to pay 300 francs for ‘les fleurs’ and 200 for ‘le paysage qui est plus petit,’ which Dorn (op. cit. [note 6], p. 48) associates with F 777 JH 2105. Schuffenecker's next letter to Jo (b 1428) suggests that she had accepted his offer. By this time Tanguy's widow had asked for a larger commission, so Schuffenecker ended up paying a slightly higher total, namely 525 francs. See further the letter from the collector A. Bauchy, who, encouraged by Schuffenecker's acquisitions, now wished to buy work from Jo (b 1206). She subsequently noted in her cash book that she had received 225 guilders from Schuffenecker for two paintings; see Chris Stolwijk and Han Veenenbos, 	extit{The account book of Theo van Gogh and Jo van Gogh-Bonger}, forthcoming in 2002 (annotation 11/14 and 61/17).} We know that this was in fact a painting of sunflowers thanks to a letter from Tanguy's widow to Andries Bonger, in which she reports that ‘Monsieur Chouffenecker [...] desireraient avoir un tableau de Mr Vincent c'est le soleil.’\footnote{The undated letter from Tanguy's widow to Andries Bonger (b 1446) was first quoted in Marc Edo Tralbaut, ‘André Bonger: l'ami des frères Van Gogh,’ 	extit{Van Goghiana} 1 (1963), p. 41, and connected with Schuffenecker's purchase by Dorn, op. cit. (note 33), p. 460.}

\textit{Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001}
This interpretation of the evidence, however, built as it is upon the knowledge that Schuffenecker owned the still life in 1901, has also become a subject of debate as a result of the controversy surrounding the authenticity of the Tokyo still life. Landais and others have claimed that the still life purchased by Schuffenecker in 1894 was not the painting now in Tokyo, but the Philadelphia canvas, which they contend the artist sold on to Vollard within two and a half years. \(^{38}\) Naturally, this theory is intimately connected to their refusal to believe in the Japanese painting's authenticity, for if the Tokyo work is a fake, the piece sold in 1894 must have been another version of the sunflowers. And this could only be the Philadelphia painting, as there is no other version whose earliest history is still unknown.

However, if we consider only the evidence of the provenance, the latter theory appears far more speculative than the former. For while it cannot be demonstrated that Schuffenecker actually owned the Philadelphia still life, we can be certain that this was the case with the Tokyo version. Landais's notion could only gain in plausibility if other paintings could be discovered that the artist sold on soon after acquiring them. To date, however, no such examples have been found.\(^{39}\)

### Four or five versions?

In addition to the matter of this individual work's provenance, we should also consider numbers. How many versions are assignable shortly after Vincent's death? Did a fifth version already exist?

Critics of the Tokyo painting believe not, basing their stance on the catalogue of works in Theo's collection (‘Catalogue des oeuvres de Vincent van Gogh’), probably compiled at the end of 1890 by his brother-in-law, Andries Bonger.\(^{40}\) This lists only four large format sunflower still lifes from Arles, each described as ‘Tournesol (30)’ and given the numbers 94, 119, 194 and 195. Ninety-four is definitely the painting now in Munich, while 194 probably refers to the Amsterdam version, as explained below.\(^{41}\) The other two numbers in the Bonger list do not immediately reveal their identity, meaning that this document cannot be used to prove the proposition that the Tokyo version was not yet documented in this period.

39 Grossvogel, op. cit. (note 32), p. 17, no. 42, points to a letter from Schuffenecker to one Haymann, dated 21 October 1886 (Paris, Fondation Custodia), which she believes might indicate that the former was already operating as an art dealer at the time. However, the letter only indicates that he was enquiring about the price of a work by Delacroix on behalf of a third party. It is impossible to judge whether he was doing this as a dealer or simply helping a friend, an acquaintance, or his brother.
40 ‘Catalogue des oeuvres de Vincent van Gogh’ (b 3055).
41 See Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 60-61. His catalogue of the various sunflower versions, however, makes insufficient distinction between interpretation and genuine fact when citing the relevant Bonger list numbers. Dorn not only assigns a Bonger number to the paintings in Munich and Amsterdam, he also gives one to the Philadelphia and Tokyo versions. While the numbers assigned to the first two are based on fact, those given to the others are derived from Dorn's own notion regarding the function of the Bonger list and an associated theory concerning the absent work, which is, however, incorrect; see above.
Unless one agrees with the opinion that a fifth version did not exist at the time the presence of four rather than five versions of the sunflower motif in the Van Gogh family collection at this time can be explained if one painting had already left, either through exchange or as a gift. Here, the work in Philadelphia is the only possible candidate, owing to its unknown provenance. The recipient may have been Gauguin, for Vincent had promised him repetitions of the sunflower pictures.

However, nothing in Van Gogh's correspondence suggests that he actually fulfilled this offer. The artist always thought in terms of an exchange, not a gift [744/573]. Gauguin would have to reciprocate with ‘deux tableaux de lui pas mediocres mais mieux que médiocres,’ as he informed Theo in early February 1889 [749/576].

Vincent developed his proposal by almost

42 Letter 744/573.
immediately also offering Gauguin a version of *La berceuse*, indicating that he would rather have been represented in his friend's collection with the recently created triptych than the two repetitions of the sunflower still lifes from the spare bedroom.\(^{43}\)

Although Gauguin's response to this proposed three-work exchange is not known, the fact that Van Gogh was still considering it in May indicates that nothing had yet been settled. Vincent then informed Theo that he should give Gauguin a version of *La berceuse*, but, he wrote, if his former companion 'veut des tournesols ce n'est qu'absolument comme de juste qu'il te donne en échange quelque chose que tu aimes autant' [778/592].\(^{44}\) In other words, Van Gogh was ready to compromise by giving Gauguin the central work from his triptych, although he apparently expected the side panels to follow later through an exchange, since he knew his friend was keen on the sunflower still life with a yellow background.

Van Gogh, however, seems to have misjudged the situation. Having been informed by Theo of the gift, Gauguin mentions only *La berceuse* in his reply from Pont-Aven: ‘Gardez le tableau à mon disposition’ [GAC 14]. It was not until 1894, long after the Van Gogh brothers had died, that he claimed the promised work from Theo's widow, without making any mention of the still lifes with sunflowers.\(^{45}\)

Although the correspondence in no way intimates that Gauguin received one of the still lifes, the artist himself suggested in January 1894 that he had one of the versions with a yellow background in his studio. In a highly literary piece on Van Gogh, he wrote that his ‘chambre jaune’ contained ‘des fleurs de soleil, aux yeux pourpres, [...] sur un fond jaune, [...] dans un pot jaune, sur une table jaune. Dans un coin du tableau, la signature du peintre: Vincent.’\(^{46}\) This passage makes it clear, however, that Gauguin was not describing his studio as it actually was, but rather a form of fiction. The painting in Tokyo is not signed, while the other two works with a yellow background - the signed versions in Amsterdam and London - were still in the possession of Jo.\(^{47}\)

Nevertheless, in 1998, Welsh-Ovcharov reckoned that Gauguin did indeed own a sunflower still life - not a yellow version but the work with the blue-greenish background in Philadelphia.\(^{48}\) In her opinion, this was the canvas referred to in an entry in the cash book kept by the Paris art dealer Ambroise Vollard, dated 10 April 1896: ‘Payé à [Georges] Chaudet de la part de Gauguin pour un tableau de Van Gogh “tournesols” 225 fr.’\(^{49}\) She seems, however, to have been mistaken, as Landais has

---

\(^{43}\) In this event Gauguin would have ‘de son côté aussi donner du bon’; 749/576. Van Gogh intended to make three triptychs, one for Theo, one for Gauguin and one for ‘La Hollande’ (747/574), but produced no more than the central work for the third of these.

\(^{44}\) Van Gogh first came up with the idea of giving Gauguin a version of *La berceuse* in late February; see letter 752/578.


\(^{47}\) Gauguin also claims (ibid., p. 274) that his yellow room contained a Van Gogh still life with shoes, but this seems to have been equally false, as all the known versions of this motif were at that time in different hands.

\(^{48}\) Welsh-Ovcharov, op. cit. (note 6), p. 187.

\(^{49}\) Paris, Musée d'Orsay, Archives Musée d'Orsay, ‘MS 421 (4,3). Registre de la caisse, consignant les entrées et sorties,’ 1894-1900.
also explained.\(^5\) In early 1895 Gauguin had commissioned Vollard to sell his two still lifes with sunflowers from Van Gogh's Paris period.\(^5\) One of these was sold that same year, while Vollard's 1896 reference appears to relate to the second, rather than to a new, more recently offered, work. The sum paid, 225 francs, seems too low to have been the price for one canvas, but as Gauguin had already received an advance of 400 francs for the two 1887 paintings from the dealer in 1895, it must have been a residual payment.\(^5\) Moreover, Gauguin wanted at least 600 francs.

51 These were F 375 JH 1329 and F 376 JH 1331. One of the two works was sold on 15 February to Félix Roux, who, however, returned it to Vollard on 23 October for 350 francs. (This latter transaction was overlooked by Welsh-Ovcharov, op. cit. [note 6], p. 185.) Strictly speaking it is not known which of the two pictures this was, but given that F 376 JH 1331 was sold shortly afterwards (29 October) to Edgar Degas for 400 francs, it is generally assumed to have been the same painting. F 375 JH 1329 was acquired by the Dutch collector Cornelis Hoogendijk from Vollard around 1897; see Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 58-59. For the sale of the works owned by Gauguin, see Paris, Musée d'Orsay, Vollard Archives, ‘MS 421 (4,2) Registre des ventes,’ 15 February, 23 and 29 October 1895.
52 Paris, Musée d'Orsay, Vollard Archives, ‘MS 421 (2,3) Reçus signés,’ dated 9 January 1895. This was overlooked by Welsh-Ovcharov, op. cit. (note 6), p. 187, who also mistakenly assumed that letter GAC 24 should have been dated to 1889. In this letter, which Cooper (op. cit. [note 45], p. 181) claims was addressed to Theo, there is talk of an exchange, which Welsh-Ovcharov then associated with the work now in Philadelphia. However, in his Gauguin et Van Gogh (Taravao [Tahiti] 1989), Victor Merlhès dates this missive earlier, namely to December 1887, and has shown the addressee to be Vincent, not Theo (p. 56). The letter discusses their exchange of paintings in that year, Van Gogh's contribution being F 375 JH 1329 and F 376 JH 1331. See also Roland Dorn's review of Cooper's Paul Gauguin: 45 lettres à Vincent, Théo et Jo van Gogh, published in Oud Holland 99 (1985), no. 4, pp. 325, 327 (note 7).
for the two works, and the sum eventually paid, 625, comes very close.\textsuperscript{53}

But if Van Gogh did not give Gauguin the painting now in Philadelphia, to whom did he give it? To no one probably, as it is unlikely that anyone other than his friend would have been the recipient of such a generous gesture. Exchanging or giving away this work would have meant that Vincent had abandoned his plan for securing a place for one of his triptychs in Gauguin's collection; this, however, seems improbable, given his great interest in the exchange.\textsuperscript{54} The only possible candidate is Emile Bernard, who, like Gauguin, also received a version of \textit{La berceuse}. As far as can be determined, however, this artist never had a sunflower painting in his collection.\textsuperscript{55}

This reasoning supports the conjecture that the work now in Philadelphia was still in the family collection at the end of 1890. However, if this was the case, the question of why Andries Bonger only recorded four versions of the sunflower motif instead of five becomes even more compelling. Roland Dorn suggests the answer should be sought in the function of Andries's list, which he believes was not a true inventory but rather a catalogue of the temporary presentation of Vincent's works in Theo's new apartment in September 1890.\textsuperscript{56} One still life with sunflowers was omitted from the list, and Dorn was convinced that this could only be the London painting, which may have been displayed in the window of Père Tanguy's shop to advertise the nearby exhibition.

Although this is an ingenious theory, there is no supporting evidence. What is certain, however, is that the Bonger list contains several lacunae, as it is known that from 1892 onwards Jo van Gogh-Bonger began to use supplementary numbering for her own administration.\textsuperscript{57} However, this second ‘catalogue’, which has not been preserved, must have been similarly incomplete, as several documents from later periods contain descriptions of works without reference to either list.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{53} On 10 April 1896 Gauguin - who had not yet been informed by Vollard of the 1895 sale to Degas - decided to lower his asking price. At this point he wanted at least 300 francs for each still life. See letter from Paul Gauguin to Claude-Emile Schuffenecker, 10 April 1896, reprinted in Paris (Hôtel Drouot), 14 December 1958, lot 115 and quoted by Welsh-Ovcharov, op. cit. (note 6), p. 185.

\textsuperscript{54} Assuming that one triptych should in any case remain with Theo; see also letter 747/574.

\textsuperscript{55} See letter 778/592, in which Van Gogh asked his brother to give Bernard a version of \textit{La berceuse} and the latter's missive to his mother, undated but probably from June 1894, in which he reported that his \textit{La berceuse} had been sold through the dealer it had been placed with for 600 francs (Paris, Bibliothèque Centrale des Musées Nationaux, Musée du Louvre, Ms 374, 5.1, f. 207). Fred Leeman was kind enough to draw our attention to this letter.

\textsuperscript{56} Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), p. 48. Nevertheless, this proposition does not seem tenable; see the arguments presented by Stolwijk and Veenenbos, op. cit. (note 36), who have suggested that the list was made after the end of October 1890.

\textsuperscript{57} The Bonger list eventually comprised 311 numbers. The highest number found so far from the second list is 336 (‘Cassirer-april 05’ [b 2185], no. 8, which can be identified as F 659 JH 1850). The supplementary list was probably drawn up in 1892, as the new, higher numbering first appears in the annotated exhib. cat. \textit{Exhibition of the paintings Vincent van Gogh in the art-gallery Arts and Crafts}, The Hague (Arts and Crafts) 1892, no. 4 (326), 12 (314), 16 (328), 24 (325), 27 (332), 42 (320); see b 3046. However, this list also features works without a number (41, 43).

\textsuperscript{58} For example ‘Tentoonstelling Wiesbaden: schilderijen Vincent v Gogh’ (b 3257), in which the self-portrait listed under number 15 is unnumbered. According to Feilchenfeldt, op. cit. (note 35), p. 90, this was probably F 356 JH 1248.
Surprisingly, one of these documents provides support for the proposed existence of a fifth, unnumbered version of the still life with sunflowers. In a list of 19 works sent to Leclercq on 8 October 1901, all the paintings have a Bonger list number except the ‘sunflowers’ noted under number seven. When the paintings were actually dispatched Jo rechecked the numbering and made several corrections; however, the listing for the sunflower picture was left unchanged, from which one can only conclude that the work did not actually have a number, as otherwise Jo would surely have added it.

‘Paintings to Leclercq, sent 8 October 1901’ (b 5738). A ‘4’ initially noted by this work was scored through. Theoretically speaking this could have been part of the Bonger numbers 194 (probably F 458 JH 1667), 84 (F 452 JH 1330), or 44 (F 377 JH 1328), but this seems unlikely. It points rather to the existence of yet another list. F 350 JH 1245 was also designated by Jo with a four (‘Cassirer - april 05’ [b 2185], no. 22), while ‘maisons de village’ on the ‘list Leclercq paintings’ (b 1533) was given the number 4bis.

A similarly unnumbered work is the self-portrait exhibited in 1903; see note 58.
The painting in question was a still life with a yellow background, of which there were still two versions in the family collection: the canvases now in Amsterdam and London. Since the Amsterdam version can be associated with Bonger 194 (as will be shown below), the unnumbered painting sent to Leclercq must have been the London picture, proving Dorn's thesis correct (although his supporting arguments are different). In this interpretation, the four still lifes in Bonger's inventory can be identified as follows: 94, as already stated, is the painting now in Munich; 119 is the version in Philadelphia or Tokyo; 194 is probably the still life now in Amsterdam; and 195 either the painting in Tokyo or the Philadelphia version.

**Leclercq**

Although the provenance offers no reason to doubt that the Tokyo *Sunflowers* is genuine, sceptics have produced still further arguments to challenge its authenticity. The crucial factor in their misgivings has been the knowledge that the work's owner in 1901, Claude-Emile Schuffenecker, had an opportunity to produce a forgery from another version of the motif.

In June 1900 Jo van Gogh-Bonger sent eight works to Paris for a presentation at Leclercq's home. One of these was a version of the sunflowers, which arrived in a less than perfect condition and required restoration - as indicated by Leclercq's correspondence. Initially he spoke of lining the canvas, but in early February (when the restorer had apparently just seen the painting for the first time) Leclercq informed Jo that this would be impossible. Consolidating the paint subsequently proved to be sufficient and the treatment was completed in late March 1901, allowing the work to be exhibited for two days at the abovementioned exhibition at Bernheim Jeune.

The painting sent to Paris was number 194 on the Bonger list. De Robertis and Landais both thought that this was the London version, but in light of the restorer's judgment that lining would be impossible, it seems more likely it would have been

---

61 Following Leclercq's sudden death at the end of October, these works were forwarded to Berlin, where they were included in an exhibition at the premises of the art dealer Cassirer. The critic Hans Rosenhagen described the painting as 'a still life of sunflowers and orange-coloured dahlias in a vase against a yellow background'; see idem, 'Von Ausstellungen,' *Die Kunst* 5 (1901-02), p. 240. On Leclercq see Marja Supinen, 'Julien Leclercq - Vincent van Goghin varhainen puolustaja,' *Taidehistoriallisia Tutkimuksia. Konsthistoriska Studier* 11 (1988), pp. 69-109 and idem, 'Julien Leclercq: a champion of the unknown Vincent van Gogh,' *Jong Holland* 6 (1990), no. 6, pp. 5-14.

62 There is another reason to assume that Jo sent the London version to Paris. According to our interpretation of the evidence, the Amsterdam still life had just returned from a long stay in Paris, where - as noted in the body of the text - a fragile paint layer had been treated. For this reason it seems unlikely that the painting would have been sent away again so soon.

63 ‘List of the paintings in Paris at Leclercq’s’ (b 5738), no. 12 (‘sunflowers’), with Bonger number 194. The consignment arrived on 15 June 1900; see Julien Leclercq to Jo van Gogh-Bonger, 15 June 1900 (b 5740). For the correspondence see the letters b 4128-42.

64 For the restoration see the following letters from Julien Leclercq to Jo van Gogh-Bonger: b 4130, b 4131, b 4134 and b 4138.

65 Letter from Julien Leclercq to Jo van Gogh-Bonger, 29 March 1901 (b 4140).

66 See note 63.
the work now in Amsterdam. 67 This painting has a wooden lat at the top, added by the artist, which might not have made lining completely impossible, but certainly more complicated. 68

Despite the still life's fragile condition, Leclercq was eager to purchase it. 69 He could not afford the asking price, however, and once the exhibition was over he proposed an exchange, by which he would receive the still life in return for Van Gogh's Daubigny's garden, which he had recently acquired (fig. 10), plus an additional payment.

67 Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), p. 54. Landais, ‘Pour le rejet,’ cit. (note 7), p. 3, suggested that a photograph of the London painting might have been taken at Bernheim Jeune's premises, but this has proven incorrect. See the ‘Errata’ to his unpublished pamphlet (October 2001), now in the archives of the Van Gogh Museum.

68 Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), p. 55, also associates the tiny holes present in the paint layers with the use of a syringe needle to inject glue during the 1901 treatment. However, several observations contradict this theory. First, when viewed with a stereomicroscope, the holes are too irregular to have been produced by a syringe needle, which would have been of a fixed shape and size. Moreover, they are concentrated in the thinly painted passages, or in patches of uncovered ground, where it would have been unnecessary to inject glue in order to re-adhere any thickly applied brushstrokes. The holes follow the regular pattern of the canvas weave, indicating a causal relationship with the primed canvas. Anthony Reeve, paintings conservator at the National Gallery, London, and Cornelia Peres, who examined the picture in 1992, gave a very plausible explanation for the origin of these holes and related damage, suggesting that they had been caused during a 1961 treatment, when the picture was lined. The report is kept in the conservation archives of the Van Gogh Museum.

69 Julien Leclercq to Jo van Gogh-Bonger, 5 April 1901 (b 4141). He had already expressed this wish in his letter of 25 November 1900 (b 4130).
Shortly afterwards, he even sent the canvas to Jo in order for her to judge the fairness of his suggestion. 70 Jo, however, was unable to agree to this unusual offer, and the still life was probably returned to her in early May. 71

De Robertis and Landais gave the following interpretation to these facts. Given Leclercq's ardour to possess the sunflower painting and his sometimes less than transparent commercial activities, they believe the information sent to Jo was intended to deceive her. According to their theory, there was no independent restorer: Leclercq's friend Emile Schuffenecker treated the damaged work and protracted the restoration in order to gain time to produce a free copy - the work now in Tokyo. The painter then presented his forgery at the Bernheim Jeune exhibition as an authentic Van Gogh, with the full knowledge of Leclercq. 72

Seen in this light Leclercq's correspondence is part of an intrigue. However, the only important factors for us are the two premises that underlie this conspiracy theory: that Schuffenecker was a forger, and that he and Leclercq were untrustworthy schemers.

---

70 Together with a work that had initially been sold but then later returned, Starry night (F 474 JH 1592); see letter b 4242.

71 Leclercq probably brought the painting with him during a visit to Jo in early May, when he travelled via Amsterdam to Berlin, where he was organising a new exhibition of Van Gogh's work at the Cassirer gallery. Once in Berlin he informed Maurice Vlaminck that he had no paintings to sell and only possessed five works by the artist from his own collection; see Maurice Vlaminck, Portraits avant décès, Paris 1943, pp. 31-33. These were F 479 JH 1601; F 581 JH 1751; F 579 JH 1692; F 613 JH 1746; and F 802 JH 2001. He had thus abandoned his plan for acquiring a still life with sunflowers. Moreover, during his visit to Jo his eye had fallen on another canvas, F 798 JH 2021. She included this picture in her later consignment of works to Paris, but did not note a price, only Leclercq's name (see b 2186, no. 8). See also her letter to Leclercq's widow, dated 9 November 1901, published in Supinen, ‘Julien Leclercq - Vincent van Goghin varhainen puolustaja,’ cit. (note 61), p. 106.

72 See Landais, ‘Pour le rejet,’ cit. (note 7), pp. 43-45, and the De Robertis articles cited in note 5. The latter, however, had a slightly different idea concerning the supposed chain of events. He surmised that Leclercq and Schuffenecker had already sold the painting in advance, without Jo's permission, to Count Antoine de la Rochefoucauld. When Theo's widow also refused to agree to Leclercq's proposed exchange of the still life for Van Gogh's Daubigny's garden, they had a problem and decided to produce a forgery.
Schuffenecker

The notion that Émile Schuffenecker was a forger was first expressed during the late 1920s, when every avenue was being explored in the hunt for the maker of a group of forgeries that had recently been unmasked - the so-called ‘Wacker forgeries.’ Schuffenecker, along with his brother Amedée, was generally viewed as a possible suspect - although everyone admitted that they did not know the precise ins and outs of the situation. ‘It is [...] generally known that Schuffenecker painted pictures like Van Gogh, or copied them, or - if you wish - forged them,’ was a typical allegation made at the time. The origin of these rumours was - and is - unclear, although Julius Meier-Graefe probably played a significant role in their creation. At any rate this influential German critic would declare during the court case concerning the Wacker affair that ‘the painter Schoeffenecker [sic] has copied many paintings by Van Gogh’ and that he was ‘also aware’ that these had sometimes been sold as real Van Goghs. Landais and De Robertis combined these old stories with information from an unpublished manuscript by Judith Gérard-Moline, stepdaughter of musician William Moline, whose circle of friends in the late 1880s had included Gauguin. This manuscript dates from circa 1950 and was inspired by her anger towards Leclercq and Schuffenecker, whom she represents as untrustworthy. Apparently referring to Jo's consignment of 1900, she wrote that Leclercq had managed to get Van Gogh's works to Paris, but that he had handled them with little respect. The paintings had allegedly been damaged during the journey and for this reason he had called on Schuffenecker for assistance, who was then working at the Lycée Michelet in Vanves as a drawing teacher. Subsequently, according to Gérard-Moline, the artist treated Van Gogh's paintings as if they were studies by his students, and with Leclercq's permission he made a number of corrections, adding grey clouds to *Houses at Auvers* (F 802 JH 2001) and painting out the cat in *Daubigny's garden* (fig. 10).

Where, however, lies the truth in this amalgam of accusations? Although a definitive biography of Schuffenecker has yet to be written, the facts as they are presently known suggest the following scenario. While it seems reasonably certain that his brother Amedée (who took over the major portion of Émile's collection in 1903 and subsequently made a lasting career in the art trade) at some point became involved in dubious practices, it is difficult to ascertain whether Émile can be accused of the same. Although in 1909 the artist issued a certificate of authenticity for a ...

75 Judith Gérard-Moline, ‘Le crime de Julien Leclercq.’ During the 1970s this unpublished manuscript was in the possession of Bengt Danielsson; the Van Gogh Museum also owns a copy. For William Moline and Judith Gérard-Moline see Bengt Danielsson, *Gauguin à Tahiti & aux îles Marquises*, Papeete (Tahiti) 1975, pp. 150-53, 156-57.
78 Gérard-Moline's claim that Amedée sold her a copy after Van Gogh's *Self-portrait as a bonze* (F 530 JH-) as a genuine work by the master appears at any rate to be true. See Gérard, op. cit. (note 75), pp. 3-4 and Vojtěch Jirat-Wasiutyński and H. Travers Newton, *Vincent van Gogh's self-portrait dedicated to Paul Gauguin: a historical and technical study*, Cambridge 1984, pp. 17-18.
work which was unjustifiably considered to be a Van Gogh (fig. 11), this does not necessarily point to deliberate foul play. During this period Van Gogh's oeuvre had not been catalogued in any definitive way, and erroneous attributions were the order of the day.

Nor is it possible to confirm or deny that Schuffenecker produced 'many copies' after Van Gogh, as Meier-Graefe contended. Only one such copy is known, a repetition in pastel of Vincent's Self-portrait with bandaged ear (F 529 JH 1658), which he must have bought early on. The 'small, fragmentary repetition' after Van Gogh's Prisoners at exercise: copy after Gustave Doré, once in Amedée's collection, however, is highly suspect. The piece has since vanished and it is therefore impossible to tell whether Emile painted it or not. In conclusion,

79 See note 74.
80 Grossvogel, op. cit. (note 32), p. 92, no. 254. The painter probably produced the copy in 1902 when he sold the original, to which he was very attached. See Roseline Bacou, ‘Paul Gauguin et Gustave Fayet,’ Gauguin: actes du colloque Gauguin, Paris 1991, p. 22. Born, op. cit. (note 2), p. 1735 and Grossvogel, op. cit. (note 32), p. 100, also point to Schuffenecker's Public garden, which they consider a copy after F 479 JH 1601, but this is incorrect. At most the work is a pastiche, and possibly not even that.
81 The work in question is F 669 JH 1885. The German critic possibly had this painting in mind when he later contended that Schuffenecker had copied works by Van Gogh (see also below, note 82). In 1904 he thought it was a genuine Van Gogh, but it could hardly have been that; see Julius Meier-Graefe, Entwickelungsgeschichte der modernen Kunst, 2 vols., Stuttgart 1904, vol. 1, pp. 110-20 (note 1). The work is probably identical to a piece entitled Prisonnier from Amedée Schuffenecker's collection, which was included in the 1901 exhibition at Bernheim Jeune as number 43 (see note 33).
although Meier-Graef may have been telling the truth, the facts are too few to corroborate his statement.\footnote{An examination should be made of copies after Van Gogh's works that are now known to have an early French provenance, including works previously deemed authentic, such as F 226 JH 1172, which Dorn has recently judged to be a copy by another hand; see idem, ‘Zur Malerei Van Goghs, 1884-1886,’ Georges-Bloch-Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Instituts der Universität Zürich (2000), pp. 159-67. The repetition F 171a JH 657, too, deserves further study; the original, F 171 JH 657, belonged to Amedée's collection. Several, later copies are also known.}

Thus, while Schuffenecker may have produced \textit{copies} after Van Gogh, there is no evidence that he actually \textit{forged} works. To date there are no known Schuffenecker forgeries - unless one presumes a negative outcome to the current research into the authenticity of certain works traditionally attributed to Van Gogh, but which some believe to have been painted by Schuffenecker, like the \textit{Tokyo Sunflowers}. Furthermore, there is a lack of documentary evidence, nor did the artist's contemporaries characterise him as fraudulent. He was occasionally described as a speculator, but this is certainly not the same as accusing him of being a forger.\footnote{Landais, ‘Pour le rejet,’ cit. (note 7), pp. 16-17, cites Paul Gauguin, who depicted Schuffenecker as such in a letter to Daniel de Monfreid of 14 February 1897 (see Paul Gauguin, \textit{Lettres de Paul Gauguin à Daniel de Monfreid}, ed. A. Joly-Segalen, Paris 1950, no. 24, pp. 100-01), without, however, noting that the former was certainly not without his own prejudices.} Gérard-Moline's recollections are typical in this respect: she wrote down many unpleasant things about the painter, but never exposed him as a forger. Her indignation was aroused purely by his tendency to correct details in Van Gogh's works as he saw fit.

Of all the accusations levelled at Schuffenecker, this is the only one that is well founded. Although Van Gogh's \textit{Houses in Auvers}, which belonged to Leclercq, was never filled with grey clouds as Gérard-Moline alleged, \textit{Daubigny's garden} (fig. 10), which Schuffenecker acquired from the former in 1901, does indeed feature a
painted-over cat. Since the correcting of ‘intrusive’ elements in paintings had a long and respectable tradition, Gérard-Moline's anger seems somewhat exaggerated. However, it must be said that Schuffenecker's corrections went further than was customary, for he not only painted out the cat, he

84 Schuffenecker did not just confine himself to Van Gogh's work; he also ‘corrected’ works by Cézanne, although he admitted to this; see John Rewald, The paintings of Paul Cézanne: a catalogue raisonné, 2 vols., New York 1996, nos. 444 and 537, and Theodore Reff's review in Burlington Magazine 149 (November 1997), p. 779.
also retouched the edges and even added a wide strip at the top. Moreover, similar additions to the picture area are found in three other works from the collection of either Emile or Amedée: in the first version of Van Gogh's *Daubigny's garden* (F 777 JH 2105), his *Portrait of Camille Roulin*, and in Gauguin's *Human miseries* (figs. 12 and 13). Altering the format of 19th-century paintings does not appear to have been common practice, but seems instead to have been a personal predilection of the painter-restorer's. The rarity of this phenomenon and the common provenance of the above-mentioned paintings, therefore, strongly suggest that these interventions were indeed the work of Schuffenecker. The artist must have been disturbed by Van Gogh's non-traditional cropping of the picture area, a style he himself never used in his own, more academic work.

To date, there has been no comparative technical investigation of all these additions, although two paintings have been subjected to detailed examination. In the first of these, Van Gogh's *Portrait of Camille Roulin* (fig. 12), unfolded tacking margins were used to extend the right and left sides of the composition by 1.5 cm, and the lower edge by 2.5 cm. The 2 cm-wide extension down the left side of Gauguin's *Human miseries*, on the other hand, was created by attaching an extra strip of canvas (figs. 13, 14).

Interestingly, the Tokyo *Still life with sunflowers* has been similarly enlarged, using a combination of the two methods. The work was extended by about 1.5 cm on four sides by flattening out the tacking margins, while a new strip of canvas was attached to create an additional 4 cm extension at the top (fig. 15). Moreover, an x-ray comparison has revealed that this strip looks very close or even identical to the extension to Gauguin's *Human miseries* (fig. 13). Both fabrics share a matching thread count, with an average of 6-6.5 warp and 5-5.5 weft threads per centimetre. In the case of the jute strip added to the Sunflowers, the weft count actually comprises paired thin threads in a basket-weave pattern (as opposed to the plain weave of the original jute canvas).

Unfortunately, poor definition of the canvas weave in the x-ray of the addition to *Human miseries* makes it impossible to be certain whether this is the case here too.

---

85 This is based on visual observation. The type of brushstroke over the cat is virtually identical to the retouching elsewhere, and also to the brushwork on the added strip at the top.

86 Van Gogh's *Cypresses* (F 613 JH 1746), which belonged to Julien Leclercq, has a similar canvas addition at the top, with associated overpainting. However, in this case the addition is quite small, some 1.5 cm wide. More research is required to confirm that this addition is of later date. We would like to thank Charlotte Hale, paintings conservator at The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, for supplying this information, cited from the 1979 treatment report by Lucy Belloli.

87 Other examples of comparatively minor additions to post-impressionist paintings are known, where rough borders, formed when brushstrokes trailed off before reaching the edges of the composition, have been made neater through retouching. Although this has similarly altered our spatial perception of the painted image, there has been no extension of the picture support. Such additions are less blatant and might easily pass unnoticed at first glance, even to the trained eye. See Renate Woudhuysen-Keller, Karin Schoeller-von Haslingen, Manfred Schoeller and Paul Woudhuysen, *Die Rosenallee: Der Weg zum Spätwerk Monets in Giverny*, Aachen & Mainz 2001, pp. 39-42.

88 Information drawn from the 1991 examination and treatment report by David Skipsey, then Mellon Fellow in Paintings Conservation at the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

89 This poor definition is due to the fact that it is obscured by a radio-absorbent paint layer applied in streaks on top. Nor does examination of the lined painting itself provide further
In the case of both paintings, the additions have been simply joined edge-to-edge with the main canvas. In *Human miseries* the added strip is held in place by the application of a glue lining. However, judging from the x-ray of the unlined Tokyo painting, in this case the strip was - and still is - held by a wooden lat, now nailed to the top of the stretcher. The idea for extending the top in this way may have been provided by the Amsterdam *Sunflowers*, which, as noted above, was probably the version displayed in the 1901 Bernheim Jeune exhibition. In the case of the Amsterdam work, Van Gogh enlarged the picture area by painting directly onto the wooden lat affixed to the top side of the stretcher.\(^{90}\)

**Forgery?**

The above observations provide cumulative evidence that Schuffenecker was most likely responsible for the extensions to the Tokyo painting. In the light of this, it would be illogical to believe he forged the rest of the painting, at the same time taking the trouble to fabricate separate extensions and to paint them in an entirely different style.\(^{91}\)

---

90 Both surface examination of the still life and paint sample cross-sections reveal that the top paint layer of the main background continues on the added lat, confirming that this extension was the work of the artist rather than a later addition. Current evidence suggests that the lat was added during the painting process (once the main background had been laid in) rather than planned in advance, although further research will be required to confirm this. While a paint cross-section from the main background shows that this was built up in two sessions (one yellow layer applied on top of another one that was already dry), a sample from the additional strip only contains the top paint layer (applied directly onto the unprimed wooden lat). However, allowance should be made for the possibility that the irregularly applied underpaint is simply absent from this particular sample. SEM-EDS analysis of paint cross-sections prepared by Inge Fiedler, microscopist at The Art Institute of Chicago, was conducted by MVA, Inc., Norcross, GA. The analytical report, dated 23 August 2001, along with the earlier documentation by Cornelia Peres, is in the conservation archives of the Van Gogh Museum.

91 Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), p. 56.
Overall view by normal light after treatment (October 1991) of Vincent van Gogh, Portrait of Camille Roulin (F 537 JH 1644), 1888, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Given by Mrs Rodolphe Meyer de Schauensee

If this seems to militate against writing the work out of Van Gogh's oeuvre, the painting's critics have offered other, equally forceful arguments to support their position. They have, for example, drawn attention to two conspicuous details. The first of these concerns the leaf that belongs with the drooping flower to the left, number 14, through which the flower-stem passes. Leaves encompassing the stem in this way are not characteristic of sunflowers. In the first version - the work in London - the stem runs slightly into the leaf, which may have erroneously created the impression of a leaf encompassing a stem. The second concerns the broken stem of flower number 7 (fig. 5). When sunflowers snap, the top part falls forward due to the weight of the head, but surprisingly this is not the case here. The overblown bloom still stands proudly upright, as it does in the London painting, which served as its model; however, the stem in that work is not broken, only slightly bent.

For these reasons critics of the Tokyo still life have concluded that it cannot be a repetition by Van Gogh's own hand. In their opinion, the artist could certainly not be reprimanded for lacking knowledge of sunflowers, and therefore the author of the work must have been a copyist. Although this conclusion at first seems reasonable, it is undermined when we examine the repetition in Philadelphia. Like the picture in Tokyo, this work also has an ‘incongruously’ snapped stem in the place where its prototype, the still life in Munich, only features a slightly bent example (cf. figs. 3, 7 and 8, flower number 4).

This means that the ‘errors of interpretation’ in the Tokyo version need not necessarily be ascribed to a copyist; they could equally well be work of Van Gogh himself repeating his motif. If this is indeed the case, the leaf enclosing the stem can only be attributed to carelessness, or a lack of botanical knowledge or interest on the artist's part. The ‘incongruously’ snapped stem, on the other hand, appears to be a deliberate stylisation, as the same angular form also recurs in the portrait of Madame Roulin (see pp. 74-75), where some of the dahlias on the background wallpaper have similarly snapped stalks.

92 Landais, op. cit. (note 1) and Tarica in his interview for the 1997 documentary.
This sacrifice of botanical reality to abstraction and stylisation is moreover apparent in all the repetitions. No botanist would recognise a sunflower in the sea-anemone-like structure of the dark head in, for example, the Philadelphia version (figs. 7, 8). The green hearts of the overblown flowers in the two repetitions of the London picture are equally unnatural. Unlike in the latter work, where the varied transition from open peripheries to the still closed flowers in the hearts of the sunflowers is clearly depicted, the repetitions instead employ separate, closed circles that create the mistaken impression that these are entire heads.

Taking this into account, it becomes difficult to base acceptance or rejection of the Tokyo still life on so-called ‘errors of interpretation.’ The only recourse can be evidence concerning style and technique. In this context, critics of the Tokyo work have stated the following objections.93 Landais claims that the way the painting has been

93 They have also attached great importance to the fact that, unlike the other versions, the Japanese picture bears no signature. However, Van Gogh rarely signed his paintings at this time. Moreover, the absence of a signature tells us nothing about the work's authenticity.
fig. 13
Paul Gauguin, Human miseries, 1888, Ordrupgaard, Ordrupgaard Sammlungen (photograph by Ole Woldbye)

built up does not correspond with Van Gogh's method of working. According to him, the artist would have painted ‘first the colours and only later the contour line’; the petals on sunflower 1, however, display the opposite approach. Furthermore, Matthias Arnold considers it suspicious that the background has been filled in around the flowers, over-lapping their contours - again contrary to Van Gogh's usual procedure. He also regards the brushstroke as problematic, contending that it is ‘much more uneven and irregular than in the two versions definitively ascribed to [the artist].’ Landais speaks of a ‘mechanical hand,’ while Hoving disparagingly used the word ‘muddy.’ Tarica also

fig. 14
Detail of x-ray of fig. 13

95 Arnold, op. cit. (note 2).
96 Ibid.
pointed to the sometimes-frayed character of the brushstroke, which he regards as uncharacteristic of Van Gogh.\(^97\)

None of these critics, however, appear to have studied the painting in a systematic fashion. For example, they have failed to take into account the picture's support. Joint research conducted by The Art Institute of Chicago and the Van Gogh Museum, involving a detailed comparative study of x-rays, has confirmed that the material on which the Tokyo *Sunflowers* is painted exactly matches the jute fabric used for other works by Van Gogh and Gauguin, and thought to have been cut from the 20-metre roll bought by the latter at the beginning of November 1888.\(^98\) The canvas is similarly of plain weave, and its thread count falls within the same range of 5-5.5 warp by 6.5 weft threads per centimetre (fig. 15).\(^99\) The thinner and less closely packed warp threads run horizontally, indicating that the canvas was orientated perpendicularly with respect to the axis of the roll. Along the top of the original canvas there is a narrow (1.5 cm wide) tacking edge, which, like the other three tacking edges, was later flattened and incorporated into the picture area. Although slightly frayed, the tacking edge seems virtually intact, preserving strong cusped deformations with accompanying tack holes where the canvas was originally fixed to the working frame. Again this is consistent with some of the other pictures examined originating from the same jute roll, which also feature narrow (1.5-2 cm wide) tacking margins along the selvedge and opposite sides.\(^100\)

Although the jute fabric was most probably manufactured in France, methods and machinery shared between countries make this difficult to confirm.\(^101\) A characteristic

---

\(^97\) See Landais, op. cit. (note 1); Hoving and Tarica gave their judgement in the 1997 television documentary.


\(^99\) Thread counts taken from the x-ray show an average of 5.0 horizontal threads by 6.5 vertical threads per centimetre.

\(^100\) Intact selvedges have been found in four paintings from the jute roll examined; see Lister *et al.*, op. cit. (note 9), p. 357.

\(^101\) From a study of the literature it emerges that a powerloomed jute weaving industry had been established both in the north and, somewhat later, in the south of France during the second half of the 19th century. By this date the former centre of the jute industry, Dundee in Scotland, had lost the bulk of its European trade. However, European mills were equipped with British machinery and staff trained by Dundee technicians. On the Dundee jute industry see H.L. Parsons, *Jute: handbook of textile technology* 4, n.p., n.d., pp. 5-6 and Enid Gauldie, ‘The Dundee jute industry,’ in J. Butt and M. Ponting (eds.), *Scottish textile history*, Aberdeen 1987, p. 123. Concerning the jute industry in France see Marcel Goossens, *Technologie des fibre et fils textile: le jute et ses fibres de remplacement. L'industrie textile*, Paris n.d., pp. 113-14.
fig. 15
X-ray of Vincent van Gogh, *Sunflowers* (F 457 JH 1666), 1888, Tokyo, Seiji Togo Memorial Yasuda Kasai Museum of Art (on permanent loan from the Yasuda Fire & Marine Insurance Company, Ltd)
selvedge comprising different coloured warp threads interwoven in various patterns may sometimes be associated with a particular maker or region. To date, however, it has not been possible to link the plain type of selvedge on the Gauguin/Van Gogh roll with a specific place of manufacture.\(^{102}\) Comparison with surviving historical samples of jute cloth suggests that the quality was equivalent to the type employed as hessian bagging for sugar sacks.\(^ {103}\) Although it may be presumed that the jute purchased in Arles was a type that was readily available, examination of Gauguin's later paintings has not yet identified any canvas that could provide an exact match.\(^ {104}\)

The jute fabric used by the two artists at Arles is thus a distinctive material, with its own particular characteristics. The fact that the Tokyo picture is painted on precisely the same kind of cloth provides compelling if not conclusive evidence of its authenticity.

Based on visual examination of the Tokyo still life, the exact nature of the ground applied is at present uncertain. In places a translucent pinkish layer is evident, which resembles the idiosyncratic barium sulphate ground that Van Gogh and Gauguin began to use at the beginning of November, having abandoned their initial choice of chalk-glue priming.\(^ {105}\) Elsewhere, however, there seems to be a denser white layer, which is more likely to be a chalk-glue primer or a barium sulphate ground.

---

\(^{102}\) A plain weave selvedge was considered the strongest type. In this case it was further strengthened by the relatively large number of warp threads used (less than four threads was also common). See Thomas Woodhouse and Thomas Milne, *Jute and linen weaving*, Manchester 1904, p. 365.

\(^{103}\) We do not know of any surviving 19th-century reference samples of jute bagging. However, 20th-century samples may still reflect former practice, since the same technical specifications were employed during their weaving.

Seventeen samples of woven jute were examined from the academic collection at the Technical University in Delft, which was established between 1907 and 1948. One sample of sackcloth displayed a thread count and selvedge that exactly matched the jute purchased by Van Gogh and Gauguin (inventory number 0522497). It is not known exactly where and when this sample was woven. For the technical specifications for different types of jute fabric woven for different purposes see, for example, A.W.J.M. Peijnenborg, *Enige facetten voor de juteindustrie*, Tilburg 1965, pp. 58-61 and A.J. Handels, *De grondstoffen van de textielindustrie*, Tilburg 1924, pp. 133-34.

\(^{104}\) Thread count surveys of Gauguin's paintings have been conducted by Carol Christensen at the National Gallery in Washington, and by Charlotte Hale at The Metropolitan Museum in New York. Some thread counts were published in Carol Christensen, ‘The painting materials and technique of Paul Gauguin,’ *Conservation Research: Studies in the History of Art* 41 (1993), pp. 63-70. To date the closest match to the Arles jute used by Van Gogh and Gauguin has been provided by the coarse picture support of Gauguin's *Tahitian women* in The Metropolitan Museum, which has an average thread count of 5.5 warp threads and weft threads per centimetre, as measured by Charlotte Hale (private communication). In Paris, Gauguin used jute of a slightly looser weave, averaging 4-5 x 5.5-6 threads per centimetre, as in his *Paris in winter* (Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum). See Lister et al., op. cit. (note 9), p. 357 and the conservation files at the Van Gogh Museum.

\(^{105}\) Concerning the use of barium sulphate grounds see Lister et al., op. cit. (note 9), p. 360. Previous examinations of the Tokyo *Sunflowers*, carried out with the naked eye, have recorded a whitish to pinkish colour of the ground (conservation archives, Van Gogh Museum). It was questioned whether this varied tint might be due to the visual impact of the dark fabric support showing through a white ground layer, lending a pinkish colour in places. However, at the Chicago venue of the exhibition it was possible to examine the painting with the help of a head magnifier, concluding that both a pink layer resembling a barium sulphate ground and a white oil ground might be present. The latter examination was carried out after
which could be a lead and/or zinc white-in-oil ground, such as subsequently employed by both artists. This is possibly a transitional technique, with the white oil ground applied on top of the barium sulphate one, but further research would be required to confirm this.

Surface examination has identified an underdrawing on this ground that employs a dry black material resembling charcoal. These contour lines are exposed between adjacent paint areas where these do not quite meet. Examination of the other versions has revealed a similar preliminary outlining of the composition; in the case of the repetitions this may be the result of tracing, as demonstrated by Kristin Hoermann Lister elsewhere in this Journal. There is also evidence that in the Tokyo Sunflowers, as in the Amsterdam version, Van Gogh returned to the use of charcoal to redefine certain contours at a later stage of painting. Thus, drawn contour lines run over the initial painted lay-in of the flowers and background in places. Examples in the Tokyo still life are the outlines of the lower petals of flower 13 against the vase, as well as some outer petal edges in flower 8, and the outlined centre of flower 9. (figs. 1, 5) In the Amsterdam version, the edges of the yellow petal facing down to the right of the green bract in flower 13 were similarly redrawn with charcoal after the first painted lay-in of the composition (fig. 6).

When viewed with the naked eye, the palette used in the Tokyo painting appears entirely consistent with other works by Van Gogh from the period, in particular the ‘Sunflower’ series. The yellow shades employed in the flowers themselves all appear to have darkened in a similar manner, owing to the use of specific lead chromate paints. In places, tiny areas of damage have exposed a brilliant yellow colour in the interior of the paint film where this has been shielded from the light. Similar spots of damage in the green passages reveal that these have also become

publication of the catalogue, where the ground was assumed to consist of lead white in an oil medium. See Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 8), p. 240.

106 See Lister’s contribution to this volume of the Van Gogh Museum Journal. She also made the observations concerning lines reiterated with charcoal on top of paint when comparing the paintings with the aid of a head magnifier at the Chicago venue of the exhibition.
darker at the surface, and perhaps consist of the same emerald green (copper acetoarsenite) pigment used in the other versions. As is the case with the other sunflower paintings, these observations provide some idea of the original bright colour scheme, incorporating detailed nuances that have now been lost.\footnote{The archetypal form of lead chromate pigment was chrome yellow, but deep yellowish-red or red shades of colour could be obtained as well as the basic lead chromate product, depending on the conditions employed in precipitating the pigment. Certain types of lead chromate pigment display a characteristic greenish to brown surface discolouration, which occurs as a result of photochemical ageing. See David Bomford et al., \textit{Art in the making: impressionism}, London 1990, pp. 60-63 and Robert L. Feller (ed.), \textit{Artists' pigments: a handbook of their history and characteristics}, 3 vols., Washington, DC 1986, vol. 1, pp. 187-217. For the darkening of emerald green see Elisabeth West Fitzhugh (ed.), \textit{Artists' pigments: a handbook of their history and characteristics}, 3 vols., Washington, DC 1997, vol. 3, pp. 226-27.}

Although Arnold's contention that the background in the Tokyo still life was painted around the flowers has been proved correct, this is not a reason for excluding the work from Van Gogh's oeuvre, as the Philadelphia version displays the same sequence. The flowers have been built up in a variety of ways. In the case of the petals of flower 1, the orange contours were drawn before these were filled in with yellow paint, as Landais observed. However, elsewhere, for example in flower 12, the reverse order is evident. Moreover, both methods are used in flower 8 of the Philadelphia version. The involucral bracts (the small rosette of leaves supporting the head) were first outlined in brown, then filled in with green before the contours were finally accentuated with yellowish and dark green paint. Thus, despite Landais's claims, it is not possible to conclude that Van Gogh invariably employed one singular working method.

Although critics of the Tokyo still life have argued that the brushwork is atypical, comparison of the individual elements in fact reveals close parallels with the artist's other works. For example, the impasto texturing of the overblown sunflowers strongly resembles that employed in the Amsterdam version. The latter also displays a similar patterning in the background, which in places is structured by crosshatched or ‘basket-weave’ strokes. While the long, parallel brushstrokes present in the foreground of the Tokyo still life may not occur in the other versions, comparable vertical strokes were used to depict the door in, for example, \textit{Vincent's chair} (fig. 16).
Viewed in its entirety, however, the texture of the paint surface is somewhat idiosyncratic. Although the other sunflower versions exhibit a contrast between thinly and thickly applied areas, the Tokyo picture has a substantial paint layer throughout. Furthermore, the pronounced impasto in the foreground and vase seems particularly obtrusive and was undoubtedly a major source of the critics' mistrust.

However, these authors have not taken into account the unusual choice of material for the picture support, namely jute. This sheds a different light on the heavily laden paint applied throughout, as will be explained below. The frayed ends to trailing brushstrokes criticised by Tarica are also the result of this coarse fabric: in places the corrugated surface has caused individual strokes to lose their definition, a clear example being the ragged edges to the final green contours around the stalks and leaves.
Finally, while the particular paint application in the Tokyo still life closely resembles the brushstroke in Van Gogh's other paintings, it has little in common with that of Schuffenecker. His technique comprised a far from spontaneous, insubstantial application of paint, which involved the superposition of thin unbounded veils of colour. He largely avoided impasto, as a raking light photograph of his Landscape with a draughtsman clearly shows (fig. 17). From the mid-1890s Schuffenecker specialised in pastels and drawings, media that were well suited to his flatter approach. By the 20th century he had almost ceased to paint, making it highly implausible that in 1901 he would have been tempted to copy a work by Van Gogh, whose style was so alien to him.

**Falsification**

Given that none of the aspects thus far examined - the provenance, the picture support, the sequence employed in building up the image, the colour palette, the brushwork - provide reason enough for eliminating the Tokyo Sunflowers from Van Gogh's oeuvre, the forgery theory should now be checked for consistency. The cornerstone of this theory is the critics' belief that the Tokyo version was based on the work sent to Leclercq in June 1900. They presume this to have been the London picture, but leaving the question of whether or not this is really correct, if the still life is indeed a forgery, it can only exhibit morphological resemblances to one of the two other versions, never to both.

It is evident that the still life in Tokyo was inspired by the London canvas. For example, bud 6 features protruding tubular flowers that also appear in the first work, but not in the Amsterdam repetition. Moreover, the interpretive error apparent in the leaf of flower 14 can only be explained by the London still life, as is also the case with the almost dappled treatment of the petals of flower 15. In the Amsterdam version this element differs completely from its counterpart in London, as it is based

---

on flat planes of colour. The critics were left with no alternative but to declare that Schuffenecker had copied the London rather than the Amsterdam version.

However, they have focused their attention entirely on the form and treatment of the stalks and flowers, failing to consider the colours, which tell quite a different story. For example, the background of the London picture is an
extremely pale yellow, over which a barely perceptible layer of greenish-yellow has been applied. The background in the two repetitions, however, consists of a virtually identical greenish-yellow, although this is often hard to judge from colour reproductions. In the London still life the centres of the faded flowers have been rendered in an arbitrary mix of green and yellow ochre, but in both repetitions they are made up of large segregated planes of colour.  

Furthermore, when the schematisation and abstraction of the flower forms is considered, the repetitions in Tokyo and Amsterdam are found to bear a greater resemblance to each other than to their joint ancestor. For example, the stalks of sunflowers 2, 4 and 7 in the London version have a rounded form, while in the repetitions these elements are ‘flattened’ and bounded by contours. Also, as stated above, the modelled centres of the faded flowers in the London still life have been replaced by flat discs of colour in both repetitions.

Thus, while the subject in the Tokyo version has certainly been copied from the London painting, in terms of its main colours and schematisation the still life displays more similarities to the Amsterdam work. This observation nullifies the forgery theory once and for all: Schuffenecker could only have taken one of the two versions as his model. It would have been plainly impossible for him - unless one believes in miracles - to introduce changes in form and colour that precisely match the details of a version he definitely would not have seen.

**Dating**

The similarities between the two repetitions of the London still life raise the question of whether the Tokyo version was painted before or after the one in Amsterdam. The Tokyo work has traditionally been regarded as the last in a series of three and dated to February 1889 (or later). Dorn has contended that it was painted at the beginning or end of February, periods when Van Gogh was prevented by his illness from keeping his brother informed about his recent output. Although his resumption of the use of jute is inconsistent with the rest of his artistic production at the time, this objection may be partially overcome if it is considered that his choice of material may indicate that he made the repetition especially for Gauguin, who favoured this type of support.

Nevertheless, the 1889 date has proven incorrect. As indicated above, the painting was executed on jute from the 20-metre roll Van Gogh and Gauguin used in November-December 1888. As Lister, Peres and Fiedler have shown in their

---

109 Sample cross-sections may confirm that the paint has discoloured at the surface, but to date no samples have yet been taken from this particular area.

110 Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), p. 44. He was also of the opinion that the Tokyo painting was the last of the three versions, as here Van Gogh had anticipated an improvement by enlarging the space of his composition at the top when compared with the London prototype. Whereas in the Amsterdam version this was achieved as an afterthought, by adding a lat during the working process, he now pre-calculated the change, placing the bouquet lower down in the picture area. However, Dorn's latter conclusion failed to take into account that the top extension to the Japanese version also includes a roughly 1.5 cm wide flattened tacking margin. This means that originally, when the tacking margin was still folded over the top side of the stretcher, the petals of the top flower would in fact have virtually touched the top edge of the composition.
reconstruction of the artists' output - based on the individual alignment of all their works within the roll - the 20 metres must have been depleted by the end of December, when Gauguin left Arles.\textsuperscript{111} This suggests the Tokyo still life should instead be dated to some time in the last two months of 1888. Moreover, the composition of the priming layer might yet allow us to date the work with still more precision. If this layer does indeed prove to consist of both barium sulphate and lead and/or zinc white, it would be reasonable to assume that the still life was painted in late November, when the two artists replaced the first type of primer with the second. Should it turn out that only a white oil ground is present, this would still situate the painting to some time between this date and the end of December.\textsuperscript{112}

Furthermore, the picture seems to have formed part of a specific artistic dialogue between Gauguin and Van Gogh, as suggested, for example, in a later account by the former concerning his activities in Arles. In 1902, when Gauguin felt André Fontainas had given too much credit to Van Gogh in a review, the artist sought to correct his claims by informing the critic that in fact the Dutch painter had learned much of what he knew from him, Gauguin: ‘Van Gogh, influencé par les recherches néo-impressionnistes procédait toujours par grandes oppositions de ton sur une complémentaire jaune, sur violet, etc. Tandis, que plus tard, d'après mes conseils et mon enseignement, il procéda tout autrement. Il fit des soleils jaunes sur fond jaune, etc., apprit l'orchestration d'un ton pur tous les dérivés de ce ton.’\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{111} See Lister et al., op. cit. (note 9), pp. 354-66.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., pp. 360-63 and note 105 above.
\textsuperscript{113} Paul Gauguin, Lettres de Gauguin à sa femme et à ses amis, ed. Maurice Malingue, Paris 1946, p. 306, no. 176, letter to André Fontainas, September 1902.
This anecdote has always been dismissed as Gauguin's attempt to discredit his former painting companion, as neither the still life in London nor the later repetitions were thought to have been painted during Gauguin's sojourn in Arles. However, if Van Gogh did indeed produce the Tokyo version in this period, it seems reasonable to assume that the reference to 'soleils jaunessur fond jaune' was not an allusion to the painting now in London but rather to the Tokyo version.\(^{114}\)

Although it is difficult to determine if Gauguin actually gave Van Gogh advice regarding the Tokyo still life, this would seem plausible. He was certainly occupied with 'l'orchestration d'un ton pur tous les dérivés de ce ton' during his time in Arles: it is known that in late November he began ‘une grande nature morte de potiron orangé et des pommes et du linge blanc sur fond et avant plan jaune’ [727/558a]. Given that Van Gogh in his subsequent letter reported a great liking for this, now lost ‘still life with yellow fore- and background’ [728/560], it is conceivable that he produced the Tokyo *Sunflowers* in response.

This inferred artistic dialogue also finds a parallel in the portraits the two artists made of each other in late November/early December. In his *Portrait of Paul Gauguin* Van Gogh represented his companion at work in front of a predominantly yellow painting (fig. 18), which has been identified on the basis of the spherical form to the left on the canvas as the still life with pumpkins.\(^{115}\) Shortly afterwards Gauguin responded with his *Portrait of Vincent van Gogh painting sunflowers* (fig. 19), whose conception in turn may have been inspired by Vincent's painting of the Tokyo still life. The highly stylised flowers provide grounds to support this theory, as they could not have been painted from life and appear to be based on Van Gogh's schematised flowers in the Tokyo work: their green hearts are represented as circles in the same unrealistic fashion.\(^{116}\) On the grounds of all this evidence, it may be conjectured that the Tokyo still life was painted in the last week of November, or during the first days in December 1888, between Gauguin's pumpkin still life and his *Portrait of Vincent van Gogh painting sunflowers*.

### The ‘Sunflowers’ series

The still life's new place in the ‘Sunflowers’ series not only reveals a great deal about Van Gogh's motivation and intention as regards this particular piece; it also sheds light on the development of the group as a whole. Although Dorn has contended that the differences between the versions were primarily inspired by the artist's need to systematically apply a specific colour theory, the painting's new position within the series gives rise to quite a different interpretation.\(^{117}\)

Van Gogh's original plan, as indicated by his description in late August, had been to depict the sunflowers against a blue background. At that time he envisaged ‘un décorations où les chomes crus ou rompus éclateront sur des fonds divers, bleus

\(^{114}\) See also Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 8), pp. 242-43, who give an alternative interpretation.

\(^{115}\) Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 8), p. 236.

\(^{116}\) Gauguin apparently later saw the green hearts as the equivalent of eyes; see Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 8), p. 240.

\(^{117}\) Dorn, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 51-52.
In his first study of the motif Van Gogh cautiously explored the possibilities (fig. 1). In keeping with his initial idea, this little still life has a decorative structure based on planes of colour, and also features the use of complementary effects, mainly evident in the opposition between the purplish-brown table and the yellow in the sunflowers.

In the second, somewhat larger study, however, in which Van Gogh exactly repeated the subject (with the addition of several flowers lying in the foreground), colour contrast began to play an even greater role (fig. 2). The artist replaced the bluish-green of the background with royal blue and made marked use of orange aureoles: ‘c.à.d. chaque objet est entourée d'un trait coloré de la complémentaire du fond sur lequel il se détache’ [672/527]. The strong contrast thus produced, in combination with the introduction of distinct contouring, successfully created the artist's intended stained-glass window effect.
However, Van Gogh soon became dissatisfied with this experimental work, and shortly after its completion he described the use of aureoles as ‘un dogme universel’ [673/528]. Although it was ‘un véritable découverte,’ he himself preferred the painterly approach of Edouard Manet, thinking in this context particularly of Manet's *Still life with peonies* of 1864 (Paris, Musée d'Orsay). ‘Simplicité de technique,’ that was what he was aiming for, ‘un travail de la brosse sans pointillé ou autre chose, rien que la touche variée’ [672/527]. A simple but varied brushstroke would henceforth play an important part in the further development of the series.

Van Gogh also seemed disillusioned with the use of complementary contrasts, as demonstrated by his subsequent work, the still life now in Munich - his first treatment of the sunflower motif in size 30 (fig. 3). In accordance with his initial conception of the series, he now allowed the primary colours blue and yellow to predominate, although he did not opt for a strong tonal contrast between the two. His aim was now a ‘clair sur clair’ effect [670/526].

The Munich work must have been an ambitious ‘étude de nature,’ Van Gogh's next piece, however - the London still life - was an attempt to produce a ‘tableau définitive’ (fig. 4). While his brushstroke in the Munich painting was still fairly arbitrary, the artist now chose a more serene, stylised treatment, practising his philosophy of ‘la touche variée’ by creating even, flat areas of thinly applied paint in addition to the impasto passages. He also introduced a greater sense of space into the composition of the bouquet, distributing the overblown flowers and their still blooming companions over the whole with a greater feeling for variety.

In order to perfect his ‘clair sur clair’ effect Van Gogh seems also to have made several changes to the colour scheme, toning down the light-dark contrast between background and subject still further. While the Munich still life featured five flowers with a reddish-brown heart (currently darkened by age), he here reduces the prominence of this element. He also painted the leaves and stalks in a light rather than dark green, and gave the background another colour, replacing the heavily whitened turquoise in the Munich still life with light yellow, a much better choice for light-on-light painting, due to its inherent light tonal value. The result was a light tone similar to the background of the London version.

In changing the background colour Van Gogh departed from his original intention of painting the series as yellow on blue. The main colours thus became ‘the three
chromate yellows, yellow ochre and veronese green and nothing else’ [745/571a]. He subsequently compared the work to his Paris Still life with lemons and quinces (F 383 JH 1339), which was also mainly yellow, but whose execution was less ‘bien plus simple’ [673/528]. This learning to use yellow and other closely related colours was apparently a project dear to Van Gogh's heart, for in the spring of 1888 he had also attempted to master the artistic problems it entailed, producing Still life with a bottle, lemons and oranges (F 384 JH 1425). The challenge of course lay in making the greatest possible use of yellow and its derivatives, without losing definition of form, which theoretically required contrast.

In late November 1888 this exercise suddenly came to the forefront once again. As we know, Gauguin had ventured into the same field with his yellow still life with
pumpkin and apples. Doubtlessly his companion wished to respond with a new painting in yellow, choosing his favourite motif: the sunflowers.\textsuperscript{118} The flowers, however, had finished blooming long before, preventing him from producing a new work from nature. Evidently this resulted in the decision to paint a free repetition after the still life now in London (fig. 5).

Several features suggest that in the Tokyo version Van Gogh sought an even more radical way to achieve the light-on-light effect. Abandoning the London picture's light-yellow background, with its barely perceptible top layer of greenish-yellow, he chose instead a more saturated form of the same greenish-yellow, further eliminating the contrast with the bouquet. Probably for the same reason he also made the overblown flowers somewhat lighter than in the London work, where the orange and greenish-yellow colours seem to have been deliberately toned down by the application of thin layers of dull orange-brown paint on top.\textsuperscript{119} Although this reduced contrast to a minimum, Van Gogh apparently wished to retain it to some degree, as he used dark green for the stalks and the leaves, elements which in the London piece are more yellow-green in colour.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{118} Around the same time, probably in early December, Gauguin produced his \textit{Arles landscape: path by the Roubine du Roi Canal} (Stockholm, National Museum), which also features a highly tonal approach; see Druck and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 8), p. 224. It also seems significant in this context that one of the two works Gauguin first mentioned after his visit to Theo's apartment around the end of 1888 or the beginning of 1889 was Van Gogh's \textit{Still life with lemons and quinces} (F 383 JH 1339); see GAC 34.

\textsuperscript{119} This observation is based on examination of the paint surface with a stereomicroscope, as conducted by Peres, Lister and Fiedler in February 1999. Paint sample cross-sections may provide further confirmation that the duller surface colour is indeed the result of a separate paint layer applied on top, rather than of surface discolouration of the paint. The greenish-yellow background may also have caused Van Gogh to modify the colour of the petals. In the London painting these were denoted with greenish-yellow (unless this is a discolouration) but in the repetition the artist now chose yellow, to distinguish these elements from the background.

\textsuperscript{120} This observation that a darker green was used for the Tokyo picture takes into account the fact that it has also darkened at the surface, as revealed by tiny areas of damage in the paint layer.
In addition to these moves towards the objective of achieving a radical light-on-light effect, the jute support
forced the artist to find new ways of obtaining a varied texture in the paint surface - his second challenge. While the brushstroke used for the flowers and background is virtually identical to that employed in the London painting, Van Gogh was unable to repeat the thinly painted areas in the pot and foreground without encountering problems. Unlike Gauguin, he was apparently less willing to exploit the texture of the jute itself, which would inevitably dominate in areas where the paint was thinly applied (in other works painted on this support and where the texture of the canvas is allowed to play a role, such as in Vincent's chair, it is only in marginal passages). The artist's only alternative was to fill in the corrugated surface of the fabric with a thick layer of paint, and for this he chose rich, pronounced brushstrokes. He could have applied the paint layer without leaving a mark - as he had done, for example, in the shawl around the woman in his Novel reader (F 497 JH 1632) - but evidently he considered this effect too monotonous when applied on a larger scale. For the sake of variety he used long, horizontal strokes for the foreground and similar turning ones for the vase - which differed from those employed in other areas of the work, treated more as flat planes. Further, he chose to echo this rich impasto in the petals, whereas in the London painting he had treated these as flat planes.

It is not known whether Van Gogh was satisfied with the final painting, but it seems unlikely. He did not mention the work to Theo and the following January, when Gauguin asked to be given what was probably the London picture, he did not offer him this repetition but instead opted to paint a new version - the work in Amsterdam. Although he continued to use the schematised flower forms found in the Tokyo still life, the forms in the second repetition were mainly based on the London version, as - for example - comparison of the shapes of flowers 5 and 8 in the three versions demonstrates. Van Gogh also introduced several changes, which seem to indicate that he may have considered the reduction in contrast between motif and background in the Tokyo version a little too dramatic. While he retained the greenish-yellow background, he depicted the flowers with a more contrasting orange in place of yellow, although allowance should be made for darkening. He also introduced several new colour accents, such as the light blue in flower 12 and the use of red contours for the vase and foreground. However, these latter changes can also be explained as part of the artist's effort to achieve a unity with the Philadelphia

121 Lister et al., op. cit. (note 9), table on pp. 362-63, assume that Gauguin had also painted his still life with pumpkins on jute.

122 While the greenish-yellow background of the Tokyo still life (with local yellow nuances) was painted in a single layer, the greenish-yellow background of the Amsterdam picture (with orange nuances) shows a separate layer of pale yellow underpainting. Examination of the different versions of the sunflower paintings has suggested that various shades of chrome pigment were used in the overblown flower heads, and that these shades may have later discoloured in different ways. Rosenhagen, op. cit. (note 61), p. 240, for example, had described one of the versions, probably the London painting, as a still life of sunflowers and orange-coloured dahlias against a yellow background. Tiny areas of damage in the overblown flowers of the London version do reveal an intense orange colour below the paint surface, where this has been protected from light. Inspection of tiny areas of damage in the Tokyo painting indicates that more use was made of a bright yellow - as opposed to orange - shade of chrome pigment in these flowers. Visual comparison of the two works while they hung side by side during the exhibition in Chicago suggested that the bouquet in the Tokyo picture had darkened to a lesser extent than in the London version, which presumably reflects this difference in the materials used.
repetition (fig. 7): the new version could not be too out of step with this work, as both were to be displayed in the same triptych.

In any event, one may conclude that Van Gogh was less than satisfied with his choice of a thick impasto throughout the Tokyo version: in the brushwork in the Amsterdam version he returned to the treatment employed in the London painting, even further developing the interplay between areas rich in impasto and those of flat brushstrokes. He contrasted the flat foreground with the impasto on the lower section of the vase, whose upper section he then painted with the same kind of flat strokes he employed to depict the petals.
Conclusion

The above discussion makes clear that Van Gogh's artistic problems with the Tokyo still life arose through the unusual combination of a drastic approach to light-on-light painting and an equally extreme use of impasto brushwork. His decision to restrict the tonal contrast between the bouquet and the background as much as possible produced a painting in which these elements merge to a far greater extent than in the London version, while his choice of a thick paint layer for the foreground and vase also led the lower flowers to lose individual definition.

In short, Van Gogh truly wrestled with this picture, and ironically it is the results of this struggle that have given the critics reason to regard the work as a forgery. The lack of lucidity in colour and form gave rise to the opinion that the work was ‘muddy.’ This, along with the painting's long obscured provenance and the knowledge that it was once in Schuffenecker's possession - a man whose reputation was tainted by allegations of forgery - inspired the critics' mistrust, which was further fuelled by the lack of any mention in the letters and by the peculiar interpretative error in the stem enclosed by a leaf.

However, recent and ongoing research has provided insight into the exceptional artistic challenge Van Gogh posed for himself with this picture. And although he may not have been entirely satisfied with the painting, it is worthwhile quoting the then-director of the National Portrait Gallery, Charles John Holmes, whose enthusiasm for the canvas in 1910 knew no bounds, demonstrating how strongly opinions on the pictorial merits of the *Sunflowers* now in Tokyo can differ: ‘No visitor who has seen this picture only by artificial light can form the slightest conception of its superb and haunting quality. As a harmony in various subtle shades of yellow, it tells upon the wall as a magnificent decorative panel. But when we come to examine it closely, we discover that these great sunflowers seem to be alive, their petals seem to writhe and flicker like flames, their hearts to be quivering with intense unearthly fire. I know no other painting of such uncanny attractiveness.’

---

fig. 1a-b
Van Gogh’s perspective frame, sketches from letters 222/254 and 255/223, 1882
Framing art and sacred realism: Van Gogh's ways of seeing Arles

Debora Silverman

In late February of 1888, Vincent van Gogh journeyed from Paris to the Provençal town of Arles. We do not know precisely why he chose Arles; he registers only a vague awareness of the region. He had read novels and stories by Alphonse Daudet, whose works evoked local sites and figures - such as the windmill on the road from Arles to Fontvieille in *Letters from my windmill*. He may have seen a festival staged in an 1887 Paris exhibition featuring Arlesian costume and the special Provençal dance, the *farandole*. Van Gogh seems to have set off with a composite picture of his destination in mind, stimulated mainly by a quest for the warm sun of the south. This composite drew on disparate sources of literary prototypes, interest in the Marseilles-born painter Alphonse Montecelli and in Eugène Delacroix's Mediterranean journey, and in the brightly coloured world depicted in the profusion of Japanese prints Van Gogh had collected in Paris.¹

Prepared then by these diverse sources, Van Gogh went to Provence in search of what he called light, warmth and ‘tranquillity.’ Stepping off the train at Arles, however, he was greeted not by the restorative sun of the south, but by similar weather conditions he had hoped to leave behind in frosty Paris: snow was falling, with freezing temperatures. Nonetheless, the clarity of the air, the ramparts of the town centre edged by the Rhône, and the vistas of broad, flat stretches of planted fields still offered him a striking contrast to the Parisian metropolis. His first reactions, recorded in a letter to Theo, linked Arles with Holland and Japan. At first glance he had thought of a Dutch town and noted: ‘Arles doesn’t seem to me any bigger than Breda [...]’. Breda, the Brabant home of Van Gogh's grandparents, was, like Arles, a town with intact ramparts, bordered by water and flat panoramic landscapes. At the same time, Van Gogh noticed the mountains marking the distant horizon, and described the spectacle of the countryside terminating in snow-covered

¹ Sections of this article condense some material explored in my book *Van Gogh and Gauguin: the search for sacred art*, New York 2000.

On Van Gogh's mixed and vague motives for choosing Arles see Ronald Pickvance, *Van Gogh in Arles*, New York 1984, pp. 11-12; Ronald de Leeuw, *Vincent van Gogh: pastels and paintings from the collection of the Van Gogh Museum*, Zwolle 1994, pp. 177-78; and Tsukasa Kôdera, *Vincent van Gogh: Christianity versus nature*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia 1990, pp. 32-33. It is Kôdera who suggests that Van Gogh may have seen a Provençal folk festival, or the many popular prints and magazines devoted to it, among the *fêtes du soleil* staged in Paris in late 1886. Alphonse Daudet's play *L'Arlésienne* was revived to great acclaim in Paris after 1885, and Van Gogh may have known of this; in this period Daudet's work being compared to that of Charles Dickens, another of Van Gogh's favourite authors. See Frederick Davies, ‘Introduction,’ in Alphonse Daudet, *Letters from my windmill*, New York 1978, pp. 928.
summits as 'just like the winter landscapes that the Japanese have painted' [579/463]. A Japanese *ukiyo-e* print come alive, a Dutch panoramic topography - these first recorded associations set the tone and the limits of Van Gogh's early assimilation of his new French environment.
Contrary to our mythic view of an immediate and uninhibited enthusiasm for the sun-saturated south, Van Gogh's encounter with Provence was both vexed and scrupulously controlled and he made an extensive and strenuous effort to transform, negate and neutralise the dimensions of Arles culture he found unfamiliar or disturbing. Particularly unsettling to Van Gogh, a former theology student trained in the new doctrine of Dutch Reformed 'anti-supernaturalism,' were the pervasive and public practices of Arlesian Catholicism, which exalted a tormented Christ and a panoply of martyred saints who were called upon in festive and devotional celebrations to intercede in the structures of rural life and the cycles of rural production. Much of Van Gogh's work in the Arles period can be interpreted as an attempt to come to terms with this dynamic Catholic culture, one that began by his excising it altogether from view and moved, by the end of his stay, towards developing an alternative imagery of modern consolation to replace the cult of miracles, martyrs and saintly protectors so dominant in the visual culture around him.

This article traces three aspects of Van Gogh's early months in Arles: first, it examines the way he responded to fields, canals and drawbridges with memories of the Netherlands, selecting those Arlesian elements that bore closest affinity to Dutch topography and motifs; second, the way he approached this repertoire of subjects by re-engaging with the tools and techniques developed during his Dutch apprenticeship, especially by returning to the regular use of the perspective frame; and third, the way he pursued drawing experiments at the important pilgrimage site of Montmajour, experiments that highlight the disparity between his own mental and visual habits and the world of an exultant, form-giving Catholicism and exclusivist regionalist politics. The article concludes by identifying the development of what can be called Van Gogh's sacred realism, characterising it as a response to the dual challenge posed by avant-garde art and populist French Catholicism in 1888.

Tourist Arles, 1888

Arles was renowned for a number of features that elicited very little, if any, verbal or visual response from Vincent van Gogh. An important Roman capital and port city founded by Julius Caesar, the town preserved major monuments of Gallo-Roman antiquity, such as the massive first-century amphitheatre, the Arènes, built to hold 20,000 people, and emerged during the mid-19th century as a tourist site for ancient art and architecture.

Sacred buildings and relics of early Christian civilisation overlay Roman Arles to enhance its reputation as part of what was called the ‘elite of French national monuments.’ By the 1880s regional scholars had collected numerous documents that chronicled the town’s special status as ‘the holy city on the Rhône.’ An archbishopric until 1801, Arles had outstripped the papal city of Avignon with its profusion of convents and churches. Here each neighbourhood was organised under

---

2 From an 1852 legend to a photograph of the cathedral of St-Trophine in Arles, in the collection of the Musée Arlatan.
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its own patron saint and saint's chapel - from St Isodore, protector of the field workers, to St Vincent, patron saint of the wine growers.\(^3\)

Arles occupies a prominent position in the legends and early histories of Christianisation which were systematically compiled and republished from the mid-19th century onwards. According to these traditions, St Martha, sister of Mary Magdalene, had journeyed to Arles with St Trophimus and together they had converted the local people to Christianity by miraculously causing a sculpture of a pagan goddess to topple to the ground. These same legends placed two Marys - les Saintes Maries - and their servant Sarah in a boat that had carried them from Judea and had landed miraculously, without sail or oar, along the coast of the Camargue; from there they disembarked and set out to evangelise Provence. Every year, on 24 May, pilgrims travelled to the Camargue to commemorate the miraculous landing of the women saints and to glorify their continuing thaumaturgical powers. Thousands of worshippers arrived at the church of Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer to witness the annual lowering of the relics from the belfry tower shrine.

and to parade to the beach carrying elaborately decorated statuettes of the saints in their model boat. Surrounded by a flotilla of garlanded fishing vessels, the Marys were launched into the waters of the Mediterranean, symbolically re-enacting their miraculous arrival and re-confirming their concrete spiritual presence in the lives of the faithful.  

The legend of St Trophimus is inscribed on the portal of the cathedral bearing his name in the centre of Arles, which also houses his relics. The cathedral's 12th-century carved doorway, tympanum and cloisters shaped its reputation as one of the finest Romanesque churches in Provence. Outside the Arles town walls to the southeast lies the ancient necropolis known as Les Alyscamps. Originally a Roman burial ground positioned along the Aurelian way, the early Christians consecrated the Alyscamps and from the 4th through the 13th centuries it was a locus of miracles and the resting place of many important saints. According to the 13th-century chronicles recovered in the 19th century, the Alyscamps was so important for Christian burial that citizens from as far away as Avignon would ‘place a corpse of some beloved dead into a coffin, fashioned like a barrel, and commit it to the Rhône.’ Floated downstream and containing money to pay the funeral expenses, these travelling biers were said to always have arrived safely at their final destination, unaided by human hands and undisturbed by robbers. By the end of the 13th century the Alyscamps encompassed thousands of tombs and sarcophagi piled up on several levels. Nineteen churches and chapels dotted the grounds, housing saints' remains and relics in their crypts.

Although the Alyscamps languished soon afterward, two of the original chapels survived and continued to function as pilgrimage sites into the late 19th century. One was the Chapelle de la Genouillade, built on the spot where, according to legend, Christ had left an imprint of his knee when he miraculously appeared to the first bishop of Arles and the assembled Christian congregation to bless the newly consecrated necropolis. The Chapelle de St Honorat also remained intact in the 1880s, marking the Alyscamps with a prominent, illuminated bell tower locally known as the lanterne des morts. On 1 November, the eve of the festival of Toussaint - All Saints - Arlesians attending midnight mass expected Christ to return to the Alyscamps, where he would seek out and resurrect all the town's saints and convene them, in the presence of the angels, to recite the mass of the dead.  


Dutch affinities

Neither the historical spectacle of Roman and Christian Arles nor contemporary Arlesian Catholic culture held any appeal for Vincent van Gogh. To be sure, he took note of the ‘priest in his surplice’ and the Arlésiennes in their distinctive regional costumes and traditional headdresses en route to Saint-Trophime for Communion. Yet the artefacts of Roman imperial power and the representations of Christian judgment seemed to him somehow bizarre: ‘There is a Gothic portico here, [...] the porch of St Trophime. But it is so cruel, so monstrous, like a Chinese nightmare, that even this beautiful example of so grand a style seems to me to belong to another world, and I am as glad not to belong to it as to that other world, [...] of the Roman Nero’ [589/470].

While Van Gogh was repelled by Arles' medieval and Roman culture, he was enthralled with the Arlesian landscape. Exploring the countryside around the town he was inundated by a profusion of associations with rural Holland, the world to which he had belonged ‘before Paris and the impressionists.’ During his first months in Arles Van Gogh constructed what he called an allegiance to a ‘second fatherland’ [708/552] out of this projection of affinities with his first Netherlandish homeland, developing a visual repertoire of subjects that to him were ‘exactly like Holland in character’ [612/488].

There were indeed powerful similarities between some features of the Arles environment and the Dutch physical world that struck and delighted Van Gogh. Like

\[\text{et leurs légendes, Arles 1994, pp. 43-46; and Bérenger-Féraud, Légendes de Provence, Paris 1888, p. 376.}\]
the painstakingly crafted Dutch terrain, the environs of Arles were a kind of constructed nature, slowly consolidated by the continuous process of reclaiming land from the sea. In the late 19th century the term ‘hydrographic régime,’ most commonly associated with the Netherlands, was also used to characterise the topography of Arles and its forms of cultivation. Named Arles by the Romans in derivation from Arelate - ‘city of swamps’ or ‘place of the waters’ - the town was originally a waterlogged marshland, secured to a cultivable base only by relentless drainage and irrigation. Beginning in the 15th century the area surrounding Arles to the southeast - the marsh of La Crau - was progressively transformed from a soggy swamp into a broad, flat plain suitable for growing wheat and vines, and for grazing. To complete the reclamation, in the late 17th century the Arles town councillors enlisted the services of a Dutch engineer, Van Hens, a representative of that envied ‘nation of Penelopes,’ described as skilled weavers of dry acreage from a liquid base.’

While La Crau was thus partially transformed into farm and grazing land, the vast domain to the southwest of Arles, the Camargue, remained throughout the 19th century a sparsely inhabited marshland filled with bogs and low lying dunes not unlike parts of Drenthe and Zeeland in the Netherlands. Camille Mauclair, travelling through Provence late in the century, compared the ‘desolate and captivating’ alternation of lagoons and dunes in the Camargue to ‘the Dutch polders,’ an area ‘neither land nor sea,’ ‘like Moerdyk, the banks of the Zuyderzee and Texel.’ Nonetheless, 19th-century Provençal engineers, as resourceful and persistent as their Dutch counterparts, continued to devise elaborate schemes for draining, pumping and reclaiming land in the Camargue, and between 1850 and 1910 they created ‘around 50 square kilometres of arable land.’ Taking the 19th century as a whole, at least 364 were recuperated in the Arles, Crau and Camargue areas by what one writer called the ‘tenaciousness of those who extracted land [...] from the swamps, mastering the Rhône and fertilising the most obdurate soils of the terrain.’

These reclamation schemes necessitated the digging of a series of canals, so prominent a feature of Dutch topography, which began to slice through Arles and the surrounding countryside in the 16th century, channelling the waters along drainage corridors and creating a network of linear perspectives and recessional frames within the landscape. The Canal de Craponne, for example, bordered Arles to the southeast, near Les Alyscamps; another archaic canal, the Roubine du Roi, still compelled


9 Rollet, op. cit. (note 7), pp. 246, see also pp. 23-24. See also O'Sullivan, op. cit. (note 7), pp. 18-33.
residents and visitors in the 19th century to cross a recessed waterway in order to reach the Arles town centre, as its embankment ran right up to the main gates of the town at the Porte de la Cavalerie. Like the unremitting challenge to the Dutch Waterstaat, Arles' water management project was additive and new waterways were continually appended to the older network. During the 19th century the most significant of these was a canal stretching from Arles to the town of Bouc on the Mediterranean. Along it were a number of bridges and locks, the first one, the Pont de Régine - known in Van Gogh's time as the Pont de Langlois - lying just outside Arles to the southwest.¹⁰

Along with a landscape carved out and protected from the waters, the town and its environs were, like the Netherlands, still very vulnerable to inundation. In the year preceding Van Gogh's move to Arles, numerous Parisian newspapers, periodicals and illustrations recorded the devastating flood on the Rhône in late 1886. Van Gogh was probably aware of the damage to the areas around Arles and Avignon through his reading of the 26 December 1886 special issue of the Courrier Français, which reported the disaster of the deluge and solicited support ‘for the unfortunate flood victims of the Midi.’¹¹

When Van Gogh arrived in Arles in 1888, then, he encountered a surprisingly familiar world that in many respects could indeed be said to ‘remind one of Holland.’ He discovered in Arles and its environs a Dutch-like world of

---


¹¹ Tsukasa Kōdera discovered this issue of the Courrier Français and also identified the special Parisian Midi festival staged to raise money for the victims of the flood at the Palais de l'Industrie of it. See idem, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 32-33, 40 and 110-11.
wooden drawbridges, windmills and dunes; of ‘cane fences’ and ‘thatched roofs’ [633/W4]; of canals and marshes; of flat, expansive fields, ‘infinite as the sea’ [643/509], yielding to remote horizons in ‘panoramic breadth’ [617/492]. On the immediate outskirts of the town he would have passed through the neighbourhood of Les Mouleyrès, named after its many windmills; each windmill had its own name, the one on the Rue Mireille being called the ‘Moulin de la Mousmée.’ As he walked from the train station to the Porte de la Cavalerie, Van Gogh would have crossed the Roubine du Roi, where local women sat on makeshift rafts in the waters doing their washing, laying out the linens and garments to dry along the embankments. This spectacle of the canal and its activities would always appear in clear view from the windows of the Yellow House, which Van Gogh rented in September and that fronted on the Place Lamartine, opposite the Roubine and the city gate. Linens played grounds in canal-lined landscapes evoked the scene depicted in one of Van Gogh's favourite Dutch paintings, Ruysdael's *View of Haarlem*, and also recalled the view of the bleaching fields behind the Van Gogh family's parish house in Zundert. Further, the laundresses' floating wooden platforms, with their visible interlocking slats and bracing posts sunk into the canal bed, resembled the fleet of Dutch wickerwork rafts known as *zinkstukken* which were a common feature along the canals of southern Holland and were used as staging platforms for bracing the ever-permeable sea walls.  

To be sure, although encouraged to ‘keep thinking of Holland,’ Van Gogh also acknowledged the powerful contrasts between Arles and the Dutch countryside. The ‘bright, clear colours’ and radiant light of the south offered a very different spectacle than what he called the effects of colours ‘veiled in the mist of the north.’ The unfolding of expansive, level plains to a distant convergence at a remote horizon, for example, allowed him to see clearly the colour and definition of things ‘far, far in the distance,’ rather than merely the ‘vague,’ indefinite ‘grey line on the horizon’ so typical of Holland. Van Gogh defined this precision and saturation of colours created by the strong southern sun as the ‘equivalent’ of the brilliant sunlit colourism of the Japanese, claiming as he settled in to live in Arles that he was now ‘in Japan’ [681/W7]: ‘Here I am in Japan,’ he wrote to Theo; I am beginning to see things with an eye more Japanese,’ to ‘feel colour differently’ [802/605].

**Van Gogh's tool kit: the perspective frame**

Van Gogh's readiness to see Arles through a Japanese eye was tempered, however, by his Dutch ways of seeing and his enduring preoccupation with art, craft and work. Soon after arriving in Arles he resumed regular use of a tool he had first constructed in The Hague in 1882: his perspective frame. This oblong wooden frame, strung with lengths of thread into the pattern of a Union Jack, could be attached to adjustable

---


13 See also letters 612/488; 664/522; 687/539; 690/542; 590/B2; 633/W4; 623/500; 631/501; and 712/555.
notches on two wooden poles and staked into the ground for outdoor sightings. Looking through it like a window, the artist trains himself to compare the proportion of objects nearby with those on a more distant plane, while the intersection of the threads presses the eye to its point of convergence at the vanishing point (figs. 1a-b). Adapted from his study of 19th-century popular art manuals, Van Gogh's frame was a formative resource throughout his Dutch period. It allowed him both to organise blocks of flat, reliefless terrain while also accustoming his eye to shoot down a corridor of space into the distance, an effect he compared to a telescope riveting the eye to a single point of focus or to an arrow speeding towards its target. His reliance on the frame yielded particular stylistic consequences, such as the creation of a distinctive format we may call the ‘framed landscape,’ where the viewer's eye is led into the distance by emphatically bounded wooden posts. In the 1882 drawing *Florist's garden on the Schenkweg*, for example, the frame prompted the artist to structure an accelerated rush of space, juxtaposing near and far along a linear alley (fig. 2). By placing the two flanking trees as a passageway to guide our eye into the distance, Van Gogh replicated the bracketed
Recent research at the Van Gogh Museum suggests that Van Gogh continued to rely on the perspective frame while working in Paris. In Arles as well the device resurfaces as an instrument of composition and an ideal implement for artists and craftsmen. Within days of arriving, Van Gogh wrote to Theo that the modern adaptation of the perspective frame could unite artists in the same way early oil painting had allied Flemish artists like Jan and Hubert van Eyck with their Italian counterparts. He also saw the frame as an opportunity for popular painting practice, a tool of an art considered as a patient, methodical métier rather than a state of exalted, unregulated genius. Van Gogh soon began to give art lessons to his new friend, the Zouave soldier Lieutenant Milliet, training him to measure distance, proportion and to find the vanishing point by looking through the perspective frame staked in the open fields of La Crau [586/468].

Van Gogh himself set to work in the Arles countryside by venturing out with his frame. As he explored the areas beyond the town walls, he was captivated by a scene with powerful Dutch overtones: pollard willows and lanes unfolding into the distance in a linear stretch of space. Roads slicing back into the distance and bounded by pollards had been a favoured subject in the drawings produced in The Hague and at Nuenen in 1882 and 1884; in 1888 Van Gogh often returned to this motif and the format of trees bending away from a strip of road as a dramatic directional marker. The perspective frame underlies the correspondences between such a pair of drawings. In the March 1888 composition *Landscape with farm and two trees* (fig. 3), Van Gogh recreated the pictorial structure facilitated by his device, the framed landscape. The trees bordering each side of the drawing form a passageway of optical movement into the distance, leading to the farmhouse at the horizon; the small rectangular window visible at the back directs the viewer's eye to the point of convergence.

---


15 On the use of the perspective frame in the Paris period see, most recently, Claas Hulshoff and Sjraar van Heugten, ‘Restoring a forest scene by Vincent van Gogh,’ *Van Gogh Bulletin* 1 (1994), pp. 8-10.
as well as to the site where Van Gogh's own eye inevitably alighted as it traversed the intersecting diagonal threads of his frame. We find a very similar compositional structure in the earlier Florist's garden on the Schenkweg (fig. 2), where the flanking trees act as anchoring stations that press the eye rapidly into the distance, where it comes to rest at the small window of a building similarly disposed on the horizon plane.

The drawbridge series

Van Gogh used his perspective frame to tackle another motif with more overt Dutch affinities. During his first month in Arles Van Gogh discovered a subject he regarded as ‘exactly like Holland in character’ and even considered its potential appeal for a Dutch audience: the wooden drawbridge on the Arles-Bouc canal, the Pont de Régine - called the Pont de Langlois after its bridge-keeper. The long alley of the canal with locks and bridge evoked for him a familiar combination of waterways punctuated by drawbridges such as those scattered through the Dutch town and country, where pedestrian and river traffic passed over and under the many bridge frames as they opened and closed in kinetic linkage. And the Arles Langlois bridge was itself originally constructed by a Dutch engineer.

We are all familiar with Van Gogh's Langlois painting and it is often celebrated as both a quaint tribute to Holland and a bright allusion to Japan (fig. 4). Yet Van Gogh attached more complex and significant meanings to this subject and its setting, meanings left unexplained by these assumptions. First, he produced not one but a total of
fig. 4
Vincent van Gogh, *The Langlois bridge* (F 397 JH 1368), 1888, Otterlo, Kröller-Müller Museum

fig. 5
Detail of Vincent van Gogh, *The Langlois bridge* (F 400 JH 1371), 1888, Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum (Vincent van Gogh Foundation)
nine images of this same bridge over a six week period, depicting it from different vantage points and in a full range of media. Each one registers his absorbing interest in the structure, function and component parts of this craft mechanism in the landscape. Taken together, these images can be considered a series project exploring the construction and operation of the bridge. All the representations - even in the fluid medium of watercolour - include very clear and discernable elements of the bridge's working parts, such as hardwood uprights, cams and chain pulleys, iron supports, strapping braces and moveable diagonal frames. Paintings of bridges by the artist's contemporaries - from the wispy, indefinite shapes of his Dutch colleagues Weissenbruch and Wijsmuller to the vaporous translucence of Monet's Dutch bridges of 1874 - are very different from Van Gogh's precise and legible renderings of the drawbridge's form and function. Further, by screening his subject through the pattern of threads on his perspective frame Van Gogh visualised some of the correspondences between the mechanisms of his craft tool and the operation of the bridge frames in the landscape. This is conveyed in the way he insists upon the bridge frames' pattern of diagonal X's, which echo the patterns of his own framing device. He also uses the shape of the bridge to gauge distance, as a substitute perspective frame, as seen here in the detail of the Van Gogh Museum's canvas, where he projects a church spire through the suspended chains (fig. 5). This kind of sighting through a frame recalls one of the lessons in perspective Van Gogh had encountered in Armand Cassagne's training manual, where the artist is directed to practise fixing a distant tower through a framing device (fig. 6). The drawbridge gauging the tower recreates these framing exercises in a new site and form. The Arles bridge pictures, considered anew as a series and as a meditation on craft mechanism and mastery, can be compared to Van Gogh's earlier studies of another kind of craft frame and mechanism of interlock: the threaded looms of the Dutch weavers, painted in 1884 and 1885. In that series the artist made similar adjustments and alterations to highlight the equivalencies between the operation of his staked and threaded perspective frame and the frame and threads on the looms as manoeuvred by the weavers - the métier of art and the canut à son métier.

16 They are F 397 JH 1368; F 400 JH 1371; F 570 JH 1421; and F 571 JH 1421 (oils); F 1480 JH 1382 (watercolour); F 1470 JH 1377; F 1471 JH 1420; and F 1416(v) JH 1415 (drawings); and B2 JH 1370 (ink sketch in letter).
Montmajour drawings

To be sure, Van Gogh did not rely exclusively on his perspective frame in Arles. He also engaged in exuberant experiments in drawing and colour, signs of his increasing technical competence. Yet his departure from the perspective frame did not preclude the need for a screen. In excursions to the pilgrimage sites of Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer and Montmajour the visual fix supplied by the physical mechanism of the frame was replaced by the operation of other types of mental filters, which acted consistently in favour of the inclusion of certain elements and the exclusion of others.

In May and July of 1888 Van Gogh made a series of drawings of the vista from Montmajour, resulting in some interesting and important panoramic landscapes.
Montmajour is the site of a ruined medieval abbey, situated at the summit of a rocky hill that overlooks what had once been flooded, muddy marshland and had become, through centuries of reclamation, the partially fertile fields of La Crau. With original buildings dating from the 12th and 14th centuries, Montmajour swarmed with Christian pilgrims during the annual Pardon of St Pierre and St-Croix; the *Historical atlas of Provence*, for example, highlights these pilgrimages as being of ‘particular renown’ in the region.18

The Montmajour abbey flourished under the Benedictine order from 1639 but was suppressed in 1786 by Louis XVI because of the involvement of its abbot, the Cardinal de Rohan, in the diamond necklace affair; in 1791 the grounds and buildings were declared national property, broken up and sold off. Left to decay for a century and a half, the cloisters, crypt and tower began to be restored by the Arles municipal authority in 1862 and this continued apace through 1889.19

By the time of Van Gogh's visits the site was both an integral part of the tourist itinerary and a key monument for regional identity. Guidebooks published between 1887 and 1905 highlight the historical and architectural interest of a trip there, ‘a mere 12 minutes away by train’ from the Arles rail station. Tourists were advised, for example, to attend to the fact that ‘both the monastery church and the huge crypt beneath it are in the form of a Latin cross’; to climb and study the carved parapets of the 14th-century donjon-tower; to notice the ‘large gargoyles and corbels’ visible on the original lean-to roof; and to admire the intricately carved capitals of the cloister, which include a dramatic rendering of St Martha miraculously rescuing a child from the local monster, the Tarasque.20

At the same time as it was claimed as a stop along the tourist route, Montmajour was reclaimed by local religious and political interests. Debates over the relocation of relics from its lower church crypt continued to rage into the 19th century, with the relics of St Anthony finally being deposited in the nearby parish church of St Julian. After 1860 Montmajour also emerged as a sacred site of Provençal regionalism. As part of his massive project to recover the autonomy and distinctiveness of Provence's language, religion and historical culture, Frédéric Mistral and his colleagues - known as the Félières - glorified Montmajour as the royal necropolis of a non-Bourbon lineage. Along with ancient Christian relics, the abbey also housed the tombs of some of the counts of Provence, who for Mistral and his allies formed the core of a suppressed pre-modern dynasty of the south that needed to be commemorated anew. ‘At Montmajour,’ wrote Mistral, ‘our Arlesian kings sleep beneath the cloister slabs.’ To solidify the link between the region's pre-history and

18 Montmajour was surrounded by so much water that it was called the ‘Island of Montmajour’ throughout the medieval period; as late as the 17th century pilgrims came and went by means of rafts. See Cook, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 26-34; S. Baring-Gould, op. cit. (note 7), pp. 109-110; and Amy Oakley, *The heart of Provence*, New York 1936, p. 223. The Atlas entry and map of important Provençal pilgrimages is reproduced in Jean-Paul Clébert, *Les fêtes de Provence*, Avignon 1982, pp. 161-62. Cook (op. cit. [note 4], p. 30) notes a figure of 150,000 devotees attending the 1409 Pardon festival, which is also mentioned in Oakley (p. 229).

19 On the restorations see Venture, op. cit. (note 7), pp. 10-16; for historical developments, see also Oakley, op. cit. (note 18), pp. 223-24; and Cook, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 26-34.

its contemporary renaissance, Mistral planned to hold the 1889 congress of the Félibres movement - the congress of St-Estelle - in the halls of the Montmajour abbey.\textsuperscript{21}

The particularities of local religious and regional culture eluded Van Gogh in his encounter with Montmajour. Unlike the tourist, he walked the hour's journey from Arles rather than taking the train, and he chose the site as a place of study, surveying and drawing, noting in his letters that he visited the place no less than ‘fifty times’ during the spring and early summer of 1888 [643/509].\textsuperscript{22} The artist showed no interest in those elements that enticed the tourist, the pilgrim or the regional revivalist. Neither the historical layers of medieval architecture nor the crypts housing the remains of secular and sacred figures drew his attention. Instead, he was riveted by the varying views of the flat landscape below.

In May and July Van Gogh produced two sets of drawings at Montmajour. He explicitly related these series to Dutch precedents and to the potential Dutch market, interspersed with what he considered the tracings of Japan and the modern landscape. The first group of seven drawings includes four panoramas looking out from the hill

\textsuperscript{21} Venture, op. cit (note 7), pp. 14, see also p. 11. Ancestor worship, mingling Troubadour culture and Christian folk culture, were central to Mistral's project. On the counts of Provence and the tombs see Bérenger-Féraud, op. cit. (note 6), p. 234; Oakley, op. cit. (note 18), p. 229; Cook, op. cit. (note 4), p. 33; and Goby, op. cit (note 4), pp. 147-56.

\textsuperscript{22} See also Van Uitert and Hoyle, op. cit. (note 20), p. 226.
from various vantage points, yielding together a virtual circling of the promontory and the views below. Van Gogh produced a second set of five drawings of the site in July 1888. Two of these (figs. 7 and 8) were panoramic scenes of La Crau, which he considered ‘the best things I have done in pen and ink.’ Unlike the May series, which were executed rapidly, these July images were ‘finished “presentation drawings,”’ ‘substitute paintings,’ ‘exhaustively explored and carefully controlled’ [643/509]. Laid out on exactly matching large sheets, when placed side by side the two pendant panoramas appear to compose a single, extensive, interlocking vista of the plains below.

La Crau seen from Montmajour (fig. 7) unfolds in regular horizontal bands in a grid-like pattern towards a gentle slope at the back, marking the partial presence of the Mont des Cordes. In typical fashion, Van Gogh coaxes the viewer's eye into the picture plane by using a directional device in the mid-foreground: three rows of trees arranged as a linear runner. He renders the main area of fertile acreage in the checkerboard blocks of the middle ground. Upright pen strokes define and frame each slice of field, while the inner swaths appear raised and nubby, with a build-up of intermeshed strokes of black and brown ink that yield a ‘heightened textural effect.’

The companion piece, Landscape of Montmajour with train (fig. 8), relies on a similar variety of graphic denotations in order to capture the expansive view over the fields and landscape, this time looking northwest towards the Rhône and the Alpilles mountains. This drawing includes clearer signs of human activity and its representatives than La Crau. A horse-drawn cart and rider move across to the left; two small but clearly discernable figures walk towards the viewer; a train puffs through the middle ground to the right, while behind it we find a plough and ploughman. Deft and discernable notations identify all these elements. If we look closely, for example, we can see how a witty small stroke and dash of ink are used to define a tiny pipe in the mouth of the walking man on the right; another on the back of the left-hand figure suggests a rectangular back-pack. Both are signs of an artist's équipe, and the pair may be hiking to their day's work at Montmajour, as Van Gogh himself so often did [506/642].

Van Gogh compared the flat huge plains of La Crau to those of ‘the old Holland of Ruysdael's time,’ a vista ‘like a map’ and ‘as beautiful and infinite as the sea.’ His inclusive view and splayed, rectangular fields have been likened to similar elements in Ruysdael's View of Haarlem, although the former lacks the ‘masses of clouds’ that dominate Ruysdael's depiction of the northern skies. The La Crau panorama also evokes the model of another 17th-century painter Van Gogh often recalled in Arles, Philips de Konink, whose works - such as his 1655 Distant view in Gelderland - are the perfect illustration of what art historian Svetlana Alpers has called the peculiarly Dutch practice of the ‘mapped landscape,’ where a ‘vast continuum of

---

24 Pickvance, op. cit. (note 1), p. 117.
land’ gives way to a ‘seemingly endless’ stretch of plains expanding simultaneously both laterally and into depth.26

Two types of selective vision are thus at work in Van Gogh's Montmajour series. The first group of drawings, circling the hill, reveals his pattern of inattention to the complex of sacred buildings that provided the major attraction for other visitors to the site. He produced his series either with his back to the abbey complex or included it only as an incidental geometric shape in the landscape, divested of its signifying Catholic symbols and carvings. The July drawings suggest a second type of transformation. An unavoidable and imposing element of the terrain Van Gogh would have observed from Montmajour was the Alpilles mountain range, which lines Provence between Avignon and Arles with jagged crests reaching some 400 metres. Van Gogh did not screen out the mountains altogether but he tends to diminish their size, scale and prominence as defining features of the landscape. In celebrating the two large panoramas as his ‘best in pen and ink,’ for example, he selected those vistas that minimise the mountainous topography most sharply. *The landscape of Montmajour with train* (fig.

---

fig. 7
Vincent van Gogh, *La Crau seen from Montmajour* (F 1420 JH 1501), 1888, Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum (Vincent van Gogh Foundation)

fig. 8
Vincent van Gogh, *Landscape of Montmajour with train* (F 1424 JH 1502), 1888, London, British Museum
8) slips in a hint of the Alpilles, cut off at the very back right corner of the composition, where they receive a lightly hatched pen treatment that allows them to emerge as a delicate pair of two low-lying triangles, less like mountain peaks than gentle mounds in the far distance. Van Gogh closes off the scene at the right, just at the point where the Alpilles begins to unfold in its chain, forming a success of massive limestone promontories markedly circling the area. In the mapped companion drawing, *La Crau seen from Montmajour* (fig. 7), Van Gogh concentrates on the view that conforms most closely to a Dutch panorama; while the slope of the Mont des Cordes is partly discernable at the left, the visual cues and traces of an Arlesian geography defined and ringed by mountain summits are conspicuously absent. These strategies of exclusion and minimisation were confirmed when Van Gogh wrote to his sister Wil some weeks after completing these drawings that he wanted to travel further in southern France, to where the country was ‘not so flat - seeing that, in point of fact, I never saw a mountain in my life’ [671/W6]. The vista from Montmajour does offer mountains, but Van Gogh's powerful filters rendered them inapprehensible. And when he does include them, the rugged Alpilles crags appear as diminutive arcs similar to the dunes marking distant Dutch horizons.

**Paul Gauguin's visionary Brittany, 1888**

When regionalist leader Frédéric Mistral surveyed the spectacle of Montmajour he saw an exalted space, distinctive to his native Provence, a space of ‘biblical hills,’ suffused with an ‘aroma and aridity that intoxicated hermits and created mirages.’ Van Gogh observed this same scene and discovered a panoramic landscape ‘like a map,’ evoking not a vision of solitary biblical hermits but a tableau of cultivated terrain, peopled by human figures and their vehicles and similar to a Dutch vista by Ruysdael or Konink. At the same time, his friend and colleague Paul Gauguin, closer in many ways to Mistral's visionary cast of mind, was setting to work in the Breton village of Pont-Aven amidst a profusion of peasant devotional ritual and pilgrimage processions and responding avidly to precisely those occasions that Van Gogh scrupulously avoided in

![fig. 9](image)

Paul Gauguin, *The vision after the sermon: Jacob wrestling with the angel*, 1888, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland
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Provence. In this Breton environment Gauguin created what he considered a major breakthrough for modern painting, a work he once contemplated calling The apparition but eventually titled Vision after the sermon, Jacob wrestling with the angel (fig. 9). Upon its completion Gauguin hoped to donate the painting to the local church, where he thought it would fit well with the ‘bare stone and stained glass.’

Gauguin linked both the form and content of The vision to his credo that art was an abstraction, a glimpse of an ethereal dream-like state, liberated from the shackles of tawdry earthbound matter in a flight to metaphysical mystery. He expressed this credo by choosing to paint a visionary state, a state whose contours he had encountered during his little-studied formation in a French Catholic seminary, and enriched through his associations with neo-Platonist and idealist colleagues in the Parisian avant-garde. In the painting, Gauguin explores shifting levels of reality by dividing the canvas into what art historians have always called the physical and psychic halves of the picture, but also by a number of lesser-known technical strategies that dematerialise the physical surface of the

canvas: he employs a thinned and light oil paint; devises a smooth, single field of non-natural background colour, with minimal surface texture and unbroken brush marks; and he exposes the ground of the canvas through a chalky, matte whiteness in the foreground which resembles the effects of a fresco.\textsuperscript{29} In his later work, Gauguin would continue to develop technical procedures to diminish the physicality of his canvases, formalising his persistent effort to attenuate materiality and to weaken its hold on consciousness. His art, paradoxically, aimed to release the contours of an ideal, non-corporeal realm through the use of pigment and primer on canvas.

By contrast, from his earliest days Van Gogh had absorbed powerful cultural barriers to idealism from his Dutch Reformed Calvinist theology and education, which would later underlie some of the profound and irreconcilable tensions in his relationship with Gauguin. These discordant cultural codes also help us understand why Van Gogh could never follow his friend in his quest for what he called the ‘phantom ship of the dream,’ an art liberated from the model, from the embeddedness of earthbound matter and from the physical density of the image. Instead, Van Gogh pursued an art of maximal texture and materiality, working the image of work into the canvas, a process he likened to weaving and ploughing. If Gauguin aspired to the immateriality of the fresco, Van Gogh aimed to create a formal equivalent to the productive craft labour of a woven kitchen towel or a piece of coloured earthenware. For him, painting was a process of ‘agir-créer,’ action painting of labor figures in action. This type of image-making as enacted faith was far removed from Gauguin's ideal of the sacred world evoked through the opaque, planar forms of fresco painting. Gauguin exhorted Van Gogh to smooth over and thin out what he contemptuously called his friend's vigorous ‘tripotages’ of paint - those messy accidents, the thickly loaded and broken surface crusted with pigment and visible brush marks. These, to Gauguin, a lapsed but tormented Catholic, were traces of what he saw as ‘sullied,’ perfidious nature, a weighted muck and mire that impeded the artist's release from deficient material reality into the ineffable netherworld of the divine.\textsuperscript{30}

Gauguin's foray into religious subjects and an art of abstraction, combined with similar impulses on the part of Emile Bernard, would position Van Gogh on the
horns of a dual dilemma. Not only was he surrounded in Arles by what he considered the archaic practices of a miraculous Christianity, but his closest colleagues in the avant-garde were also turning to a particular form of religious art. This twofold challenge necessitated other responses than the posture of negation so characteristic of his first months in the south. During and after the period of his difficult collaboration with Gauguin, Van Gogh would consolidate a new position, formed in stated and unstated dialogue with the dynamic supernaturalism he encountered in social and avant-garde practice. Moving from negation to naturalisation, he would come to locate in a certain kind of depiction of the human figure a powerful humanist alternative system of meaning which we might call a Protestant counter-imagery. This constituted an art of sacred realism, shorn of miraculous interventions and visionary ruminations but nonetheless vested with spiritual force and the functions traditionally associated with religious art.
During the months when Gauguin painted his Breton Vision, Van Gogh produced his Sower, rendering what he referred to as ‘the longing for the infinite’ [630/B7] in a peasant figure in action, seeking in the roughness, density, palpability and fibrous texture of the canvas the pictorial equivalents of the clods of earth and physical exertion depicted. In contrast to Gauguin's tactics of dematerialisation, evocative of the fragile indeterminacy of the ideal, Van Gogh proceeded by forms of re-materialisation, naturalising divinity in the service of ‘rendering the infinite tangible’ [651/B12].

‘La berceuse’ and sacred realism

Van Gogh's developing project for a secular devotional imagery, what can be called his emerging ‘sacred realism,’ nourished by long-term legacies and sparked by the short-term challenges of avant-garde and populist French Catholicism, culminated in his series of portraits of Madame Augustine Roulin as a cradle rocker, La berceuse (fig. 10). In letters to Theo and Bernard, he described these paintings as agents of rest, comfort and consolation, qualities associated with traditional religious art, particularly for sailors, who - Van Gogh suggested - could conjure such a reassuring image of a mother rocking a cradle as they pitched and swayed on the waves [747/574]. In his series, Van Gogh evoked and transposed scenes from Pierre Loti's novel Le pêcheur d'Islande, in which sailors engaged in the talismanic practice of summoning supernatural assistance from a figurine of the Madonna on board their ship. Van Gogh assigned the source of their solace and fortitude to the visual memory and image of a real mother singing to her baby.

Van Gogh deepened the sacred realism of these portraits by characterising La berceuse as a modern equivalent of early Christian saints and holy women, ‘saints et saintes femmes’ [802/605]. He devised the work as the possible central panel of a triptych (fig. 11), flanked by glowing beacons of sunflowers, which he described

31 On this painting see also ibid., chapter 2.
32 See also 757/582.
as symbols of gratitude and claimed conveyed similar effects to those of stained glass windows [778/592]. According to Bernard, Van Gogh

34 See also Silverman, op. cit. (note 14), pp. 330-33. While Van Gogh's reference to stained glass is usually attributed to the influence of Gauguin's *cloisonisme*, an independent and earlier source exists for referring to these qualities in *La berceuse*: the Maris Stella window in the Andrieskerk in Antwerp, which Van Gogh admired and wrote about in 1886. In a similar way, paintings by Van Eyck and Memling of Flemish Madonnas enthroned and surrounded by floral brocade canopies may have inspired him as well. Neither of these two precedents of religious art have previously been discussed in relation to *La berceuse*. See also Silverman, op. cit. (note 14) pp. 331-69.
proposed setting the triptych in a tavern at Saintes-Marie-de-la-Mer or Marseilles, where sailors coming and going from rough seas could be inspired and heartened by the work's crude and radiant colours, interlinked forms and familiar and humble subject.\footnote{35}  

In giving a triptych form and consolatory function to his painting Van Gogh was not simply substituting one kind of religious imagery for another. New evidence from local sources suggests that La berceuse represents a dynamic and creative adaptation of particular elements of Catholic popular piety uniquely available to Van Gogh during his time in Provence, elements that helped shape the form, meaning and function of the paintings.

First, Van Gogh began working on La berceuse during the Christmas weeks of 1888, a period of particularly vibrant popular Nativity culture in Arles. The local market was lined with stalls selling ceramic figurines called santons, which feature a variety of male and female types - from the cheese seller and spinner to the broom seller and knife grinder - to be placed in family crèches alongside the Holy Family in the stable manger. These Provençal santons came to life in annual theatrical versions of the Nativity known as pastorales, which combined farcical comedy with anachronistic miraculous witnessing as local characters such as peasants, artisans, municipal officials and gypsies were shown making their way to welcome the baby Saviour. Although he did not fully understand theOccitan dialect, Van Gogh went to the Folies Arlésiennes in early January of 1889 to see such a play, the Riboun Pastorale, a Nativity 'comic-opera in 5 acts.'\footnote{36} The combination of music, pantomime, special effects and spectacle made the story generally comprehensible. Van Gogh was deeply affected by the music, writing to Theo of the stirring singing of the ‘amazing’ ‘old peasant woman’ at the cradle of the newborn Jesus in the last scene of the play [747/574].\footnote{37}  

The letter in which Van Gogh describes this pastorale and his reactions is also the one in which he describes the third version of La berceuse, expressing his idea that the canvas might convey solace for sailors in their isolation, elicit a 'sense of being rocked' and recall 'childhood lullabies.' The Arles pastorale offered at this critical moment in the evolution of La berceuse a theatrical version of a modern sacred Nativity, culminating in a scene of collective redemption at the baby's cradle. The musical climax of the play and the wondrous voice of the woman singing to the baby may also have triggered his associations of the musicality of La berceuse as an agent of consolational form.

Van Gogh's combined allusion of La berceuse to sailors, early Christian saints and holy women and the setting of Saintes-Marie-de-la-Mer or Marseilles also has a distinctive and historically-specific meaning and resonance. Both of these coastal towns were centres of dynamic 19th-century matriarchal Christian cults linked to

\footnote{35} See Emile Bernard, Les hommes d'aujourd'hui 8 (1891), no. 390, n.p.  
\footnote{36} The play, with sketches of the characters and musical scores and lyrics, was later published in E. and A. Perret, Riboun Pastorale, opéra-coumique en 5 Ate, Aix-en-Provence 1925. It is dedicated to Frédéric Mistral and inscribed by the brothers with place and date: Eyguieres, 1888. I am indebted to Elizabeth Covington and Aaron Segal for helping me track down the play, which we could not find in the archives or libraries of Arles; it was finally discovered in the collection of the New York Public Library.  
the lives and fates of sailors at sea. The pilgrimage town of Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer - also known as Notre Dames de la Barque or ‘Our Ladies of the Boat’ - celebrated the miraculous landing of the two Marys and St Sarah at the dawn of Christianity. The statuettes and model boat of the female saints were elaborately decorated and launched in the massive annual ceremony completed just five days before Van Gogh arrived to work there at the end of May 1888, having hired a coach service specially run for the duration of the pilgrimage.38 The visual culture of the town of Saintes-Maries - including prints, postcards, paintings and figurative arts - was dominated by the presence and miraculous agency of the female saints in their celestial ship. The churches at both Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer and Marseilles contained some of the largest collections of ex-voto paintings in Provence, a genre of popular religious art that offered thanks to a saint or the Virgin for acts of deliverance from earthly misfortune or accidents. A special type of nav-

igational ex-voto commemorating the rescue of sailors from shipwrecks or storms at sea proliferated at Saintes-Maries and Marseilles, often depicting the intervention of heavenly protectors from the skies above in keeping vessels from destruction in the seas below (fig. 12). 39

Van Gogh's *La berceuse* triptych also joined a symbol of gratitude to a sanctified maternal figure who offered solace to sailors. This was gratitude not for already accomplished and presumed supernatural acts involving the miraculous reversal of the order of nature, but gratitude for comfort and consolation that was provided by human agents on earth in companionship and hope, divested of expectations of direct celestial intrusion. But the presence and power of local Provençal materials suggests that Van Gogh pressed particular elements of Catholic popular piety, theatre and images into the service of his Protestant, modernist religious realism, affirming a new art as materialist embodiment, an object of exchange and communication, and an emanation of divinity in and through nature and the redemptive interdependence of corporate community.

Van Gogh's Arles work extends the technical practices and theological framework of his Dutch formation, yielding an art that screened the bright colours and Catholic culture of Provence through the filters of craft labour and Protestant humanism. As we welcome the exhibition 'Van Gogh and Gauguin: the studio of the south,' visitors are urged to discover the signs of mechanism, weaving and secular devotion that set the Dutch minister's son apart from his Parisian symbolist colleague. Weaver and dreamer linked modern painting to different forms of divinity.

fig. 12
Detail of a navigational ex-voto, Antibes, Notre-Dame de Bon-Port

---

fig. 1
Vincent van Gogh, *La berceuse* (F 508 JH 1671), 1888/89, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, bequest of John T. Spaulding
Tracing a transformation: Madame Roulin into La berceuse
Kristin Hoermann Lister

During his ten-year career as an artist, Vincent van Gogh regularly used a variety of traditional methods to facilitate the transfer of motifs and images from one medium to another or between the same mediums. Initially, he copied prints with the help of a grid laid over the original (squaring). Later, he would use the same means when making his painted enlarged copies of Japanese prints, and in St-Rémy he turned to it once again when creating his ‘colour translations’ of prints after Rembrandt, Delacroix and Millet.

Over a number of years the perspective frame also played an important role. He first used this tool in early 1882 and continued to employ it in Arles, and probably even afterwards. What the drawn grid does for a print, the perspective frame achieves for three-dimensional reality: its lines allow the artist to transfer what he sees to a piece of paper or canvas onto which similar lines have been drawn.

Both procedures had a long-standing tradition. When in 1998, during the preparation for the exhibition Van Gogh and Gauguin: the studio of the south, a study of the techniques and methods used in the paintings both artists created during their nine-week collaboration in Arles was undertaken, a related studio practice came to light.

After examining the majority of paintings from this period, comparing their x-rays, and superimposing our own tracings, Cornelia Peres and I were faced with two explanations for the correspondence of multiple versions, including the five ‘Berceuses.’ Either Van Gogh possessed a virtually unimaginable ability to transpose compositions freehand from one canvas to another with such accuracy that the contours of the principle forms align almost exactly, or he used tracings. We support the latter conclusion, first presented to the public by Roland Dorn in 2000, when he illustrated the congruity between the contours of Madame Roulin in the two portraits of her and in La berceuse, placing this transfer process in the context of Van Gogh's

+ The author is indebted to Cornelia Peres with whom the examinations and initial tracings were undertaken, to Douglas W. Druick, Peter Kort Zegers, Sjraar van Heugten and Britt Salvesen for their contributions to this essay, and to Bonnie Rimer for producing the scaled computer overlays.

1 In the two tracings that still exist, Van Gogh traced images of Japanese prints onto translucent paper and squared them for enlargement and transfer to larger canvases: Japonaiserie: bridge in the rain (after Hiroshige) (F 371 JH 1297) and Japonaiserie: Oiran (after Kesaï Yeisen) (F 373 JH 1298).

2 The curators spearheading the research project were Douglas W. Druick and Peter Kort Zegers at The Art Institute. The conservators who examined the paintings and collected the data were Cornelia Peres, former head of conservation at the Van Gogh Museum and myself. Mary Weaver provided research assistance and Inge Fiedler coordinated sample analysis. Colleagues from the Van Gogh Museum, Ella Hendriks, Louis van Tilborgh, Sjraar van Heugten and Leo Jansen provided valuable input during the project. The research involved unprecedented cooperation from institutions around the world, which allowed us to examine the paintings under the microscope in their conservation studios, provided x-rays that enabled comparison between works in different collections, and in most cases provided canvas fibre and ground samples for analysis. See Kristin Hoermann Lister, Cornelia Peres and Inge Fiedler, ‘Appendix. Tracing an interaction: supporting evidence, experimental grounds,’ in Douglas W. Druick and Peter Kort Zegers, exhib. cat. Van Gogh and Gauguin: the studio of the south, Chicago (The Art Institute) & Amsterdam (Van Gogh Museum) 2001-02, pp. 354-69, for further results of this research.
craftsmanship and working strategies. The use of tracing not only produced the overall close correspondence, but also explains two otherwise unaccountable facts: that the Van Gogh Museum's *Sunflowers* of January 1889 (F 458 JH 1667) aligns with the August 1888 version (F 454 JH 1562), but the contours correspond section by section, which could only occur if tracing had been used and the paper had shifted once or twice as the artist trans-

---


4 See the article by Louis van Tilborgh and Ella Hendriks in this volume of the *Van Gogh Museum Journal*. 
ferred it; and that The Art Institute's *Berceuse*, the second in the series, corresponds exactly to the underdrawing rather than the final painted contours of its predecessor in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, which can only be explained by a tracing previously made from the initial sketch.

In the case of the *Sunflowers*, not only the later January versions but also the work on jute (F 457 JH 1666), determined by our study to have been painted in December 1888, were begun with tracings taken from the original August paintings. In developing the initial composition for *La berceuse* (F 508 JH 1671, fig 1), also in December, Van Gogh traced part of an earlier painting and later employed tracing to repeat the composition. Both motifs, it should be noted, were also associated with Gauguin. The discovery of Van Gogh's use of tracing in *La berceuse* is particularly interesting because portraiture was central to his practice and mission. A picture constructed using various pre-existing elements rather than painted from life, *La berceuse* marks a greater departure from basic principles on Van Gogh's part - and a greater responsiveness to Gauguin's ideas - than had previously been imagined. Van Gogh acknowledged this later in a letter to Emile Bernard in which he made a statement about *La berceuse* that is perplexing if we assume he based the work solely on studies from life - as was more typical for his portraits - but makes perfect sense in the context of the procedure outlined in this essay: ‘When Gauguin was in Arles, I once or twice allowed myself to be led astray into abstraction, as you know, for instance in the *Berceuse*. [...] At the time, I considered abstraction an attractive method. But that was delusion, dear friend, and one soon comes up against a brick wall’ [824/B21].

**Tracing**

A tracing is made by placing a thin, translucent paper (called *papier calqué* or *papier végétal* in French) over a source image and following the contour lines with a pencil, crayon, etc.\(^5\) The traced image can then be transferred by several methods. The simplest is to apply a friable medium such as chalk or charcoal to the reverse of the paper, place this chalked side against the new surface, and retrace the lines with a pointed tool or pencil, thereby transferring lines of chalk from the reverse to the fresh surface.\(^6\) Another method is to chalk a thin sheet of paper and slip it between the tracing and the new surface. By this ‘carbon copy’ method, the back of the original need not be covered with chalk. These methods of transfer would of course transfer the image in the same size (one-to-one).\(^7\)

---

\(^5\) If the original was drawn in soft chalk or charcoal it is also possible to lay a paper over it, rub the entire surface, and pick up enough of the original material in a counter image that can then be transferred (perhaps after reinforcing) onto another surface. My thanks to René Boitelle of the Van Gogh Museum for providing this information.


\(^7\) Pierre Louise Bouvier published a comprehensive artist's manual in 1827, *Manuel des jeunes artistes et amateurs en peinture*, which describes these two methods of transfer in the 18th lesson, ‘how one traces a drawing made on paper that is to be reproduced on a canvas.’ My thanks to René Boitelle for providing this information and translating it from the Dutch edition, *Handboek voor jonge beoefenaars en liefhebbers der Schilderkunst*, Breda 1831.
Our technical examinations of Van Gogh's works painted during the period from late 1888 to early 1889 revealed that he almost invariably began by making a light charcoal contour sketch on the primed canvas, outlining areas of the composition and (in the case of portraits) the features of a sitter in a most summary manner. Occasionally he would then reinforce the charcoal lines with a painted sketch, sometimes also laying in thin, flat underlayers of colour; but more frequently he proceeded directly from the charcoal underdrawing to applying his thick, gestural, interwoven brushstrokes. He generally worked within the areas delineated by the contour sketch, making only slight deviations and adjustments; during the final steps of painting he often covered the join between adjacent areas of colour with a heavy contour line. The charcoal contours transferred from the back of a tracing would have functioned in an identical manner to contours sketched freehand. Snatches of these charcoal underdrawings, where they have not been covered by paint layers, can be seen on Van Gogh's paintings with the aid of a microscope, but these areas are so small that no distinction can be made between freehand and transferred lines.

The evidence for this new discovery regarding Van Gogh's tracing practice is mainly circumstantial. Only two pp. 229-32. ‘Pouncing’ is another transfer method, whereby small holes are pricked along the lines of the drawing or tracing and loose pigment passed through to the new surface. Gauguin sometimes used this method; see Vojtěch Jirat-Wasiutyński and H. Travers Newton Jr, Technique and meaning in the paintings of Paul Gauguin, Cambridge 2000, pp. 70-71, 76, 81, 87-88, 121-22, 227 (note 39), and 239 (note 14).

8 For example, the yellow-on-blue Twelve sunflowers in a vase (F 456 JH 1561), painted in August 1888, shows evidence of a green painted sketch and of flowers first laid in with flat yellow.

9 A sample of the underdrawing material from The Art Institute's Berceuse (F 506 JH 1670, fig. 6a) was identified as charcoal by polarized light microscopy. SEM-EDX identified carbon. My thanks to Inge Fiedler for the analysis. Because charcoal particles do not adhere well to the ground layer, they were often picked up by the strokes of paint. These dark particles can also be seen mixed into the paint along the contours. Later cleaning and varnishing can dislodge exposed remnants of the charcoal. Infrared reflectography, commonly used to reveal underdrawings and even to determine whether the lines have been drawn freehand, transferred or pounced, is of little use in examining these pictures, not only because Van Gogh's thick and uneven impasto cannot be penetrated by this analytical device, but because many lines were presumably dislodged during painting.
Tracings have been preserved, both from the Paris period, but these are squared for enlargement and were not used for direct transfer. In contrast, for example, to prints with grids, such tracings had no intrinsic value and if the reverse had been blackened would have been difficult to store as well. Nor does Van Gogh ever mention tracing in his letters - although this does not necessarily mean much, as he is rather reticent about such matters in general. The proof that Van Gogh did indeed use tracings was delivered when the relevant works were scanned and sized to scale with the aid of a computer. Printed out on transparent melinex, the images were then laid on top of one another. The similarities thus revealed were so astonishing that it was immediately obvious - even without primary evidence - that the artist had indeed used the tracing method.

It seems possible Van Gogh already employed tracings in Nuenen. There is, for example, a remarkable correspondence between the two versions of a head of an old peasant woman (F8oa JH 682 and F 388r JH 732). Similarly, there is a literal correlation between the contours and facial feature in three studies of a young peasant girl (F 85 JH 693, F 141 JH 783 and F 160 JH 772). In both these cases Van Gogh used the same head for different artistic experiments with colour and brushwork. In Paris, too, it seems Van Gogh made use of tracings, for example in copying the Japanese prints found in the background of the large Portrait of Père Tanguy (F 363 JH 1351); the painted copies are precisely the same size as the original woodcuts and the intricate design of Toyokuni III's Miurayano Takao: a geisha, for example, is reproduced exactly.

Up to this point, Van Gogh's use of tracing had been somewhat sporadic, relating either to the production of replicas, to artistic experiments, or feeding into the major pictorial statement of a tableau. He only truly began to use the method on a broader scale in Arles, where he came to rely on it more and more in the course of 1888. It can be demonstrated that he used tracing to transpose drawings into paintings in Path through a field with willows (F 407 JH 1402) and Fishing boats on the beach (F 413 JH 1392); and to develop the portrait sketch into a finished work in the Portrait of Patience Escalier (F 443 JH 1548). This latter effort, the leap from study to fully realised pictorial statement, was a long-held goal.

In the summer of that year, await Gauuin's arrival, Van Gogh had been explicit about his hope that the former would facilitate his production of tableaux, and this expectation conditioned his receptiveness (and resistance) to his friend's approach and method. Gauuin, observing Van Gogh's preference for painting quickly before the motif, demonstrated his own techniques of working from the imagination and of synthesising a picture by combining elements from different sources. He got a prime opportunity to do so when their neighbour, Madame Ginoux, came to the studio to pose for both artists in early November. After drawing a large portrait of Madame Ginoux (fig. 2a), Gauuin traced and transferred her onto his canvas The night café (fig. 2b), borrowing the setting from Van Gogh's September composition of the same scene (F 463 JH 1575) and inserting caricatures of Van Gogh's friends the Zouave and the postman into the background. It is not known whether Gauuin used tracing before coming to Arles. To be sure, he often made full-size preparatory drawings, but evidence suggests that up until this point he usually reproduced these drawings.
on canvas by squaring rather than by tracing and chalking.\(^\text{10}\) Perhaps Van Gogh suggested that Gauguin try the more direct tracing method and even supplied the tracing paper (he had similarly supplied prepared canvas when Gauguin first arrived).\(^\text{11}\) At the same time, Gauguin encouraged Van Gogh to borrow his own, more far-reaching methods of pictorial synthesis and to experiment more freely with composing from the imagination.

\(^{10}\) It has been suggested that in Arles Gauguin may also have used tracing for the figure in *Human miseries* (W 304; Paris, Fondation Dina Vierny); see Jirat-Wasiutyński and Newton, op. cit. (note 7), p. 239. A drawing on tracing paper of the principal figure still exists, but it is not actually the same size. My thanks to Peter Kort Zegers for determining this.

\(^{11}\) See Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 2), pp. 165-66 and 355.
Madame Roulin

In one sense, the portraits Van Gogh painted of the Roulin family - beginning in late November and continuing into December - represent a return to the more familiar ground of working directly from nature, following his brief but stimulating foray with Gauguin into the realm of painting from the imagination, as seen in experimental works such as Brothel scene (F 478 JH 1599), Spectators at the arena (F 548 JH 1653), A novel reader (F 497 JH 1632) and, most significantly, Memory of the garden at Etten (F 496 JH 1630, fig. 8). Around 4 December 1888, Vincent informed Theo of his retrenchment: ‘I have spoiled that thing that I did of the garden in Nuenen, and I think that you also need practice for work from the imagination. But I have made portraits of a whole family [...] You know how I feel about this, how I feel in my element [...]’ [728/560]. However, in another sense Van Gogh viewed these portrait sessions as a means of moving forward in order to achieve a greater end; he continued: ‘And if I manage to do this whole family better still, at least I have done something to my liking and something individual.’ He envisioned producing more considered tableaux based on these studies, as he had done with the portrait of Patience Escalier. And, in formulating this aim, he was not denying Gauguin's synthetist methods but affirming them in service of his own humanist ideals.

When Madame Roulin came to sit in late November, both Gauguin and Van Gogh painted horizontal, size 15 portraits of her (fig. 3a and F 503 JH 1646, fig. 3b), now in the Saint Louis Art Museum and the Oskar Reinhart Collection, Winterthur, respectively. Van Gogh probably completed his painting more or less in a single session, while Gauguin's required later refinement. To paint a portrait bust in the horizontal format was not a natural choice for Van Gogh; he must have followed Gauguin's lead or intended, even from the beginning, to include some allusive details in the background, inspired perhaps by the similar horizontal compositions of the self-portraits Gauguin, Bernard and Charles Laval had recently sent him.

At this same time, Van Gogh painted Madame Roulin with baby (F 491 JH 1638, fig. 4a), now in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, which is essentially a portrait of the Roulins' four-month-old daughter,
Marcelle’s face received the most attention in this rapidly executed sketch, but Van Gogh also focused on the mother's hands, which he included in the initial underdrawing, held in reserve and painted towards the end of the session. He elaborated the hands with layers of different colours in thicker impasto and he included the detail of Madame Roulin's double wedding band. Tracing the baby's head as soon as he had completed the underdrawing (rather than waiting until after the paint layer had dried), Van Gogh prepared for a future work. This must have become a standard procedure, first identified by our

12 The figure of Madame Roulin was added almost as an afterthought - her head was painted over the yellow background and bent to fit into the remaining space, her body cropped at the edge. Van Gogh probably captured the restive baby in this momentary pose as he sketched the underdrawing onto the canvas and then continued painting even when she had changed positions. Gauguin drew the baby Marcelle, apparently at the same time, but in his sketchbook drawings she is portrayed in a more placid state (see his sketchbook from Brittany and Arles in The Israel Museum, Jerusalem).
research in his two portraits of Patience Escalier. He similarly traced the head from the underdrawing of the Winterthur *Madame Roulin* (fig. 3b) to be used later.\(^{13}\)

These tracings were meant to serve multiple purposes. In describing his first portraits of the Roulin family to Theo, Van Gogh declared that he hoped ‘to be able to get more careful posing, paid for by portraits’ [728/560]. In fact he gave the Roulins a portrait of each family member, several produced by means of tracing.\(^ {14}\) For example, he used the tracing of Marcellle's head to paint a smaller portrait of her with the hands in a different position and then traced this new image to make two replicas (F 441 JH 1641, F 441a JH 1640 and F 440 JH 1639).\(^ {15}\)

Probably inspired by Gauguin's methods of compositional synthesis, Van Gogh now addressed the challenge of combining two studies in a new, larger composition. Soon after making the tracings of baby Marcelle's head and of Madame Roulin's head from the New York and Winterthur studies, he combined them together in a size 30 canvas, the Philadelphia Museum of Art's *Madame Roulin and her baby* (F 490 JH 1637, figs. 4b and 4c). This picture may have been conceived as a pendant to the large

---

\(^{13}\) In the examples discussed here, it seems likely that the tracings were made from the initial underdrawings rather than from the completed paintings, as the first portraits would still have been wet when he began the next ones.

\(^{14}\) According to Marcellle Roulin, her family sold these five portraits, along with a still life, to the dealer Ambroise Vollard in 1895 for 450 francs; see J.B. de la Faille, *The works of Vincent van Gogh: his paintings and drawings*, Amsterdam 1970, p. 225.

\(^{15}\) During this period he also used tracings to produce a second version of the *Portrait of Camille Roulin* (F 537 JH 1644, traced from F 538 JH 1645) and of *L'Arlésienne: Madame Ginoux* (F 433 JH 1624, traced from F 497 JH 1632).
(size 25) Portrait of Joseph Roulin (F 432 JH 1522, fig. 5a) in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Both husband and wife are shown in three-quarter length and the background of Madame Roulin with baby was initially a pale blue similar to the background of the husband's portrait, but more turquoise in hue.

It is possible that Madame Roulin and her baby actually sat for the second, size 30 representation, after Van Gogh had set the composition by transferring the tracings, much as he had done for the likeness of Patience Escalier, where he had traced the contours and features from an earlier portrait but had worked from the model while painting. The frenetic quality of the brushwork does suggest a sitting of limited time, perhaps dependent on the baby's disposition; however, Van Gogh would also dash off a painting when working from memory, as demonstrated by the loose and rapid brushwork of A novel reader. The only elements of the Philadelphia painting not included in the two earlier studies - Madame Roulin's arm, bosom and lap, along with the bottom of the baby's gown and bottom of the chair - are on the whole so awkwardly constructed that they do not appear to have had a model at all. Some areas of paint are thinly applied, and Van Gogh may have intended to build upon and refine the forms once they had been set down. He did begin to work up the thin orange and green initial modelling of the baby's face and arms with pink impasto, and likewise covered the underlayer of her gown with thick white brushwork. Perhaps at this point he became dissatisfied with the baby's part in the composition and abandoned it. But it seems more likely that the painting served as a further experimental study, and as such Van Gogh could play all the more freely with an intuitive and generalised method of constructing and modelling form. It builds upon his recent experience with working from the imagination, where in paintings such as the Brothel scene and Spectators at the arena he employed a similarly broad method of planar construction.¹⁶ The power of this picture and Spectators at the arena - especially for the modern viewer - is sparked by an awareness of its experimental nature: here the working process rather than the final product was paramount in the artist's mind.

¹⁶ The Portrait of the postman Joseph Roulin (F 533 JH 1649) exhibits the same broad facial planes and was apparently not painted directly from the model but instead reprises the three-quarter-length August portrait that was still in the studio. See Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 2), p. 233.
La berceuse

La berceuse (fig. 1) is the tableau that followed, in mid-December 1888, upon these studies of Madame Roulin. Like Van Gogh's first masterpiece, The potato eaters, it was not painted from life but created from the imagination, fuelled by recent portrait studies. Following the pattern exemplified, for example, by the portraits of Patience Escalier, Van Gogh held true to the particular form of the sitter's face, based on a previous study from life, but intensified the arrangement of colours, simplified the interlocking forms, added emblematic allusions to the sitter's persona and invented a resonant background. Encouraged by Gauguin's example and by his own recent work from memory, Van Gogh reached farther afield than he ever had before to draw upon elements from a variety of sources, arranging them together in a deliberately abstract and synthetic manner.

For the head of La berceuse Van Gogh once again used the tracing he had made from the Winterthur Madame Roulin (fig. 3b). Out of the five versions of La berceuse, it is the head in the Boston version (figs. 1 and 5b) that most nearly matches that in the traced source (the head becomes progressively smaller in the other versions). The contours and features of the Winterthur and Boston paintings match closely, with several differences: in the latter the lines have been simplified (by adjusting the outlines, and smoothing and shortening the end of the nose and chin); the shape of the head has become more geometric (by widening the forehead and crown on the left and by straightening the hairline and eyes); and the modelling has been flattened (by eliminating tonal contrast) - all changes in the direction of abstraction.

The composition of La berceuse is divided almost in half at the sitter's waist. The head centres the top portion, with the eyes riveting the viewer's amid the roiling activity of the wallpaper. In the lower portion the hands have an almost equal importance and act as the fulcrum, holding a loop of rope in the green swell of the skirt. Since Van Gogh had decided to take the baby out of Madame Roulin's hands,
he now required a model for new hands, which he found in his August portrait of Joseph Roulin. Adding the hands to the underdrawing, he borrowed Joseph's more finished left hand for the corresponding top hand of *La berceuse*, perhaps using Joseph's right thumb for the hand that lies beneath (fig. 5c). He may have actually traced Joseph's hands - the disposition of proper left fingers and right thumb match the *Berceuse'*s hands with some variations - or he may simply have referred to the August painting as a visual guide.\(^{17}\) Having now placed the husband's hands in the wife's lap, Van Gogh added the double wedding band she wears in the New York *Madame Roulin with baby* (fig. 4a).

For the most part, Van Gogh retained the position of Madame Roulin's body as he had fleshed it out in the Philadelphia mother-and-child study (fig. 4c). However, he also borrowed several details from the horizontal portrait Gauguin had painted of her (fig. 3a): the high, rounded neckline with a hint of a white undergarment below the far side of the chin; the forearm nearest the viewer resting along the arm of the chair with the other forearm angled, and a view inside the sleeve at the wrist on the right side with the other cuff closed. These details, seen in both Gauguin's portrait and *La berceuse*, are not consistent with an actual sitting, where the two artists would have viewed her from opposite sides, as was discovered during our study when a to-scale model of the studio was constructed and the sittings recreated.\(^ {18}\) From Van Gogh's position, for example, he would not have been able to look up the cuff on the right. Because *La berceuse'*s round-necked costume differs from the V-shaped, open neckline shown in Van Gogh's earlier studies of Augustine Roulin, it has been suggested that she returned for a second sitting. However, it seems more likely that there was only one sitting and that the higher collar and undergarment were invented by Gauguin, who finished his portrait after the sitter had left.\(^ {19}\) Borrowing these details for *La berceuse*, Van Gogh incorporated them in a manner that was inconsistent with observed reality.

In a larger sense Van Gogh was also inspired by the calm, meditative containment of Gauguin's figure, her stolid serenity, expressed formally by large areas of flat colour contained within simple, flowing contour lines. It was this persona and more abstract style that Van Gogh chose for his *Berceuse*, transforming Augustine Roulin from the earthy, dishevelled mother of his first study into a serene high priestess

\(^{17}\) He may have traced and transferred each hand onto the underdrawing but made changes during the painting process.

\(^{18}\) See Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 2), pp. 228-29, fig. 99.

\(^{19}\) Gauguin painted more slowly than Van Gogh and would not have been able to complete the picture in a single session with the model. The x-ray reveals that Gauguin had first positioned the undergarment toward the centre, but later moved it to the far side. Gauguin made other adjustments to the composition as he painted and he often invented forms from his imagination.
who, in his own references to the picture, ‘offers consolation for the broken-hearted’ [743], to the fishermen in ‘mournful isolation, exposed to all dangers, alone on the sad sea’ [747/574].

From the outset Van Gogh placed his sitter against an evocative background. While it is possible that he based the design of dahlias and undulating curves on a particular wallpaper or fabric, it seems more likely that it was his own inspired creation, developed from the imagination. The full pink dahlia blossoms together with more schematic flowers,

---

20 In his letter of 29 March, when he announced that he was painting La berceuse for the fifth time, he also wrote: ‘Oh, I must not forget to tell you a thing I have very often thought of [...] Here is this very, very, very old epitaph [...] “Thebe, daughter of Thelhui, priestess of Osiris, who never complained of anyone”; see 757/582. This may, by association, relate to La berceuse.
composed of flat, concentric rings of colour, are prefigured in a foreground passage of *Memory of the garden at Etten* (fig. 8), where both flowers types appear, set against a similar pointillist pattern of orange and blue marks. The tendrils in the *Berceuse* wallpaper repeat the curve of the serpentine path. The abundance of flowers recalls the fertility to which the sprouting bulbs allude in his first portrayal of Madame Roulin (fig. 3b), where the winding path was also included. In *La berceuse* each yellow curve of the wallpaper is elaborated with a row of smaller marks; this pattern is repeated in the yellow strokes of the twined rope, as though Van Gogh had plucked one of the tendrils from the space behind her and placed it in her lap. Not only does this visual echo tie together the upper and lower halves of the composition, but the rope - ostensibly used to rock the unseen cradle - becomes the emblem for the baby she had previously held.

Van Gogh refers to the flowers in both pictures as pink dahlias; see 725/W9 and 745/571a. The outer yellow ray petals of the concentric flowers in *Memory of the garden* were added later.
The ‘Berceuses’

Mathematically speaking, there are 120 different sequences in which the five ‘Berceuses’ can be ordered (figs. 1, 6a-d). Rather than considering the various permutations of likely scenarios, this essay presents a sequence inferred from new evidence discovered during our technical examinations and by comparing x-rays and superimposed, computer-scaled
images made from uncropped transparencies - a comprehensive process that first led us to posit the necessity of tracing in the *Sunflowers* and ‘Berceuses.’ The sequence that this new evidence suggested in fact corroborates that proposed by Jan Hulsker, which was based on a close reading of the relevant letters:  

**1st version:** Boston, Museum of Fine Arts (F 508 JH 1671, fig. 1), begun sometime in December 1888; almost complete by 23 December (when Van Gogh was hospitalised) [743, 744/573]; 2nd session: resumed 21 January 1889 [743], completed 23 January [744/573].

**2nd version:**

The Art Institute of Chicago (F 506 JH 1670, fig. 6a), begun c. 24 January, completed by 28 January [747/574].

**3rd version:**

New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art (F 505 JH 1669, fig. 6b), begun by 30 January [748/575], completed by 3 February [749/476].

---

Vincent van Gogh, *La berceuse* (F 508 JH 1671), 1888/89, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, with tracing from fig. 3b

**4th version:** Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum (F 507 JH 1672, fig. 6c), begun by 3 February [749/576], put aside by c. 7 February (hospitalised); 2nd session: resumed 21 or 22 February [752/578], probably abandoned by 24 February (hospitalised).

**5th version:** Otterlo, Kröller-Müller Museum (F 504 JH 1655, fig. 6d), begun c. 29 March [757/582].

From this documentation we know that the second and third versions were painted quickly, each in about four days; and that the first and fourth versions were each painted in two separate sessions. One would thus expect the second and third versions to exhibit wet-into-wet paint layers in most areas, and the first and fourth to show evidence of

23 A comparison of canvas structure and ground application, as visible in x-rays, together with SEM-EDX analysis of ground samples will become more meaningful when more paintings from 1889 have been sampled and their x-rays compared. Preliminary results have determined that the Boston and Chicago *Berceuses* were cut from the same larger piece of 11.5 × 18 thread/cm canvas as the *Sunflower* replicas painted in late January 1889 and the *Still life: drawing board, pipe, onions and sealing-wax* (F 604 JH 1656), painted earlier that month. See Lister, Peres and Fiedler, op cit. (note 2), pp. 365-66. The Otterlo and New York versions were painted on canvas of this same thread count, but they may or may not have been from the same piece of material. No ground sample was available from the New York version. Ground analysis for the Otterlo *Berceuse* (as well as *Orchard of Arles with trees in blossom* (F 515 JH 1683), painted in April 1889) was very similar to the January paintings - primarily lead with minor amounts of barium and zinc - but insufficient trace inclusions in each sample were analysed to characterise the ground as identical in each painting. The thread count and ground of the Amsterdam *Berceuse* differ from the others, but it finds a match in the 15 × 12 thread/cm canvas that Van Gogh had used in late November-early December 1888 for the *Portrait of Armand Roulin* (F 493 JH 1643). These grounds have a high percentage of barium sulphate, zinc and calcium and a lower percentage of lead. My thanks to Inge Fiedler, Joseph Rebstock of McClone Associates, Inc. in Westmont, and Tim Vander Wood of MVA Inc. of Atlanta for undertaking the analysis; to Luuk van der Loeff and Ella Hendriks for sampling the Otterlo *Berceuse*; to Ella Hendriks for sampling the *Orchard of Arles* and Amsterdam *Berceuse*; and to Muriel Geldof and Karin Groen, Instituut Collectie Nederland, in collaboration with Kees Mensch, Shell Research and Technology Centre, Amsterdam (SRTCA), for analysis of the Otterlo *Berceuse*.
extended drying time between some layers. This is indeed the case. Microscopic examination has revealed that the Boston and Amsterdam versions had areas that were completely dry when subsequent layers, including the hands and rope, were added; and that the Chicago and New York versions were painted very quickly, wet-into-wet - as was the Otterlo version.24

Van Gogh provided some specific information about the first version, describing it to Gauguin as ‘my canvas of Mme Roulin, the one in which, due to my accident, the hands had been left unfinished’ [743]. This can only be the Boston painting, the one corresponding most exactly to the tracing of his initial portrait of Madame Roulin and the version that undoubtedly took the most time. It is less direct in

24 In the Otterlo version (which many have considered the first because the wallpaper is more realistic than in the others) the hands were painted completely wet-into-wet, as was the entire background wallpaper, and both were wet-into-wet with the final blue outlines. The signature and inscription ‘La berceuse’ were added while the underlying paint of the chair and floor was still wet. This would seem to eliminate Otterlo as the first version as it was painted in one extended session. There could not have been a stage when the painting was generally complete except for the unfinished hands. By contrast, the Boston floor was completely dry when the inscription was added. My thanks to Ella Hendriks for examining the Otterlo Berceuse after our own investigation to corroborate the extent of wet-into-wet painting.
approach than the other, more systematically painted versions, as is apparent in many details, including the initial painted sketch, made on top of the underdrawing. In this sketch, the contour lines of the various elements were painted with different colours: head and bodice in brown; hands in greenish yellow; left cuff in olive green (this cuff was lengthened); flowers and leaves in light blue and green; and left chair arm in bright orange (this was one of the last elements completed). This variety reflects the piecemeal manner in which the first version was composed. Glimpses below the top paint layers reveal that Van Gogh's next step was to lay in thin, flat underlayers of colour: the face and hands in greenish yellow; the hair in a dull orange tan (these are the same colours he had used for the underlayers of the Sunflowers on jute, also painted in December and similarly developed using tracing); the

The underdrawing and painted sketch lines are only revealed in select spots not covered by subsequent paint layers, so this may be an incomplete accounting.
bodice in bright green; and the wallpaper and skirt in the same shade of turquoise.
In the subsequent versions, the painted sketches are not as varied, and Van Gogh often skipped the initial lay-in of colour, instead moving directly to shaping the form with intermittent brushstrokes.

After the first lay-in of colour, the head of the Boston *Berceuse* was beautifully sculpted with yellow and orange brushstrokes of stiff dry impasto, applied to the face and hair in tightly enmeshed layers of directional strokes that render the head like one of the sunflowers in the recent *Still life: vase with fourteen sunflowers* (F 457 JH 1666), painted on jute. The rough, encrusted paint of the face contains dried red and green paint chips that Van Gogh must have mixed into the yellow himself.²⁶

Similar dried paint chips appear in the impasto of the yellow sun in the *Sower* (F 450 JH 1627) and may also be found in Gauguin’s two

²⁶ There are also many small white granular inclusions that contribute to the rough, dry effect. These are commonly found in varying amounts in Van Gogh’s chrome yellows and oranges. An unusually large amount of these inclusions appear in the faces of several of the *Berceuse* paintings.
Vincent van Gogh, *La berceuse* (F 507 JH 1672), 1889, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum

*Washerwomen* (W 302 and 303), all from late November. This small detail perhaps provides additional evidence for placing the Boston version first, closest in time to other works exhibiting this same feature.

The yellow complexion of the Boston *Berceuse* is modelled with orange and olive shading and subtle highlights of pale green, chartreuse, pink and salmon orange - a palette Van Gogh also used when copying the small *Portrait of Camille Roulin* (F 537 JH 1644), probably at this same time. The faces of the second and third versions of *La berceuse* (Chicago and New York) are modelled with similar colours. The tonality of the fourth version (Amsterdam) is duller, in part because much of the picture is underpainted in cool, neutral tones - a pinkish grey underlies the face. The Otterlo face has only minimal modelling and very few touches of varied colour. Both the face and hair were laid down together in olive yellow, only later differentiated by strokes of orange on the hair and yellow on the face. The paint application is so summary in the Otterlo version that the ground is in many places visible between the strokes; indeed, the brushwork
and colour used in the face of this final version effectively function as a brief synopsis of the technique used in the earlier works.  

Changes in appearance due to aging and restoration must be considered. The high proportion of barium sulphate in the lead white ground of the Amsterdam version caused it to become duller when saturated by wax and varnish from restoration. In the New York version the modelling is more difficult to analyse, as large fills and retouches in the forehead, upper lip and cheek confuse the issue. At present the bright highlights on the forehead and cheek of the Otterlo version give a false impression of the modelling and exaggerate the tonal contrast. The highlights were at some point preferentially cleaned of discoloured varnish and so are brighter in relation to the rest of the face than they were meant to be. Presently the Otterlo, Amsterdam and New York versions have varnish, while varnish was recently removed from the Boston and Chicago versions, returning them to a state much closer to their original appearance. The surfaces of Van Gogh's chrome yellows and oranges tend to discolour and darken with age. This effect cannot be safely reversed but should be considered when evaluating the appearance of his paintings. Unfortunately the yellow is particularly sensitive to solvent abrasion, so that this darkened skin is sometimes broken through when cleaned, which results in unnaturally bright spots and a mottled appearance. See also note 37, below, regarding fading.

Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001
Although the first Berceuse was fully conceptualised and for the most part completed in December, it had developed in an organic, unsystematic way. When Van Gogh resumed work on the portrait in January 1889, the skirt, hands, rope and part of the chair and background remained unfinished. These are the elements that do not feature in either Van Gogh's or Gauguin's previous studies of Madame Roulin, and that were more slowly resolved. Evidence of extended drying time between layers indicates that before Van Gogh was hospitalised in late December the skirt had received only underlayers of paint (a first underlayer of turquoise, followed by a second, relatively flat green layer) and the hands had probably received only one flat underlayer of greenish yellow paint. On circa 21 January the artist expressed the hope that Madame Roulin might model again: ‘If I could finish it, I should be very glad, but I am afraid she will not want to pose with her husband away’ [744/573]. He apparently completed the hands that same day without a sitting, possibly referring to the August Portrait of Joseph Roulin (fig. 5a) as a model, as he had for the underdrawing in December. In a letter a day or two later, Van Gogh described the hands to fellow artist A.H. Koning as though they were finished: ‘The complexion is chrome yellow, worked up with some naturally broken tones for the purpose of modelling. The hands holding the rope of the cradle, the same’ [745/571a]. Van Gogh completed the hands quickly, with fluid strokes of many mixed colours: yellows, pinks, blues and greens, which recall the medley of colours used for her hand in the earlier portrait holding the child (fig. 4a). The chromatic range renders the hands and face closer in appearance to each other and to the artist’s letter description than in any of the other versions.

During the second session Van Gogh probably completed a few unfinished details of the wallpaper, gave form to the skirt with a layer of varied green and yellow strokes, completed the chair and final contour lines, and added the inscription ‘La berceuse.’ He also elaborated the rope in paint. The rope was not part of the initial underdrawing, but the artist had already indicated its position in December: he must have planned to add it when the first, turquoise underlayer of the skirt was still wet, for he marked its shape with the brush in the wet paint, leaving a textural indication of where it should go. Since this paint layer had already dried when Van Gogh returned to paint the actual rope in January, the indication for it must have been made during the first campaign.

Van Gogh used tracing not only to develop the image from earlier sources, but also to produce three of the four subsequent versions. He apparently traced the contours of the first Berceuse as soon as its underdrawing was complete, using this tracing to transfer the contours of the entire figure to the canvas of the second version, executed circa 24-28 January 1889. The alignment between the Boston and Chicago versions is very close, with a slight shift down when the hands and forearms were traced (fig. 7). Certain differences result from the fact that the tracing was taken from the underdrawing of the first version rather than from the completed painting: the lower right shoulder and sleeve seam in the Chicago version follow a pentiment visible in the Boston prototype, although Van Gogh had made an adjustment in the

---

28 Hulsker, op. cit (note 22), p. 577, suggests that this picture began as a simple portrait and that the rope was only conceived in January when Van Gogh began to elaborate its symbolic connotations, giving it the title La berceuse, but the indication of the rope during the first campaign proves that this is not the case.
Other deviations appear to be formal in nature: in the Chicago *Berceuse* the fingers are lengthened in one direction, the rope is swung to the other side, and the cuff is shortened to accommodate the rope. Van Gogh also made some changes to lend the figure a more solemn presence: the eyelids are lowered, the corner of the mouth is drawn downward, and the plaits pinned more tightly to the head. Adding to the solemnity, the colour of the wallpaper background is now a deep, mysterious green. The encrusted impasto in the face of the first version has become more subdued, a change paralleled in the shift from thick impasto in the December *Sunflowers* (F 457 JH 1666) to thinner paint application in the January versions (F 458 JH 1667 and F 455 JH 1668) - the latter painted at the same time as this second *Berceuse*.

---

29 The texture of the paint that followed these earlier contours is visible under the surface of the Boston picture.

30 An interesting detail about this second version is that it was signed ‘Vincent/Arles 89’ before the final contour of the chair was added. This suggests that Van Gogh decided early on to give it to someone he had known there. The only other version that was signed with the word ‘Arles’ was the one given to Madame Roulin herself (the New York version). After sending the paintings to Theo in May, Van Gogh wrote: ‘If he will accept it, give Gauguin a copy of *La berceuse* not mounted on a stretcher, and another to Bernard as a token of friendship’; see 778/592. In 1894 Gauguin and Theo's widow, Jo, corresponded about the version that belonged to the former but had been on deposit with Tanguy while he was travelling (GAC 43). This was probably the Chicago version, since it afterwards passed through the hands of Amédée Schuffenecker. There was also a version in Bernard's estate, likewise deposited with Tanguy and sold in 1894. This was most likely the Boston version. The Amsterdam and Otterlo versions remained with the Van Gogh family until much later. My thanks to Louis van Tilborgh and Nienke Bakker for providing this information on the provenance. See also note 14.
Having traced and completed the second version in a matter of days, Van Gogh was emboldened to work without tracing - the third version (New York) was apparently sketched freehand and completed between 30 January and 3 February 1889.\(^{31}\) None of the contours quite align with any of the other versions. The eyes (particularly on the left) are higher in the face, the ear is smaller, the neck is a little longer and the jowl reduced. The shoulders are more relaxed, the forearms longer and more balanced, the breasts more shapely and the bottom more rounded. There is a monumentality to this version that derives from a more integrated proportionality and bolder, more dynamic contour lines. Perhaps the confidence Van Gogh demonstrated by painting freehand also led him to experiment with the position of Madame Roulin's hands, placing the proper right one on top and extending the fingers that had previously been hidden. There is nothing to suggest that Madame Roulin returned to sit again, thus providing a model for the change - in fact, the hands are even stiffer and less lifelike than before, and they hold the rope as unconvincingly.

Van Gogh had agreed to let Augustine Roulin choose one of the three versions thus far completed, provided he could produce a copy of her selection before parting with it [749/576], and, as provenance research suggests, it was the New York version she selected. Van Gogh remarked: ‘She had a good eye and took the best, only I am doing it again at the moment and I do not want it to be inferior’ [752/578]. This fourth version, now in the Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam, was thus specifically designed to be a copy of the New York work, and in its early stages Van Gogh began to duplicate the right-over-left configuration of hands that appears only there. But, surprisingly, this initial attempt to copy the hands is the only element in the Amsterdam work that is actually similar to the version the artist meant to duplicate. He did not attempt to copy the new contours and proportions and he did not repeat its freehand approach. As he was beginning to experience a recurrence of the attacks later diagnosed as epilepsy, he may have lacked the confidence to do so. And he could not work from a tracing of the New York version, since he had not traced its sketch and its paint was still very wet. Instead he began the Amsterdam painting with

\(^{31}\) Alternatively, Van Gogh may have used the same tracing and simply deviated more markedly from it during the painted sketch or painting stages.
the tracing of the Boston Berceuse. The alignment of facial features and body contours is extremely close, but in the Amsterdam version the head is significantly
shorter at the top and narrower at the back. The shape of the head has become a more nondescript oval and the contours in general are more flaccid. After establishing the figure, Van Gogh sketched the reversed hands of the New York version into place. He got as far as the underpainting before he was taken to the hospital on 7 February. By the time he resumed painting two weeks later, Madame Roulin had left Arles to live with her mother, presumably taking her Berceuse along. Without the New York version to serve as a guide Van Gogh decided to return to the hands of the Boston version. It seems, in fact, that he may have used the tracing of the Boston Berceuse to add the hands onto the partially completed painting. As he did this the tracing paper apparently shifted slightly, which could account for the elongated hand and the broad middle finger. After only a few days of painting, Van Gogh returned to the hospital and left the Amsterdam version unfinished. Large areas of the skirt have only an incomplete turquoise underlayer, many leaves lack their final contours and most of the large dahlias were apparently left as a first lay-in on top of the background colour. This is the only version that is not inscribed - another indication that it was not completed.

It is difficult to say whether Van Gogh again used the Boston tracing one month later for the final version, now in the Kröller-Müller Museum, Otterlo, or whether he might actually have made a tracing of the fourth version. Possibly he used both. The body matches both and the hands are closer to the Boston tracing, but the head

---

32 This does not, however, imply that the rest of the painting was also only completed to the underdrawing stage. The texture of the brushstrokes used to apply the paint for the first hands is still visible on the painting and it is also possible to see an odd appendage or rope end pointing almost straight down. This early hand and/or rope were apparently not in exactly the same position as in the New York version.

33 The right proper wrist, thumb, index finger and top edge of the middle finger align perfectly, then a slight shift occurs and the three lower fingers, rings, left proper wrist and rope contours match. The exact alignment of the separate parts includes certain odd details like the indentation along the top contour of the middle finger (before the shift), and the extreme indentations in the lower contour of the hands (after the shift). Similar shifting of the tracing paper occurred in the sunflower series. Van Gogh's ready adaptation to such shifting provides a further insight into his use of tracings as tools: he did not slavishly depend on the tracings but they facilitated the painting process by carrying over essential forms.
matches the smaller size of the Amsterdam version. It seems almost as if Van Gogh wished to pick up where he had left off with the unfinished version, correcting its weaknesses and bringing it to completion. The contours in the Otterlo work
have regained their animation. Triangulating the head in the manner of the early versions Van Gogh exaggerated this shape by narrowing the neckline, while retaining the double contour at the top edge of the bodice, which had only appeared in the Amsterdam version. In this final version he also changed the proportions of the body by lowering the waist. In a letter of 29 March, in which Van Gogh mentions that he was painting *La berceuse* for the fifth time, he stated that ‘it has not even the merit of being photographically correct in its proportions or in anything else. But after all, I want to make a picture such as a sailor at sea who could not paint would imagine to himself when he thinks of his wife ashore’ [757/582]. This comment may reflect how far Van Gogh now had come from the actual live model by working from his imagination and from his own original studies and tracings.  

Having determined how tracing was used to compose the five versions of *La berceuse*, it is now possible to separate out certain elements that Van Gogh consciously adjusted to differ from the tracing and also to identify those parts of the compositions that were created without tracing. This comparative analysis gives insight into the artistic problems that concerned Van Gogh at the time and reveals progressive developments in certain directions.

The hands and rope were the aspects of *La berceuse* that troubled Van Gogh the most. In the first version he experimented with active brushwork and colour on the hands, but he abandoned this in subsequent versions, perhaps because it drew attention to them. In the second version, he tried lengthening the fingers of one hand and swinging the rope to the side, making both into more dynamic elements of the composition; in the third, the diagonals are strengthened by extending the fingers of both hands. Besides switching the hands' position in the New York version, he initially planned for only one diagonal segment of rope - the left portion was not drawn or held in reserve but was instead added later, over the skirt. In the fourth version, the hands are elongated (perhaps by a shift in the tracing, as suggested above) and none of the rope was included in the underdrawing, again being added after the skirt was painted. In the fifth and final version Van Gogh perhaps decided that the best way to deal with the awkward rope and hands was to de-emphasise them - the hands are thinly painted in neutral tones, the contours around them are less pronounced (although now possibly faded from an originally darker tone), while the viewer's eye is drawn instead to the surrounding area of the skirt, which is energised with more dynamic brushwork, thicker impasto and stronger colours than those used in the other versions.  

These changing configurations of the hands and rope indicate Van Gogh's difficulty in portraying these elements convincingly and integrating them into the composition, perhaps ultimately stemming from his dissatisfaction with not having painted the hands from life.

As Van Gogh varied the *berceuse's*, hands, he also changed the ring on the third finger of her left hand, replacing her wedding band, in progressive stages, with a

---

34 Although he did bring more naturalistic flowers and foliage details into the wallpaper in this version, his great familiarity with flowers would have allowed him to do so without a model on hand.

35 The interwoven pattern of parallel green and yellow brushstrokes in the Otterlo skirt might almost suggest a landscape, visually comparable to the pattern of green and yellow grass in *Two white butterflies* (F 402 JH 1677), probably painted soon thereafter. Perhaps the arrival of spring was an inspiration for this brushwork. The more naturalistic flowers in the Otterlo background may also reflect a re-awakened interest in nature.
large blue jewel. In the first Berceuse, Madame Roulin wears double gold bands, as in the New York mother-and-child portrait painted from life (fig. 4a). In the second version, Van Gogh initially painted the same double wedding band, but then added a blue jewel on the upper band and painted out the lower one. This was probably at the same time that he was adding orange dots to the wallpaper, for he used the same colour, which does not blend well with the hand. Perhaps the original wedding band was too strong an allusion to the outside world and Madame Roulin's everyday role as wife. In the third version, Van Gogh covered her ring finger by placing her right hand on top. In the fourth, after abandoning the right-over-left
hands, he returned to the first depiction, including the double bands. For the final version, however, a ring with an enormous blue jewel - the lump of impasto as impressive as a real gemstone - is set upon her finger. This embellishment is in keeping with the greatly elaborated wallpaper and skirt of this version, the other areas where his imagination came into play.

The wallpaper design was the area of the composition where Van Gogh gave his imagination free rein. He did not use tracing, but always sketched it freehand. For the first, second and third versions, the design is part of the charcoal underdrawing. After this he no longer required the drawing, simply painting the pattern on top of the background colour. By eliminating the underdrawing, he could apply the large block of background colour more quickly, without painting around the edge of every flower, leaf, stem and curve. With each version of La berceuse, Van Gogh progressively added new elements to the wallpaper. In the Chicago picture, he refined the positions of the elements - a placement he followed in the next two versions - and also added a large leaf on the left, two extra curves at the edges and further elaborated several of the existing curves. In the New York version he added a new stem and curve in the space above Madame Roulin's head and incorporated several naturalistic details - adding interior veins to the leaves and more overlapping pointed petals to the dahlia blossoms. The wallpaper was left unfinished in the Amsterdam Berceuse, but Van Gogh had begun to define the dahlias' pink pointed petals, as in the previous version. He also added two new curves, one above and one at the back of Madame Roulin's head. The progression culminates in the phantasmagorical design of the Otterlo Berceuse.

Van Gogh used a very similar wallpaper design in one of the three versions of the Portrait of the postman Joseph Roulin (F 436 JH 1675, fig. 9a), also painted in the spring of 1889. The wallpaper in this Postman, now in the Museum of Modern Art, New York, seems to be an intermediate step between the New York and Otterlo Berceuse.
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---

36 The gold ring beneath the jewel is quite broad and might still be a double band.

37 In all the versions, there is evidence that the dahlias were originally bright pink and have now faded considerably. This can be seen at the edges, where the flowers have been protected by the frame and the pink is much stronger. The Amsterdam flowers also appear more bluish, thanks to the manner in which they were laid in over the blue. In the New York version the flowers still retain a strong pink colour and give a sense of the important part they played in the original colour harmony. It is likely that other red and pink elements in these paintings have faded, such as Madame Roulin's lower lip and possibly some modelling and contours in the hands. The inscriptions have also faded considerably.

designs, which possibly dates it somewhere between them. The *Postman* wallpaper, like that of the New York *Berceuse*, has articulated veins in the leaves, but the inclusion of the deeply cut edges and tripartite structure typical of dahlia leaves makes them more naturalistic. In the Otterlo *Berceuse* Van Gogh elaborated them further, cutting the leaves into surreal, feathery fronds. However, the Otterlo *Berceuse* and the New York *Postman* share the branching structure of serpentine curves and the same flower grouping: both have a closed dahlia bud (drooping realistically as dahlia buds do) set against each set of three
fig. 9b
Vincent van Gogh, *Starry night* (F 612 JH 1755), 1889, New York, Museum of Modern Art, Mrs. John Hay Whitney Bequest
full blossoms. This is not immediately obvious because in the Postman the flower group has been rotated 180 degrees. On at least one occasion Van Gogh had turned a Berceuse upside down on the easel as he painted the wallpaper, and this may also explain the rotated flower group in the Postman.

In the Otterlo version of La berceuse every element of the wallpaper has become more elaborate and the space overflows with an abundance of flowers and curves. When working from the imagination as here, Van Gogh had no natural endpoint. Thus, as in Memory of the garden at Etten (fig. 8), he continued to elaborate the surface. In contrast to the abbreviated, almost staccato brushwork of the face, the wallpaper is fully developed, with multiple layers of textural impasto and varied colours that give dimension to the forms. The entire picture is painted with loose, rhythmic brushstrokes, applied with a sure hand and sense of purpose that Van Gogh had acquired by painting the composition so many times before. Like a musician playing a familiar piece he confidently controlled the rhythm, the clarity of the notes and the variations in dynamics. The artist himself later described the act of copying a composition in similar terms: ‘And then my brush goes between my fingers as a bow would on the violin, and absolutely for my own pleasure’ [806/607]. In this particular piece, the intricate elaboration of the wallpaper design may be the performer's colourful cadenza.

The preponderance of expressive repeating curves seen in the wallpaper of the Otterlo Berceuse had hitherto not been a feature of Van Gogh's style. These curves mark a stage in a progression: from the serpentine path in Memory of the garden at Etten, reiterated in the first study of Madame Roulin; through the repeating curves in the wallpaper design of the first Berceuse and the Portrait of Doctor Félix Rey (F 500 JH 1659); to the elaborately scrolled curves of the Otterlo Berceuse and two versions of the Postman (F 435 JH 1674 and fig. 9a). These curving strokes would finally evolve into one of Van Gogh's most signature brush patterns and stylistic elements. In St-Rémy they moved out of the abstract portrait space and into the landscape and sky, as seen in paintings such as Starry night (F 612 JH 1731, fig. 9b).

38 Also seen in another version of the Postman (F 435 JH 1674), now in The Barnes Foundation, Merion, Pennsylvania. As in the two last ‘Berceuses,’ the wallpaper of the New York and Barnes ‘Postmen’ was not included in the underdrawing, but painted on top of the background colour.

39 That Van Gogh turned the Boston version upside down when the wallpaper was partially completed can be deduced from the fact that some of the orange dots drip in an upwards direction. By turning the painting upside down, these dabs of orange were less likely to drip on the face and body. There is an orange drip on the Boston face that was painted out. My thanks to Jim Wright, conservator at the Museum of Fine Arts, for pointing out the upwards drips and also the fact that the Otterlo wallpaper resembles that of the Postman when turned upside down.

40 In Memory of the garden the pattern of orange and blue marks over the mother's shawl and servant's dress, the additional flowers in the foreground and background beds, and other surface elaborations were added after the picture had ostensibly been completed (as sketched in a letter to his sister, 725/W9). These changes were made over dry paint. See also note 21.

41 This passage relates to the paintings Van Gogh made by copying prints after Eugène Delacroix and Jean-François Millet.
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Coda

Van Gogh's series of portraits of the postman Joseph Roulin could be analysed using the same principles detailed above. These likenesses of Augustine Roulin's husband were done at about the same time as the 1889 ‘Berceuses,’ but there are no letter references to them and the sequence has not yet been carefully studied in light of the information that in-depth technical examinations can provide. They, too, are based on the use of tracing, with significant deviations and developments in the different versions. The nuances in the painting methods used, together with the naturalistic and schematic tendencies they exhibit, are surely intertwined with those of *La berceuse*.

While many other possible uses of tracing in Van Gogh's oeuvre have yet to be fully explored, there are two portrait series after the ‘Berceuses’ that can be mentioned in addition to the ‘Postmen.’ One group is a pair of self-portraits done in August and September 1889, in St-Rémy. The first, in which Van Gogh holds a palette (F 626 JH 1770), was presumably done from life and was definitely traced to produce the second (F 627 JH 1772), in which he portrays himself against an abstract pattern of serpentine curves that is a continuation of the evocative space developed in *La berceuse*.

42 At this same time Van Gogh used tracing to make a replica of *The bedroom* (F 482 JH 1608 and F 484 JH 1771). Earlier self-portrait series do not appear to involve tracing. Later, in June 1890, Van Gogh again used tracing for the head in the second portrait of *Doctor Gachet* (F 753 JH 2001).
Another set of portraits that depended on tracing is the series of five ‘Arlésiennes’ (F 541 JH 1893, F 540 JH 1892, F 542 JH 1894, F 543 JH 1895 and an additional version, mentioned as lost in a letter from the asylum director, Dr. Peyron). These were painted one year after the ‘Berceuses’ and depict the other woman at Arles with whom Van Gogh had an unusually sympathetic rapport, Marie Ginoux. They also allude directly to Arles through their source image: not one of Van Gogh’s own portraits of Madame Ginoux, but the drawing of her that Gauguin had made in the first weeks of their collaboration and had left behind (fig. 2a). It would not be surprising to find a development in these portraits that is informed by the Berceuse series, and it is tempting to speculate that in the final version of L’Arlésienne Van Gogh elaborated the background with a pattern of flowers that was both evocative of Madame Ginoux’s persona and emblematic of the artist’s interaction with Gauguin.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{43} The flower that appears in the wallpaper pattern had been plucked from the background of Gauguin’s Self-portrait (‘Les misérables’) (Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum) and applied to Madame Ginoux’s fichu by Van Gogh in his first portraits of her in 1888. Van Gogh made this particular version of L’Arlésienne: Madame Ginoux (F 543 JH 1895) for Gauguin; see Druick and Kort Zegers, op. cit. (note 2), p. 63 and Hulsker, op. cit. (note 22), p. 51.
fig. 1
Frédéric Bazille, *The artist's studio, rue de la Condamine*, 1870, Paris, Musée d'Orsay
‘Avant et après’ - Paul Gauguin and Vincent van Gogh in Arles:
projections of a friendship
Beatrice von Bismarck

I.

Such is the extent to which the names Gauguin and Van Gogh have been mentioned
in the same breath by art historians of the 20th century that in 1947 Lee van Dovski
did not shrink from drawing comparisons with the relationship between Friedrich
Schiller and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. This reference to the quintessential
embodiments of German culture - and not least when viewed together - exaggerates
a connection that has come to be taken for granted, proposed and supported by the
titles of such important art-historical works as Gauguin und van Gogh by Carl
Sternheim or John Rewald's Post-impressionism: from van Gogh to Gauguin.1 ‘Van
Gogh had the same flaming temperament as Schiller,’ writes Van Dovski, ‘that grand
pathos: “Let me embrace you, O millions!” Gauguin, on the other hand, wore the
cool, stony mask of Weimar's Privy Councillor. What drove Schiller to despair -
before he finally got through to Goethe's passionate inner self - was also what drove
Van Gogh to despair. His fiery temperament risked freezing to death on the apparent
iciness of the calm, unemotional, taciturn Gauguin.'2

For Van Dovski and others the notion that these two artists inexorably belonged
together stemmed from the fact that they had at one time lived and worked side by
side in Arles. Notwithstanding the conclusions we may draw as to their respective
personalities and aesthetic convictions, the events of October-December 1888 certainly
prompt us to ‘pair’ the one with the other. The culmination of this relationship, the
point at which all the tension built up during this short period was finally discharged,
was Van Gogh's act of self-mutilation. Historically speaking, this act brought about
not only the physical separation of the two artists but also marked an intellectual
break with previous notions about their friendship - a break which, as we will see,
gave the pairing of the names Gauguin and Van Gogh a special significance in the
discourse on the modern artist throughout the 20th century.

One piece of literature stands out in this context, clearly illustrating the changing
concept of the artists friendship after 1889 and thus reduplicating in itself the rhetorical
figure of ‘before and after.’ Significantly entitled Avant et après, it is Gauguin's
account of his life before and after his departure for the South Seas, written on the
Marquesas Islands in 1903, shortly before his death in May. Published in English
under the title The intimate journals of Paul Gauguin (1921) it describes, among
other things, his encounters with Vincent van Gogh, from their first meeting in Paris

1 See Carl Sternheim, Gauguin und van Gogh, Berlin 1924 and John Rewald,
2 Lee van Dovski (pseudonym for Herbert Lewandowski), Paul Gauguin oder Die Flucht vor
lodernde Temperament Schillers, das große Pathos: “Seid umschlungen, Millionen!” Gauguin
aber besaß bereits die kühle steinerne Maske des Weimarer Geheimen Rates. Was Schiller
zur Verzweiflung brachte, bis er endlich durch die Maske hindurch zum glühenden Inneren
Goethes durchstieß, das brachte auch van Gogh zur Verzweiflung. Sein glühendes
Temperament drohte zu erfrieren an der scheinbar eisigen Ruhe, der Unbeweglichkeit des
wortkargen Gauguin.’
in the winter of 1886 through the time they spent together in Arles.\(^3\) No other account has been as frequently quoted - sometimes verbatim - in works on Gauguin and Van Gogh, be they biographical, art-historical, novelistic or cinematic. Van Dovski, too, leaves it to Gauguin to characterise the period spent in Arles: ‘Between

two such beings - the one a perfect volcano, the other boiling, too, but inwardly - a kind of battle was in preparation. Underlying Gauguin's description is a logic that proceeds from the premise of insurmountable incompatibility and concludes with the inevitability of Van Gogh's self-disfigurement. Gauguin also includes further 'details' in his narrative: how Van Gogh threw an absinth glass at him; followed and threatened him with an open razor; returned, on his own, to the Yellow House; mutilated himself and then deposited his severed earlobe at the brothel the two artists generally frequented, whereupon Gauguin left Arles without Van Gogh's ever seeing him again. The sequence of events as set out in the *Intimate journals* has been repeated in a great many different works. The early monographs on both Van Gogh and Gauguin - from Curt Glaser (1921) through Julius Meier-Graefe (1922) to Carl Sternheim (1924) - describe the incidents in this order, as do the biographical novels of Beril Becker (1931), Irving Stone (1934), Lee van Dovski (1947), Lawrence and Elisabeth Hanson (1954) and Erich Landgrebe (1959). Feature films such as *Lust for life* by Vincente Minelli (1956) and *Vincent and Theo* by Robert Altman (1990), finally, cemented the episode into the foundations of the myths that now surround the two artists. Arles, the period of companionship, has been transformed into 'drama.'

II.

Thus it is that the view of the personal and aesthetic differences between Gauguin and Van Gogh presented in the *Intimate journals* has left its mark on the conception of the two artists both in popular culture and in art history. This view, however, is not just one-sided - based on the standpoint of only one of the two persons concerned - but belated as well, for it was not formulated until several years after the events described. That this source should have had such an overriding power may be ascribed to the fact that the most essential contemporary sources of information for research on Van Gogh, namely his letters to his brother Theo, provide almost no information on those few crucial weeks in Arles. Thus, Gauguin's memoirs - irrespective of the time that had elapsed between the events and his account of them - are our only

---


7 Isolated parts of the account first appeared in an article published by Gauguin in 1894: ‘Natures mortes,’ *Essais d'art libre* 4 (January 1894), pp. 273-75.
‘eyewitness report.’ Indeed, they have acquired the status of historical documents despite the fact that by the time of their appearance the naturalisation of the painters' friendship - i.e. the transformation of their history into myth - had already taken place. For whilst the retrospective picture Gauguin created of his relationship with Van Gogh derives from ideas the artists had of one another and their communal life in Arles, it nevertheless alters their meaning.

At the beginning of their relationship, the prevailing notion was one of an artists' community, which was neither limited to Van Gogh and Gauguin nor based on any kind of fateful attraction between them. Van Gogh's notion of a 'studio of the south' instead stemmed from the wish to organise like-minded artists for purely economic reasons. Working and living together could, for example, serve to reduce everyday expenses. Above all, however, the aim of such a community would be to channel the activities of its members for the financial benefit of everyone involved: relatively well-known and less well-known painters could, through the sale of their comparatively expensive works, help provide the upkeep of those who were just starting out. Theo van Gogh, who was to handle the business side
of things, was to have overall control of the enterprise. Indeed, whenever the correspondence between Van Gogh, his brother, Gauguin and Emile Bernard refers to the planned artists' community in Arles (or in Pont Aven), its gist was always the same, stressing the economic advantages of working together.\(^8\)

Van Gogh's idea took on concrete form when he asked Theo to support him and Gauguin in Arles, in exchange for the latter's paintings.\(^9\) Although Gauguin was open to the suggestion it was only after considerable hesitation that he left for the south, a decision motivated more by his own financial difficulties than by anything else. Whereas in Pont Aven he was unable to pay his rent, his doctor's fees and his travel expenses, the move to Arles would mean freedom from debt and, at least temporarily, a guaranteed income.\(^10\) Quite apart from that, however, he himself had reflected on the economic benefits of such joint ventures, although his own ideas to this end revolved instead around finding collectors who were interested in investing in an art fund comprising the work of younger artists.\(^11\)

Both these pragmatic approaches to artistic collaboration reflect the situation of the moment and the structural changes that had taken place in the art world during the 19th century. In this context Cynthia and Harrison White have spoken of the evolution of the 'dealer-critic system,' which grew in direct proportion to the loss of power of the aristocracy (as the traditional buyers of art) and the academies (as the guardian both of the procedure of admission to the profession and of the production, presentation and distribution of works of art).\(^12\) Among the concomitant results of these institutional changes were independent one-man and group exhibitions mounted on private initiative; the transformation of the artist's studio - hitherto considered a private place - into a public salesroom;\(^13\) and the association of artists who saw themselves united by common aesthetic convictions, artists who were not infrequently supported and encouraged by critics, patrons and dealers of similar persuasions. The initiative taken by the impressionists exemplifies this new strategy for success: these artists came together for the express purpose of mounting a joint

\(^8\) On Van Gogh's plans for an artists' colony in the south see, for example, 628/498: 'You know, I do believe a community of Impressionists could be something like the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood in England, and I am sure it would be viable. Indeed, I believe that artists themselves could provide for their own upkeep, mutually, and independently of the dealers, if all of us were to give a considerable number of paintings to the community and the profit and loss were shared. I don't believe this community would last for ever, but I do believe that, for as long as it existed, we could live and work more boldly.' On the structure and tasks of the planned artists' community see also 580/464; 581/465; 586/468; 604/480; 638/507; 668/523; 665/524; 686/538; 689/544; and 707/550. On the various ways of creating a public for younger artists see 604/480.


\(^11\) On Gauguin's plans see 626/496 and Paul Gauguin et Vincent van Gogh, cit. (note 9), p. 70.


exhibition that would attract and organise a public favourable to their aims. On the one hand, it was to differentiate them from the prevailing standards of art and its institutional structures; on the other, it directed the attention of potential buyers and viewers to the specific characteristics of their own art. Moreover, in gathering a circle of initiates around charismatic, out-of-the-ordinary personalities, the show created the necessary prerequisites for the dissemination of their very impact and fame.

The exclusivity of such circles, the separation of the initiated from the uninitiated, is the mainspring of the mechanism. The conflicts concerning admission to the group exhibitions had their roots not just in aesthetic differences but also in the strategic desire to create a new, unified and easily recognisable direction in art. Frédéric Bazille's painting *The artist's studio, rue de la Condamine* (fig. 1) is the perfect illustration of this channelling of interests towards exclusivity: hanging on the walls of the studio, as if in a public exhibition, are Bazille's own works and those of his colleagues, while other accessories, - the piano, for example - denote the private nature of the space. Privacy is also suggested by the small number of people present, these being, without exception, the artist's close friends. In conveying the idea of access

14 See White and White, op. cit. (note 12), pp. 111-54.
granted only to the ‘initiated,’ Bazille's painting clearly seeks to attract attention to the art of the impressionists. One might see in this a parallel model for the kind of association sought by Van Gogh and Gauguin: a small circle of like-minded artists whose work was publicised and offered for sale by an agent - not by Frédéric Bazille and not by Paul Durand-Ruel, the most important impressionist dealer, but by Theo van Gogh, the trusted spokesman of the younger generation.\(^{18}\)

Closely bound up with such reflections on the socioeconomic structures of the art world during the closing years of the 19th century are Van Gogh's and Gauguin's own notions about the life of the artist. However, although these ideas were ultimately derived from these self-same structures, they had already been de-historicised and mythologised. The sign, as Roland Barthes puts it, had become the signifier, the historical had been transformed into the natural, entering into the realm of connotation, of second-order signification, and hence of myth.\(^{19}\) Myth and history merge, for example, when Van Gogh writes of illness as an integral part of the life of the artist.\(^{20}\)

He sees himself

---

\(^{18}\) To expand upon the argument of Evert van Uitert, who ascribes the competition between Van Gogh and Gauguin to the endeavour of both artists to outstrip impressionism, it could be said that the artists’ community they hoped to establish was a strategic attempt to beat the older generation using the means they themselves had introduced and made successful. See Evert van Uitert, ‘Vincent van Gogh and Paul Gauguin: a creative competition,’ *Simiolus* 9 (1977), no. 3, pp. 149-55.


\(^{20}\) See 585/467: ‘For Heaven's sake, when shall we ever see a generation of artists with healthy bodies?’
as a permanent sufferer and characterises Gauguin's life similarly. Both of them, he writes, are poor, starving and - he more than all others - lonely.\(^{21}\) This highly individual state of mind and body is seen by both Van Gogh and Gauguin as symbolic: suffering and loneliness are the passport to the world of the artist.

While illness had been a topos of the myth of the artist since the Renaissance, loneliness and poverty are notions notably associated with the modern-day creator, a consequence of his exclusion from bourgeois society, which, in turn, results from the failure of that society to recognise his (often highly unconventional) personal and artistic qualities.\(^{22}\)

The ‘studio of the south’ was to provide a cure for suffering, illness, poverty and loneliness.\(^{23}\) Rather than a strategically conceived, outgoing and publicly oriented understanding of the artists' association it follows an inward-looking concept of community, its primary aim to provide consolidation and consolation, and to relieve pain. As an antidote to a malicious, ungrateful society, it would give shelter to the (still) unknown artist, becoming a place of refuge for the ‘troglodytes,’ those who suffer from a lack of understanding by their fellow human beings.\(^ {24}\) It was to be a community of artists that offered its members a substitute for the social recognition they had previously been denied.

The pictures that Gauguin and Van Gogh painted with the other in mind give visual form to these notions of the artist. No matter with whom they identified - whether Jean Valjean, the outlaw in Victor Hugo's *Les misérables* (fig. 2),\(^{25}\) the poet (fig. 3)\(^ {26}\) or the Buddhist monk (fig. 4)\(^ {27}\) - all, without exception, were outsiders. Crime, dream, religion - all were areas that defied or counteracted social norms and legislation.

---

\(^{21}\) On illness, suffering and loneliness for the sake of art see 617/492; 620/495; 640/504; 650/513; 663/520; and 665/524. See also *Paul Gauguin: 45 lettres*, cit. (note 10), pp. 220-21, 234-35, and 242-45.


\(^{23}\) On their hopes of a curative effect see 701/545; 703/546; 706/549; and 707/550.

\(^{24}\) Oskar Bätschmann uses the term ‘troglodyte’ to describe the artist who withdraws from his public as a reaction to his new status as an *Ausstellungskünstler* (exhibition artist, a term coined by Bätschmann to distinguish the artist of the last two hundred years from the court artist of former times); see idem, ‘Ausstellungskünstler: Zu einer Geschichte des modernen Künstlers,’ in Michael Groblewski and Oskar Bätschmann (eds.), *Kultfigur und Mythenbildung: Das Bild vom Künstler und sein Werk in der zeitgenössischen Kunst*, Berlin 1993, pp. 4-7.

\(^{25}\) See *Paul Gauguin: 45 lettres*, cit. (note 10), pp. 242-47.

\(^{26}\) See also the series of paintings Van Gogh entitled *The poet's garden*, designed to decorate Gauguin's room at the Yellow House; these are: F 468 JH 1578; F 468a JH 362; F 479 JH 1601; and F 485 JH 1615. On the relationship between the works see Roland Dorn, *Décoration: Vincent van Goghs Werkreihe für das Gelbe Haus in Arles*, Hildesheim, Zurich & New York 1990, esp. pp. 378-382, 394-95 and 402-03. See also Gauguin about himself in a letter to Emile Schuffenecker in *Lettres de Gauguin à sa femme et à ses amis*, ed. Maurice Malingue, Paris 1946, no. 73.

\(^{27}\) See 701/545.
Exclusion from bourgeois society, the mark of the artist throughout the 19th century - as seen in self-portraits, studio depictions and paintings of precisely

fig. 3
Vincent van Gogh, Portrait of Eugène Boch (Le poète) (F 462 JH 1574), 1888, Paris, Musée d'Orsay

those poets whom Van Gogh envisaged for his series of the Poet's garden - is central to Van Gogh's and Gauguin's perception of both themselves and each other prior to their time in Arles. In requesting Gauguin become the head - the abbot - of a community of artists, Van Gogh conveys the clear message that being beyond the pale also offers opportunities
for the artist.28 Thus, in a fusion of mythical and real perceptions of the life of the artist, the ‘studio of the south’ became a social alternative with its own hierarchical structures, laws and values.

III.

Given the prominence the Arles episode has enjoyed in the 20th-century reception of both artists, one might suppose that the first articles on Gauguin and Van Gogh to be published after 1888, as well as those that appeared throughout the 1890s, would contain numerous references to this period. Quite the contrary: neither the objectives of their cooperation nor the events in Arles, nor even their personal relationship, were of much interest. Instead, most attention was paid to Van Gogh's concept of an artists' community - although now it was discussed not in conjunction with any definite names but rather, in a more extended sense, roughly along the lines of a yearning à la Gauguin for a life beyond Europe and civilisation. The notion of a social alternative here becomes closely bound up with the hope of discovering completely new areas of aesthetic expression beyond the shores of France and the restrictions of French society. Such associations played a role whenever Van Gogh's plans for a ‘studio of the south’ were considered. That the first-ever attempt to found such a community had been a complete failure was ignored by the critics.29 In keeping with this emphasis, the reviews made no attempt to proffer a picture of the artists' friendship either. Only their significance for contemporary art - for symbolism and

28 698/544.
29 See, for example, Emile Bernard, ‘Vincent van Gogh,’ La Plume (September 1891), pp. 300-01. This failure to mention the fiasco of the artist's community has its parallel in similar omissions in contemporary writings on Gauguin. No mention is ever made of the painter's painful experiences on the island of Martinique or during his first Tahiti voyage although it was precisely these experiences that made him return to France; see Beatrice von Bismarck, Die Gauguin-Legende: Die Rezeption Paul Gauguins in der französischen Kunstkritik 1880-1903, Münster & Hamburg 1992, pp. 162-84.
for neo-traditionalism as defined by Maurice Denis - was noted, and it was this
significance alone that warranted the joining of their names.30

In fact, instead of underscoring their friendship, writers soon took to stressing the
differences between the two artists' characters. While in Van Gogh's case it was his
childlike naiveté, exuberance, excess and lack of control that found mention (and
even gave rise to speculation about his sanity), Gauguin's critics continued to
characterise him as uncivilised and primitive - as they had done ever since his first
voyage to the South Seas in 1891.31 Viewed together, these characterisations may,
however, be regarded as different aspects of one and the same idea, namely that of
the artist as a social outcast seeking refuge in either the inner or outer worlds.

The first of Albert Aurier's series of articles, written with the aim of validating the
symbolist movement, was entitled ‘Les isolés’ and bears exemplary witness to this
idea.

30 See, for example, Jules Antoine, ‘Critique d'art. Pavillon de la Ville de Paris. Exposition des
artistes indépendants,’ La Plume (May 1891), pp. 156-57 and Gustave-Albert Aurier, ‘Les
symbolistes,’ La Revue encyclopédique 2 (1 April 1892), no. 32, pp. 474-86.
31 On the reception of the two artists during the 1890s and the consolidation of their images
see Carol M. Zemel, The formation of a legend: Van Gogh criticism, 1890-1920 (diss.), Ann
Arbor 1977, pp. 59-79; Bismarck, op. cit. (note 29), pp. 149-84; idem, ‘Genie, Märtyrer und
Führerfigur: Der “primitive” Paul Gauguin. Kunstkritik und Mythenbildung um 1900,’ in
Uwe Fleckner and Thomas W. Gaehtgens (eds.), Prenez garde à la peinture! Kunstkritik in
Aurier's monographic studies of both Van Gogh and of Gauguin underline their exclusion from contemporary society, pointing an accusing finger at the bourgeoisie and assuring that things would look very different in the future: ‘[...] connaîtra-t-il un jour - tout est possible - les joies de la réhabilitation, les cajoleries repenties de la vogue?’ he asks at the end of his piece on Van Gogh. Similarly Aurier concludes his manifesto-like Le symbolisme en peinture, for which Gauguin served as his model, by accusing his contemporaries of ignorance, ending with the appeal: ‘[...] des murs! Des murs! Donnez-lui des murs!’ Social alienation and lack of recognition here go hand-in-hand - a motif that was already a part of the myth of the modern artist in the 19th century and which has since become thoroughly engrained in the legends surrounding Van Gogh and Gauguin.

IV.

The mythologemes just mentioned are not, however, the ones at work in Gauguin's 1903 account of those few weeks in Arles. His description instead evidences a change of perspective, instigating a paradigm that would henceforth characterise the two artists more in relation to one another other. The decisive passage, at least as far as the discussion of their aesthetics is concerned, is the one in which Gauguin claims responsibility for having persuaded Van Gogh to drop neo-impressionism in favour of a kind of painting more suited his temperament. It was from this moment on, Gauguin alleges, that his friend began to make progress, ‘and the result was that whole series of sun-effects over sun-effects in full sunlight.’ While Gauguin insists his ‘enlightening’ advice influenced the younger painter, he simultaneously stresses that it had not led to Van Gogh forfeiting any of his originality.

In the final analysis, however, this description of the differences in their approaches to art serves primarily to distinguish between their personalities, for Gauguin hints at a relationship of power, which, in one form or another and to a greater or lesser extent, informs his entire account. In this relationship, an equal exchange between the two artists was impossible; rather, Van Gogh could ‘repay’ Gauguin only by recognising him as his teacher: ‘When I arrived at Arles, Vincent was trying to find himself, while I, who was a good deal older, was a mature man. But I owe something to Vincent, and that is, in the consciousness of having been useful to him, the confirmation of my own original ideas about painting.’

Gauguin played a similar role in regard to Van Gogh's untidiness in what seemed to be every sphere of his life and work: ‘In the first place, everywhere and in

33 For Nathalie Heinich, the Van Gogh legend is the archetype of the myth of the unrecognised genius and has become a paradigm by which the rejection of any artist in the present proves his greatness in the future; see Nathalie Heinich, The glory of van Gogh: an anthropology of admiration, Princeton 1996, pp. 140-50.
35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
everything I found a disorder that shocked me." The chaos began in Van Gogh's paint box and spread from there to the way he cooked, the way he handled his money, how he painted and the way he thought. Just as he took over the management of their joint finances and began to cook for them both, Gauguin also endeavoured ‘to disentangle from this disordered brain a reasoned logic in his critical opinions.’

Making no mention of the financial motivation behind his decision to leave Pont Aven, Gauguin instead stresses how long he resisted Van Gogh's urging him to come to Arles. This steadfastness has its parallel in Gauguin's physical strength, which, he feared, might lead him to strangle Van Gogh the next time the latter attacked him. The physical superiority is underlined in his contrasting reference to Van Gogh's ‘well-known step, short, quick, irregular.’ It corresponds not only with the role Gauguin intended for himself as the ‘director’ of the planned artists' community but also, and primarily, with the trial of strength that took place during their very last encounter. Gauguin's description of this scene consecrates once and for all the fundamental differences between the

---

37 Ibid., p. 24.
38 Ibid.
40 Ibid., p. 23.

*Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001*
two artists: ‘My look at that moment must have had great power in it, for he stopped and, lowering his head, set off running towards home.’ Gauguin's powerful gaze wards off Van Gogh's armed attack, forcing the latter not merely to stop in his tracks but, after a gesture of submission, to beat a retreat. Later, at the bedside of the unconscious Van Gogh, this dreadful gaze metamorphoses into the dreadfulness of the sight of Gauguin himself, the affect of which might well have been ‘fatal’ for the younger artist. Van Gogh's addressing Gauguin as ‘Master’ in his last letter to him completes the picture Gauguin paints of his friend's subordination.

There are two ways in which Gauguin's narrative transforms what had hitherto been the defining aspects in the reception of the two artists: in the first place, it shifts the accent away from the artists Van Gogh and Gauguin towards the human beings Vincent and Paul. Nathalie Heinich describes this accentual relocation as an essential step in the formation of a legend and the glorification of the artist, for it crystallises ‘the general process of folding artistic excellence into religious forms of greatness.’

Secondly, Gauguin's account gives us a picture of two human beings linked by fate. Whereas in the 1890s phrases such as ‘eccentric and mad’ and ‘uncivilised and primitive’ were used by art critics to characterise and differentiate Van Gogh and Gauguin's respective qualities, Gauguin's chronicle evokes a relationship in which the two artists are so closely bound up with each other that the personality and behaviour of the one can henceforth be defined only in relation to the personality and behaviour of the other. The two artists have now become the symbolic embodiment of pairs of opposites within a social frame of reference: outgoing enthusiasm is yoked with calculating reserve; the readiness to receive with the generosity of giving; the insecure search with the self-assurance of the initiated; intuitive chaos with intellectually controlled order; altruism with egocentricity; subjugation with commanding power.

Gauguin's account thus makes an important addition to the images previously developed of what linked these two artists together. To the pragmatic idea of joining forces with the aim of achieving greater exposure, a more

---

41 Ibid., p. 29.
42 Ibid., p. 30.
43 Ibid., p. 33.
44 See Heinich, op. cit. (note 33), pp. 46, 61-75 and 140.
intensive exchange and, last but not least, financial security, and also to the underlying associations with the existing myth of the artist as social outcast, Gauguin now adds the description of a binding tie between two very different, even incompatible, personalities. It is precisely the latter that qualifies their relationship as more than one of mere coexistence but actually as a ‘friendship’ in the sense of Michel de Montaigne. In his definition, friendship is about the ‘harmonisation of two wills’ and the ‘fusion’ of two souls. Its opposite is the state of marriage which, according to Montaigne, is ‘a deal serving ordinary purposes that have nothing to do with friendship. [...] With friendship, on the other hand, there is no bargaining or dealing, it is concerned
solely with itself." Implicit in this idea is that friendship ranks higher than civic duties, that loyalty to one another can override all the other laws governing society. Friendship thus has the potential for effecting change; it can offer an alternative to existing communal structures - an alternative that can just as much result from changed norms and values as it can constitute new ones.

V.

Which norms and values were embodied in Gauguin's account of the friendship is a question that cannot solely be answered in aesthetic terms. The artists' debates on symbolism and its departure from both realistic depictions of nature and neo-impressionism only constitute a minor battlefield in the clash of forces Gauguin describes. As presented in his writings, their differences, rather, were akin to those one would conventionally associate with a love affair between members of the opposite sex, with gender-specific behavioural patterns: the one soft, submissive, illogically intuitive and receptive; the other physically superior, self-assured, confident of his intellect and dominant.

What Gauguin only implies becomes in the accounts that follow the main cause of their quarrels. The aesthetic dispute is here replaced by a battle of the sexes - and with clearly erotic undertones. The most explicit expression of this can be found in Carl Sternheim, who compares Van Gogh's waiting for Gauguin to a ‘fever of lascivious longing’ in which, for example, he would yearningly dash off a few lines to Gauguin and then run off to the brothel. The months in Arles only heightened the tension: ‘They played cat and mouse with each other, like a man and a girl at the moment when cheeks are flushed and defloration is nigh.’ In this scenario Van Gogh's resort to the razor becomes an impulsive act of revenge, directed not least against the satisfaction Gauguin derives from his visits to the prostitutes. The conception of Gauguin as a successful womaniser - both here and in Beril Becker's later biography - automatically casts Van Gogh in the role of the woman who gives herself to her seducer. Van Dovski modifies this notion slightly, turning the seduction into a

46 Ibid., p. 92: ‘They were more friends than citizens, more friends amongst themselves than friends and foes of their country.’
48 See Becker, op. cit. (note 5), pp. 115, 122-23.
marital confrontation and likening the ups and downs in Arles to those of a marriage. Gauguin's wish to return to Paris leads to a ‘marriage drama’ in which Van Gogh, weeping, implores him to stay. The actual trigger of the crisis was Gauguin's behaviour in the brothel.⁴⁹ These two narrative elements are also linked in Vincente Minelli's film version of Irving Stone's novel Lust for life, the most famous biographical novel about Van Gogh. The tension that has been mounting between the two artists reaches its climax in the scene in which Gauguin's imperious gaze forces Van Gogh, cowering before him, to leave (fig. 5). In Robert Altman's Vincent and Theo the moment has explicitly sexual connotations, for Gauguin draws a dagger on the now scantily clad Van Gogh and taps it against his chest, touching him and yet at the same time keeping him at a distance (fig. 6). In Altman's film this is an unambiguously homoerotic incident: Van Gogh kisses Gauguin passionately and the latter pushes him away, thus provoking the events that follow.

VI.

Gauguin's account forms the backdrop for all these representations. It provides the stimulus for their embellished, sexualised fictionalisations. It is the source of the clichés around which all these tales have been woven. Decisive for the lasting impact of Gauguin's memoirs is their extraordinary abundance of anecdotes. Indeed, it is to this abundance that Avant et après owes its credibility. As Catherine M. Soussloff points out, the anecdote in its original sense - i.e. a private, unpublished narrative - always has something of the revelation about it. It lends ‘realism’

⁴⁹ See Van Dovski, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 97, 103-05.
to what in fact has been imagined. The continual repetition of an anecdote, for example in history books, creates the illusion of authority - not least thanks to the reference to all the other authors who have quoted it in the past - in spite of the fact that the image it conveys actually precedes the historical events.\textsuperscript{50}

The decisive image in Gauguin's \textit{Intimate journals}, in which notions of the modern artist are reproduced in mythologised form, is that of the friendship between himself and Van Gogh. This image adds to the notions ‘primitive’ and ‘mad’ (that mirror the status of the two artists as social outcasts) features more specifically bound up with the internal, structural changes taking place in modernism. These are expressed in the tense ‘duality of togetherness and irreplaceable uniqueness’ which, according to Klaus-Dieter Eichler, distinguishes friendship.\textsuperscript{51} Gauguin and Van Gogh share their fate as outcasts just as they shared an initial artistic leaning towards impressionism and a subsequent break with it. They differ, on the other hand, both in regard to the personal characteristics that resulted in their social exile and in the way they broke with their former styles. The friendship motif becomes a kind of pillar, a pillar supported equally by what separates and unites them, and which also assumes a supporting function in itself. In this sense the artists' references to one another, their mutual respect and subsequent separation as depicted by Gauguin exemplify - in a condensed form - the strategies Griselda Pollock has described as ‘avant-garde gambits’ or: 'the play of reference, deference and difference.' This is a playful technique of self-positioning within the art field: first referring to what is currently happening in the avant-garde, then showing deference to the movement's current leading figure, and finally differentiating oneself from the latter once and for all.\textsuperscript{52}

Gauguin describes Van Gogh's development along just such lines: it was, he writes, Meissonier, Monticelli and the neo-impressionists - at the time among the most discussed painters - to whom Van Gogh initially related, showing them, and him, Gauguin, the greatest respect.\textsuperscript{53} The fact that Van Gogh was nevertheless able to break away from them and to discover his own, original style was the decisive point as far as Gauguin was concerned. Even though he claims to have been responsible for some of the steps taken by Van Gogh, he simultaneously stresses the younger painter's continuing originality.\textsuperscript{54} Here Gauguin calls upon Albert Aurier as his witness. Aurier had published the first detailed monographic articles on Gauguin and Van Gogh in 1890/91, drawing attention to the differences in their respective symbolist approaches and it was to Aurier, Gauguin writes, that Van Gogh had confessed to the latter's influence upon him.\textsuperscript{55} Van Gogh's artistic uniqueness, which in Gauguin's account of their friendship is closely bound up with the notion of their togetherness, was proof that both of them belonged to the avant-garde. In his memoirs as in his art, Gauguin implements strategies of self-assertion that take into account modernism's changing demands on the artist. In his version of his relationship with

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} See Catherine M. Soussloff, \textit{The absolute artist: the historiography of a concept}, Minneapolis & London 1997, pp. 149-55.
\item \textsuperscript{51} See Eichler, op. cit. (note 45), p. 221.
\item \textsuperscript{52} See Griselda Pollock, \textit{Avant-garde gambits 1888-1893: gender and the colour of art history}, London 1992, pp. 12-16.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Gauguin, op. cit. (note 3), pp. 24, 27.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p. 28.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
Van Gogh, these strategies operate on the level of the artist's personality or image, for, in the final analysis, the culmination of their relationship in a battle of the sexes reflects nothing other than the contradictory image of the modern artist. On the one hand, we have the notion of the self-absorbed - male - artist, full of inexhaustible creativity and productive urges, subjugating material to his will; on the other, a concept of the artist more in keeping with the art field's changed structures of presentation and sale, an artist who - in a role with feminine connotations - exposes himself, offers himself to the public's gaze and invites attention. The autonomous, virile artistic approach of the one - which lost none of its attraction during the 20th century - is enfolded in the coquettish posing in the spectator's view.

In the symbolic usage of the biographical anecdote Gauguin and Van Gogh are made out as representatives of these two aspects respectively. While they are independent and individual artistically, as required by the tenets of the avant-garde, when taken together they embody the contradictory personal qualities ascribed to the modern artist in general. Their characteristics stand in for the various ways the artist and society have interacted since the beginnings of modernism. The relationship between the two artists, which Gauguin is so keen to describe in his retrospective account of 1903, reconciles these opposites in a composite picture. Considering their relationship as described in the *Intimate journals* and its subsequent life in film and fiction, neither Van Gogh nor Gauguin emerges from the Arles conflict as the winner in the struggle for a new kind of art.\(^{56}\) Rather we see that both are integral parts of the image of the modern artist. It is in their personal relationship that a certain self-assertion strategy becomes manifest af-
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\(^{56}\) If we consider Gauguin and Van Gogh separately instead of as an inseparable pair, we may conclude that Gauguin - as the new hero of modernism - emerged in the end as the winner. It is in this sense, too, that Griselda Pollock interprets the film *Lust for life*, in which Anthony Quinn (as Gauguin) succeeds in preserving his integrity both as a man and as an artist. And it is for this reason, she adds, that he, and not Kirk Douglas (in the role of Van Gogh) received the Oscar. See Griselda Pollock, ‘Crows, blossoms and lust for death: cinema and the myth of van Gogh the modernist artist,’ in Kōdera and Rosenberg, op. cit. (note 5), p. 226.
ter all; not the economic and social one envisaged by Van Gogh and Gauguin prior to 1888, but rather a discursive one, one which, despite - or even because of - their differences has in the course of the 20th century made both of these two men into paradigms of the modern artist.
fig. 1
Memories of Van Gogh and Gauguin: Hartrick's reminiscences

Martin Bailey

Archibald Standish Hartrick (1864-1950) is one of the few artists who knew both Van Gogh and Gauguin and who went on to record his memories of them. In July 1886, at the age of 22, the British painter met Gauguin in Pont-Aven. Hartrick returned to Paris in November and soon afterwards met Van Gogh, with whom he remained friends for nearly a year. An important newly rediscovered text written by Hartrick in 1913 records his detailed reminiscences of the two post-impressionists. More tangible evidence of Hartrick's visit to Pont-Aven has also just emerged: two of his rare Brittany paintings have been acquired by the Courtauld Institute Gallery in London. All this makes it an opportune moment to re-evaluate Hartrick's links with Van Gogh and Gauguin.

From Bangalore to Brittany

A.S. Hartrick was born in Bangalore, India, on 7 August 1864, the son of a British army captain. Two years later his family returned to their native Scotland. Hartrick later studied at the Slade School in London under Alphonse Legros (1884-85), and then went to Paris, initially attending the Académie Julian. During the summer of 1886, probably in June, he travelled to Pont-Aven, to work in the small Breton port. There he stayed at the Pension Gloanec, meeting many of the other painters who flocked to this new artist's haven. In November he returned to Paris and the following month entered the Atelier Cormon. He worked in Paris for a year, encountering many avant-garde artists, and at the end of 1887 he returned to Scotland.

Hartrick's Pont-Aven paintings have remained relatively unknown, but two key works were acquired by the Courtauld in 2000: Gauguin's studio, Pont-Aven and Village street, Pont-Aven, both dating from 1886. They were donated by Miss Eva A. Black, a niece of the artist who lived in Scotland and who died in 2001, aged 98.1

I would like to thank the following, who assisted my research: Michael and Audrey MacLeod, Ernst Vegelin van Claerbergen, Catherine Puget, Philip Dennis Cate, Herbert Schimmel, Jane Lindsey and Sheila Clarke.

1 Few other works done by Hartrick in France survive. One summer's day, depicting a mother and child, may have been painted in Pont-Aven. It was once in the collection of Mr and Mrs Herbert D. Schimmel; see Phillip Dennis Cate, exhib. cat. The circle of Toulouse-Lautrec, New Brunswick (Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum) 1986, no. 69, pp. 109-10. The work was sold by Sothebys.com on 4 April 2001. The titles of two other Hartrick paintings of this period are known from early exhibitions: Un blanchissage Breton (Paris Salon, 1887, no. 1182, possibly the Courtauld's Village street) and November in Finistère (London, Royal Society of British Artists, Suffolk Street, 1887-88).

2 Both paintings had passed to Miss Black after Hartrick's death in 1950. They have been exhibited as follows: exhib. cat. An artist's pilgrimage: fifty years of painting, London (Fulham Central Library) 1936, no. 23: Pont-Aven (presumably the Courtauld's Village street); exhib. cat. A.S. Hartrick: a memorial exhibition, London (Arts Council) 1951, no. 1: Pont-Aven (the dimensions are given as 5 × 9 inches, but this may have been a mistake and the work was probably the Courtauld's Village street), and no. 2: The back of Gauguin's studio, Pont-Aven; exhib. cat. Drawn from Nature, Canterbury (Royal Museum), Rye (Art Gallery), Eastbourne (Town Art Gallery), Hove (Museum of Art) and Bristol (Royal West of England Academy) 1980-81, no. 52: Village street, Pont-Aven and no. 54: The back of Gauguin's
The two paintings are fairly traditional in style, particularly the road scene, and owe little to the influence of Gauguin and the nascent Pont-Aven School.

Gauguin's studio, Pont-Aven (fig. 1) depicts the exterior of the Manoir de Lezaven, where an atelier extension

Studio at Pont-Aven; and The circle of Toulouse-Lautrec, cit. (note 1), no. 68: Gauguin's studio at the Pont-Aven [sic] and no. 70: Pont-Aven.
fig. 2
had been built in 1865. The studio is in the centre of the painting (just the upper part of its white wall is visible beneath the roof). In the foreground is a girl wearing a Pont-Aven costume of the period, and washed linen is drying on the grass. Hartrick does not focus on the buildings, but on the setting, and it was probably only later that he entitled the picture *Gauguin's studio*. Indeed, the painting could well be his *Blanchissage Breton*, shown at the Paris Salon in 1887. The studio building was never depicted by Gauguin, nor, apparently, in detail by any other 19th-century artists, and there are no early photographs. This therefore appears to be the best visual record of the place during Gauguin's period, although the building does still survive.

_Village street, Pont-Aven* (fig. 2) depicts a road, with a woman and two little girls walking towards a group of farmhouses. The location has not been identified, and it probably shows houses which have since disappeared. The costumes are typical of those worn in Pont-Aven in the 1880s. When the painting was exhibited in 1936, the *Fulham Chronicle* recorded a story that presumably came from Hartrick: ‘During the painting of this [work] the artist was actually stoned by the resentful Breton villagers! It was only the timely intervention of the priest from Nizon that prevented this exhibition from being robbed of one of its pleasantest pictures.’ The assistance of the Nizon priest suggests that the painting may have been done on the road to the small village, which lies three kilometres to the west of Pont-Aven. The priest was probably Hippolyte Orvoën, who served from 1886-89. The reference to him is intriguing, since in September 1888 Gauguin wanted to present him with his *Vision after the sermon* (*Edinburgh, National Galleries of Scotland*) for the Nizon church, but it was rejected.

Following his departure from France, Hartrick settled into a much more conventional milieu in Britain. In 1890 he became an illustrator for the *Daily Graphic* in London, where he worked for two years. One of his fellow illustrators, Philip May (1863-1903), drew his portrait in 1892 (fig. 3). In 1896 Hartrick married the artist

---

3 The picture is 48 × 61 cm and is signed and dated [18]86. I am very grateful to Catherine Puget of the Musée de Pont-Aven for her comments on this work and on the *Village street, Pont-Aven*.

4 It does, however, feature in the far distance of _La ferme de Lezaven_ (Dublin, National Gallery of Ireland), by the Irish artist Roderic O’Conor (1860-1940). His picture is dated 1894, when he worked in the Lezaven studio alongside Gauguin; see Roy Johnston, _Roderic O’Conor_ , Dublin 1992, no. 39, p. 194 and ill. 18.

5 The work is 54 × 81 cm and is signed and dated 1886, with traces of an inscription, ending in ‘en’, presumably *Pont-Aven*.

6 The *Fulham Chronicle* (15 May 1936). The comment refers to no. 23 in the catalogue _An artist’s pilgrimage*, cit. (note 2), which is presumably the Courtauld picture (since virtually all the loans were from Hartrick and he is not known to have saved many other Pont-Aven works). The newspaper also reported: ‘An interesting point is that Mr Hartrick prepared the canvas himself - fifty years ago, and it is as good now as then.’

7 Gauguin told Van Gogh that he had initially wanted to give the painting to the church at Pont-Aven (see _Correspondance de Paul Gauguin*, ed. Victor Merlhès, Paris 1984, p. 230), and Emile Bernard claimed he then offered it to the Nizon church; see Richard Brettell _et al._ , exhib. cat. *The art of Paul Gauguin*, Washington (National Gallery of Art) & Chicago (The Art Institute) 1988-89, p. 103. In 1889 Gauguin also painted the Calvary statue located outside the Nizon church, although in a different setting, in _The green Christ* (*Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique*).
Lily Blatherwick (1854-1934), who was his stepsister, and the couple moved to the Gloucestershire countryside for a

fig. 3
Phil May, *Portrait of Hartrick*, 1892, present location unknown (reproduced in *A painter's pilgrimage*, p. 102)
decade, initially to Acton Turville and then to Tresham, before eventually returning to London. From the late 1890s he worked mainly as an illustrator and printmaker, and in 1909 he was a founding member of the London-based Senefelder Club, named after the inventor of lithography. He was also elected an associate of the Royal Watercolour Society in 1910 and a full member ten years later. Hartrick taught drawing and painting at London's Camberwell School of Art (1908-14) and lithography at the Central School (1914-29). He illustrated numerous books and wrote studies on drawing and lithography. Hartrick died on 1 February 1950.

Reminiscences

Although Hartrick recorded his memories of Van Gogh and Gauguin in his autobiography, *A painter's pilgrimage through fifty years*, they have never been taken particularly seriously, mainly because they were not published until 1939 - 53 years after he had known the artists in France. The author also admitted in the introduction to his book that it was not based on documentary material: ‘I kept no diary; and although I have looked at some papers and letters, I preferred not to burden what I wished to say with details already forgotten.’

I have, however, tracked down evidence that Hartrick’s reminiscences of Van Gogh and Gauguin were recorded before the First World War, i.e. more than a quarter of a century before the publication of his autobiography. A paper entitled ‘Post-impressionism, with some personal recollections of Vincent Van Gogh and Paul Gauguin’ survives in three forms. First, it was published in the May 1913 issue


11 Hartrick, op. cit. (note 9), p. xi. Very few of Hartrick's papers appear to have survived, and none have been found from the 1880s.
of *The Imprint*, a London journal primarily devoted to typography and printmaking.\(^\text{12}\) This was a very short-lived venture, and only nine issues appeared before it ceased publication. The article does not appear to have been cited in any of the subsequent literature on either Van Gogh or Gauguin.

Secondly, the same text was privately reprinted as a slim 24-page book, *Post-impressionism, with some personal recollections of Vincent Van Gogh & Paul Gauguin*. At the back of the book is an explanatory colophon: ‘Printed at the L.C.C. [London County Council] Central School of Arts & Crafts by the Day Technical School of Book Production. Teacher J.H. Mason. 1916.’ The book is extremely rare and it is neither in the British Library nor in the UK National Art Library.\(^\text{13}\) The three extant copies can be found in the archive of the Central St Martin's School of Art. Each is bound differently, and they were apparently preserved as examples of books typeset and bound by students, rather than for their content. Finally, a 29-page typescript of the text of Hartrick's paper also survives in the college archive.\(^\text{14}\)


\(^{13}\) The Central School book does not appear to have been cited in the literature, other than a brief reference in Charles Mattoon Brooks, *Vincent van Gogh: a bibliography*, New York 1942, p. 28, no. 337. Welsh-Ovcharov mentions that *A painter's pilgrimage* is ‘based upon a private publication of 1916’ (*Van Gogh in Perspective*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1974, p. 29), but she is presumably following Brooks. Hartrick refers to his text in a somewhat obscure reference in his autobiography: ‘Alan Seaby, Professor of Art at Reading University, arranged for me to give a set of lectures to his pupils at Reading on the subject of Modern Painting, and the lectures some years later were published in *The Imprint*, after which J.H. Mason, the head of the printing department at the L.C.C. Central School, set them up in a little book with the aid of his class, and a few copies were printed and bound at the school for private circulation’; see Hartrick, op. cit. (note 9), p. 224. Because there was no specific reference to either post-impressionism, Van Gogh or Gauguin here this lead never seems to have been followed up.

\(^{14}\) My thanks to the archival staff. In the present article, citations of Hartrick's 1913 reminiscences are given from *The Imprint* (op. cit. [note 12]), since this is the slightly more accessible of the three forms of the text.
In preparing his 1913 paper, Hartrick had probably been spurred on by the controversial ‘Manet and the Post-Impressionists’ exhibition, held at London's Grafton Galleries from November 1910 to January 1911. Twenty-three works by Van Gogh and 21 by Gauguin had been on show, giving the British public their first real taste of the paintings of these two artists. Visiting the exhibition must have reawakened Hartrick's interest in his old colleagues, and friends probably encouraged him to record his memories. When in 1939 he came to publish his autobiography, he presumably took his 1913 essay, added further details and expanded it with secondary material.

The fact that Hartrick's reminiscences actually date from 1913 means that scholars should take them far more seriously than has previously been the case. Not only were they recorded considerably closer to the time when he had known the two painters, but there are other reasons to suggest that the author's recollections are, in fact, trustworthy. In 1913 relatively little material had been published on Gauguin and Van Gogh, so Hartrick's account would have been much less coloured by the writings of others. The two artists were not nearly as famous as they were to become, meaning Hartrick would have had less incentive to exaggerate his links with them - in contrast to 1939, when his publisher is likely to have encouraged him to stress this aspect in his autobiography.

Hartrick's 1913 memoirs are particularly important because they cover periods in the life of the two post-impressionists that are relatively less well documented. Van Gogh was living with his brother Theo in Paris and therefore not in correspondence with him. The only other significant personal account of Gauguin's first visit to Pont-Aven in 1886 was written by the artist Henri Delavallée (1862-1943), whose brief recollections were published by Charles Chassé in 1921. Despite later critical comments regarding the reliability of Hartrick's autobiography, a detailed examination of his 1913 essay suggests that they are relatively accurate. The text not only provides a revealing insight into the personalities of the two artists, but also sometimes helps in the dating of works and chronology.

15 The 1910-11 exhibition made a deep impression on Hartrick; see idem, op. cit. (note 9), pp. 222-24.
16 Some of Hartrick's reminiscences about Gauguin were also published in the catalogue of for the 1924 exhibition at the Leicester Galleries, but this short essay has only rarely been cited in the Gauguin literature, most writers instead using Hartrick's more accessible autobiography; see 'Some reminiscences of Gauguin,' exhib. cat. Catalogue of the Paul Gauguin exhibition, London (Leicester Galleries) 1924, pp. 15-27.
17 On Van Gogh, the only book available to Hartrick in English would have been The letters of a post-impressionist, being the familiar correspondence of Vincent van Gogh, translated and introduced by Anthony M. Ludovici, London 1912, but this early edition of the letters has very little on Van Gogh's Paris period. Elizabeth Du Quesne van Gogh's Personal recollections of Vincent van Gogh was published in London in 1913, but since The Imprint article appeared in May, it seems unlikely that Hartrick saw it before he wrote his text. There were no monographs on Gauguin in English at this time. Hartrick would, of course, have seen the catalogue of the 1910-11 post-impressionism exhibition, but this has comparatively little biographical material. The one author whom Hartrick cites is Julius Meier-Graefe, presumably a reference to his Modern art, London 1908 - which in volume two has sections on Gauguin (pp. 59-66) and Van Gogh (pp. 202-12), but again includes very little on Gauguin's first visit to Pont-Aven or Van Gogh's stay in Paris. Hartrick may well have read French, but relatively little had been published on these two particular periods.
Hartrick spent the summer of 1886 at Pont-Aven, probably arriving in June or possibly early July. He was certainly there when Gauguin arrived on 25 July. Both men lodged at the Pension Gloanec, a favourite haunt of visiting artists in the central square of the village. Hartrick recalled his initial impression of Gauguin: ‘Tall, dark, rather handsome, with a fine powerful figure, and about forty years of age, wearing a blue jersey, and a beret on the

side of his head, is how I saw him first.\textsuperscript{20} In terms of personality, he found him ‘self-contained, confident, silent, almost dour.’

Hartrick recounted an incident which took place during one of their first encounters: ‘Gauguin, a few days after his arrival and more or less a complete stranger, was passing through the little crowd of painters standing round the door of the Auberge, waiting for dejeuner. He was carrying a sketch, on which he had just been working, representing some nude boys bathing on a weir, painted in the now familiar “impressionist” manner, all spots in touches of pure colour.’\textsuperscript{21} Gauguin was immediately ridiculed by a Dutch artist also staying at the pension, and a crowd quickly gathered. Hartrick discreetly refers to him only as V, short for Hubert Vos (1855-1935).\textsuperscript{22}

Hartrick then recounts what happened two weeks later. A pupil of Vos's, named only as P, switched his allegiance and began to go to Gauguin for instruction. P is presumably Ferdinand du Puigaudeau (1864-1930), then 22 and nicknamed Piccolo.\textsuperscript{23} In his 1924 Leicester Galleries catalogue essay on Gauguin, Hartrick added that P ‘invited his new master to share a studio he had taken at les Avens [Lezaven], and there Gauguin worked in comfort for the rest of his time at Pont-Aven.’\textsuperscript{24} This comment is interesting, since it has usually been assumed that Gauguin only began using the Lezaven studio on his third visit to Pont-Aven in 1889, returning there again in 1894. The Lezaven house was owned by Marie-Perrine Lollichon, whose son, Louis Bergé, was then the village mayor. It is located on a hillside, \ldots

\textsuperscript{20} Hartrick, op. cit. (note 12), p. 312. Gauguin was then aged 38. A photograph taken in Pont-Aven in 1888 shows him with a beret, but it is unlikely that Hartrick would have seen this photograph by 1913; it is reproduced in Correspondance, cit. (note 7), p. 215.

\textsuperscript{21} Hartrick, op. cit. (note 12), p. 312. The ‘sketch’ was almost certainly La baignade au moulin du Bois d'Amour (Hiroshima Museum of Art). It is reproduced in colour in exhib. cat. Paul Gauguin, Graz (Landesmuseum Joanneum) 2000, no. 18, p. 185. There has been some debate over whether the picture should be dated to 1886 or 1888, since the last digit on the painting is unclear: Georges Wildenstein (Paul Gauguin, Paris 1964, vol. 1, W 272) gives 1888, although the Graz catalogue suggests 1886. Hartrick's comment appears to confirm the earlier year. See also Vojtĕech Jirat-Wasiutyński and H. Travers Newton Jr, Technique and meaning in the paintings of Paul Gauguin, Cambridge 2000, pp. 63-64.

\textsuperscript{22} Vos is identified in Correspondance, cit. (note 7), p. 439 (note 6).

\textsuperscript{23} The presence of Du Puigaudeau and Vos is confirmed in a contemporary publication: ‘Deux artistes, l'un M. Hubert Vos [sic], médaillé au dernier Salon de Paris, et l'autre son camarade d'atelier, M. du Puigaudeau, voulant, à la veille de leur départ, donner une marque de sympathie à la population'; see Union Agricole et Maritime de Quimperlé (1 August 1886), quoted in André Cariou, Les peintres de Pont-Aven, Rennes 1999, p. 49. Du Puigaudeau (at least) stayed several weeks longer, as a letter from Emile Bernard (in which he uses du Puigaudeau's nickname, Piccolo), dated 19 August 1887, confirms; cited in exhib. cat. Ferdinand du Puigaudeau, Pont-Aven (Musée de Pont-Aven) 1998, p. 62. Gauguin himself boasted that he very quickly developed a reputation in Pont-Aven. In late July 1886, just a few days after his arrival, he wrote to Mette: ‘On me respecte comme le peintre le plus fort de Pont-Aven [...]. En tous cas celà me fait une réputation respectable et tout le monde ici (Américains, Anglais, Suédois, Français) se dispute mes conseils [...]’; Correspondance, cit. (note 7), p. 137. Many years later Du Puigaudeau recalled his visit to Pont-Aven of 1886, but he included no significant details; see Le Fureteur Breton (November-December 1919), p. 80.

\textsuperscript{24} Paul Gauguin, cit. (note 16), p. 22. Further confirmation that Gauguin used the Lezaven studio is Hartrick's 1886 painting of the building, which he later entitled Gauguin's studio (fig. 1).
from the west bank of the River Aven, and Gauguin frequently painted in the nearby Champ Derout-Lollichon.

Another of Hartrick's anecdotes provides an insight into Gauguin's attitude towards drawing. Gauguin compared some studies of geese he had made with those of the English illustrator, Randolph Caldecott (1846-1886), who had visited Pont-Aven in the 1870s. Hartrick recounted: 'I remember one interesting conversation with him [Gauguin], in which he expressed great admiration for the drawings of Randolph Caldecott, whose children's books he had. That, he said, was real drawing expressive of character and of life, as distinct from the machines made in the studio.'

In his 1924 essay, Hartrick also recalled a lost work which Gauguin had made for the Pension Gloanec: 'I remember he painted a panel for the dining-room of the Auberge, an autumn landscape, which appeared to most of us who fed there as being very extreme in its crude exaggeration of purple and gold; though of course it was nothing to what we were soon to become accustomed to.'

Hartrick noted that although 'I never knew Gauguin intimately, I saw him daily at the Auberge Gloanec for

---

25 Hartrick, op. cit. (note 12), p. 314. Several geese are included in one of the illustrations in Randolph Caldecott, *A sketch-book*, London 1883 (no. 12), although it is unclear if this is the image to which Gauguin referred. Gauguin's drawings of Pont-Aven geese include those in a sketchbook (René Huyghe, *Le carnet de Paul Gauguin*, Paris 1952, p. 189) and on a sheet in the Louvre (reproduced in Denise Delouche, *Gauguin et la Bretagne*, Rennes 1996, p. 23). Geese appear in Gauguin's *Four Breton women* of 1886 (Munich, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen). Both Hartrick and Gauguin must also have known Henry Blackburn and Randolph Caldecott's *Breton folk: an artistic tour in Brittany*, London 1880, which includes a delightful illustration of artists sitting outside the Pension Gloanec (p. 131).

26 *Paul Gauguin*, cit. (note 16), p. 20. The painting has not been identified, and may well be lost. It was the custom for artists to present paintings to the innkeeper, Marie-Jeanne Gloanec, for her saint's day on 15 August. In August 1886, for example, Gauguin gave her a still life, *The white tablecloth*, now in a private collection in Japan. The autumn landscape could well have been a leaving present, on his departure in October.
three or four months, and heard him talk.’ At the time Hartrick also knew Charles Laval (1862-1894) and Du Puigaudeau, and ‘from these two I gathered, vicariously, perhaps more about him [Gauguin] than I should probably have arrived at on my own.’ However, Hartrick admitted that he did not get to know Gauguin ‘in anything like the way I knew Van Gogh,’ since Gauguin was ‘a much more reserved and difficult person to become intimate with.’ Gauguin returned to Paris on around 13 October and Hartrick left in late November.

Memories of Van Gogh

It was in Paris that Hartrick was introduced to Van Gogh, through their mutual friend, the Australian artist John Russell (1858-1934). Russell had been in Paris since early 1885 and had joined the Atelier Cormon, where he later got to know Van Gogh. Hartrick first met Vincent at Russell's apartment, at 15 impasse Hélène, off avenue de Clichy. Shortly afterwards, Russell left for a visit to Sicily, renting his studio to Hartrick and the British artist Henry Ryland (1856-1924). At this point Van Gogh and Gauguin had not yet met, but it is possible that Hartrick told Van Gogh about his contact with Gauguin in Pont-Aven.

In 1939 Hartrick recalled: ‘all through the early part of 1887, Vincent frequently came to see me in the Impasse Hélène, to the horror of poor Ryland.’ They also sometimes met at Theo's apartment at 54 rue Lepic, where Vincent was staying. ‘I have been to his rooms with him (I think they really belonged to his brother). Anyway he seemed to be living quite comfortably and showed me some very good Japanese prints, besides some lithographs and etchings by Matthew Maris, with whom he seemed to be very friendly.’

Hartrick also reported Van Gogh's anger at not being able to sell his paintings, despite Theo's important position with Goupil: ‘He did not sell any of his work at that time, and used to rage from time to time that though connected with the picture trade no one would buy anything he did.’ Hartrick was particularly struck by Van Gogh's interest in complementary colours: ‘He used to carry in either pocket a large

---

27 Ibid., p. 17-18.
29 Gauguin planned to leave on 13 October (Correspondance, cit. [note 7], p. 140) and Hartrick left in November (Hartrick, op. cit. [note 9], p. 39). As a postscript, it is interesting that Hartrick, an expert on lithography, many years later saw what he believed was an unrecorded Gauguin print (although it is possible that it was by one of his followers). He described it as ‘a small head of a Breton girl,’ which he dated to 1894. Hartrick came across it after the First World War at the Eldar Gallery in London; see Hartrick, Lithography, cit. (note 8), p. 33.
30 Hartrick, op. cit. (note 9), p. 42. Russell is also mentioned in the 1913 essay (op. cit. [note 12], p. 308), but Hartrick goes in to more detail on his role in introducing him to Van Gogh in his 1939 memoirs.
31 Ibid., p. 51.
32 Hartrick, op. cit. (note 12), p. 311. Van Gogh's links with Matthijs Maris are confirmed in his correspondence, but few of the relevant letters would have been published in English by 1913; this suggests that Hartrick's memories on this point were not influenced by later publications.
33 Ibid., p. 311.
lump of blue and red chalk: with these he was always ready to illustrate his theories on whatever was handy.'34 Hartrick was concerned that Van Gogh might damage Russell's apartment, so 'as soon as he came in, I placed a newspaper or two conspicuously on the table, and on these he illustrated his themes or theories quite cheerfully, with lines of blue or red chalk at least a quarter of an inch thick.'35

34 Ibid., p. 307.
35 Ibid. Van Gogh wrote about complementary colours in a letter to Horace Livens (1862-1936) in August/October 1886 [459a/D572], but this was not published until 1929, long after Hartrick's essay. Van Gogh's use of blue and red chalk also recalls his box of wool samples, which interested him for their colour contrasts; the box is now in the Van Gogh Museum.
Van Gogh's ideas on light and colour made a deep impression on Hartrick: 'He was particularly pleased with a theory that the eye carried a portion of the last sensation it had enjoyed into the next [...] the entering of a lamplit room out of the night increases the orange effect of light and in the contrary case, the blue. Hence, to depict it properly, according to the theory, it is necessary in the former case to include some blue in the picture and in the latter some orange. Van Gogh used to roll his eyes and hiss through his teeth with gusto, bring out the words “blue”, “orange”, complementary colours, of course.'

In his 1913 memoir, Hartrick also gives an interesting description of his friend: ‘Van Gogh was a rather weedy little man, with pinched features, sandy hair and beard, and a light blue eye. He had an extraordinary trick of pouring out sentences in a mixture of Dutch, English, and French, then glancing quickly at you over his shoulder and hissing through his teeth as he finished a series. In fact, when excited, he looked more than a little mad: and this look Russell had caught exactly.'

Hartrick also provides a fascinating insight into Vincent's character. Van Gogh was 'extraordinarily sensitive to physical impressions, specially those of brightness or light. He was always in a state of wild excitement to explain to some one else the pleasure - or pain if you like - that he had received from something he had seen or imagined.' Hartrick then makes some perceptive comments about his friend's spontaneity: 'Whatever Van Gogh got, he took from nature directly and on the spur of the moment, guided by a sort of instinct, like a dog on the scent of a trail [...]'. In most aspects Van Gogh was personally as simple as

36 Ibid., pp. 307-08. One Van Gogh painting which mixes the effects of lamplight and darkness is the Café terrace at night of 1888, now in the Kröller-Müller Museum (F 1519 JH 1579).
37 Ibid., p. 308. Hartrick here refers to the Russell portrait of Van Gogh now in the Van Gogh Museum. He further described the portrait as 'splendid,' saying it was 'much more convincing as a likeness than any of Van Gogh's self portraits.'
38 Ibid., p. 307.
a child, expressing pleasure and pain loudly in a child-like manner. The direct way in which he showed his likes and dislikes was sometimes very disconcerting, but quite without malice or any conscious knowledge that he was giving offence.  

There has been considerable discussion about when exactly Van Gogh studied at the Atelier Cormon, but Hartrick recalled that he knew him ‘about six months after he had left [there].’ Hartrick then recounted an incident which is said to have involved a row between Cormon and his then-student Emile Bernard: ‘The story goes that Van Gogh, in great indignation, went round with a pistol to shoot Cormon, so much had he taken to heart this interference with the free expression of the individual.’ Bernard was indeed expelled from the studio, but Van Gogh’s supposed violent reaction is unlikely to have occurred and is not recorded by any of the other students. Hartrick also deliberately distances himself from this detail, stating that it was merely ‘a story,’ which had occurred before he had known Van Gogh. This appears to be the only time in his account of the two post-impressionists when Hartrick repeats a rumour.

Hartrick ended his reminiscences by concluding: ‘I frankly confess that neither myself, nor any of those I remember about me, imagined at that time that Van Gogh would be talked of as a great genius a few years later. We thought him a little cracked, but harmless, interesting, and certainly amusing at times. Always an artist in temperament, we thought his work too rudimentary and apparently unskilful in handling to appeal to us as students, many of whom could surpass it from that point of view.’

Hartrick left Russell’s accommodation when the Australian returned from Sicily, following the tragic death of Russell’s infant son, Jean. ‘I had to move out and go to a hotel for the remainder of my time in Paris, and with this move I lost touch with Vincent.’ Hartrick himself left Paris at the end of 1887.

Decades later, Hartrick drew portraits of both Van Gogh and Gauguin. These date from the 1930s, and were probably done for reproduction in A painter’s pilgrimage. Hartrick made an ink and watercolour sketch of Van Gogh (fig. 4), which was published as the frontispiece of the autobiography. The Van Gogh Museum acquired the original work in 1997. Hartrick also did two portraits of Gauguin, one now lost and the other at the Glasgow Art Gallery. These works were probably based mainly on secondary sources (the John Russell portrait of Van Gogh and photographs or self-portraits of Gauguin), although they still give a very personal view of the two artists. Despite the fact that they were made half a century after his encounters with them, they may still be considered Hartrick’s homage to the two painters he had known as a young man.

39 Ibid., p. 310-11.
40 Ibid., p. 307. Assuming that Hartrick met Van Gogh in December 1886, this suggests Van Gogh left the studio in about July. There has been considerable scholarly debate over the period when Van Gogh was studying at Cormon’s.
42 Ibid., p. 312.
43 Hartrick, op. cit. (note 9), pp. 52, 54.
44 The first was published in ibid., opposite p. 32, and the second is reproduced in Isabelle Cahn and Antoine Terrasse, exhib. cat. Gauguin und die Schule von Pont-Aven, Munich (Kunsthalle) 1998, p. 133.
[Van Gogh studies]

fig. 1
Vincent van Gogh, *Olive grove* (F 707 JH 1857), 1889, Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum (Vincent van Gogh Foundation)
A modern Gethsemane: Vincent van Gogh's Olive grove

Joan E. Greer

In late November 1889 Vincent van Gogh painted The olive grove (fig. 1), one of a series of five paintings he executed that fall.¹ He had already depicted olive trees several times in the spring and at least twice the previous year, but it was during the autumn of 1889 that this subject began to occupy him in earnest.²

Van Gogh was then living in the asylum St-Paul-de-Mausole outside St-Rémy, feeling mentally and physically vulnerable, and conscious of the financial burden he was on his brother Theo. He was beginning to gain critical recognition and to see his own nascent image as an artist developing and assuming an heroic, almost Christ-like form. Such mythologising, in which he himself participated - he writes, for example, of ‘Father Millet,’ ‘Puvis the Seer,’ etc. - upset him considerably when it concerned his own person, no doubt in part because he had unwittingly contributed to it through his identification with Christ and his christological understanding of the role of the artist.³

This identification with Christ as a personal guide and model began early in life and was complex in nature. It was informed over the years by a multitude of sources, the most important being the two branches of Protestantism Van Gogh encountered within his own family - the Groningen and Modern Schools of Calvinism. He was also profoundly influenced by his readings of the Bible, of Thomas à Kempis and of Ernest Renan. This christocentrism continued to be a determining factor in his conception of his own role in life, and informed his image of himself as an artist and of the artist in general.

However, references to Christ, and especially to Van Gogh himself as Christ or Christ-like, were seldom explicit. Just as Jesus had chosen the parable as a means of communicating truths, Van Gogh used indirect or metaphorical means when addressing

+ An earlier version of this research appeared in my dissertation The artist as Christ: the image of the artist in The Netherlands, 1885-1902, with a focus on the christological imagery of Vincent van Gogh and Johan Thorn Prikker (Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, 2000). My thanks to Carel Blotkamp for his valuable suggestions and critical commentary and to Anita Vriend, Monique Hageman, Sjraar van Heugten, Fieke Pabst and Louis van Tilborgh for their ongoing assistance at the Van Gogh Museum. Unless otherwise noted, the English translations of Van Gogh's letters are from The complete letters of Vincent van Gogh, 3 vols., Boston 1958.


his personal and professional identification with Christ. The figure of the sower with his head enframed by the sun, for example, could function in a number of ways. On the literal level, he represented a worker in the field. However, he could also serve to symbolise the artist and to allude obliquely, through association with the biblical sowing parable, to the relationship between the artist's task and that of Christ.

Religious questions began once again to absorb Van Gogh during the period he spent in St-Rémy, and, as will be seen, these questions suffused his theories concerning the production of art. In relation to the Olive grove, there is no doubt that Van Gogh was enthusiastic about the formal challenges the orchards presented him with, and the way they characterised the countryside surrounding the town. He also felt the motif would do well in the marketplace. The aspect of the subject to which he returned repeatedly
in his correspondence at the end of November, however, was its relevance as a response to two works by Paul Gauguin and Emile Bernard depicting Christ in the garden of olives (figs. 2 and 3) - works which distressed him to such a degree that he became preoccupied with them almost to the point of obsession.

In this article I will investigate the extent to which in its understated sobriety of form and colour, its insistent basis in observed reality and its associative qualities - which simultaneously transcend the real - Van Gogh's olive grove painting represents a visual response to Gauguin and Bernard. I will argue that the subject was a means of both coming to terms with ideas concerning Van Gogh's personal role as an artist, and of defining the task of the modern painter in general. Further, I will suggest that, contrary to the widely held notion that Van Gogh rejected the belief system within which he had grown up, his thoughts concerning artistic identity were firmly linked to his early religious ideas.

The olive orchard: formal challenge, regional emblem

The olive orchard is connected to other agrarian themes in Van Gogh's oeuvre, such as scenes of sowing and reaping. There are no olive pickers in most of the paintings - simply because none were available for observation. This focus on the landscape, however, soon also reinforced Van Gogh's resolve to make his olive groves quite unlike those of Bernard and Gauguin.

Late in September Van Gogh had written to Theo with enthusiasm about the olive orchards, emphasising, as noted above, the subject's formal challenges and regional significance [807/608]. About ten days later, before having received word of the works by Gauguin and Bernard, Van Gogh wrote to the latter recommending the subject. In late November Van Gogh would expand to Theo on the regional significance he had identified earlier - stating that together with the cypress, the olive tree was to the St-Rémy area what the willow was to the Netherlands [825/615]. The nostalgia he was feeling for his native land informed his painting, and he wrote that he hoped his work would result in 'a series of really sympathetic Provençal studies,'
which will somehow be linked [...] to our distant memories of our youth in Holland’ [830/617].

The style of the *Olive grove*, similar to the other olive grove paintings done by Van Gogh at about this time,⁵

---

⁵ Ronald Pickvance has identified the other four as F 586 JH 1854; F 587 JH 1853; F 708 JH 1855; and F 710 JH 1856. He reproduces all five in idem, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 158-67, nos. 40-43 and fig. 37.
is characterised by the use of short regular brushstrokes which are not uniform throughout the work but rather are varied, creating a patterned effect. The artist was well aware of the expressive qualities assigned to the direction of lines by Charles Blanc and Humbert de Superville, whose theories were popularised by Blanc and well known to Van Gogh and other avant-garde artists in France in this period. De Superville had written, for example, that lines pointing in an upward direction relate to positive sentiments, while those with a downward orientation are associated with sorrow and unhappiness. Also pertinent to these notions, and known to Van Gogh through Signac, were the theories of Charles Henry.

The *Olive grove* (fig. 1) consists of three main areas. At the bottom the emphasis is on horizontality; in the middle on verticality; and in the sky the brushstrokes move in a diagonal direction. The shape of the foliage in many of the trees ends in flame-like plumes pushing skyward. One tree, rising higher than the others, is distinguished by the double plumes at the top, which, like the wings of a bird, are accentuated against the sky. Considering the painting from the theoretical point of view outlined above we find a combination of directions here. This is consistent with Van Gogh's belief that a painting was able to convey both sorrow and consolation.

The light colours of the sky just above the trees suggest the breaking of dawn or falling of dusk, throwing the dark green band of foliage below into sharp relief. This in turn gives way to the brown, orange and sienna of the earth and tree trunks, interspersed with areas of blue in the shadows. Taking into account the likelihood of some fading having occurred, the overall effect remains decidedly sober in comparison to other works Van Gogh executed in Provence. Both in colour and brushwork he here demonstrates a marked restraint, which corresponds to a similar tone found in his writings concerning artistic production at this time.

---


7 See letter 761/584a.

8 My thanks to Louis van Tilborgh for his comments concerning this aspect.
Christ in the garden of olives

In the third week of November Van Gogh received copies - a drawing and a photograph respectively - of Gauguin's and Bernard's paintings of Christ in the garden of olives (figs. 2 and 3). Both works were idiosyncratic, non-naturalistic interpretations of the subject. Gauguin's work, of which he included a sketch for Van Gogh in a letter, was, in fact, a self-portrait.

As noted above, Van Gogh himself identified strongly with the figure of Christ. He had alluded to this earlier in the Still life with open Bible of 1885, and much more recently in a painting done in September 1889 after Delacroix's Pietà (fig. 4) in which the redheaded Christ could easily be taken for a self-portrait, and often has been. Furthermore, he had explicitly linked the artist's task in a more general sense to that of Christ in his correspondence from the previous year. In fact, in the summer of 1888, Bernard, Gauguin and Van Gogh had engaged in a mutually influential discussion concerning Christ, which, echoing current symbolist writings, conflated artistic and divine creativity.

One letter, written to Bernard from Arles at the end of June 1888, elucidates Van Gogh's christological interpretation of art and artistic production. In it Van Gogh expresses his approval of the fact that Bernard had turned to the Bible, and identified Rembrandt, Delacroix and Millet as the only artists to have painted the doctrine of Christ as Van Gogh himself had experienced it: ‘Christ alone [...] lived serenely, as a greater artist than all other artists, despising marble and clay as well as colour, working in living flesh. [...] [Christ's] spoken words [...] are one of the highest summits - the very highest summit - reached by art, which becomes a creative force there, a pure creative power’ [635/B8].

Van Gogh was corresponding with Gauguin at this time as well, and in August 1888 Bernard joined the latter at Pont-Aven. The three were thus in close touch. This is reflected in Gauguin's religious references in his correspondence of August and September, which echo closely Van Gogh's construction of Christ as artist quoted above: ‘What an artist, this Jesus, who carved [a taillé] in humanity itself!’

Van Gogh attempted to paint Christ in the garden of olives twice during this period but, significantly, destroyed both works. He was not comfortable with painting religious images from imagination, stating that a subject of such importance could not be done without a model.

9 Letter 819/GAC 37.
10 Greer, op. cit. (note 3).
11 See, for example, Ronald de Leeuw, Van Gogh Museum, Zwolle 1997, p. 200. There are two versions of this painting.
12 A non-Christian variation of the linking of the artist's task to that of a spiritual figure also dating from this period is Van Gogh's Self-portrait as a Japanese Buddhist priest (F476 1581.)
13 The emphasis is Van Gogh's.
14 Letter from Paul Gauguin to Emile Schuffenecker; quoted in Ziva Amishai-Maisels, Gauguin's religious themes (diss.), New York 1985, p. 21 (bracketed French words are included by Amishai-Maisel).
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Van Gogh's two aborted ventures do not seem to have prepared him for his colleagues' representations of the subject. In November 1889 Gauguin's work (fig. 2), in which he represented the Christ-artist analogy literally, even going so far as to depict himself as Christ, offended Van Gogh deeply. Gauguin included a small scene of Judas's betrayal in the background. As Ziva Amishai-Maisels has demonstrated, this scene likely refers to the artist's feeling of betrayal by the art world, within which even the support of Theo van Gogh seemed to be growing increasingly uncertain.  

Bernard's painting (fig. 3), described by Van Gogh as 'that nightmare of a Christ in the garden of olives' [824/B21], was judged equally repugnant. Theo had seen the picture itself and described it to Van Gogh as 'a purple Christ with red hair, with a yellow angel' [821/T20]. In comparison to Gauguin's work, Bernard's figures are even less tied to observable reality, with their attenuated forms and the inclusion of an angel. The painting was not intended as a self-representation but, curiously, contains a portrait of Gauguin between the soldiers on the right. This depiction of Gauguin as Judas may symbolise Bernard's general feeling of mistrust towards his friend, and perhaps his resentment that Gauguin was obtaining more critical recognition than he himself. It is also possible, however, that Bernard here constructs Gauguin as a traitor not in relation to himself but in relation to Van Gogh, following their period together in Arles. In this case the redheaded Christ would function implicitly as a Christ-artist reference to Van Gogh.

16 Ibid., pp. 83-86.
The allusion may have been prompted by Bernard having drawn his own conclusions concerning the ear-severing episode. Bernard, like Gauguin and Van Gogh, would most certainly have known of the traditional association of the ear with the biblical tale of the betrayal at Gethsemane. In the scriptural narrative one of Jesus' disciples, attempting to protect him from arrest after Judas's betrayal, cuts off the right ear of the high priest's servant - a mutilation reversed by Christ in a miraculous act of healing (Luke 22:50-52). None of this is referred to explicitly in the correspondence. However, the reading seems credible, and was one that in all likelihood occurred to Van Gogh when he viewed the work, adding to his dismay.

While the precise meaning these images held for Van Gogh may remain obscure, what is clear from the correspondence is that he rejected and was upset by these works,17 and that upon receiving copies of them he turned with renewed energy to his own olive groves. The primary objection to the pictures articulated in Van Gogh's letters was that they were not based on observation of the natural world. The magnitude of his response, however, suggests there was far more to his protest than this.

Van Gogh described Bernard's and Gauguin's pictures as dream-like or nightmarish, stating in a letter to Theo that they caused him an unpleasant feeling of collapse rather than progress: ‘[…] to shake that off, morning and evening […] I have been knocking about in the orchards, and the result is five size 30 canvases, which along with the three studies of olives that you have, at least constitute an attack on the problem’ [825/615].

In a letter to Bernard concerning his Christ in the garden of olives and other biblical scenes, Van Gogh was direct and uncompromising in his criticism, and provided concrete suggestions for a more acceptable approach towards religious subject matter based on his own work. He wrote about two paintings - a view of the park surrounding

the hospital (F 660 JH 1849) and a wheat field with rising sun (F 737 JH 1862); ‘one can try to give an impression of anguish without aiming straight at the historic Garden of Gethsemane; [...] it is not necessary to portray the characters of the Sermon on the Mount in order to produce a consoling and gentle motif’ [824/B21]. The second painting illustrates Van Gogh's tendency to use the sun to represent Christ. Consistent with this is the notion of consolation, which in Van Gogh's ideation was also related closely to Christ.

Van Gogh turned to the olive grove in order to formulate a visual response to Gauguin's and Bernard's pict-
tures and to find relief from the disquiet they had caused in him. It was now imperative for him to distance himself from the approaches of these two men with whom such a short while before he had hoped to work closely. He considered the olive grove an appropriate subject for modern religious painting and turned to it with the story of Christ in mind. As was the case with Jesus in the biblical story of Gethsemane, the olive grove for Van Gogh was a means of coming to terms with his anguish and it held the possibility of consolation.

As the letters show, at this point in Van Gogh's career he was taking a much less ambitious approach in his art. This meant not painting things he could not see, and leaving the representation of sublime ideals to those capable of expressing them. This tendency was linked to the notion of humility, which was a recurring theme in Van Gogh's writings at this time. He states this clearly in the letter to Bernard cited above, in which he notes that although some modern artists have been able to capture biblical truths in their religious pictures, it is better to have less lofty aims.

Achieving a 'humble' manner is indeed one of the underlying goals of the olive grove series, one that is well represented by the work under discussion here, in which Van Gogh addresses the subject of Christ in the garden associatively - without resorting to non-naturalist means - and with stylistic restraint. The olive trees are at once solidly tied to the earth and connected to the heavens, with the glowing light in the sky combined with the wing-like projection and upward reaching shapes of the foliage subtly implying the transcendence and release of the soul from the earthly realm. The emphasis is on understatement and is entirely consistent with Van Gogh's christological conception of his position as an artist. He held a non-supernaturalist view of Christ as the humble servant and consoler of humankind, one who was of and not above the people, and one who suffered and was misunderstood during his lifetime. It was after this image that Van Gogh modelled himself as an artist. Consequently, he was unwilling to embrace a self-image that exalted him or emphasised his superiority, or a style that was not based on a sober rendering of that which he saw around him.

**Religious anxiety and the Catholic south**

The letter to Bernard marks a departure from what Van Gogh had written regarding biblical subject matter the preceding year. The circumstances surrounding the painting of the *Pietà* (fig. 4), done only a few months before Van Gogh received copies of Gauguin's and Bernard's works, are instructive in understanding his renewed and somewhat revised preoccupation with religious questions at this time.

The *Pietà* was executed early in September 1889 and in his correspondence from this period Van Gogh emphasises that religious associations were once again causing him anxiety. St-Paul-de-Mausole, originally an Augustinian monastery, remained a Catholic institution administered by nuns. In a letter to Theo, Van Gogh wrote that his attacks threatened to assume ‘an absurd religious turn,’ which he related to having lived in a monastery setting for too long - first in the hospital in Arles (which had
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20 Pickvance, op. cit. (note 1), p. 44.
also originally been a monastery) and then in St-Rémy, concluding that a return to the North was desirable, if not necessary [802/605].

Van Gogh also wrote, however, that despite the distress caused by his surroundings, religious thought could sometimes bring him great comfort. He told Theo of how, during his last illness, his lithograph of Delacroix's *Pietà* had fallen into his oil and paint, and been damaged. Saddened by this, he had undertaken to make a copy of the work. He did not comment on the physical resemblance between himself and the figure of Christ, but no doubt saw it as an indirect means of expressing his identification with Jesus and his sufferings. The fact that this was a copy - what Van Gogh sometimes referred to as a ‘translation’ - of another artist's (religious) work and not his own original conception seems to have made both the subject matter and the implied self-representation more acceptable.

Van Gogh reiterated his uneasiness with his religious surroundings in another letter, writing to Theo that his desire to leave the south was caused by the ‘confused
and horrible religious thoughts’ that arose in him there: ‘I am surprised that I, with the modern ideas I have, I, who am such an ardent admirer of Zola and De Goncourt [...], have attacks such as a superstitious person and that confused and horrible religious thoughts arise in me which I never have had in the north’ [806/607].

Van Gogh may very well have related the non-realist styles of Gauguin and Bernard - both of whom had been brought up as devout Catholics - with Catholicism, although he would have recognised that their works were in no way typical of traditional religious images. His rejection of ‘superstition’ and reiteration of his admiration for Zola and the Goncourts arise from the same naturalist attitude that led him to express fury with Gauguin's and Bernard's representations of Christ in the garden of olives, which ‘contain nothing that has been observed’ [825/615]. In both cases, he reaffirms his commitment to the non-supernaturalist approach to interpretations of Christ that he had adopted years earlier. This approach had a firm basis in the ideas of the Groningen School of Calvinism within which he had been brought up, and even more strikingly, as I have discussed elsewhere, in the Modern School, which had affected him strongly during his period of theological studies in Amsterdam with his uncle, J.S. Stricker.

Gauguin and early legend-making surrounding Van Gogh

As suggested at the outset, Van Gogh was unhappy with how his image as an artist was beginning to be defined. He was uncomfortable with the fact that his persona was assuming a religious and, more specifically, christological dimension. In Gauguin's and Bernard's paintings, Van Gogh found himself confronted with a literal conflation of an artistic and religious figure. Although the reference is not openly about Van Gogh, he likely felt - and as has been seen, not without reason - that he was implicated in this tendency in their art. Viewing these works, Van Gogh may have thought he had been misunderstood, taken too literally in his earlier utterances concerning the Christ-artist analogy.

Gauguin appears to have been the first to construct Van Gogh in openly christological terms. He identified both himself - as clearly articulated in his self-portraiture - and Van Gogh with the figure of Christ. That he constructed Van Gogh christologically and, perhaps more importantly, as someone who himself identified with Christ, is evident in his narrative describing the now-legendary period the two artists spent together in Arles at the end of 1888. Equally apparent is that Gauguin conflated an image of elevated religiosity with one of insanity.

21 Van Gogh's emphasis, my translation: ‘Ik ben verbaasd dat ik met de moderne ideeën die ik heb, ik, die zo'n vurig bewonderaar ben van Zola en De Goncourt [...], anvallen heb als een bijgelovige en dat er verarde en afschuwelijke godsdienstige gedachten bij me opkomen die ik in het Noorden nooit heb gehad.’


Stressing Van Gogh's religious fervour and Christ-like dedication, Gauguin relates how, long before their time together in Arles, his friend had ministered selflessly and Christ-like to the poor miners in the Belgian Borinage. Gauguin describes an occasion on which Van Gogh had taken in a victim of a pit-gas fire, declared by the doctor to be a hopeless case: ‘But Vincent believed in miracles, in maternity. [...] He spoke the words of a consoling priest (decidedly he was mad). This work of a madman succeeded in reviving a Christian from the dead.’ Once the miraculous healing had taken place, Gauguin continues, Van Gogh had seen a vision of the martyred Christ on the miner's forehead. Gauguin then links this verbal description of the artist to a painting he - Gauguin - had been working on in Arles, *Vincent van Gogh painting sunflowers*, now in the Van Gogh Museum.

Gauguin writes that while the two men were painting together, Van Gogh himself alluded to his mental stability (or lack thereof) on the one hand, and religious fervour and identification with the Holy Spirit on the other: ‘He [Van Gogh] would trace with his brush the purest yellow on the wall, which was suddenly violet: I am sound in spirit / I am the Holy Spirit.’

Gauguin's accounts are not necessarily reliable. What does seem clear, however, is that in addition to the christological constructions of the artist and of artistic production noted earlier, Van Gogh must also have discussed with Gauguin his personal ideas concerning religious vocation and his ongoing dedication to seeing Christ as his own model.

That the figure of Christ held a special place in his relationship with Gauguin is indicated by the ear-severing incident of December 1888, which, as pointed out, has christological overtones. Furthermore, a small drawing of

26 Ibid.
27 Ibid., p. 274: ‘Lui, traçait de son pinceau le plus jaune, sur le mur, violet soudain, Je suis sain d'Esprit. Je suis Saint-Esprit.’
the symbol of Christ - a fish with the word *Ictus* [sic] within it - appears at the end of a letter he wrote to Gauguin in January 1889 [743/GAC VG/PG] (fig. 5). Bogomila Welsh-Ovcharov has suggested that Gauguin, in relating the stories of the injured miner and mutilated ear, attributed to Van Gogh the same kind of overt identification with Christ that is evident in Gauguin's own works.28

With the possible exception of the *Pietà*, however, which was likely never intended to be viewed publicly and was in any case a generalised rather than explicit, recognisable self-portrait, Van Gogh never went so far as to represent himself as Christ. In the tradition of *imitatio Christi*, he identified closely with him, but he did not see himself as Christ. For Van Gogh this difference was essential. Undoubtedly, Gauguin's suggestion to the contrary - that Van Gogh in his madness viewed himself as 'the Holy Spirit' - would have disturbed him deeply. Identifying with and modelling one's life after Christ was one thing, explicitly deifying oneself was quite another. The former was consistent with the Dutch religious ideation Van Gogh had developed in his formative years,29 while the latter reflected symbolist writings such as those of Charles Morice, which set forth the notion of the artist as an 'emanation of God.'30

It is not known if Gauguin's narrative ever got back to Van Gogh, but it seems likely that in some form it did. It was not published until 1894,31 but Gauguin, upon arriving back in Paris at the end of 1888, told the story to Bernard, who in turn related it to Albert Aurier in a letter of 1 January 1889.32 Gauguin undoubtedly also recounted it to Theo, with whom he had travelled from Arles back to Paris on 25 December, and to whom he eight days later gave *Vincent van Gogh painting sunflowers* as a present.33 Gauguin's tale, then, had taken on a life of its own by the beginning of 1889, and is arguably the starting point of the legend that was beginning to form around the person and art of Van Gogh.

At just this time, Theo, too, began to associate his brother with images of religious martyrdom. In a letter to his fiancée Jo Bonger, written early in February 1889, he compared Vincent's ‘tormented expression’ with Rodin's head of John the Baptist, then on display at his gallery on the Boulevard Montmartre. In this letter, Theo
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29 Greer, op. cit. (note 3).
30 See Amishai-Maisels, op. cit. (note 14), pp. 73, 109, note 3.
31 See note 25.
32 Welsh-Ovcharov, op. cit. (note 24), p. 6, note 16.
brought together ideas of religious martyrdom, modern artistic production and social reform; he attributed his brother's anguish to his artistic struggle to address the social problems he saw around him. This was to become another focal aspect of the Van Gogh legend beginning to take shape. The letter, admittedly, was private in nature. But private utterances concerning Van Gogh were also entering the public domain. As both Vincent's brother and art dealer, Theo was in a position to communicate these ideas to the growing number of people becoming interested in Van Gogh's art and persona. There seems little doubt that he did just that, in his professional capacity as well as in his more private musings.

Vincent van Gogh, however, repudiated this connection between his own sufferings and religious martyrdom. In a letter to his sister Wil, written in April 1889, he clearly stated that he rejected the life of a martyr and that he had never striven to be a hero - something he admired in others, but did not perceive as either his duty or his ideal. It is significant that the very next sentence deals with Ernst Renan, whose non-supernaturalist and contentious Vie de Jésus Van Gogh knew and admired. He praised the religious theorist for having written in a French that was understandable to all. Of relevance here is that Van Gogh also refers to the olive grove in this passage, stating that it, along with other ‘characteristic plants’ and the blue sky of the south, often made him reflect on Renan's writings [768/W11].

By the autumn of 1889 Van Gogh was feeling discouraged that his works were not even bringing in enough money to pay for painting costs, and he was becoming increasingly
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aware of the growing posthumous success on the art market of artists like Millet. He felt society was often to blame for the living artist's difficulties. This bleak outlook was likely compounded by the fact that he felt a sense of inevitability when it came to his mental instability and illness. He was well aware of the archetypal image of the melancholic or indeed mad artist, and had written how sad it was that the lives of many painters - ‘Troyon, Marchal, Méryon, Jundt, M. Maris, Monticelli, and numerous others’ - had ended in madness [778/592]. Ironically, it was at this point that he began gaining recognition, and that he became cognizant of the first significant critical references to himself and his art. Critical attention, however, caused Van Gogh anxiety of a new kind.

Critical reception

At the end of October Van Gogh received an article that had been published on 17 August 1889 in De Portefeuille. In it, the Dutch painter and critic J.J. Isaïëscon referred to him as an artist who provided an answer to all that was wanting in modern art. In a note Isaïëscon added that he hoped in the future to say more about ‘this remarkable hero,’ an intention that Van Gogh himself saw to was never realised.

The article accompanied a letter from Theo, written on 22 October, which further underlined the fact that Van Gogh's works were beginning to gain exposure - albeit still largely in the select circles of Theo's friends and acquaintances. Theo wrote that the Dutch artists Isaac Israëls and Jan Veth, the latter also a critic for De Nieuwe Gids, and the Belgian artist and member of Les XX, Théodore van Rijsselberghe, had viewed Van Gogh's pictures [815/T19]. The following month, Van Gogh, who in September had already had two of his paintings exhibited in Paris at the Société des Artistes Indépendants, received an official invitation from Octave Maus to exhibit with Les XX in Brussels.

The extent of the confusion triggered by Isaïëscon's attention in particular became apparent in mid-November when, having received a letter from the critic, Van Gogh wrote to Theo: ‘Isaïëscon's letter gave me much pleasure; enclosed my reply, which you must read - my thoughts begin to link up a little more calmly, but as you will see from it, I do not know if I must continue to paint or let painting alone’ [822/614]. Van Gogh was unable, or unwilling, to accept the prominent leadership position in modern art that Isaïëscon was suggesting for him. In fact he was uncomfortable with the notion of success in general, even though, as we have seen, he was extremely concerned about his financial position and ostensibly rejected the life of a martyr. Thus, while he desired success on the one hand he also feared it. He articulated this anxiety to his mother half a year later, writing that success was about the worst thing that could happen in a painter's life [865/629a]. This attitude no doubt had its basis both in Van Gogh's knowledge of the vicissitudes of the art market and his

37 See letters 820/- (from Octave Maus) and 822/614.
christological approach to his role as an artist. In neither case did recognition within one's lifetime conform to the ideal model.

Carol Zemel, whose 1977 study of the first four decades of Van Gogh criticism remains the most comprehensive work on the subject, correctly identifies Van Gogh's uneasiness with Isaäcson's critical attention. According to Zemel, his response in general was ‘a mixture of gratitude,
humility, anxiety and argument'; his 'repudiation of Isaäcson's praise' was a 'telling summary of his aesthetic ideals and personal fears.' According to Zemel, this repudiation was a 'telling summary of his aesthetic ideals and personal fears' and was largely founded on his religious ideation, in which the rejection of pride and of lust for material wealth and earthly glory played an important role.

Far from having lost interest in religious questions during this period, Van Gogh was very much concerned with and troubled by these issues. He had earlier turned his back on the institution of religion in general, including his own Calvinist upbringing. This is not to say, however, that he had lost his interest in the fundamental religious questions that had first arisen in an earlier, Protestant context. Nor, contrary to what might be expected, was the Reformed Church entirely absent in his life while he was living in the south of France.

Interventions from a Protestant minister

One aspect of Van Gogh's life in Arles and St-Rémy that seems to have gone largely unnoticed is the position held in it by Frédéric Salles (fig. 6). Salles (1841-1897) was the minister of the Reformed Church in Arles between 1874 and 1897. His involvement with Van Gogh and his family was extensive. He visited Van Gogh when he was in the hospital in Arles in February 1889. He saw to it that his needs were being met and he mediated on Van Gogh's behalf in order to prevent a long-term legal confinement. Between February and May, Salles kept in touch with Theo, reporting on Vincent's health, and it was to Salles he entrusted legal power to act on the family's account should it be necessary. When Van Gogh was able to leave the hospital in Arles, Salles assisted him in looking for accommodation and, when the idea of living alone proved too much, he found and accompanied him to the asylum of St-Paul-de-Mausole. Furthermore, when Van Gogh took a two-day excursion from St-Rémy to Arles in November 1889 the clergyman was one of the few people he saw. His contact with Salles at this very difficult period in his life, then, was extensive, particularly considering the degree of his social isolation.

Van Gogh's letters tell us little about his relationship with Salles. This was likely because he did not want to draw attention to the trouble he was causing his brother, Salles and others at this time - a concern both the preacher and Van Gogh address in their correspondence with Theo. In April 1889, for example, Salles wrote: 'You would hardly believe how much your brother is preoccupied and worried by the

---

40 For a more complete consideration of Salles see Joan E. Greer, *The artist as Christ: the image of the artist in The Netherlands, 1885-1902, with a focus on the christological imagery of Vincent van Gogh and Johan Thorn Prikker* (diss., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2000), pp. 36-39.
42 Letter of 2 March 1889; ibid., p. 28.
43 Letter of 19 April 1889; ibid., p. 33.
thought that he is causing you inconvenience.'44 A few days later Van Gogh expressed the same worry directly to his brother, telling him he was sorry to have caused Salles, Rey (his doctor in Arles) and Theo so much difficulty [763/628].

Although Van Gogh's references to Salles were generally brief they were also numerous - appearing in no less than 18 letters written in the 12-month period between February 1889 and February 1890.45 Whether the two discussed their mutual interest in religious matters or the figure of Christ in particular remains unknown. Most of the references pertain to practical matters, but they make it clear that Van Gogh trusted, respected and admired Salles, turning to him as a personal confidante and advisor.

Van Gogh was grateful and keen to express his gratitude. In one letter, written in March 1889 [757/582], he told his brother that he had given Salles Germinie Lacerteux, a book whose protagonist he compared to the Mater Dolorosa in Delacroix's Pietà [805/W14]. Several months later he suggested to Theo that a print of Rembrandt's Christ at Emmaus would make an appropriate gift to thank Salles for all his efforts. Finally, in January 1890, Van Gogh, overcome by the clergyman's thoughtfulness after Salles had paid him a surprise visit in St-Rémy, sent him a small painting of his own: pink and red geraniums ‘on a completely black background’ [838/622].46

What emerges from a close reading of the relevant correspondence between the three men, then, is that Salles provided Van Gogh with something like what the painter himself would have referred to as consolation, a concept closely linked in his writings with assistance, comfort and companionship. As noted earlier, Van Gogh's notion of consolation was also closely intertwined with the image of Christ. Indeed, Rembrandt's Christ at Emmaus, like Ary Scheffer's Christus Consolator (Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum), embodied his christological understanding of the term.47 It would have been an appropriate gift for Salles for this very reason. What also emerges is that Van Gogh felt only gratitude towards Salles. There is no longer even a hint of the animosity he had earlier expressed toward representatives of the Protestant Reformed Church or, for that matter, towards organised religion in general. This may be seen in the con-
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44 Ibid.
46 The picture's present location is unknown.
47 Greer, op. cit. (note 3), pp. 36-37.
text of Van Gogh's dependency on Salles and his brother, which would have made any overt criticism of the former's interventions on his behalf seem ungrateful. Still, taken as a whole, it is not simply the absence of negative sentiment but the presence of warmth that suggests that Salles was a welcome person in Van Gogh's life.

Most important with regard to Van Gogh's manner of representing christological ideas in his paintings is the simple fact that here, late in his life and at a time when his Catholic surroundings were causing him anxiety, a Protestant clergyman played a decisive role. The belief system of his upbringing was thus neither forgotten nor entirely absent from his life at this point in time, and it informed his imagery with renewed vigour. Salles's presence in Van Gogh's life cannot be said to have led to this tendency, but neither can it be denied that it likely helped reinforce it.

Conclusion

In the autumn of 1889 Van Gogh conceived of his work as an artist in terms that derived from his religious background. In his eyes, the artist's Christ-like mission was to serve humankind. Art should offer spiritual consolation and hope in a guise understandable and relevant to the modern viewer. This meant choosing subjects with a firm basis in visible reality, which, at the same time, also suggested a meaning beyond themselves. The olive orchard, as seen in the painting Olive grove (fig. 1), through its very tangible presence in the St-Rémy area and its evocation of the age-old cycles of rural labour on the one hand, and the biblical theme of Gethsemane on the other, was just such a subject. It allowed Van Gogh to offer an alternative to Gauguin's and Bernard's paintings while maintaining his own christological role as a painter of modern religious themes. Moreover, it did so in a way that neither offended his non-supernaturalist religious sensibilities, nor his related desire for humility and self-effacement. Self-effacement, however, was not compatible with the glorification of the artist, so much part of artistic discourse at this time and an essential component of successful art marketing. And from this arose one of Van Gogh's chief and, ultimately, unresolved dilemmas.
fig. 1  
Van Gogh and Italy
A.M. Hammacher

The title of this essay, condensed to *Van Gogh and Italy*, has its origins in an area of inspiration totally different from any that Vincent had drawn me into previously. While preoccupied with a late revival of an old fascination with the culture represented by painting and literature in Italy from some time in the 13th until well into the 15th century, [I was reminded] that it was the art historian Jacob Burckhardt who, in 1860, with barely contained passion, had published a discovery, a phase in his unforgettable studies of Italian culture. The subject that he had chosen was Petrarch, a poet and so much more than that! (fig. 1) His theme, however, did not concern the well-known ‘Canzoniere’ that were written over a period of many years and reflected Petrarch's first and immediately overwhelming ecstasy of love, which, although unrequited and faded, continued to fulfil him in both a literary and a creative sense.

So, in the 19th century, it was not the ‘Canzoniere,’ but a single letter from Petrarch about an adventurous and extremely primitive ascent of Mont Ventoux in Provence near Avignon (Vaucluse) that persuaded Burckhardt to regard Petrarch as the first inspiring explorer of nature, who set in motion the slow and varied transition from the restrictive core of mediaeval religion to a renaissance that was subsequently to be called humanism.

It compelled me to reread that study of 1860 and, in particular, the fruitful letter in which Petrarch related his experiences on Mont Ventoux with unusual self-analysis and an unusual sense of reality. I felt mildly critical as I read, yet I was afraid of doing an injustice to that Petrarch-Burckhardt reputation. Still, it seemed to me that it would now, at the beginning of the 21st century, be of interest to find out whether major 19th-century painters, and maybe others who moved in those circles, had made any reference to Petrarch in their diaries and letters. Without any immediate hope that Vincent would prove to be of interest in the search, I nonetheless wanted to reread his letters as I had done so many times before. And then the unexpected happened.

![fig. 2](Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001)

Vincent van Gogh, *Self-portrait with straw hat and pipe* (F 524 JH 1565), 1888, Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum (Vincent van Gogh Foundation)

In 1888, Vincent arrived in Arles from Paris in a state of exhaustion. The countryside and a small town would, he thought, revitalise him. His stay in Paris, begun with such enthusiasm, had not brought him what he expected to find there (fig. 2). As he left the train at Arles, he noted that, except for the artistic and mental
baggage that he had brought with him from Paris, he felt unsure about finding his way, about the varying quality of his achievements.

There are no data to prove whether Theo was actually in a position to put him in touch with the most promising artists of the day. It does not appear to be so. Vincent himself thought that Cézanne's work was certainly interesting, but he felt he did not know enough about it. Before leaving Paris, he had just managed to visit Seurat's studio. He was better acquainted with Signac. Not counting a few
less important artists, he appreciated Gauguin and Bernard as personal friends, and found it possible to have discussions with them.

All in all, it was not enough to raise his spirits but, after finding his bearings in Arles, he apparently managed to overcome his depression, becoming quite cheerful even. Here, for the first time, nature and the countryside caused him to discover the Italian origins that were to make him regard Provence as a source of inspiration. It would fire his creativity as a painter again, both visually and pictorially. Writing to Theo from Arles, he reported enthusiastically: ‘J'ai lu il y a quelques temps un article sur Dante, Pétrarque, Boccace, Giotto, Botticelli. Oh, mon Dieu, come cela m'a fait de l'impression en lisant les lettres de ces gens-là.’ He then continued, ‘Or Pétrarque était ici tout près à Avignon et je vois les mêmes cyprès et les mêmes lauriers. J'ai cherché à mettre quelque chose de cela dans un des jardins peints en pleine pâte jaune citron et vert citron’ [687/539]. Inspired by the surrounding countryside, the very fact of this evocation of major Italian painters and writers surely has a mental and cultural source of its own. A short time later Van Gogh was to write further: ‘Mais n'est-ce pas vrai que ce jardin a un drôle de style qui fait qu'on peut fort bien se représenter les poètes de la Renaissance, Dante, Pétrarque, Boccace se baladant dans ces buissons sur l'herbe fleurie!’ [692/541].

These fragments of fundamental reactions are easy to gloss over, but certainly merit further analysis - hence the present essay. The customary brevity of Vincent's style of writing has a background that is not immediately obvious. At the same time, it reveals a fresh observation of nature as it appeared to him in Provence. The small parks in Arles were inspiring. He even developed an interpretation of a kind that, in terms of scenery and countryside, had previously aroused in his imagination only - because he had never been to Italy.

Working out-of-doors, he was repeatedly to give his themes - if he had anything to say about them - a link with Italy. Seeing Provence as a French continuation of Italy, both visually and, as a rule, in association with his feelings and emotions, was therefore a discovery that he made there (fig. 3).

The simultaneous creation of a hallucinating image of the above selection of men of the greatest merit in those various disciplines of the Italian pre-Renaissance is more difficult, as mentioned above.

The ecstatic power and tone, and, at the same time, the intensity of Van Gogh's inspiration by Italy, is not only visual and pictorial, but also literary. He twice felt the need to inform Theo about all this, and a third letter - to Gauguin - also refers to it [699/544a]. They prove how profound, and also how comprehensive, this creative
response was. It was neither superficial nor a mere fancy, not even in his letters.

Vincent conveys the impression - convincingly, in my opinion - that he had a greater knowledge of that pre-Renaissance evolution in Italy than was previously known or suspected. As for his modern problems, it made him hanker after a more intense and international atmosphere (London, Paris and, finally, Arles). The books by modern French writers that he had been reading while still in the Netherlands were consistent with those read there at the time and included, for instance, works by Zola, Hugo, Flaubert.

In his letter from Arles, however, Vincent ventured to refer to a selection of Italian cultural elements. This evocation of illustrious personalities from the pre-Renaissance centuries might be considered very general but for the fact that Vincent, whose succinct style of letter-writing rarely included much detail, wanted to tell Theo, to everyone's surprise, that he had a pronounced preference for Giotto.
The first published letter from his days in Brabant in which Vincent mentions Giotto, is of greater value than might appear initially. The undated letter to Theo [479/391], presumably a New Year's Eve letter written in late 1884 (?), was in fact a reply to Theo's interpretation of a modern painting he had acquired. The subject, according to Theo, was ‘Dantesque’ - whom he further characterised as ‘Mephistophelian.’ Vincent promptly disputed this as being a grave misconception. He even mentioned - as a source of his knowledge and understanding of the days of Dante and Giotto - a French publication in his possession, from which he quoted the following line about Giotto: ‘le premier il mit la bonté dans l'expression des têtes humaines.’ Vincent assumed that Theo was familiar with the portrait of Dante painted by Giotto, and drew the following conclusion from it: ‘Dante's expression, however sad and melancholy it may be, is essentially the expression of that which is infinitely good and tender’ (‘[…] de expressie van Dante hoe triest en melancholiek ook is essentieel de uitdrukking van het oneindig goede en tere’).

A brief note on this letter's connection with Vincent's main output during his period in Brabant is required here. The letter was written at the time of his intense preoccupation with notions about rendering more profound his own creativity and visual reactions to the people around him, the peasant families of Brabant in their homes (fig. 4).

The attention Van Gogh devoted to Giotto and Dante was referred to above as unexpected, but in the subsequent repeated references to the painter in the letters his personality, so full of affliction, played a part alongside his talents as an artist. Vincent himself, overcome by his struggle with the suffering that he had to experience - and which constituted a threat to his creativity - felt his admiration for Giotto all the more profoundly because of the latter's ability to let creativity triumph in spite of everything. Van Gogh wrote: ‘Giotto m'a touché le plus - toujours souffrant et toujours plein de bonté et d'ardeur comme s'il vivait déjà dans un monde autre que celui-ci. Giotto est extraordinaire d'ailleurs et je le sens mieux que les poètes Dante, Pétrarque, Boccace […]’ [687/539]. It is clear from the occasional remarks in his letters that Van Gogh was not satisfied with a visual, technical and aesthetic experiment, but hoped that his work would include something of the whole.

fig. 4
Vincent van Gogh, Study of a peasant woman: Gordina de Groot (F 85 JH 693), 1885, Otterlo, Kröller-Müller Museum
human being, in a more profound, humane and psychological sense. He wrote further: ‘Ce drôle de Giotto duquel sa biographie disait qu'il était toujours souffrant et toujours plein d'ardeur et d'idées. Voilà, je voudrais pouvoir arriver à cette assurance qui rend heureux et vivant en toute occasion’ [695/543].

Vincent did not, of course, wish to imitate Giotto's style, but it seems justifiable to conclude that Giotto continued to have an effect on his reflections. Furthermore, some self-identification had played a part ever since the remarks made in Brabant. By stressing Giotto's suffering (‘il souffre’), he acknowledged an affinity with the artist. Overcoming resistance was something that Van Gogh recognised as being only too necessary in his own malady.

In Arles, Vincent was also preoccupied with the question of which member of that group associated with
Dante seemed closest to him. Pondering this, he was left with Giotto and Petrarch. Besides Giotto, whom he wanted to mention first because of his discipline as a painter, it was Petrarch who fascinated him the most, for reasons unrelated to pictorial intentions. There is no doubt that in the case of Petrarch, a poet, he probed more widely and profoundly than he could do with painters - no longer visually or technically, but with his efforts directed more towards psychological and spiritual aspects. The question thus remains, how, where and as a result of what, could a creative personality, a poet who never painted and who was not ever involved in discussions on painting - i.e. someone from a different discipline - came so close to Giotto when Vincent made his choice.

It is possible, although there is no evidence for it, that the raptures in Van Gogh's correspondence relate primarily to Petrarch's letter about his far-reaching, comprehensive, and physical victory over the harsh mountain conditions on Mont Ventoux, a mountain that was not far from Avignon and almost inaccessible when the poet climbed it.

Petrarch had faced the demands of the strenuous climb without reservations. It continually brought him to the brink of psychological exhaustion, which he ultimately overcame through his sentiments and state of high mental tension. The view from the heights was so beautiful, emotional and magnificent that it led to an unprecedented enrichment of all his topographical knowledge and to a perception, an ecstasy even, whereby he understood all of space to be an entity.

Yet serious doubts beset Petrarch during the descent, when he suddenly gave way to an irresistible urge to read a text from St Augustine's Confessions. It contains a warning not to succumb to the human passion for the panoramic views provided by mountain peaks, since they distract the spirit from the uphill path to the immensity of eternal space (Book 10, Chapter 8). As he read, Petrarch's doubts about the image of space that he had just experienced were strengthened. His reaction was a mighty silence rather than a defence. He even imposed that dictatorial silence on his brother, who had accompanied him on his climb.

Petrarch did not formulate a reply to these warning texts. He could neither give up his respect for St Augustine nor his newly acquired earthly emotions about nature. Burckhardt, actually biased in his enthusiastic and decisive observations on Petrarch, did not touch upon this psychological aspect.
Petrarch's powerful silence also reveals him to be one of the first modern sceptics! He then sent his letter - which is not without significance - to his former teacher in Paris, Dionigi da Borgo di San Sepolcro, a theologian and an admiring authority on Augustinian doctrine, whose lectures he had attended at the Sorbonne between 1328 and 1332.

The letter is not only a literary account that is still significant today, it is also full of modern self-analysis. Petrarch did not ask any questions about the problem of doubts, but it was not a real confession either. The two religious ways of thinking were to live on together, without a solution, during Petrarch's lifetime.

For Van Gogh in 1888 it was not only absorbing but also deeply moving to discover that vehement inner struggle in which the early-modern and doubting Petrarch had been engaged. It is certainly appropriate, in the context of this essay, to take a specific look at Petrarch's work as a unique source.

The first problem to consider is how Van Gogh learnt about Petrarch while he was in France. Some research was needed to find out the position of published translations during the years that Van Gogh spent there.
At my request, the Italian specialist Professor Pierre Jodogne of the University of Liège undertook this research at the Biliothèque Nationale in Paris. He discovered that there was a flurry of translations of Italian works into French precisely during this time. Victor Develay in particular published French translations of Petrarch, including the famous letter on the ‘Ascension du Mont Ventoux.’

There are several more indications that Vincent continued to be preoccupied with Petrarch. He felt it was necessary for Theo to know that it had done him good to discover that the poet had lived in the Vaucluse, not far from where he was himself, having moved there in order to be able to work in peace, away from bustling Avignon (which Petrarch mentions as being in many respects an objectionable city). Vincent was convinced that his cherished author had looked at the same laurels and oleanders as he had - a sign of human empathy (fig. 5). He thought this strengthened the affinity. These experiences, however, with their positive Italian slant, did not help the exhausted Van Gogh to overcome his disquiet about his own main problem - how to carry on with his work.

He then created the five ‘Berceuses,’ with ideological intent. The marked difference in quality between them raises the question of whether Vincent himself was in the process of becoming aware of their disappointing unevenness. I am convinced that this was so. For a whole complex of reasons, his continuous state of agitation had an inhibiting effect.

His exuberant enjoyment of Arles lost some of its intensity as the prospect of a return to his native country rather than a technical revolution loomed ahead. France could no longer hold him and Auvers became his final stopping place. His painting speed increased as a result of that obsession with returning home. There is an ominous, logical sequence of themes - still requiring art-historical investigation - that remained hurried, not fully worked out, whilst his Dutch researches suddenly became more active.

It struck me, since I wished to pursue the matter a little further, that even in his original work, Van Gogh abandoned - as no longer usable - his switch in the use of colour, so important at the time, from shades of grey (especially those of Brabant) to the concept of a bright and colourful palette. There was still some kind of an
illusion that, once he was back at home with his mother, he would like to review his work.

Everything that he created at Auvers vibrates with doubt, but this tragic and ineluctable destructive process did not prevent him from producing a number of outstanding works. In particular, I have in mind his painting of the small church at Auvers, in which, in deep sorrow, the memory of his father's church played a part (fig. 6). There, expression and memory guided the painter's hand. Largely because of an awareness of his weakened creative talents, Vincent's total existence reached its lowest ebb.

Thus, Auvers rapidly - and visibly in his work - ceased to be the final stop before a considered, if unstable, return. In increasing disquiet, Vincent himself soon became aware that he was reaching the end of the creativity - now more and more erratic - that had previously sustained his existence. It was a catastrophic process brought to an end by himself. The work that he left, matured through tensions, proved to be a revelation.

[The collection in context]
fig. 1
Eugène Delacroix, *Agony in the garden*, c. 1851, Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum
The 19th-century novelist and art critic Théophile Gautier believed that Jesus was always a tragic character and that such a personage ‘could be captured only by great artists like Rembrandt, Goya and Delacroix.’ In Eugène Delacroix's painting *Agony in the garden*, currently in the collection of the Van Gogh Museum, Jesus is portrayed as a pathetic character, seemingly aware of the ignominious death that awaits him (fig. 1). This powerful treatment of a scene from the Passion narratives exemplifies a popular *typos* of romantic religious painting which emphasised the human suffering of the God-man. As such, Delacroix's interpretation is typical of a new thematic content and iconography that flourished at mid-century.

The following essay proposes several points that contradict critical assumptions about 19th-century religious art in general, and about Delacroix's religious paintings in particular. First, the study suggests that a consideration of the theologies that influenced romantic painters and an analysis of their thematic and historical content are mutually necessary elements for an adequate interpretation of these artists' works. A review of the (art) history shows that the cultural climate of the mid-19th century was one that embraced religion, and that theological tenets interfaced with political and social concerns. Thus, the religious paintings of this period cannot be fully understood apart from the historical, political and even religious context. For example, throughout the 1830s and 1840s, when humanitarian and progressive Catholic philosophies were most influential, paintings representing these philosophies flourished. What is perhaps more surprising is that artists as diverse as Eugène Delacroix, Ary Scheffer, Théodore Chassériau, Paul Delaroche and Hippolyte Flandrin entered into a thematic consensus based upon a modern iconographic language rooted in these liberal theologies. Conservative stylists on the other hand - for example A.-J.-V. Orsel, E. Amaury-Duval, Adolphe Roger et al. - continued to draw inspiration from more traditional Tridentine dogmas of Christian faith.

Second, I will show that Delacroix's biblical themes indicate that he approached his subjects under the dual influence of liberal Catholicism and the dynamic concept of the Church first developed by theologians at Tübingen, Germany.

Third, without denying Delacroix's critical attitude toward liberalism and his scepticism towards Catholic doctrine - readily apparent in his *Journal* - I suggest that the artist's sympathetic and sustained interest in Christianity was totally consistent with the theological tenets he espoused. Further, it is argued that Delacroix's true and consistent religious position is made apparent through a detailed analysis of his written articles and published essays. Specifically, an examination of Delacroix's correspondence, letters and notebooks reveals evidence of the artist's intense religious convictions. In these letters, the artist frequently refers to the paintings that he was creating, often stating that he was dedicating them to the Virgin and the Saints. This is especially evident in his letters to his closest friends, which frequently discuss the spiritual and religious aspects of his work. Delacroix's personal religious beliefs are also reflected in the iconography of his paintings, which often feature religious figures and symbols.

Finally, it is proposed that Delacroix's paintings were not simply illustrative of biblical narratives, but rather were a manifestation of his own personal religious beliefs and spiritual experiences. By focusing on the artist's personal religious beliefs, this essay provides a more nuanced understanding of Delacroix's religious paintings, and challenges the conventional interpretations of his work that prioritize historical and cultural context over the artist's personal religious beliefs.
with the *sentiments religieuses* of his time. Finally, I will demonstrate that this newly enriched thematic content satisfied the desire for a modern religious art, while the motif of the vulnerable, solitary hero in the *Agony in the garden* met the aesthetic needs of an elite class.

**Religious revival and iconography**

The revival of interest in religious topics in art was primarily a response to the resurgence of devotional practices and a renewed commitment to the Church among the
European intellectual and social elite at the close of the Napoleonic regime. Beginning under the Restoration (1815-30) and continuing during the July Monarchy (1830-48), Salon records reveal that biblical themes outpaced those of antique goddesses and allegorical subjects. In his Salon review of 1837, critic Auguste Barbier noted that the number of sacred scenes had even exceeded those of battle pictures. Frederic de Mercy, whose 1838 review appeared in the Revue des Deux-Mondes, commented that ‘there is hardly an artist this year who has not made a religious picture.’ During the 1840s pictures of the Passion and death of Christ predominated in the annual Salons. Between 1831 and 1848 Salon artists exhibited 39 paintings of Christ in the garden of olives, 30 pictures of Christ on the cross, 33 heads of Christ, 29 images of Christ in the tomb, 24 paintings of The descent from the cross, and 15 of Christ dying on the cross. This represented a 73-percent increase over earlier decades.

Another possible reason for the large number of renderings of scenes from the Passion was the widespread devotion to the Way of the Cross, which the faithful were encouraged to meditate upon during the mass. The subject was particularly popular in France during times of social and political upheaval, as it underscored the basic Christian belief in redemptive suffering. Historian F.P. Bowman has observed that ‘the image of Christ's despair in the Garden of Gethsemane now became the model for the “crucifixion” of the just [...]. Jesus was seen less and less as the realisation of the prophets and more and more as a revolutionary in the human condition.’ In this period, the popular cult of the Sacred Heart encouraged believers to contemplate the sacrificial nature of Jesus' love and in the iconography we find the heart encircled by a crown of thorns. Subsequently, veneration of the suffering Jesus was linked to contemporary political strife, and we often find devotional literature and devotional art, as well as rituals, illustrating this idea. Images of Jesus's Passion (and of the Virgin Mary) were associated with the political revolutions of 1830 and 1848, where religious phenomena and supernatural appearances were coupled with the social unrest and disruptive events.

A third impetus for the renewed interest in gospel themes among artists was the increasing support for Utopian and humanist doctrines. Demanding greater economic justice and workers' rights, many secular reformers found a basis for social ethics in religion and in the Jesus of romanticism. Images of Le Christ des barricades and Le Christ libérateur were widespread, and christology (that part of dogmatic theology that studies the redemptive nature of Christ's person and work) seeped into contemporary art and literature. Writer and editor of the liberal Catholic journal L'Européen Philippe-Joseph-Benjamin Buchez was one voice among many insisting on the value of Christian themes in art in promoting concern for the underclass and

7 Ibid., pp. 97-100. See also Thomas A. Kselman, Miracles and prophecies in 19th-century France, New Brunswick, NJ 1983.
8 Bowman, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 69, 343, 356.
effecting social regeneration, advocating the importance of religion for an organic social system. Art historian and avid communist Léon Rosenthal was the first to point to the connection between religious art and the social reform movement in this volatile period. Rosenthal noted that although liberal Catholicism and the tenets of social humanitarianism were at first scoffed at, they gradually gained acceptance after 1840.9

In seeking to explain the turn towards New Testament subjects in art, we find that the dramatic resurgence also resulted from a re-engagement with religious thought, a recommitment to Christian beliefs, and from the fervent interest in German idealist philosophies that had developed in the first decades of the century. In France, liberal theologians and ecclesiastics posited a radical christocentric humanitarianism that was buttressed by secular demands for social reform.

After 1850, however, we find an abrupt decline in paintings representing the principles of liberal Catholicism and a subsequent retrenchment in traditional iconography. The triumph of conservative thinking after years of ecclesiastical conflict led to a re-emergence of both the content and the formal and expressive means of traditional Tridentine iconography, crushing all further attempts at pictorial expression derived from radical contemporary sources.

The importance of Möhler

What made it possible for Delacroix and other painters to render the figure of Jesus Christ in doubt and suffering - without, however, compromising his divine nature - was the inspiration they drew from a theological model that placed greater emphasis on the dynamic relatedness of the infinite (God) and the finite (man). This model elevated the status of man in relation to God, effectively making new themes available for religious art. We can trace the origin of these radical theologies to Germany and such early 19th-century Protestant philosophers as Freidrich Schleiermacher and Freidrich Schelling, whose teachings admitted more subjectivity in the experience of the divine (as an awareness of absolute dependence on God). Stimulated by their ideas, influential Catholic thinkers began calling for reforms and expanding theology away from the more rigid medieval scholasticism of Thomas Aquinas, re-conceptualising the theology of the person of Christ from an anthropological perspective. Foremost among them was Johann Adam Möhler, whose ideas were instrumental in determining the revision of Catholic theology. Möhler moved beyond purely romantic theology, with its emphasis on the immediacy of individual feeling, towards a more open and dynamic idea of the Church as a communal embodiment of the Spirit. Möhler’s ‘incarnational theology’ defined the Church as the indwelling of the Holy Spirit among a community of believers and provided ecclesiastical models from which new typologies could be drawn. He was particularly concerned with the organic unfolding of divine and human relatedness as a shared experience of both the infinite and the finite.

Möhler's definition of ecclesiology joined with the principles of social Catholicism and helped shift artistic focus towards the depiction of earthly events and the human dimension of Jesus' redemptive action rather than his glorious, heavenly existence. The emphasis for artists became the created being and not the Creator; they concerned themselves with earthly events rather than the heavenly realm, and concentrated on daily life and prescriptions for a living sainthood.

10 From the 16th century, Thomism had been the official philosophy of the Catholic Church, falling into obscurity until re-affirmed in the 19th century. Thomism is based on the 13th-century philosophy of St Thomas Aquinas; as a systematic theology it is a vast, intricately designed system to logically support all teaching of the faith based on reason.

11 See Michael Himes, Ongoing incarnation: Johann Adam Möhler and the beginnings of modern ecclesiology, New York 1997. Although banned during his lifetime, Möhler's thoughts were increasingly valued among theologians, and excerpts from his work were written into drafts of the documents from the First Vatican Council in 1870. Nevertheless, the enemies of an open, organic theology held sway and Möhler's words were finally expunged. It was not until the Second Vatican Council in 1963 that his ideas were officially disseminated.
Delacroix's *Agony in the garden* of 1851, as well as his many versions of *St Sebastian helped by the holy women* and *The good Samaritan* (fig. 2), and his renderings of *The disciples and the holy women piously retrieving the body of St Stephen* (figs. 3 and 4)\(^2\) cannot be fully understood without some knowledge of Möhler's contemporary theology. With regard to the *St Stephen* in particular we may say the subject is conceived in Möhlerist terms, as Delacroix takes up the scenario of the first Christian martyr from the point of view of the disciples, thus underscoring the notion of the communal share in incarnate suffering. By the same token, his interpretation of Jesus crawling un-heroically on the ground does not violate belief in his sacred person. Theologian G.A. McCool has explained this paradox: ‘Neither the perfection of Christ’s human nature nor his possession of the Beatific Vision excludes the possibility of ignorance and of progressive growth in his human knowledge. As such, it required human experience of the world, and it was in no way incompatible with doubt or with suffering.’\(^3\)

---

12 See Lee Johnson, *The paintings of Eugène Delacroix: a critical catalogue*, 6 vols., Oxford 1981-89. Versions of *St Sebastian helped by the holy women*: vol. 4 *Plates*, no. 422, pl. 230; no. 424, pl. 231; no. 430, pl. 231; no. 450, pl. 260; no. 465, pl. 261; and no. 467, pl. 261. See also vol. 3 *Texts* pp. 213-14; p. 215; pp. 218-19; pp. 231-32; pp. 243; and pp. 244-45. Versions of *The good Samaritan*: vol. 4, no. 437, pl. 246; no. 446, pl. 247; and vol. 3, pp. 224-25 and p. 229. Versions of *The disciples and the holy women retrieving the body of St Stephen*: vol. 4, no. 448, pl. 256; no. 449, pl. 257; no. 471, pl. 258; and no. 472, pl. 259; and vol. 3, p. 230; pp. 230-31; p. 249; and pp. 249-50.

13 ‘The ordinary human subject needs time and the experience of life in order to thematise this un-objective knowledge in objective concepts [...]. Christ's knowledge in objective concepts was a genuine growth in knowledge’; see *A Rahner reader*, ed. Gerald A. McCool, New York 1981, pp. 159-60.
Delacroix consistently adopted the dynamic style of baroque naturalism for scenes that stressed human charity as a locus for divine grace - not only in those subjects previously mentioned but also in *The entombment*, *The lamentation* and *The supper at Emmaus*, as well as such genre scenes as *The education of the Virgin*.\(^{14}\) Many of these resemble Counter-Reformation works based on 17th-century theology, which emphasised God's presence in the humble activities of human life. There are thus similarities between the painting styles of the romantic and baroque periods that correspond to the similarities between romantic and baroque theology, both of which underscore the discovery of the theological in the anthropological.

If we ask how Delacroix, a religious sceptic and critic of liberal humanitarianism, first learned of these modern Catholic philosophies, we discover that the path was a surprisingly direct one. In France, Möhler's ideas were disseminated in the seminaries by Abbé Bautain, and in more popular forums by Père Félicité Lamennais. As one of the most influential preachers of liberal Catholicism in this era, Lamennais's radical proposals for the remedying of injustice galvanised his followers, and his many publications inspired a kind of 'Jesus-liberator' iconography. In all likelihood, Delacroix became familiar with Lamennais's thought through his close friend George Sand, who was associated with the priest and also deeply influence by the principles of Catholic humanitarianism.\(^{15}\) Delacroix was in accord with certain aspects of Lamennais preaching, believing that Christianity possessed a superior moral code and was thus a safeguard to civilisation, but he disagreed with the radical notion of equality among the social classes.

During the later years of the July Monarchy the revived interest in the historical development of Christ's human consciousness spread beyond the seminary and universities, giving rise to new interpretations in religious art. Paintings such as Delacroix's *Christ at the column*,\(^{16}\) Scheffer's *Christ intercessor* (Utrecht, Centraal Museum) and *Christ consoler* (Amsterdam, Van Gogh Museum), Chassériau's *Christ in the garden of olives* (fig. 5) and *Christ descending the garden of olives* (Souillac, St Mary's), Paul Delaroche's *Christ on the mount of olives* (fig. 6), and Flandrin's *Descent from the cross* and *Piétà* (Lyon, Musée de Beaux-Arts) illustrate this popular mid-century typology. In

---

\(^{14}\) Johnson, op. cit. (note 12). Versions of *The entombment*: vol. 4, no. 420, pl. 228 and no. 470, pl. 275; and vol. 3, pp. 211-12 and p. 248. Versions of *The lamentation*: vol. 4, no. 431, pl. 237; no. 434, pl. 242; no. 435, pl. 243; no. 459, pl. 244; and no. 466, pl. 272; and vol. 3, p. 219; pp. 221-23; pp. 223-24; p. 239; and p. 243. See also vol. 6, no. 564, pl. 40; and vol. 5, pp. 79-85. *The supper at Emmaus*: vol. 4, no. 458, pl. 266; and vol. 3, p. 238. Versions of *The education of the Virgin*: vol. 4, no. 426, pl. 234; no. 461, pl. 235; and vol. 3, pp. 215-16 and p. 240.

\(^{15}\) In her fiction, Sand often focused on the theme of rehabilitated sinners and outcasts, ‘les parias,’ who will be rejoined to society in Jesus' coming kingdom. Her ‘doctrine of equality’ was based on Lamennais's thesis of universal brotherhood: king and pauper were equals. Sand later became a devotee of the Christian communist Pierre Leroux. See Bowman, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 69, 79, 266, 343 and 356, and idem, ‘George Sand, le Christ et le Royaume,’ *Cahiers de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Françaises* 28 (1976), pp. 243-62.

\(^{16}\) Johnson, op. cit. (note 12). Versions of *Christ at the column*: vol. 4, no. 439, pl. 250; no. 447, pl. 251; and vol. 3, pp. 225-26 and 229-30.
the same humanitarian spirit, Lamennais's protestations against the bourgeoisie demanded a living-out of the values promulgated in the gospels and called for justice for the underclass. Principles of liberal Catholicism influenced popular iconography, which included depictions of Christ as the universal brother, as the ‘good shepherd to the outcasts,’ as the ‘sower of the Word,’ as a labourer, and as the liberator of the poor and oppressed - motifs that served the working class audience and subjects that were meant to stimulate the piety of the masses.

Not surprisingly, the bourgeoisie preferred other themes, more specifically scenes from Christ's Passion. Filled with feelings of existential anxiety stirred by economic uncertainty and social unrest, bourgeois taste tended toward images of the suffering redeemer almost as an emblem of a class and an epoch. When we consider that the literacy rate in France was merely five to ten percent of the adult population, the abundant literary references to this model of Jesus mirror the self-identity of this elite class. For example, Charles Blanc, founder and editor of the influential Gazette des Beaux-Arts, believed that the suffering,
tragic figure of Christ was a pervasive one, but Salon records and church commissions reveal a much more varied iconography. Thus, the powerful bourgeoisie projected a rather narrow Christian theology that focused on individual human existence, even solitary suffering, rather than on tenets of resurrection and salvation.

Salon reviews in general, and those written by Gautier in particular, addressed this elite segment of society: in 1844 the critic wrote that in Chassériau's *Christ descending the garden of olives* ‘a modern sadness pounds under the traditional tunic of Christ; they are the tears of our times that flow from these eyes [...]'; our melancholy pours from this head in tears; this figure is intelligent and tired [...]’, it is the suffering anxiety of our age [...]’. In the same review, he reminded readers of Chassériau's pendant piece, *Christ in the garden of olives* (fig. 5): ‘[...] Christ receives from the hands of the archangel the chalice filled to the brim with the bitter wine of sorrows. [...] it is the mark of a desolation and sadness even more profound.’

17 T. Gautier, ‘Le Salon de 1844,’ *La Presse* (27 March 1844). ‘[... mais] une douleur moderne palpite sous la tunique traditionnelle du Christ: ce sont les larmes de notre temps qui coulent par ces yeux, notre mélancolie s'épanche dans ces cheveux en pleurs; cette figure intelligente et fatiguée [...] C'est la souffrance inquiète de notre âge [...] un Christ recevant des mains de
of Delaroche's *Christ on the mount of olives* (fig. 6) seized on its symbolic meaning for the present generation: ‘The spectacle of sad humanity, then something more, the feeling of true sadness, has brought Delaroche to the only true religion, to the religion of pain,"

"l'archange le calice rempli jusqu'au bord de l'âcre vin des douleurs. [...] il est empreint d'une désolation et d'une tristesse plus profondes encore.’
to Christianity.’

Bowman has observed a similar preference for this model of Jesus in the writing of George Sand: ‘Sand evoked very little of the gospel material and the life of Jesus, preferring only those scenes of the cenacle, the garden of olives, and the Passion.’

Sources

The raw power of Eugène Delacroix's *Agony in the garden* (fig. 1) gives the image of Christ's human nature a great pathos and renders it evocative of a deep melancholy, which, in view of our shared humanity, is meant to raise in us feelings of anxiety. Rather than seeking to arouse our pity Delacroix instead calls on the spectator's empathy. In a *Journal* entry of 28 February 1847 the artist wrote enthusiastically about wanting to read a recently published and popular intimate account of the sufferings of Christ during the Passion as revealed to Sister Catherine Emmerich:

‘The exceedingly interesting book [...] is by a German ecstatic, I must read it.’

Although we have no record of Delacroix's reaction to the book, the *Agony in the garden* is clearly faithful to the biblical text, as the Synoptic Gospel writers never recoiled from depicting Jesus' utter agony, his feeling of having been forsaken by God the Father as he faces a horrible death. The painting in the Van Gogh Museum

---

18 A. Nettement, ‘Une visite à Paul Delaroche (May 1857),’ published in *Poètes et artistes contemporains*, Paris 1862, p. 22: ‘Le spectacle des douleurs humaines, puis quelque chose de plus, le sentiment de ses propres douleurs ont conduit Paul Delaroche à la seule religion vraie, à la religion de la douleur, au christianisme.’
19 Bowman, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 268-69.
20 Delacroix wrote: ‘The exceedingly interesting book, translated by M Cazalis, is by a German ecstatic, I must read it. It contains extraordinary details about the Passion that were revealed to this young girl’; see *The journal of Eugène Delacroix*, ed. Hugh Wellington, trans. L. Norton, New York & Oxford 1951, 28 February 1847, p. 67. Anna Catherine Emmerich was a German mystic devoted to the stigmata and the Passion. Her book was first published in France in 1835 and by 1850 there were at least 30 editions. Emmerich's book was popular in England as well; by 1892 there were 15 English editions of her *Dolorous Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ from the meditations of Anne Catherine Emmerich.*
appears nearest to the Markan account of the gospel story, in which Jesus tells the disciples: ‘My soul is sorrowful even unto death’ (Mark 14:34). Delacroix's painting shows Christ isolated and vulnerable; the God-man throws himself upon the ground and prays that this hour might pass him by: ‘Abba, Father! […] take this cup away from me. But let it be as you, not I would have it.’(Mark 14:37). The concept of a Jesus nearly crushed under the weight of the temptation to forgo obedience and death is a radical 19th-century modality, in the sense that non-traditional theology and not biography determines the image.

Eugène Delacroix's portrayal of Jesus' prescient vision of the impending desertion by his disciples, of Peter's denial, of his arrest and trial, torture, mocking and death is exemplary of the kind of romantic excess that alarmed certain conservative critics. His energetic forms, vibrant colours and baroque tenebrism intensify the emotional power of the religious mystery already inherent in the ‘Agony in the garden’ theme, a scenario that depends on a compelling narrative, with plot, action, reaction and a cast of supporting characters who add to the drama of Jesus' profound struggle for faith in his abysmal state of uncertainty - ‘My God, my God why have you forsaken me?’ The profundity of this conflict will be revealed only at his death, with the words: ‘It is consummated.’ Biblical scholar and exegeticist R. Brown reasons that unless we take these words seriously we cannot see the logic of Jesus' anguished prayer that the cup be taken from him.

Although Delacroix did several versions of this subject in a variety of media (oil, pastel, pen and ink wash, pencil and crayon) dating from the 1840s through the 1850s, the pic-

22 While the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke describe the solitary Jesus at prayer at the Mount of Olives or in Gethsemane, it is only in Luke that there is any mention of consoling angels. Delacroix composed this scene with figures of angels in an earlier work of 1827.
23 See Comte de Grimouard de Saint-Laurent, Guide de l'art chrétien, 6 vols., Paris 1872-74, vol. 4, pp. 343-45. The critic believed that the portrayal of the Virgin Mary in Delacroix's Lamentation of 1844 (Johnson, op. cit. [note 12], vol. 6, no. 564, pl. 40; and vol. 5, p.p. 79-85) showed excessive emotion. Her grief was inconsistent with the Catholic theology of Christian resurrection.
24 Raymond E. Brown, A crucified Christ in Holy Week: essays on the four gospel Passion narratives, Collegeville, MN 1986, p. 44.
ture in the Van Gogh Museum most closely resembles a known, but now lost work of the same title of circa 1849: both show the cloaked but muscular torso of Jesus, a man with broad shoulders lying prostrate and nearly writhing with pain.25 The figure is drawn on a diagonal in the middle ground, while his right arm lengthens the diagonal and his right leg appears from beneath a swathe of deep cerulean blue cloth, which enfolds his body and extends backward into the composition. Although the form is rather flaccid and bulky, a psychic energy shoots through it, as if Christ's whole body is wrestling with the temptation to flee. The drama of the moment is accentuated by expressive details such as the downward turn of the mouth, the strained tilt of the head, the open palm and clenched fingers. Delacroix's story takes place without ministering angels, and an austere and vulnerable Jesus ‘sweats blood’ at the thought of his impending ordeal - a sharp contrast to the self-possessed God-man in the Johannine account.26 (R. Brown clarifies that agōnia - from which we derive the scene's title - is a Greek word describing the supreme tension of the sweat-drenched athlete at the start of a contest.27) In Delacroix's painting, Jesus' head twists upward, his neck muscles wrenched and straining; despite the fact that the head appears disproportionately small, the jaw line is clearly defined, indicating a kind of heroic determination: ultimately, the Passion strengthens rather than weakens his resolve. Delacroix's image evokes the passage from Isaiah with the description of the suffering servant who ‘sets his face like flint’ (Isaiah. 50:7).

**Eugène Delacroix and Ary Scheffer**

If I am right that Delacroix's various paintings of *St Sebastian helped by the holy women* and *The good Samaritan* exhibit a Mennaisian influence and that Möhlerist ideas determine works such as *The disciples and the holy women piously*

![Image](image.jpg)

Paul Delaroche, *Christ on the mount of olives*, 1855, present location unknown (photograph by permission of the British Library)

25 Johnson, op. cit. (note 12); see vol. 4, no. 438, pl. 248 and vol. 3, p. 225.
26 In the Johannine account, Jesus is fully aware of all that is to happen and in control of his destiny, his divinity is more apparent; see John 18:4.
retrieving the body of St Stephen and The entombment, then he had a well-known predecessor: Dutch painter Ary Scheffer. More than any other artist of the 1830s, Scheffer devised themes from biblical narratives and religious tenets that stressed Christ's compassion, and this helped make his paintings popular with an audience eager for a modern religious art. His Christ the consoler is based on the Gospel of Luke (4:18), but it forgoes narrative and instead interprets Jesus' proclamation ‘I have come to set the captives free.’ Scheffer's image includes the figures of an African and a Pole.

28 Scheffer's painting Christ the consoler enjoyed prolonged success through wide circulation as an engraving by Dupont. It remained one of the most popular pious images for over 50 years.
and shows the poor as mistreated and economically enslaved. In the reviews Scheffer's rendition of the gospel verse sparked contemporary analogies: ‘It was Christ who breaks the chains of the Poles [...] it is a bloody reproach against those who have taken the part of the Tsar against the Polish people.’

Other critiques concerned the unsuitability of Scheffer's Mennaisian theme and non-Tridentine subject. Scheffer's religious scenes were viewed as ‘too philosophical’ or ‘too German.’ Christ the consoler was thought to be ‘overly intellectual [...] less like a painting and more like a book.’

In 1859 Louis Viardot noted that Scheffer was caught up in the spirit of the times - ‘a period more concerned with morality than faith.’ Such comments were attempts to diffuse the growing influence of German theologians and the perceived dangers of liberal Catholic philosophy; Viardot claimed that ‘these metaphysical paintings cast aside art's true role [...] his [Scheffer's] subjects practically require a written explanation.’

Ludovic Vitet also alluded to the influence of German thinkers on Scheffer's themes and iconography: ‘There is more philosophy in this painter than religion.’

In pairing Delacroix's scenes of the Passion with Scheffer's images of New Testament precepts, I want to demarcate a group of painters - Pierre Proud'hon, to Hippolyte Flandrin, Hippolyte Lazerges, Emile Signol et al. - all of whom drew on themes and symbols derived from Lamennais's philosophy. They rejected the traditional iconography of an awe-inspiring Second Person of the Trinity, emphasising instead the historical person of Jesus, who was heroic in his isolation and vulnerability, a man-God whose earthly mission ended on the cross. Their interests reflect contemporary theologies that sought a deeper historical understanding of Christ's human consciousness. In repositioning these artists I am not attempting to use the ‘exceptions to prove the rule,’ to point up consistencies between incongruent styles, or to depoliticise religious commissions by revealing that similar (negative) criticism was dispersed across disparate works. Rather, I seek to clarify these artists' intentions to visualise the compassionate and fraternal aspects of Christianity with a heightened appreciation of the incarnate and mystical in theology. Both artists expand imaginatively beyond traditional models under the stimuli of liberal Catholicism and the dynamic concept of the Church articulated by the theologians at Tubingen.

**Religious aspirations**

The approximately 120 religious paintings and over 220 drawings and pastels by Delacroix have led me to readdress the widely-held view that these works were

---

29 Piel, ‘Salon de 1837,’ L’Européen 2 (July-August 1837), p. 27.
31 Ibid.
33 Bruno Foucart was the first to discuss religious pictures by diverse artists, uniting them by genre; however, he avoided the issue of how religious ideas had affected iconography and formal means. Foucart's study ends in 1860, a date he admits saw an obvious and abrupt break in the choice of subject of religious painting. See Bruno Foucart, Le renoveau de la peinture religieuse en France (1800-1860), Paris 1987.
merely commissions and, as such, remote from the artist's personal taste or experience. In fact, Delacroix considered biblical subjects a fecund source of inspiration for an artist, an important impetus in calling forth ‘the aspirations of the soul.’ In a revealing entry in his *Journal*, the painter declared: ‘I thought of all religion has to offer to the imagination, and at the same time of its appeal to man's deepest feelings. “Blessed are the meek, blessed are the peacemakers”: what other religion has ever made gentleness, resignation and simple goodness the sole aim of man's existence. “Beati pauperes spiritu”: Christ promised heaven to the poor in spirit, that is, to the simple-hearted; this is not so much intended to humble our pride in the human mind as to show us that a simple heart is better than a brilliant intellect.’ Delacroix's eloquent expression of pious feeling, his interest in biblical subjects and his sympathy toward Catholicism were not atyp-

---


ical, as many romantics valued religion for both personal and social reasons.36

As an esteemed artist who gained major church commissions, Delacroix had to endure criticism for the supposed lack of religious feeling in these works; at the same time, however, supporters lauded his ‘enormous talent for sacred scenes.’37 L. Clément de Ris reported that each time Delacroix touched upon the themes of Christ's Passion, he captured a singular combination of ‘mysterious terror and divine majesty […] the viewer is thrilled to things divine.’38 Critic and scholar Ernest Chesneau commented on this aptitude, particularly in those biblical or religious pictures created for the artist's own pleasure: ‘When one considers the devotional themes that Delacroix has treated in the course of his life of painting, one arrives at an enormous total; and when one reflects that these were most often subjects he had chosen of his own inclination, without having to be amenable to the exigencies of commissions, one must conclude that, without being either a mystic or a devout believer, Delacroix had not only poetry but a religious soul.’39

Without denying Delacroix's scepticism, my claim that the artist possessed a religious consciousness is scarcely without foundation in fact.40 Near the end of his life, in a rather profound entry in his Journal, we find the following: ‘God is within us. He is the inner presence that causes us to admire the beautiful, that must glad when we do right, and consoles us for having no share in the happiness of the wicked. It is he, no doubt, who breathes inspiration into men of genius, and warms their hearts at the sight of their own productions. Some men are virtuous, others are geniuses and both are inspired and favoured by God.’41 Moreover, we find that sacred subjects became increasingly important to Delacroix: eight paintings date from the 1830s; 18 from the 1840s; and 32 from the 1850s. The artist showed religious pictures in nearly

39 ‘Quand on récapitule par la pensée les sujets religieux que Delacroix a traités dans le cours de sa vie de peintre, on arrive à un total énorme; et quand on songe que ses sujets, il les a choisis le plus souvent de son propre mouvement, sans y être amené par les exigences des commandes, on en doit conclure que sans être un mystique ni un dévot, Delacroix avait, ne fût-ce qu'en poète, l'âme religieuse’; see Alfred Robaut (ed.), L'oeuvre complète de Eugène Delacroix: peintures, dessins, gravures, lithographies, catalogué et reproduit par Alfred Robaut avec commentaire par Ernest Chesneau, Paris 1885, p. 450.
40 In his invaluable Journal, we find, for example, that he often attended Mass, found himself ‘enchanted’ by various other Catholic services, dined with the Archbishop of Orléans and felt grateful for the opportunity that religious subjects afforded a painter. He wrote that he often liked ‘to sit quiet and alone in churches to have a good long meditation.’ See Journal, cit. (note 20), 26 June 1853, p. 192; 24 December 1853, pp. 215-16; 21 May 1854, p. 230; 12 September 1854, p. 254; and 29 August 1857, p. 368.
41 ‘Dieu est en nous: c'est cette présence intérieure qui nous fait admirer le beau, qui nous réjouit quand nous avons bien fait et nous console de ne pas partager le bonheur du méchant. C'est lui sans doute qui fait l'inspiration dans les hommes de génie et qui les échauffe au spectacle de leurs propres productions. Il y a des hommes de vertu comme des hommes de génie; les uns et les autres sont inspirés et favorisés de Dieu’; see Journal de Eugène Delacroix, ed. A. Joubin, 3 vols., Paris 1932, vol. 3, 12 October 1862, p. 329.
every Salon from 1845 through 1859. His heightened interest in the thematic content of these scenes is apparent in his critical evaluation of other artists. For example, a Journal entry of 6 June 1854 shows us his decidedly religious impatience with Poussin's renderings of the figures of Christ and the Virgin Mary: ‘Poussin was never able to paint the head of Christ, or the body either - that body which should express so much tenderness, and the head that must be eloquent with divine grace and pity for the sufferings of mankind [...]. [As for] the Virgin, he seems to have no conception of the holiness and mystery surrounding her personality.’ On the other hand, Delacroix believed that he himself was quite capable of almost effortlessly giving a spiritual component to his own devotional pictures: ‘Walked home, and went into St Roch to hear the midnight mass, I do not know whether it was because of the crowd or the lights or the solemnity of it all, but the pictures seemed to be colder and more insipid than ever, How rare talent is! [...] and yet what finer opportunity could any man have than religious subjects such as these! I only wanted one touch, just one single spark of feeling and deep emotion from all these pictures [...] a touch which I feel I could have given almost unconsciously.’

Delacroix's sacred works are rendered with a spiritual feeling that strongly suggests his dramatic storytelling and brilliant brushwork are inseparable from his sympathies toward religion itself. Moreover, his choice of Mennaisian and Möhlerist themes as subject matter demonstrates that his characteristic modernity extends well beyond a romantic style of painting.

42 Lucien Rudrauf, Maurice Sérullaz and Susan Strauber have traced the growing importance of religious paintings in Delacroix's oeuvre from the 1820s through to his death in 1863; they concur that ‘his interest in these subjects seemed to ignite’ in the 1840s, evinced by the sharp increase in devotional pictures that continued until his last days. See Lucien Rudrauf, Delacroix et le problème du romantisme artistique, Paris 1942; Maurice Sérullaz, Delacroix: peintures et dessins d'inspiration religieuse, Nice 1986; and Susan Strauber, The religious paintings of Eugène Delacroix (diss., Brown University, 1983).

43 Journal, cit. (note 20), 6 June 1854, p. 142.
44 Ibid., 24 December 1853, pp. 215-16.
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This catalogue contains the paintings and drawings acquired by the Van Gogh Museum from August 2000 to July 2001. Each work has an inventory number made up as follows: the first letter stands for the technique (s = painting, d = drawing); this is followed by a reference number and then by a capital letter (B = loan, N = State of the Netherlands, S = Van Gogh Museum [after 1 July 1994], V = Vincent van Gogh Foundation) and the year of acquisition.

Paintings

Amiet, Cuno
Swiss, 1868-1961

Two children (Copy after Van Gogh) 1907
Oil on canvas, 51.3 × 46 cm
Monogrammed and dated on reverse: CA 1907, annotation:
COPIE/NACH/VAN GOGH
s 506 S/2001 (colour plate p. 138)

After completing his academic training in Munich and Paris the Swiss artist Cuno Amiet moved to Pont-Aven in 1892. He stayed a year in this small Breton port, where he became acquainted with French painting and came into contact with the work of Vincent van Gogh and Paul Gauguin. From this moment onwards their art would exert a major influence on Amiet's style. In 1906 he joined Die Brücke, the artists' group founded in Dresden, which played a leading role in German expressionism.

Amiet's painting in the Van Gogh Museum is an exact copy of Van Gogh's Two children (F 784 JH 2052, private collection), a work produced by the artist in June 1890 in Auvers-sur-Oise. In 1907 the original painting was included in an exhibition in the Künstlerhaus in Zurich, the first painting by Van Gogh to be exhibited in Switzerland. Amiet visited this exhibition, probably in the company of his friend, the Zurich-based collector, Richard Kisling. Later that year Kisling would acquire Van Gogh's Two children on Amiet's recommendation. According to Kisling himself, he bought the canvas for 2000 francs from Van Gogh's brother Theo. However, Theo had died in January 1891 and Kisling presumably confused him with Van Gogh's uncle, the art dealer C.M van Gogh, who was then active on the Swiss art circuit. After purchasing the painting Kisling loaned it for a year to Amiet, who thoroughly analysed the work and produced two copies (the other is now in a private collection). For Amiet this was a unique opportunity to study the methods of an artist he greatly admired.

The special attraction of our copy is that it shows how Van Gogh's work would most likely have looked in 1907, for the original's appearance has been altered by subsequent discolouration. Areas that were initially pink and violet, for example, are now light blue and white. This was confirmed during restoration in 1967, when two narrow strips to the extreme left and right of the painting were found to have retained
their original colour: their position beneath the frame had prevented them from suffering the effects of light. When Amiet produced his version of the *Two children* these pink and violet areas had only faded slightly. He probably also used a less unstable paint sort, which did not discolour as rapidly.

**Provenance** Oscar Miller Collection, Biberist; Galerie Kornfeld, Berne; acquired by the Van Gogh Museum (2001).


**Dupré, Jules**

**French, 1811-1889**

The sunken path c. 1835-40
Oil on canvas, 101 × 83 cm
Signed at lower left: *Jules Dupré*

s 505 S/2001 (colour plate p. 135)

Jules Dupré began his artistic career as a porcelain painter. He also received lessons from the landscape painter Michel Diebolt and studied the work of 17th-century Dutch landscapists, Ruisdael and Hobbema in particular. Dupré made his debut at
the Paris Salon in 1831; that same year he travelled to England where he was impressed by the works of John Constable and John Crome. Upon returning to Paris he worked with such artists as Théodore Rousseau and Constant Troyon; from 1840 he would paint around the village of Barbizon, and later in the Pyrenees and at L'Isle-Adam.

Dupré executed *The sunken path* between 1835 and 1840. One of the painting's striking features is the contrast between the clear blue sky and the dark trees and shaded areas on the right and in the foreground. This is underlined by the expressive, visible brushwork used to create the landscape and the fine, smooth technique employed for the sky. In painting the scene, Dupré chose a fairly high viewpoint, beside the sunken road. This stance and the theatrical composition lead the viewer's eye down the path and into the depths of the painting, where a herd of cows has been rendered with confident brushstrokes. In a second version of the painting, produced during the same period and now in a private collection, the cows are absent. It is not known which version is the earlier. A pencil drawing, also in private hands and depicting a similar location in the winter, may have been a preliminary study for the two paintings. The Van Gogh Museum acquired a watercolour by Dupré in 1997; this is the first oil painting by the artist in the museum's collection.

**Provenance** A. Marmontel; Hôtel Drouot (Paris), 28 and 29 March 1898, lot 94; Alfred Beurdeley; Galerie Petit (Paris), 6 May 1920, lot 47; private collection; Brame & Lorenceau (Paris); purchased by the Van Gogh Museum (2001).


**Monet, Claude-Oscar**

**French, 1840-1926**

Mills at Westzijderveld near Zaandam 1871
Oil on canvas, 48.5 × 74.2 cm
Signed at lower left: Claude Monet
s 503 S/2001 (colour plate p. 136)

Claude Monet made his first trip to Holland in 1871, staying in Zaandam for four months, from June to October. He came from London, where he had been in
self-imposed exile in order to escape conscription during the Franco-Prussian War. It is not known what prompted him to delay his return to France with a prolonged stopover in the Netherlands. John Rewald has suggested that Charles Daubigny, who visited both London and Holland that year, may have advised the younger painter to follow this route. In Monet in Holland, however, Boudewijn Bakker disagreed, setting Monet's sojourn against a wider pattern of French artistic interest in its northern neighbour. According to Bakker, Zaandam's fame as a tourist attraction, together with encouragement from the dealer Paul Durand-Ruel, may have persuaded Monet to go there in search of attractive and saleable Dutch subjects.

Travelling via Amsterdam, Monet arrived in Zaandam around 2 June, accompanied by his wife Camille and their son Jean. In general we know relatively little about his life and associations during his stay. A single portrait depicting the daughter of a local timber merchant provides evidence of contact with at least one well-off family, but it is not known whether the artist made any sustained attempt to foster relations with Dutch patrons. Wary of potential subversives making their way north in the aftermath of the Paris Commune, the Dutch authorities kept a close eye on visiting French nationals. Monet's movements were monitored by the local police, whose reports provide some glimpses of the painter's activities and contacts. The arrival of the artist and his family was reported by the local police commissioner to his superior in Amsterdam, who added that there was ‘nothing in connection with the said alien to arouse suspicion […]’. A few weeks later, on 22 June, the commissioner reported the arrival of two more French guests, Henry Havard (an art critic and historian) and the painter Henri Michel-Lévy: ‘The movements of the Frenchmen [...] do not yield anything remarkable. They seek each other's company a great deal, and go for walks or at times row on the Zaan. The two painters are seen working from time to time.’

The commissioner's laconic report does little justice to Monet's industry during his months at Zaandam. Monet himself wrote to Camille Pissarro in mid-June that he was working at full tilt. During his four-month stay he produced some 25 canvases, a sharp contrast with the 8 known works that stemmed from his rather longer stay in London. Clearly, Monet was inspired by his new surroundings. In an earlier letter to Pissarro he had written: ‘Zaandam is particularly remarkable and there is enough here to paint for a life-time.’ In another letter, also to Pissarro, he noted that ‘there

---

1 John Rewald, The history of impressionism, New York 1946, p. 221.
4 Ibid., p. 40.
5 Ibid. p. 40.
7 Letter to Camille Pissarro, 2 June 1871; ibid., p. 180.
are the most amusing things everywhere. Houses of every colour, hundreds of windmills and enchanting boats, extremely friendly Dutchmen who almost all speak French.  

Monet’s works from Zaandam cannot be set in any clear, chronological order. He explored various aspects of the town and the surrounding areas, from views of the harbour and its buildings to more panoramic vistas of the Zaan River. As a group, the pictures are diverse in both mood and approach, displaying considerable experimentation in the techniques of outdoor painting. Several seem closely related in style and subject to the nascent impressionism of Monet’s work at La Grenouillère in 1869, with rapid brushwork and a bright palette. Others seem more subdued and conventional, inviting comparison with the work of established masters such as Daubigny.

The Van Gogh Museum’s Mills at Westzijderveld counts as one of the more daring of the Zaandam pictures. It is one of a small group of works painted

![Image](image1)

**fig. 1**
Westzijderveld at Zaandam, c. 1900, Zaanstad, Gemeentearchief

![Image](image2)

**fig. 2**
Westzijderveld at Zaandam, c. 1900, Zaanstad, Gemeentearchief

in Westzijderveld which, as the name implies, is an area to the west of the town, a polder landscape criss-crossed with ditches and canals and dotted with an abundance of windmills and their outbuildings (figs. 1 and 2). This area still retains something of its original character although the precise location painted by Monet can no longer be identified with any certainty. The artist did, however, render sufficient detail to be able to identify all but the mill second from the left as so-called smock windmills (bovenkruiers). In this region they were in use mainly as sawmills, the top half of the structure being swivelled to optimise the angle of the sails to the wind. In the painting the sails are depicted in the typical summer colours of orange and white, this last gradually discolouring in the wind and rain to become the murky grey Monet has recorded. In late October the sails were changed to their traditional winter colours of yellow and brown.

The foreground of the painting is dominated by the view along a wide ditch brimming with water and crossed by a series of wooden footbridges. Behind the mills, blocks of grey cloud mask the sunlight in a subtle contre-jour effect. Monet uses combinations of sombre greens, greys and mauves to evoke an overcast day under a water-laden Dutch sky, an effect that serves to heighten the dramatic orange-red of the windmill sails. As with many of the Zaandam pictures the viewpoint

---

8 Letter to Camille Pissarro, 17 June 1871; ibid., p. 181.
suggests the artist was working from a boat, and the swift handling suggests that all
or most of the work was executed on the spot. As Ronald Pickvance has observed,
this is ‘one of Monet's most direct and confident paintings of Zaandam.’ In many
areas of the picture he applied his paint with fluid, block-like strokes, using
the square-ended brushes that he favoured in the early 1870s. By contrast the rippling
water is depicted with simple, almost child-like scribbles, which seem to be unique
to this picture. Traces of an earlier composition are still visible beneath the present
work. It is possible that Monet painted over an earlier work, although x-radiographs
give no indication of what this might have been.

At Zaandam Monet made some studies of similar subjects under differing
conditions of light and weather. A painting of an analogous view in Westzijderveld
has a contrasting sunset effect. The calm water reflects a tranquil sky, while the
windmills, with their sails tilted away from the viewer, lead the eye gently into depth,
evoking the mood of river scenes by mid-19th-century masters such as Daubigny or
Corot. The Van Gogh Museum picture, however, is remarkable for its audacious
composition. Any effect of recession suggested by the ditch is immediately countered
by the flat silhouette of the windmills and their sails, establishing the almost abstract
pattern across the canvas that prompted Pickvance to compare the design with
Mondrian's early river scenes. The emphatic two-dimensionality of the composition
has also been compared to Japanese prints. The story that Monet ‘discovered’ Japanese
art by accident during his first trip to Holland is no longer accepted, but certain
features in the Dutch landscape may have helped to stimulate his interest in such
woodblock prints. One of the pencil sketches Monet made as he scouted for subjects
in this area shows a wooden footbridge not unlike the one in the Van Gogh Museum
painting. The delicate form of the bridge in the drawing has been convincingly
compared to a print of a similar motif by Hokusai. This particular parallel may be
coincidental but in a more general way the strong sense of surface pattern in Mills
at Westzijderveld seems to reflect the artist's awareness of the bold compositional
devices of Japanese prints.

When in 1872 Eugène Boudin saw the works Monet had made at Zaandam he
wrote to a friend: ‘He has brought some very beautiful studies from Holland and I
believe that he is meant to take one of the leading places in our school.’ The
significance of Monet's first journey to the Netherlands has long been recognised. If
his period of exile in London was something of a hiatus, at Zaandam he was able to
recapture the creative energy of the works painted at La Grenouillère and Trouville
in 1869 and 1870, and to take forward his experiments with outdoor painting. In
commercial terms the trip seems also to have been something of a success.
Durand-Ruel bought a number of the Zaandam pictures, including our Mills at
Westzijderveld near Zaandam. It was later acquired by Max Liebermann. As an
admirer of Monet and an enthusiastic visitor to Holland (by chance Liebermann was

9 Ibid., p. 128.
10 Mills in the Westzijderveld (W182); see ibid.
11 Ibid. p. 127.
14 Liebermann had a small but distinguished collection of works by Manet and the impressionists;
see Karl-Heinz Janda and Annegrete Janda, ‘Max Liebermann als Kunstsammler. Die
Enstehung seiner Sammlung und ihre zeitgenössische Wirkung,’ Forschungen und Berichte.
Staatliche Museen zu Berlin 15 (1973), pp. 105-49. The Monet is illustrated in Max Osborn,
also in the Netherlands in 1871) it is no surprise that the German painter should have been attracted to this picture.

**Provenance** Acquired from Monet by Durand-Ruel (either in September 1872 as *La Passerelle* or in February 1873 as *Moulin de Bois*); 7. Internationale Kunstaussstellung der Münchner Sezession, Munich 1899, no. 200 (owner not identified); between 1899 and 1909 acquired by Max Liebermann, Berlin; together with other works from Liebermann's collection, in Kunsthaus (Zurich), 9 May 1933;¹⁵ to Liebermann's daughter Käthe Liebermann and her hus-

---

¹⁵ For a description of the inventory of Liebermann's collection at the Kunsthaus see Janda op. cit. (note 14), p. 122, no. 65. The *Mills at Westzijderveld near Zaandam* is listed as no. 13, *Holländische Landschaft (Schiedam).*
band Kurt Riezler, by whom sold to Paul Rosenberg & Co., New York (1943); by Harry N. Abrams (1949); gift of Mr and Mrs Abrams to The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (1968); de-accessioned in 1969 to the Wildenstein Gallery; private collection, USA; purchased by the Van Gogh Museum through Hirsch and Adler Galleries (New York) with funds provided by the Dutch Sponsor Lottery, the Stichting Nationaal Fonds Kunstbezit, the Vereniging Rembrandt, supported by the Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds and a donation from VNU, the Ministry of Education Culture and Science; the Mondrian Foundation, the VSB Fonds and the Vincent van Gogh Foundation (2001). The donation from the Stichting Nationaal Fonds Kunstbezit was made possible with contributions from Philips Electronics, Shell, Unilever, ABN AMRO, ING, Fortis and Heineken.

**Literature**


**View of the Prins Hendrikkade and the Kromme Waal in Amsterdam 1874**

Oil on canvas, 50 × 68 cm  
Signed at lower right: *Claude Monet*  
s 504 S/2001 (colour plate p. 137)

Monet's second visit to Holland is shrouded in mystery. There are 12 views of Amsterdam which, to judge from their style, were painted in 1873 or 1874. None of these works, however, were dated by the artist, and not a single document survives to record Monet's presence in the Netherlands during those years. Most of the 12 works disappeared quickly into private collections, bypassing his dealers, and Monet himself never exhibited any of them. None of the Amsterdam views were on display in the early group shows of the impressionists.

There is no record of the painter's whereabouts between the end of January and 1 April 1874, and so it seems likely he made a brief visit to Amsterdam.

---

16 According to information in the archives of the Rosenberg Gallery, Monet's *Moulins en Holland* was bought on 20 March 1943 from Dr K. Riezler, and sold to Harry Abrams on 15 March 1949 in exchange for a painting by Cézanne. We are grateful to Mrs Rosenberg for supplying this information.

17 The Monet was exchanged at Wildenstein for a painting by Jean-Baptiste-Marie Pierre, *The Death of Harmonia*, acc. no. 69.129.
during this period. The pictures themselves offer no clear clues for a more precise dating; two of them are snow scenes, several others are wintry in effect, while two paintings show trees that appear to be just coming into leaf. We can only speculate on the reasons Monet returned north at this particular moment. It has been suggested that it was a form of artistic retreat, allowing the painter to experiment away from the distraction of his friends and colleagues. However, a more commercial motive cannot be ruled out. Most of his subjects were familiar tourist landmarks that had already been frequently reproduced in guides, postcards and prints. Some of the pictures, such as the view of the Roozenboom mill seem blatantly picturesque in composition.

As with the Zaandam picture discussed above, the View of the Prins Hendrikkade and the Kromme Waal in Amsterdam must have been painted from a boat. The subject is located not far from the city's central railway station. The houses at the right stand on what is now called Prins Hendrikkade (before 1879 known as Kamperhoofd). The buildings, though somewhat altered, are still recognisable today (fig. 3). The boats to the left are moored in Waalseilandsgracht, while in the distance Monet has shown parts of Kromme and Oude Waal, which lead towards the centre of the city. A larger painting now in the Rau Foundation collection shows the same group of buildings but from around the corner. It seems that Monet may have manipulated the scenery to suit his own compositional ends. A drawing by Carel Storm van ’s-Gravensande, showing much the same view as the Van Gogh Museum's picture, clearly records a bridge over Waalseilandsgracht that Monet seems to have edited out (fig. 5).

3 See exhib. cat., Meesterlijk verzameld: Vijf eeuwen Europese schilderkunst - de collectie Gustave Rau, Rotterdam (Kunsthall) 2001, no. 61.
It also seems that the bridge pier at the right of Monet's painting was not actually visible from this vantage point. Perhaps Monet felt the need for a feature here to add interest to the foreground.

In technique the view of Amsterdam is quite different from the earlier vista of Zaandam. If in the terms familiar to the impressionists the latter could be described as an étude (a finished picture painted directly from nature), then the View of the Prins Hendrikkade is a pochade, i.e. a rapid and freely painted sketch. By 1874 Monet was using a variety of different brushstrokes to bring his subjects to life. Here, soft dabs of paint recreate the characteristic canal-side buildings of Amsterdam; small, nervous touches define the skimpy, leafless trees, while longer trails of liquid paint are used to capture the flickering reflections in the water. Monet began by laying in both sky and water with a base colour of pinkish grey. This colour and the grey priming layer are left exposed throughout the picture, acting as a unifying element in the colour scheme. The arrangement of the composition has a simplicity verging on artlessness. The real interest in the picture lies in the rendering of light and atmosphere. The artist's muted colours and delicate handling conspire to evoke the subtle, watery light of Amsterdam, tempered by a play of ever-changing reflections.

The first recorded owner of View of the Prins Hendrikkade was Eugène Murer, a pâtissier, amateur writer and painter who amassed a substantial collection of works by the impressionists in the later 1870s. In the 1880s Murer owned a hotel in Rouen.

---

4 On the reverse of the canvas is the stamp of the Paris firm of Alexis Ottoz. This mark appears on the back of numerous works by Monet and other impressionists. Alexis Ottoz ceased trading in 1876; see David Bomford et al., exhib. cat., Art in the making: impressionism, London (National Gallery) 1990-91, pp. 42-43.
and works from his collection were regularly on view there. A change of fortune forced him to sell most of his pictures in the later 1890s. The *View of the Prins Hendrikkade* was acquired by another enthusiastic collector of impressionism, Pieter van de Velde. The painting remained in private hands in France and, with the exception of an appearance at auction in 1989, does not seem to have been shown in public for over 100 years.

**Provenance** Purchased from Monet in 1877 by Eugène Murer; by 1900 in the collection of Pieter van de Velde, Le Havre; to Henri Thieullent (1922); by descent to a private collection, France (1957); sold by the latter at auction, Paris (Drouot-Montaigne), 8 April 1989, lot 38; Lake; private collection, Japan; Noortman Gallery, Maastricht; purchased by the Van Gogh Museum with funds provided by the Dutch Sponsor Lottery, the Stichting Nationaal Fonds Kunstbezit, the Vereniging Rembrandt, supported by the Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds and a donation from VNU, the Ministry of Education Culture and Science; the Mondrian Foundation, the VSB Fonds and the Vincent van Gogh Foundation (2001). The donation from the Stichting Nationaal Fonds Kunstbezit was made possible with contributions from Philips Electronics, Shell, Unilever, ABN AMRO, ING, Fortis and Heineken.


---


6 A Dutch merchant resident in Le Havre, Pieter van de Velde was an acquaintance of Eugène Boudin. He collected works by Boudin and the impressionists between 1889 and 1895. See Général Réquin, ‘Souvenirs sur Eugène Boudin,’ *Arts* 4 (18 August and 1 September 1950).

7 Henri Thieullent was related through marriage to Pieter van de Velde.
Drawings

Rachou, Henri
French, 1856-1944

Figure study 1887
Pencil and black crayon on paper, 59.9 × 38.9 cm
Signed at lower right: A Jean Rivièrè / Henry Rachou / 87

Henri Rachou studied at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in his native city of Toulouse. He then moved to Paris where, from 1879, he apprenticed himself to the well-known portrait painter Léon Bonnat. At Bonnat's studio Rachou came into contact with contemporaries such as Louis Anquetin and Eugène Boch. When the studio closed in 1883 Bonnat passed his pupils on to Fernand Cormon, who instructed them in drawing from plaster casts and the nude model. From 1884 Rachou was a massier (senior pupil) at Cormon's studio, where he produced this academic figure study in 1887. The artist was a friend of Toulouse-Lautrec's and must also have met Vincent van Gogh, who worked in the studio sometime between October 1886 and January 1887. Due to the lack of archive material, however, little is known about either relationships within the studio or Cormon's teaching methods. From 1881 Rachou repeatedly displayed work at the Salon, where he was awarded several medals. He generally painted conventional subjects, such as portraits and impressionistic landscapes. Around the turn of the century he came under the influence of symbolism. Rachou's work is not very well known. This can partly be explained by the new direction his career took during the early years of the 20th century, when he was appointed director of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and curator at the Musée des Augustins, both in Toulouse.

The Rachou drawing is one of the few tangible pieces of evidence that sheds light on the teaching methods at Cormon's studio; the only other documented testimony is provided by the studies produced there by Toulouse-Lautrec and Van Gogh. The recumbent male nude is sketched in pencil and black chalk; the artist has employed hatching to model the figure. The soft shadows contrast with the clearly defined body contour. A conspicuous feature is the network of squares, which points to the use of
a perspective viewer. The annotation at the lower right indicates that the artist gave the work to a friend, Jean Rivière.

The drawing is the second work by Rachou acquired by the Van Gogh Museum: the collection already contains a Japanese-style lithograph by the artist, part of the collection of Nabis graphic works purchased in 2000 (See *Van Gogh Museum Journal* 2000, p. 125 and this volume, pp. 151-181).

**Provenance** Riviere family; Galerie Moulins, Toulouse; purchased by the Van Gogh Museum (2001).

**Zandleven, Jan Adam**

**Dutch, 1868-1923**

Peasants digging c. 1903  
Black crayon, 42.5 × 31.7 cm  
Marked at lower right: *J.A.Z*  
d1099 S/2000

Study of hands c. 1903  
Black crayon, 43.5 × 31.5 cm  
d1100 S/2000

A forest c. 1904  
Black, white and brown crayon, 33.5 × 52.0 cm  
Signed at lower left: *J.A. Zandleven*  
d1101 S/2000

Study of a tree 1914  
Black crayon, 46 × 61.2 cm  
Signed and dated at lower left: *J.A. Zandleven 1914*  
d1102 S/2000

Jan Adam Zandleven was a self-taught artist and protégé of the art pedagogue and critic H.P. Bremmer (1871-1956). Bremmer advised Hélène Kröller-Müller on the compilation of her collection and played a significant role in promoting the appreciation of Vincent van Gogh in the Netherlands. He gave Zandleven financial support and enabled the artist to take part in exhibitions. Although Zandleven's work sold reasonably well during his lifetime, it received little recognition from the critics - aside from several laudatory articles in Bremmer's own journal, *Beeldende kunst.*
Zandleven mainly painted still lifes, forest views and landscapes. He was considerably influenced by the work of Vincent van Gogh, which was becoming increasingly well known in the Netherlands at the beginning of the 20th century. Zandleven's woodland scenes, interiors and farmhouses, produced in dark impasto colours, are inspired by the work of Van Gogh's Brabant period; his paintings of fruit trees in blossom are also modelled on Van Gogh's.

The four Zandleven drawings donated last year to the Van Gogh Museum are the first works by the artist in the collection. Although the museum does not usually collect work by 20th-century Dutch artists, the obvious Van Gogh influence proclaimed by Zandleven's drawings make them of particular interest. They show that Van Gogh's works on paper, like his paintings, provided a valuable source of inspiration for later artists.

*Peasants digging* and *Study of hands* were displayed at the 1962 exhibition *J.A. Zandleven* in the Dordrechts Museum. The exhibition catalogue assigns them to around 1903. Although there is no date on the drawings themselves, their style and subject suggest that Zandleven drew them during the early years of his artistic career, between 1902 and 1906, a period in which he produced a number of drawings of farmers working the land. *Peasants digging* has a strong resemblance to Van Gogh's 1885 black-chalk drawings of agricultural labourers, which Zandleven may have seen at the exhibition held in the Stedelijk Museum in 1905. The *Study of hands* - two hands holding a shovel - may be a preliminary study for *Peasants digging*.

*A forest*, a dark *sous-bois* of tree trunks and thick foliage in black crayon, is less sketchy than the first two drawings. Zandleven uses brown and white crayon to bring some life to the scene. Although the drawing is not dated, its similarity in subject, treatment and technique to a drawing in the Kröller-Müller Museum (*A forest, with heavy tree trunk in the foreground*, black and coloured crayon, 1904) assigns it to the same early period.

The *Study of a tree* is dated 1914; stylistically it also belongs to a later period than the other drawings. Van Gogh’s influence is obvious in the tree trunk and the foreground. Zandleven has translated
the typical brushwork found in Van Gogh's paintings from 1887-90 into small parallel lines, which he uses to create a decorative pattern that fills the surface.

**Provenance** Private collection; Stichting 't Schou, Schipluiden; donated to the Van Gogh Museum (2000).

Documentation
The new collection of French graphic works
colour plates

Félix Valloton
Le bon marché 1893
Félix Vallotton
The bath 1894
Pierre Bonnard
France-Champagne 1889
Camille Martin
Couverture décorative pour la deuxième année de ‘L’Estampe Originale’ 1894

Pierre Bonnard
La petite blanchisseuse 1896
Paul Ranson
*Tigre dans la jungle* 1893
The new collection of French graphic works

In the spring of 2000 the Vincent van Gogh Foundation, owner of the major portion of the works in the Van Gogh Museum, purchased an extensive and important collection of prints dating from the last two decades of the 19th century. These were acquired from a private collector who had accumulated them over a 50-year period. Thanks to this new acquisition, which comprises more than 800 works by artists such as Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, Pierre Bonnard, Edouard Vuillard, Maurice Denis and Félix Valloton, the museum can now boast a collection that includes most of the major prints produced in Paris between 1890 and 1905. A new focal point for the museum has been instantly created, providing a fine impression of art in the 15 years following Van Gogh's death that complements the existing range of works by the artist himself, his predecessors and contemporaries.

During the last 1880s and 1890s the graphic arts underwent a significant evolution. Prints, particularly lithographs, had previously been regarded as mainly reproductive or used for political purposes, but by the end of the 80s the emphasis increasingly lay on their artistic quality and they became an independent art form. The majority of prints made in this period, largely coloured lithographs, were produced in limited editions (circa 100), and intended for aficionados and collectors.

An important role in these developments was played by a group of artists known as the Nabis, or Prophets, who were active in Paris between 1890 and 1905. Although the association had no formal structure and its various members worked in widely differing styles, there were nonetheless similarities: compositions were often constructed of planes of colour, contours emphasised and some elements reduced to silhouettes. All these features can be largely attributed to the influence of Japanese prints.

The art dealer and publisher Ambroise Vollard was a great champion of the Nabis' production. By publishing albums and groups of prints by these artists he became responsible for some of the most impressive series of prints in the history of the graphic arts. He also brought out special collectors' editions of books illustrated by Nabis artists, such as Verlaine's Paralléllement, with plates by Bonnard. This and some 20 other illustrated publications have now been added to the museum's collection as well.

Among the most striking works are the Nabis' contributions to the avant-garde journal La Revue Blanche and the albums of L'Estampe Originale. This latter publication, which appeared nine times between 1893 and 1895 and on which 75 artists collaborated, constituted a veritable breakthrough in the acceptance of graphic art as an autonomous artistic medium. The recent acquisition means that the Van Gogh Museum now owns a virtually complete set of L'Estampe Originale, which is most uncommon.

The new collection of prints also includes an impressive group of applied graphic works. Artists such as Ibels, Toulouse-Lautrec and Bonnard, who were closely involved in avant-garde theatre, regularly produced magnificent designs for posters, theatre programmes and song sheets.

Before acquiring this splendid collection the Van Gogh Museum already possessed several hundred 19th-century French prints. However, these works were largely unconnected with each other, making it difficult to devise a focused collecting policy.
Purchase of the Nabis collection has resolved this situation, as these works now provide a foundation on which to base future acquisitions.

The following is a list providing basic information on all the works (prints and books) in the collection. A detailed catalogue devoted to the new collection will be published at a later date.

Marije Vellekoop
Prints

Abel-Truchet
French, 1857-1919
La fumée, puis la flamme 1895
Colour lithograph, 30.9 × 24 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1642 V/2000

Aman-Jean, Edmond
French, 1858-1936
Sous les fleurs 1897
Colour lithograph, 35 × 27 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right
p 1370 V/2000

André, Albert
French, 1869-1954
L'anneau de Çakuntala 1895
Lithograph, 32.9 × 50.6 cm
p 1229 V/2000

Anquetin, Louis
French, 1861-1932
Mariage d'argent
Lithograph, 31.7 × 24.7 cm
p 1625 V/2000
Le cavalier et le mendiant 1893
Lithograph, 36.7 × 50.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in red crayon at lower right margin

Stein and Karshan 1
p 1017 V/2000
Don Quichotte et Sancho Panza 1893
Lithograph, 26.7 × 37.2 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1107 V/2000
La fille d'Artaban; La nébuleuse;
Dialogue inconnu 1896
Lithograph, 29.3 × 21 cm
Aitken 34
p 1626 V/2000
Le talion; La cage; Ceux qui restent;
Fortune 1898
Lithograph, 27.2 × 21.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 38
Auriol, George
French, 1863-1938

**Ménages d'artistes; Le maître** 1890
Colour lithograph, 21.5 × 31 cm
Signed with monogram stamp on stone at upper left and on stone at lower left
Aitken 4; Fields 33

**Bois frissonnants** 1893
Colour lithograph, 49.5 × 32.4 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right
Stein and Karshan 2

**Chansons d'Ecosse et de Bretagne** 1895
Colour lithograph, 26 × 24 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at upper left
Fields 10

**Irises** 1895
Lithograph, 32.5 × 48.9 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at upper left
Not in Fields

Bac, Ferdinand
French, 1859-1952

**Le canard sauvage** 1891
Photogravure, 18.3 × 11 cm
Signed in plate at lower right
Aitken 10

**Irices** 1895

Bataille, Henri
French, 1872-1922

**Annabella** 1894
Lithograph, 23.5 × 29.5 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower left
Aitken 66

**Ton sang** 1897
Lithograph, 35 × 27.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
Aitken 91

Behrens, Peter
German, 1868-1940
Waterlilies 1899
Colour lithograph, 50 × 63.5 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower centre and in pencil at lower right
p 994 V/2000

Bernard, Emile
French, 1868-1914

Washerwomen 1888
Woodcut, 10.9 × 39.3 cm
Signed with stamp initials at lower right margin
p 1373 V/2000

Crucifixion 1891
Woodcut, 35.6 × 15.2 cm
Stein and Karshan 4
p 1019 V/2000

Les Cantilènes (title page) 1892
Zincograph, 33 × 20.5 cm
p 1140 V/2000

Voix qui revenez 1892
Zincograph, 32.8 × 19.8 cm
p 1141 V/2000

La comtesse se peigne (Esmérée) 1892
Zincograph, 33.2 × 20.2 cm
p 1142 V/2000

J'écoute les jets d'eau 1892
Zincograph, 32.7 × 20 cm
p 1143 V/2000

Il la prend par la belle et longue chevelure (La femme perfide) 1892
Zincograph, 33.1 × 20 cm
p 1144 V/2000
Va tuer mon mari (La femme perfide) 1892
Zincograph, 33 × 20 cm
p 1145 V/2000
Il vinrent amenant le Saint Sacrement (La vieille femme de Berkeley) 1892
Zincograph, 33 × 20 cm
p 1146 V/2000
Maryo file la laine 1892
Zincograph, 20 × 33.3 cm
With maple leaf and ‘92’ in reverse at lower right
p 1147 V/2000
Nocturne: Le bon ménusier, from ‘Les Cantilènes’ 1892
Zincograph, 33 × 20 cm
p 1148 V/2000

Besnard, Paul Albert
French, 1849-1934
La fin de tout 1883
Etching, 24 × 21 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin; inscribed ‘Tiré a 100’ at lower centre margin and ‘La Fin de Tout (5e et dernier état)’ at lower right margin
Delteil 14
p 1645 V/2000
Madame Besnard 1884
Etching, 26.7 × 20.8 cm
Signed with initials in plate at lower left and in pencil at lower right
Delteil 16
p 1646 V/2000
La femme 1886
Etching, 32 × 25 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Delteil 47
p 1233 V/2000
La morte 1888
Etching, 24 × 20 cm
Delteil 74
p 1647 V/2000
La femme à la pèlerine 1889
Etching, 23.7 × 16 cm
Signed in plate at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Delteil 86
p 1374 V/2000
Intimité 1889
Etching, 18 × 24 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Delteil 89
p 1648 V/2000
La mère malade 1889
Etching, 20 × 30 cm
Delteil 90
p 1649 V/2000
L'intruse 1893
Lithograph, 35.9 × 46 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in brown ink at lower right margin

Stein and Karshan 5; Delteil 200
p 1020 V/2000
La baignade à Talloires 1894
Etching and aquatint, 16 × 23.8 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 6; Delteil 80, 2nd state of 2
p 1021 V/2000
La liseuse devant la fenêtre 1895
Etching, 13.7 × 19.7 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 7; Delteil 82
p 1022 V/2000
Nuit de Noël à Fontarabie 1904
Etching, 34 × 26 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Delteil 160
p 1234 V/2000
Pompilia 1919
Etching, 13.8 × 10.8 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Delteil 188
p 1650 V/2000
Le modèlenu les bras levés 1925
Etching, 26.7 × 20 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Delteil 198
p 1651 V/2000

Blache, Charles-Phillipe
French, 1860-1907
Crépuscule 1894
Colour lithograph, 36.7 × 25.4 cm
Signed in blue chalk, vertical, at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 8
p 1023 V/2000

Bonnard, Pierre
French, 1867-1947

Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001
La lettre c. 1925  
Lithograph, 23 × 30.5 cm  
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin  
Roger-Marx 85  
p 1155 V/2000  
Dans la rue c. 1900  
Colour lithograph, 26 × 13 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower left margin  
Roger-Marx 46  
p 1410 V/2000  
Portrait de Renoir c. 1914  
Etching, 27 × 29 cm  
Bouvet 84  
p 1417 V/2000  
France-Champagne 1889  
Colour lithograph, 78 × 50 cm  
Signed with initials on stone at upper right  
Roger-Marx 1  
p 995 V/2000  
Scène de famille 1892  
Colour lithograph, 21 × 26 cm  
Signed on stone at upper left  
Roger-Marx 2  
p 1276 V/2000  
Scène de famille 1893  
Colour lithograph, 31 × 18 cm  
Signed on stone at upper left  
Roger-Marx 4; Stein and Karshan 9  
p 1024 V/2000  
Les chiens 1893  
Lithograph, 28 × 27 cm  
Signed with initials on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower centre  
Roger-Marx 25  
p 1277 V/2000
Garde municipal 1893
Lithograph, 26 × 17 cm
Signed with initials on stone at left centre and in pencil at lower left margin
Roger-Marx 26
p 1278 V/2000

Femme en chemise 1893
Lithograph, 29 × 17 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower left margin
Roger-Marx 27
p 1279 V/2000

Portrait 1893
Lithograph, 30 × 26 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower left margin
Roger-Marx 28
p 1280 V/2000

Affiche de ‘La Revue Blanche’ 1894
Colour lithograph, 80 × 62 cm
Signed on stone at centre left
Roger-Marx 32
p 996 V/2000

Couverture de l’album ‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’ 1895
Colour lithograph, 41 × 33 cm
Johnson 10; Roger-Marx 56
p 1166 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Avenue du bois 1899
Colour lithograph, 31.5 × 46 cm
Johnson 10.1; Roger-Marx 57
p 1167 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Avenue du bois 1899
Colour lithograph (watercoloured proof), 31 × 46 cm
p 1179 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Coin de rue 1899
Colour lithograph, 57.5 × 35 cm
Johnson 10.2; Roger-Marx 58
p 1168 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Maison dans la cour 1899
Colour lithograph, 34.5 × 25.7 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Johnson 10.3; Roger-Marx 59
p 1169 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Rue vue d’en haut 1899
Colour lithograph, 37 × 22.5 cm
Johnson 10.4; Roger-Marx 60
p 1170 V/2000
‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Boulevard c. 1896
Colour lithograph, 17.4 × 43.4 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Johnson 10.5; Roger-Marx 61
p 1171 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Place le soir 1899
Colour lithograph, 28 × 39 cm
Johnson 10.6; Roger-Marx 62
p 1172 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Marchand des quatre-saisons 1899
Colour lithograph, 29 × 24 cm
Johnson 10.7; Roger-Marx 63
p 1173 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Le Pont des Arts 1899
Colour lithograph, 27 × 41 cm
Johnson 10.8; Roger-Marx 64
p 1174 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Au théâtre 1899
Colour lithograph, 20 × 40 cm
Johnson 10.9; Roger-Marx 65
p 1175 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Rue la soir, sous la pluie 1899
Colour lithograph, 25 × 35.5 cm
Johnson 10.10; Roger-Marx 66
p 1176 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Arc de Triomphe 1899
Colour lithograph, 32 × 47 cm
Johnson 10.11; Roger-Marx 67
p 1177 V/2000

‘Quelques aspects de la vie de Paris’: Coin de rue vue d'en haut 1899
Colour lithograph, 36.5 × 21.2 cm
Johnson 10.12; Roger-Marx 68
p 1178 V/2000

NIB carnavalesque 1895
Lithograph, 32.5 × 25 cm
Roger-Marx 36
p 1230 V/2000

La partie de cartes sous la lampe 1895
Lithograph, 13 × 24 cm
Signed in plate at lower right
Roger-Marx 29
p 1407 V/2000

La grand'mère 1895
Lithograph 19 × 22 cm
Signed in plate at lower left
Roger-Marx 30
p 1408 V/2000
Couverture de l'album de ‘La Revue Blanche’ 1895
Lithograph, 40 × 60 cm
Roger-Marx 33

p 1694 V/2000
Parisiennes 1895
Lithograph, 22 × 13 cm
Roger-Marx 34

p 1695 V/2000
Femme au parapluie 1895
Colour lithograph, 25 × 15.5 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at upper left
Roger-Marx 35

p 1696 V/2000
Affiche pour l'exposition Les Peintres Graveurs 1896
Colour lithograph, 64 × 47 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Roger-Marx 40; Johnson 12

p 1002 V/2000

Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001
Affiche pour Le Salon des Cent 1896
Colour lithograph, 63 × 45 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right
Roger-Marx 45
p 1003 V/2000
La petite blanchisseuse 1896
Colour lithograph, 30 × 19 cm
Signed on stone at upper centre
Roger-Marx 42; Johnson 11
p 1108 V/2000
La dernière croisade 1896
Lithograph, 30 × 49 cm
Signed with initials on stone at centre
Roger-Marx 39; Aitken 82
p 1216 V/2000
Couverture de l'album d'estampes originales de la Galerie Vollard
1897
Colour lithograph, 57 × 87 cm
Roger-Marx 41; Johnson 14
p 989 V/2000
Affiche pour ‘L'Estampe et L'Affiche’ 1897
Colour lithograph, 80 × 60 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left
Roger-Marx 38
p 997 V/2000
Le canotage 1897
Colour lithograph, 26 × 47 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
p 1110 V/2000
L'omnibus de Corinthe 1897
Lithograph, 32 × 25 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left
Roger-Marx 37
p 1409 V/2000
L'enfant à la lampe 1898
Colour lithograph, 33 × 45.4 cm
Roger-Marx 43; Johnson 15
p 1109 V/2000
Frontispice pour ‘La lithographie en couleurs’ 1898
Colour lithograph, 21 × 19 cm
Roger-Marx 73
p 1281 V/2000
La complainte de M. Benoît 1898
Lithograph, 31 × 23.5 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Aitken 111; Roger-Marx 49
p 1316 V/2000
La berceuse obscène 1898
Lithograph, 31 × 25 cm
Aitken 112; Roger-Marx 50
p 1317 V/2000
Paysage de neige 1898
Lithograph, 32.5 × 26 cm
Aitken 113; Roger-Marx 51
p 1318 V/2000
Du pays tourangeau 1898
Lithograph, 31 × 25 cm
Aitken 114; Roger-Marx 52
p 1319 V/2000
La malheureuse Adèle 1898
Lithograph, 31 × 23 cm
Aitken 115; Roger-Marx 53
p 1320 V/2000
Velas, ou L’officier de fortune 1898
Lithograph, 31 × 24 cm
Aitken 116; Roger-Marx 54
p 1321 V/2000
Billet de naissance 1898
Lithograph, 16 × 12 cm
Roger-Marx 69
p 1411 V/2000
Couverture de ‘La lithographie en couleurs’ 1898
Colour lithograph, 21.5 × 15 cm
Roger-Marx 72
p 1412 V/2000
Le verger 1899
Colour lithograph, 33 × 35 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Roger-Marx 47
p 1111 V/2000
Les boulevards 1900
Colour lithograph, 26 × 33 cm
Roger-Marx 74
p 1282 V/2000
Affiche pour ‘Le Figaro’ 1903
Colour lithograph, 56 × 38 cm
Roger-Marx 70
p 1112 V/2000
Nu à la toilette 1912
Colour lithograph, 14 × 9 cm
Signed on stone at lower centre
Bouvet 80
p 1416 V/2000
Le baigneur de Cézanne 1914
Lithograph, 14 × 8 cm
Roger-Marx 91
Affiche pour ‘Le Bulletin de la Vie Artistique’ 1919
Lithograph, 71 × 52 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Roger-Marx 76

Place Clichy 1922
Colour lithograph, 47 × 63.5 cm
Signed on stone at upper left
Roger-Marx 77

Portrait d'Ambroise Vollard 1924
Etching, 35.3 × 23.7 cm
Bouvet 107

Le bain 1925
Lithograph, 33 × 22.5 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Roger-Marx 79

La coupe et le compotier 1925
Lithograph, 18 × 26 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right
Roger-Marx 80

Femme debout dans sa baignoire 1925
Lithograph, 30 × 19.5 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at upper right and in pencil at lower right margin
Roger-Marx 81
Landscape in southern France 1925
Lithograph, 22 × 29 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Roger-Marx 82
p 1152 V/2000

La toilette assise 1925
Lithograph, 32 × 22 cm
Signed with monogram on the stone and in pencil at lower right margin
Roger-Marx 83
p 1153 V/2000

Étude de nu 1925
Lithograph, 29 × 16.5 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Roger-Marx 84
p 1154 V/2000

Le menu 1925
Lithograph, 30 × 26 cm
Signed on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Roger-Marx 86
p 1156 V/2000

La rue Molitor 1925
Lithograph, 43 × 22 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Roger-Marx 87
p 1157 V/2000

Les bas 1925
Lithograph, 21.5 × 30.5 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right
Roger-Marx 88
p 1158 V/2000

La nuit tombe 1925
Lithograph, 21 × 30 cm
Roger-Marx 89
p 1159 V/2000

Dernier reflet 1925
Lithograph, 20 × 30 cm
Roger-Marx 90
p 1160 V/2000

La rue 1927
Lithograph, 24 × 18 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Roger-Marx 92
p 1414 V/2000

Toilette 1927
Etching, 22 × 16 cm
Boutet, Henri
French, 1851-1919
La Parisienne 1893
Etching, aquatint, 53.7 × 30.5 cm
Signed in plate at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 10

Bracquemond, Félix
French, 1833-1914
Vive le Tzar! 1893
Etching, 32.9 × 22.9 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 11

Bresdin, Rodolphe
French, 1822-1885
Le bon Samaritain 1861
Lithograph, 56.4 × 44.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and with monogram on the camel
Van Gelder 100
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Frontispice pour ‘Fables et contes’ 1868
Lithograph, 24.5 × 19.9 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Van Gelder 122
p 1611 V/2000
Les villes derrière le marécage 1868
Lithograph, 19 × 15.5 cm
Van Gelder 124a
p 1612 V/2000
Le repos en Égypte 1871
Etching, 22.9 × 19.7 cm
Van Gelder 138
p 1375 V/2000

**Buhot, Félix**
French, 1847-1898
Une matinée d'hiver au Quai de l'Hôtel-Dieu 1876
Lithograph, 23 × 34.8 cm
Bourcard-Goodfriend 123
p 1236 V/2000
Enfant dessinant 1892
Lithograph, 32 × 25 cm
Bourcard-Goodfriend 182
p 1376 V/2000
L'hiver à Paris 1897
Etching, 23.7 × 35 cm
Bourcard-Goodfriend 128
p 1235 V/2000
Burne-Jones, Edward
English, 1833-1898
La belle au bois dormant 1894
Etching, 22 × 12 cm
Aitken 64
p 1343 V/2000

Bussy, Simon Albert
French, 1870-1954
Aërt 1898
Lithograph, 24.8 × 38 cm
Aitken 98
p 1344 V/2000

Carrière, Eugène
French, 1849-1906
Alphonse Daudet 1893
Lithograph, 39.8 × 31 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Delteil 16
p 1006 V/2000
Tête 1893
Lithograph, 39.1 × 34.1 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Delteil 15; Stein and Karshan 12
p 1027 V/2000
Méditation 1893
Etching, 24 × 15.2 cm
Delteil 14
p 1652 V/2000
Tête de femme: Nelly Carrière 1895
Lithograph, 46.5 × 35.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Delteil 18; Stein and Karshan 13
p 1028 V/2000
Henri Rochfort 1896
Lithograph, 56.6 × 40.2 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Delteil 27
p 1007 V/2000
Marguerite Carrière 1901
Lithograph, 43.2 × 34.9 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower left margin;
inscribed ‘épreuve unique 1/1’ at lower left margin
Delteil 43
p 1008 V/2000
Charpentier, Alexandre-Louis-Marie
French, 1856-1909
  L'école des veufs; Au temps de la ballade 1889
  Lithograph, embossed, $22 \times 18.4$ cm
  Aitken 11
  p 1346 V/2000
  Nell Horn 1891
  Colour lithograph, embossed, $22 \times 18.4$ cm
  Aitken 11
  p 1345 V/2000
  Girl playing the violin 1894
  Colour lithograph, embossed, $26 \times 29.5$ cm
  Signed in blue ink at lower right margin
  Stein and Karshan 14
  p 1029 V/2000

Chassériau, Théodore
French, 1819-1856
  Venus Anadyomene 1839
  Lithograph, $27 \times 32$ cm
  p 1377 V/2000

Chéret, Jules
French, 1836-1932
  La fille Élisa; Conte de Noël 1890
  Lithograph, $35 \times 22$ cm
  Signed on stone at lower right centre
  Aitken 8
  p 1347 V/2000
  La danse 1893
  Colour lithograph, $37 \times 23$ cm
  Signed on stone at centre left and in pencil at lower right margin
  Stein and Karshan 16
  p 1030 V/2000

Christiansen, Hans
German, 1866-1945
  L'heure de bergère 1897
  Lithograph, $35 \times 22$ cm
  p 1269 V/2000
  L'heure de bergère 1897
  Colour lithograph, $35 \times 22$ cm
  Signed on stone at lower right
  p 1397 V/2000

Cottet, Charles
French, 1863-1924
  Bretonnes sur le port
  Lithograph, $15.1 \times 20.4$ cm
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Crane, Walter
English, 1845-1915
Danseuse aux cymbales 1895
Lithograph, 43.3 × 30.8 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left and in black ink at
lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 17
p 1031 V/2000

Cross, Henri Edmond
French, 1856-1910
La promenade 1897
Colour lithograph, 28.5 × 41 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Johnson 27
p 1113 V/2000
Les Champs Elysées 1898
Colour lithograph, 20.5 × 26 cm
p 1378 V/2000

Delambert, Maurice
French, 1873-?
Elên 1895
Photo-relief, 34 × 25.8 cm
Signed in plate at lower left
Aitken 27
p 1348 V/2000
Delâtre, Eugène  
French, 1864-1938  
Portrait de Huysmans 1894  
Etching and aquatint, 32.4 × 24.1 cm  
Signed in plate at lower right and in blue pencil at lower right margin

Stein and Karshan 18  
p 1032 V/2000

Denis, Maurice  
French, 1870-1943  
Pour sagesse 1889  
Woodcut, 4 × 9.9 cm  
Cailler 13  
p 1421 V/2000  
Pour sagesse 1889  
Woodcut, 10.2 × 5 cm  
Cailler 21  
p 1422 V/2000  
Pour sagesse 1889  
Woodcut, 6.1 × 7.3 cm  
Cailler 22  
p 1423 V/2000  
Affiche pour ‘La Dépêche de Toulouse’ 1892  
Colour lithograph, 141.2 × 95.8 cm  
Cailler 33  
p 1001 V/2000  
Frontispice pour ‘La damoiselle élue’ 1892  
Colour lithograph, 11.3 × 29.5 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower right margin  
Cailler 30  
p 1114 V/2000  
Programme de ‘La dame de la mer’ 1892  
Lithograph, 17.5 × 24.9 cm  
Signed with initials on stone at lower left  
Aitken 54; Cailler 32  
p 1349 V/2000  
Frontispice pour ‘Lettre à l’élue,’ de Dante-Gabriel Rossetti 1892  
Lithograph, 15.3 × 10.4 cm  
Signed with monogram on stone at upper left  
Cailler 29  
p 1424 V/2000  
Madeleine (deux têtes); Tendresse 1893  
Colour lithograph, 29.8 × 25 cm  
Signed with monogram on stone at upper right, vertical, and in purple ink at lower right margin  
Cailler 70; Stein and Karshan 19
Titre de l'exposition Maurice Denis chez le Barc de Boutteville 1893

Lithograph, 24.5 × 14.7 cm
Cailler 75

Les pleureuses 1893
Lithograph, 27.3 × 22.5 cm
Cailler 69

Apparition 1894
Colour lithograph, 19 × 28.7 cm
Cailler 77

La visitation 1894
Colour lithograph, 16.2 × 12.8 cm
Cailler 79

Jeune fille à sa toilette 1895
Colour lithograph, 32.5 × 52.7 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Cailler 87

Les pèlerins d'Emmaüs 1895
Colour lithograph, 45.5 × 30.6 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower left margin
Cailler 84

Marthe présentant les burettes 1895
Lithograph, 21.8 × 32 cm
Signed with initials on stone at upper left and in pencil at lower left margin
Cailler 83

Baigneuse au bord d'un lac 1895
Lithograph, 28.2 × 38 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right
Cailler 93

La scène; La vérité dans le vin; Pieds nickelés; Intérieurs 1895
Lithograph, 23 × 35 cm
Signed with initials on stone at centre right
Aitken 70; Cailler 85

La visitation à la Villa Montrouge 1896
Colour lithograph, 31.3 × 36.7 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right, and in pencil at lower left margin
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Cailler 94; Johnson 30
p 1116 V/2000
Le reflet dans la fontaine 1897
Colour lithograph, 25 × 39 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Cailler 100; Johnson 31
p 1117 V/2000
Au-delà des forces humaines; La motte de terre 1897
Lithograph, 32.2 × 24.8 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right
Aitken 88; Cailler 95
p 1351 V/2000
De mépris des honneurs du temps 1897
Lithograph, 11.7 × 11.3 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right
Cailler 99
p 1426 V/2000
Couverture de l'album ‘Amour’ 1898
Colour lithograph, 52.6 × 41.3 cm
Signed on stone at upper left
Cailler 107
p 1118 V/2000
‘Amour’: Allégorie 1898
Colour lithograph, 26.7 × 41.2 cm
Cailler 108
p 1180 V/2000
‘Amour’: Les attitudes sont faciles et chastes 1898
Colour lithograph, 39.5 × 27.5 cm
Cailler 109
p 1181 V/2000
‘Amour’: Le bouquet matinal, les larmes 1898  
Colour lithograph, 39.8 × 28.5 cm  
Cailler 110  
p 1182 V/2000

‘Amour’: Ce fût un religieux mystère 1898  
Colour lithograph, 42 × 29 cm  
Cailler 111  
p 1183 V/2000

‘Amour’: Le chevalier n'est pas mort à la croisade 1898  
Colour lithograph, 40 × 27.7 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower right margin  
Cailler 112  
p 1184 V/2000

‘Amour’: Les crépules ont une douceur d'ancienne peinture 1898  
Colour lithograph, 41.5 × 30 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower right margin  
Cailler 113  
p 1185 V/2000

‘Amour’: Elle était plus belle que les rêves 1898  
Colour lithograph, 41.5 × 29.3 cm  
Cailler 114  
p 1186 V/2000

‘Amour’: Et c'est la caresse de ses mains 1898  
Colour lithograph, 40 × 28.5 cm  
Cailler 115  
p 1187 V/2000

‘Amour’: Nos âmes en des gestes lents 1898  
Colour lithograph, 29.3 × 40.3 cm  
Cailler 116  
p 1188 V/2000

‘Amour’: Sur le canapé d'argent pâle 1898  
Colour lithograph, 42.5 × 28.5 cm  
Cailler 117  
p 1189 V/2000

‘Amour’: La vie devient précieuse, discrète 1898  
Colour lithograph, 28.5 × 40.7 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower right margin  
Cailler 118  
p 1190 V/2000

‘Amour’: Mais c'est le coeur qui bat trop vite 1898  
Colour lithograph, 46.3 × 29.5 cm  
Cailler 119  
p 1191 V/2000

Programme pour l'audition des élèves de Mme Parrot-Lecomte 1898

Lithograph, 14.5 × 20.5 cm  
Signed with initials on stone at upper right
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Cailler 102
p 1427 V/2000
Maternité au cyprès 1898
Lithograph, 17.3 × 24.5 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right
Cailler 103
p 1428 V/2000
Maternité devant la mer 1900
Colour lithograph, 34.7 × 25 cm
Signed with initials on stone, vertical, at lower right
Cailler 120
p 1287 V/2000
Nymphe couronnée de paquerettes 1901
Colour lithograph, 55.7 × 44 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right
Cailler 121
p 1010 V/2000
Nativité 1907
Colour lithograph, 13.9 × 17.7 cm
Cailler 132
p 1429 V/2000
D'après une nature morte de Cézanne
Lithograph, 16 × 18.5 cm
Cailler 135
p 1430 V/2000
Frontispiece for ‘Poèmes (Marie et Jésus)’ 1936
Colour lithograph, 37.3 × 27.5 cm
p 1431 V/2000
Illustration for ‘Poèmes’ 1939
Colour lithograph, 45 × 32.3 cm
p 1288 V/2000
Illustration for ‘Poèmes’ 1939
Colour lithograph, 44.7 × 32.2 cm
p 1289 V/2000
Illustration for ‘Poèmes’ 1939
Colour lithograph, 43 × 32.3 cm
p 1290 V/2000
Illustration for ‘Poèmes’ 1939
Colour lithograph, 45.1 × 32.3 cm
p 1291 V/2000
Illustration for ‘Poèmes’ 1939
Colour lithograph, 43 × 32 cm
p 1292 V/2000
Illustration for ‘Poèmes’ 1939
Colour lithograph, 44.6 × 32 cm
p 1293 V/2000
Illustration for ‘Poèmes’ 1939
Colour lithograph, 44.1 × 32.5 cm
p 1294 V/2000
The annunciation 1943
Colour lithograph, 46.1 × 59 cm
p 1119 V/2000

Dethomas, Maxime
French, 1867-1929
Fire 1895
Colour lithograph, 35.2 × 44.4 cm
Aitken 74
p 1217 V/2000
Une mère; Brocéliande; Les flaireurs; Des mots! Des mots! 1896
Lithograph, 30.6 × 24.7 cm
Aitken 79
p 1218 V/2000
La victoire 1898
Lithograph, 37.6 × 27.8 cm
Aitken 100
p 1352 V/2000

Dillon, Henri Patrice
French, 1851-1909
Mandoliniste 1893
Lithograph, 18.4 × 30.6 cm
Signed in purple ink at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 20
p 1034 V/2000
Duez, Ernest-Ange  
French, 1843-1896  
**Fleurs** 1893  
Etching, $40.8 \times 19.1$ cm  
Signed with monogram in plate at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin  
Stein and Karshan 21  
p 1035 V/2000

Dulac, Charles-Marie  
French, 1865-1898  
**Paysage** 1893  
Colour lithograph, $31.9 \times 48.4$ cm  
Signed on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower left margin  
Stein and Karshan 22  
p 1036 V/2000  
**Bouquet d'arbres** 1894  
Colour lithograph, $47 \times 35.7$ cm  
Signed on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower left margin  
Stein and Karshan 23  
p 1037 V/2000

Dumont, Maurice  
French, 1869-1899  
**Carmosine** 1895  
Gyptograph, $11.9 \times 15.5$ cm  
Aitken 73  
p 1629 V/2000

Evenepoel, Henri-Jacques  
Belgian, 1872-1899  
**Au square** 1897  
Colour lithograph, $32.5 \times 23.3$ cm  
Signed on stone at upper left  
p 1398 V/2000

Fantin-Latour, Henri  
French, 1836-1904  
**La tentation de St Antoine** 1893  
Lithograph, $32.5 \times 40.3$ cm  
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin  
Stein and Karshan 24  
p 1038 V/2000  
**Duo des Troyens (Nuit d'extase)** 1894  
Lithograph, $29.4 \times 22.3$ cm  
Signed on stone at lower right.  
Hédiard 117
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Inspiration 1895
Lithograph, 26.7 × 22 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
Hédiard 121

Les brodeuses 1895
Lithograph, 20.1 × 32.1 cm
Hédiard 123

Feure, Georges de
French, 1868-1943
Au bord du canal
Lithograph, 40 × 28.3 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin

Les soeurs
Etching, aquatint, 39.5 × 28 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin

La source du mal 1894
Colour lithograph, 34.9 × 25.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 25

Forain, Jean-Louis
French, 1852-1931
Après l'apparition
Etching, 25.8 × 29.7 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin; inscribed ‘3ème état’ at lower left margin
Faxon 36; Guérin 82

Le cabinet particulier
Lithograph, 32.6 × 51 cm

Rue Laffitte 1892
Lithograph, 26.3 × 21.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
Guérin 6

En Grèce 1897
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Lithograph, 20.2 × 41.4 cm
Signed with initial f in black ink at lower right
Faxon 185; Guérin 60; Johnson 47
p 1237 V/2000
Piéta 1910

Etching, 23.7 × 31.6 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin; inscribed ‘2eme état’ at lower right
Faxon 126; Guérin 117
p 1239 V/2000
Le repas à Emmaüs 1910
Etching, 24 × 29.8 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin; inscribed ‘ep. d'essai du 2eme état’ at lower left margin
Faxon 102; Guérin 97
p 1240 V/2000
La rencontre sous la voûte 1910
Etching, 30.8 × 42.2 cm
Signed in black chalk at lower right
Faxon 105; Guérin 100
p 1241 V/2000

**Gandara, Antonio de la**
French, 1862-1917

Femme assise 1894
Lithograph, 25.6 × 11.6 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 26
p 1040 V/2000
Portrait de femme 1895
Lithograph, 20.6 × 27.9 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 27
p 1041 V/2000
Gauguin, Paul  
French, 1848-1903  
Manao Tupapau 1894  
Lithograph, 18.1 × 27.3 cm  
Signed on stone at upper left  
Stein and Karshan 28  
p 1042 V/2000

Gerbault, Henri  
French, 1863-1930  
Inquiétude 1893  
Colour lithograph, 32 × 24.2 cm  
Signed on stone at lower right  
Aitken 23  
p 1353 V/2000

Goeneutte, Norbert  
French, 1854-1894  
Portrait 1894  
Lithograph, 53.3 × 25.4 cm  
Signed on stone at lower right and in blue pencil at lower left margin

Stein and Karshan 29  
p 1043 V/2000

Grasset, Eugène  
French, 1841-1917  
Vitrioleuse 1893  
Photo-relief, 27.6 × 21.6 cm  
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin  
Stein and Karshan 30  
p 1044 V/2000  
Salon des Cent 1894  
Colour lithograph, 59 × 38 cm  
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left  
p 1011 V/2000  
A. Falguière 1898  
Lithograph, 52.5 × 37 cm  
Signed with monogram on stone at upper right and in pencil at lower right margin  
p 1012 V/2000

Groux, Henri de  
Belgian, 1867-1930  
Porte-étendard 1893  
Lithograph, 27.6 × 21.6 cm  
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 31
p 1045 V/2000
Morituri 1898
Lithograph, 38.1 × 26 cm
Signed on stone at lower centre
Aitken 99
p 1354 V/2000

Guérard, Henri Charles
French, 1846-1897
Les lapins 1893
Woodcut, 32.9 × 23 cm
Signed with monogram in block at upper left
Stein and Karshan 32
p 1046 V/2000
Bateaux dans le brouillard 1894
Mezzotint, 14.9 × 20.5 cm
Signed with monogram in plate at lower right
Stein and Karshan 33
p 1047 V/2000

Guilloux, Charles
French, 1866-1946
L'inondation 1893
Colour lithograph, 20.8 × 28.7 cm
Stein and Karshan 34
p 1048 V/2000

Helleu, Paul César
French, 1859-1927
Méditation 1894
Etching, 27.9 × 19.8 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Stein and Karshan 35
p 1049 V/2000

Hermann Paul, René-Georges
French, 1864-1940
Modistes 1894
Colour lithograph, 24.8 × 35.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower left margin
Stein and Karshan 49
p 1063 V/2000
La brebis; Le tandem 1896
Lithograph, 48.6 × 28.9 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left
Aitken 84
p 1219 V/2000
Les petites machines à écrire 1896
Colour lithograph, 30.4 × 22.4 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Johnson 64
p 1243 V/2000
La crème 1ère 1898
Colour lithograph, 36.5 × 23 cm
Signed with monogram in pencil at lower left margin
p 1244 V/2000

Houdard, Charles-Louis
French, ?-?
Grenouilles 1893
Aquatint, 26.2 × 39.5 cm
Signed with monogram in plate at upper right and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 36
p 1050 V/2000

Ibels, Henri Gabriel
French, 1867-1936
Cover of ‘Les progammes du Théâtre Libre’: Silhouette d'Antoine dans Les Tisserands'
Colour lithograph, 47 × 34.8 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1245 V/2000
Antoine
Lithograph, 25 × 18 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1511 V/2000
Clown with guitar
Lithograph, 26.5 × 17.5 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1512 V/2000
Mother and child in a meadow
Lithograph, 26.8 × 17.5 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1513 V/2000
Conferencier
Lithograph, 25 × 16 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1514 V/2000
Yvette Guilbert
Lithograph, 26.9 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in brown chalk at lower right margin
p 1515 V/2000
Femme à bord de l'eau
Lithograph, 27.5 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
p 1516 V/2000
Les amoureux dans le champ
Lithograph, 27.5 × 17.5 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1517 V/2000
Deux clowns
Lithograph, 18.5 × 12.4 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1518 V/2000
Amoureux près d'un fleuve
Lithograph, 27.5 × 17.8 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1519 V/2000
Le cirque
Lithograph, 21.5 × 30 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1520 V/2000
Hamlet
Lithograph, 33.5 × 24 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1521 V/2000
L'oubliée
Lithograph, 27 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower right and in blue chalk at lower left margin
p 1522 V/2000
Le pendu
Lithograph, 27.5 × 17.5 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1523 V/2000
L'amour s'amuse
Lithograph, 28.1 × 19.1 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1524 V/2000
Femme à sa toilette
Lithograph, 23.6 × 15.7 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1525 V/2000
Couple avec enfants
Lithograph, 32 × 25 cm
Signed on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
p 1526 V/2000
Couple dans la rue
Lithograph, 33.8 × 23.8 cm
Signed in green chalk at lower right margin
p 1527 V/2000
Ouvrier avec faux
Lithograph, 17.5 × 28 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower right margin
p 1528 V/2000
Métier à tisser
Colour lithograph, 43.3 × 30.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1529 V/2000
Pierrot et danseuse
Colour lithograph, 40.5 × 29.1 cm
Signed on stone at left centre
p 1530 V/2000

Vieux dormant
Lithograph, 35.4 × 27.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1531 V/2000
Devant la porte
Lithograph, 31 × 23 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1532 V/2000
Avant la sortie
Lithograph, 37.9 × 27.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1533 V/2000
Lui!
Lithograph, 27 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1534 V/2000
A bas le progrès
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Colour lithograph, 32.6 × 24.8 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1535 V/2000
Invitation to an exhibition of works by Ibels
Lithograph, 12 × 14.8 cm
p 1536 V/2000
Peasant girls on the coast
Etching, 44.2 × 30.4 cm
p 1537 V/2000
Le bon temps
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 18.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1538 V/2000
Le bon temps
Lithograph, 35.9 × 27.3 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower left margin
p 1539 V/2000
Les malchanceux
Colour lithograph, 35.1 × 27.3 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1540 V/2000
Le malchanceux
Lithograph, 35.1 × 27.3 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1541 V/2000
La chanson du Rouet
Lithograph, 27.5 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1542 V/2000
La chanson du Rouet
Lithograph, 32.6 × 23 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
p 1543 V/2000

Les culs-terreux
Colour lithograph, 26.7 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1544 V/2000

Les culs-terreux
Lithograph, 34.4 × 27.7 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower right margin
p 1545 V/2000

Vieille fille
Colour lithograph, 27.2 × 17.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1546 V/2000

Vieille fille
Lithograph, 34.9 × 27.5 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower right margin
p 1547 V/2000

Les squares
Colour lithograph, 27.5 × 17.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1548 V/2000

Les squares
Colour lithograph, 36.1 × 27.3 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower left margin
p 1549 V/2000

Comment on s'aime
Colour lithograph, 27.7 × 17.5 cm
p 1550 V/2000

Comment on s'aime (proof)
Lithograph, 34.9 × 27.2 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in blue pencil at lower right margin
p 1551 V/2000

Amoureux!
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1552 V/2000

Amoureux!
Lithograph, 35.3 × 27 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower left margin
p 1553 V/2000

Aubade à la lune
Colour lithograph, 26.8 × 17.3 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
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p 1554 V/2000
Aubade à la lune
Lithograph, 28.3 × 18.5 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower right margin
p 1555 V/2000
Mensonges
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1556 V/2000
Mensonges
Lithograph, 34.9 × 18.2 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
p 1557 V/2000
La Rose et Pierrot
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1558 V/2000
La Rose et Pierrot
Lithograph, 38 × 27.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1559 V/2000
Amoureuse!
Colour lithograph, 26.8 × 17.7 cm
Signed on stone at upper left
p 1560 V/2000
Amoureuse!
Lithograph, 35 × 27.3 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower right margin
p 1561 V/2000
Mère moderne
Colour lithograph, 27.6 × 18.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1562 V/2000
Mère moderne
Lithograph, 34.2 × 27.3 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower right margin
p 1563 V/2000
Les ‘27’
Colour lithograph, 27.7 × 17.3 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1564 V/2000
Les ‘27’
Lithograph, 34.7 × 27.2 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1565 V/2000
Femme honnête
Colour lithograph, 27.7 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1566 V/2000
Femme honnête
Lithograph, 34.9 × 27.4 cm
Signed in blue pencil at lower right margin
p 1567 V/2000
L'argent
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1568 V/2000
Les camarades
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.8 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1569 V/2000
La mort du propre à rien
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1570 V/2000
Les veuves du Luxembourg
Colour lithograph, 26.8 × 17.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1571 V/2000
La chanson du Macchabée
Colour lithograph, 27.1 × 17.3 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1572 V/2000
La morgue
Colour lithograph, 27.7 × 17.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1573 V/2000
Mimi
Colour lithograph, 27.1 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1574 V/2000
Lettre d'un mari trompé
Colour lithograph, 27.1 × 17.2 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1575 V/2000
Jean Pierre
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1576 V/2000
Elle
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1577 V/2000
La petite correspondance du Gil-Blas
Colour lithograph, 27.1 × 17.5 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left
p 1578 V/2000
Le condamné
Lithograph, 27 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1579 V/2000
La danse des ventres
Colour lithograph, 27.2 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1580 V/2000
Sketch for ‘La danse des ventres’
Potlood en pen in inkt, 29 × 19.9 cm
Signed in ink at upper left
d 1113 V/2000
Mes moutons
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 17.7 cm
p 1582 V/2000
Les mal tournés
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1583 V/2000
La fin d'une bordée
Colour lithograph, 27.4 × 17.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1584 V/2000
La mort des guex
Lithograph, 27.5 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1585 V/2000
Un début dans le monde
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 17.6 cm
Signed with monogram on stone in spiegelbeeld at lower centre
p 1586 V/2000
Les petites mères
Colour lithograph, 27.3 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1587 V/2000

Ceux d’la côte
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 17.6 cm
p 1588 V/2000

Ya d’la gloire
Colour lithograph, 27.1 × 17.4 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right
p 1589 V/2000

Un tour à Satan
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 17.7 cm
Signed on stone at left centre
p 1590 V/2000

Coeur meurtri
Colour lithograph, 27.3 × 17.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1591 V/2000

Le pitre
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1592 V/2000

Les pousse-cailloux
Colour lithograph, 27.5 × 17.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1593 V/2000

Les bibis
Colour lithograph, 27.4 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1594 V/2000

Retour au nid
Colour lithograph, 27.2 × 17.6 cm
p 1595 V/2000

Restons chez nous
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at right centre
p 1596 V/2000

Pierrot médecin
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1597 V/2000

Amour est un rêve
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1598 V/2000

Si vous le vouliez, o mademoiselle
Colour lithograph, 27.7 × 17.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1599 V/2000
Serment trahi
Colour lithograph, 26.8 × 17.5 cm

p 1600 V/2000
La valse des bas noirs
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.4 cm

p 1601 V/2000
Pauvres hommes, si l'on voulait!
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower right

p 1602 V/2000
Envolons-nous
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 17.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left

p 1603 V/2000
Le bleu des bleuets
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower right

p 1604 V/2000
Ma mie arrive ce matin!
Colour lithograph, 26.9 × 17.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left

p 1605 V/2000
L'aveu de la faute
Colour lithograph, 26.8 × 18.1 cm
Signed on stone at lower left

p 1606 V/2000
Lettre d'amour
Colour lithograph, 27.1 × 17.5 cm

p 1607 V/2000
Femme au panier
Colour lithograph, 24.8 × 16 cm
p 1700 V/2000
Le grappin; L'affranchie 1892
Colour lithograph, 29.1 × 40.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 14
p 1246 V/2000
Les fossiles 1892
Colour lithograph, 22.9 × 28 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 15
p 1247 V/2000
Le grappin; L'affranchie 1892
Colour lithograph, 22.5 × 30.8 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 14
p 1322 V/2000
Les fossiles 1892
Colour lithograph, 22.9 × 28 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 15
p 1323 V/2000
Au cirque 1893
Colour lithograph, 49.2 × 26.2 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
Stein and Karshan 37
p 1051 V/2000
A bas le progrès; Mademoiselle Julie; Le ménage Brésile 1893
Colour lithograph, 23 × 31.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
Aitken 16
p 1248 V/2000
Le devoir 1893
Colour lithograph, 22.6 × 30.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left centre
Aitken 17
p 1249 V/2000
Mirages 1893
Colour lithograph, 22.6 × 30 cm
Signed on stone at left centre
Aitken 18
p 1250 V/2000
Boubouroche; Valet de coeur 1893
Colour lithograph, 23.8 × 31 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 19
p 1251 V/2000
Les tisserands 1893
Colour lithograph, 22.3 × 24.8 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 20
p 1252 V/2000
La belle au bois rêvant 1893
Colour lithograph, 21.4 × 16.8 cm
Signed on stone at lower centre
Aitken 21
p 1253 V/2000
A bas le progrès; Mademoiselle Julie; Le ménage Brésile 1893
Colour lithograph, 23 × 31.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
Aitken 16
p 1324 V/2000
Le devoir 1893
Colour lithograph, 22.6 × 30.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left centre
Aitken 17
p 1325 V/2000
Mirages 1893
Colour lithograph, 22.6 × 30 cm
Signed on stone at left centre
Aitken 18
p 1326 V/2000
Bouberouche; Valet de coeur 1893
Colour lithograph, 23 × 31.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 19
p 1327 V/2000
Les tisserands 1893
Colour lithograph, 21.4 × 16.8 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 20
p 1328 V/2000
La belle au bois rêvant 1893
Colour lithograph, 21.4 × 16.8 cm
Signed on stone at lower left centre
Aitken 21
p 1329 V/2000
Affiches-estampes de l'Escarmouche 1893
Lithograph, 24.7 × 15.6 cm
p 1670 V/2000
Les caboulets de l'amour et de la mort 1894
Colour lithograph, 76 × 56.5 cm
Signed on stone at upper left
p 999 V/2000
Les pavesurs 1894
Etching, 30.5 × 20 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
Stein and Karshan 38
p 1052 V/2000
Les paveurs 1894
Zwart, blauw en oranje krijt, en witte gouache, 36.5 × 24.5 cm
d 1111 V/2000
Salon des Cent 1894
Colour lithograph, 59 × 39.5 cm
Signed on stone at left centre
p 1120 V/2000
Exposition H.G. Ibels 1894 1894
Colour lithograph, 54.5 × 57.5 cm
Signed on stone at right centre
p 1121 V/2000
Grand-papa; Si c'était 1895
Lithograph, 22.7 × 30.2 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 29
p 1355 V/2000

**Jarry, Alfred**
French, 1873-1907
Ubu Roi 1896
Lithograph, 23.7 × 31 cm
Aitken 87c
p 1356 V/2000
Ouverture d'Ubu Roi 1898
Lithograph, 30.4 × 22.3 cm
Aitken 117
p 1357 V/2000
La chanson du dé cervelage 1898
Lithograph, 30 × 25 cm
p 1358 V/2000
Marche des Polonais 1898
Lithograph, 28.5 × 22.7 cm
Aitken 118
p 1359 V/2000

Jeunesse, Ernest la
French, 1874-1917
La comédie de l'amour 1897
Lithograph, 22.2 × 31.5 cm
Aitken 93
p 1360 V/2000

Jongkind, Johan Barthold
Dutch, 1819-1891
Le canal 1862
Etching, 20.9 × 16 cm
Signed in plate at lower right
Delteil 2
p 1382 V/2000

Jossot, Henri-Gustave
French, 1866-1951
La vague 1894
Lithograph, 52.5 × 35.1 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
Stein and Karshan 39
p 1054 V/2000

Khnopff, Fernand
Belgian, 1858-1921
Portrait 1900
Lithograph, 17 × 12.2 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1664 V/2000

Laboureur, Jean-Émile
French, 1877-1943
Le bal Bullier 1898
Woodcut, 22.2 × 29.9 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in pencil at lower left margin
Laboureur 579
p 1254 V/2000
L'arrosoir 1902
Etching, 13.2 × 17.7 cm
Signed and dated in plate at lower left Laboureur 31
p 1654 V/2000
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Toilettes: L'eau fraîche 1907
Woodcut, 25 × 15 cm
Signed with initials in block at lower left Laboureur 633
p 1655 V/2000
Toilettes: Un cour 1907
Woodcut, 25 × 15 cm
Signed with initials in block at upper right
Laboureur 632
p 1656 V/2000
La lecture interrompue 1912
Woodcut, 25 × 17.5 cm
Signed with initials in block at lower right
Laboureur 674
p 1383 V/2000
Modiste au chapeau noir 1912
Woodcut, 25 × 17.5 cm
Signed with initials in block at lower left and in pencil at lower left margin
Laboureur 668
p 1384 V/2000
L'île déserte 1914
Etching, 29.6 × 34.8 cm
Signed in plate at lower centre and in pencil at lower left margin
Laboureur 135
p 1255 V/2000
Marie Laurencin 1914
Woodcut, 25 × 22 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in pencil at lower left margin;
inscribed ‘épreuve du 1er Etat’
Laboureur 707
p 1385 V/2000

Lacoste, Charles
French, 1870-1959
Portland-place 1894
Lithograph, 24.6 × 32.4 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Stein and Karshan 40
p 1055 V/2000

Lebasque, Henri
French, 1865-1937
Les fils de l'abbé; Le fardeau de la liberté 1897
Lithograph, 30.7 × 23.5 cm
Aitken 92
p 1361 V/2000

Lemmen, Georges
Belgian, 1865-1916
La libre esthétique 1895
Colour lithograph, 51 × 36.3 cm
p 1272 V/2000

Lepère, Auguste Louis
French, 1849-1918
Blanchisseuses 1893
Etching and aquatint, 39.4 × 22.9 cm
Signed in plate at lower right and in blue crayon at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 41
p 1056 V/2000

Luce, Maximilien
French, 1858-1941
La meule; Jeune premier! 1891
Lithograph, 16 × 19.5 cm
Aitken 9
p 1631 V/2000
Femme se coiffant 1894
Lithograph, 43.2 × 31.1 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 42
p 1057 V/2000
Chemin à la Roche Gayon 1900
Lithograph, 26 × 25 cm
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin
p 1256 V/2000

Lunois, Alexandre
French, 1863-1916
L'illumination 1893
Colour lithograph, 33 × 27.1 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 43
p 1058 V/2000
Maillol, Aristide
French, 1861-1944

Léda
Lithograph, 16 × 23.5 cm
Signed with monogram in pencil at lower right margin
p 1257 V/2000
L'art d'aimer
Lithograph, 38 × 28 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right and in chalk at lower centre margin
p 1258 V/2000
Profil de jeune fille c. 1893
Zincograph, 35.9 × 27.8 cm
Signed with monogram in plate at lower right
Guérin 257
p 1386 V/2000
Femme nue de dos
Lithograph, 30.5 × 12 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right
p 1391 V/2000
La laveuse 1895
Zincograph, 19 × 30 cm
Signed in plate at lower left and with monogram in pencil at lower right margin
Guérin 259
p 1387 V/2000
Concert champêtre 1895
Zincograph, 16 × 20.5 cm
Signed in plate at lower left
Guérin 261
p 1388 V/2000
Adam et Eve 1895
Zincograph, 24.5 × 31 cm
Signed in plate at lower left
Guérin 262
p 1389 V/2000
Deux baigneuses nues 1895
Zincograph, 25 × 30.5 cm
Signed in plate at lower right
Guérin 263
p 1390 V/2000

Martin, Camille
French, 1861-1898

Couverture décorative pour la deuxième année de ‘L’Estampe Originale’ 1894
Colour lithograph, 56 × 84.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower right and in blue pencil at lower right margin  
Stein and Karshan 44  
p 990 V/2000  
Esquisse pour la couverture décorative pour la deuxième année de  
‘L'Estampe Originale’ 1894  
Pencil, black and grey ink, 65 × 97.7 cm  
Roger-Marx 43; Johnson 13  
d 1110 V/2000

**Martin, Henri**  
French, 1860-1943  
Indécision  
Lithograph, 44.4 × 31.7 cm  
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left and in ink at lower right margin  
p 1392 V/2000

**Maufra, Maxime**  
French, 1861-1918  
La route de Gaud 1893  
Colour lithograph, 20 × 29.2 cm  
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin  
Stein and Karshan 45  
p 1059 V/2000  
L'anse de Bilfort 1893  
Etching and aquatint, 29.8 × 35.6 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower right margin  
Morane 2  
p 1122 V/2000  
Le bateau de pêche 1894  
Etching, 29.7 × 35.6 cm  
Signed in blue chalk at lower right margin  
Morane 11  
p 1123 V/2000  
Tonquédec 1894  
Etching, 29.7 × 35.3 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower right margin  
Morane 17  
p 1124 V/2000  
Notre Dame de Clarté 1894  
Colour lithograph, 37.5 × 48.6 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower right margin  
Morane 19  
p 1125 V/2000  
Le Cimetière-Plougasnou 1894  
Colour lithograph, 39.8 × 31.1 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower right margin  
p 1126 V/2000
Maurin, Charles
French, 1856-1914
Portrait of Toulouse-Lautrec 1893
Aquatint, 22.5 × 13.7 cm
Signed in plate at lower right and in blue pencil at lower right margin

Stein and Karshan 46
p 1060 V/2000

Meunier, Constantin
Belgian, 1831-1905
Mineur 1895
Lithograph, 34.6 × 53.7 cm
Signed in brown ink at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 47
p 1061 V/2000

Mouclier, Marc
French, 1866-1948
La cloche 1893
Lithograph, 24.7 × 15.7 cm
p 1671 V/2000

Müller, Alfredo
Italian, 1869-1940
L'echelle; Le balcon 1898
Lithograph, 34 × 25.6 cm
Aitken 97
p 1362 V/2000

Munch, Edvard
Norwegian, 1863-1944
Peer Gynt 1896
Lithograph, 27.8 × 31.3 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Aitken 86; Schiefler 74
p 1363 V/2000
Jean-Gabriel Borkman 1897
Lithograph, 25.5 × 35.4 cm
Aitken 94
p 1364 V/2000

Nicholson, William
English, 1872-1949
Sous l'arche du pont 1894
Colour lithograph, 24 × 28.6 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left
Stein and Karshan 48
p 1062 V/2000

Pennell, Joseph
American, 1860-1926
La Tamise 1894
Etching, aquatint, 21 × 26.2 cm
Signed in pencil at lower centre margin
Stein and Karshan 50
p 1064 V/2000

Pissarro, Camille
French, 1830-1903
Paysage à Osny 1887
Etching, 11.7 × 15.6 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 51
p 1065 V/2000
Gardeuse d'oies 1888
Etching 19.9 × 14 cm
Delteil 76
p 1657 V/2000
Haymakers 1890
Etching, 19.9 × 13.2 cm
Delteil 94
p 1658 V/2000
Women bathing 1895
Lithograph, 15.6 × 21.6 cm
Signed on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Delteil 142; Stein and Karshan 52
p 1066 V/2000

Pissarro, Georges
French, 1871-1961
Le dindon de la farce 1894
Woodcut, 21.6 × 20.8 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Pissarro, Lucien
French, 1863-1944
Ronde d'enfants 1893
Woodcut, 20.6 × 16 cm
Signed in block at lower left
Stein and Karshan 54
p 1068 V/2000

Pitcairn-Knowles, James
Scottish, 1864-?
Le bain 1894
Woodcut, 55.5 × 43 cm
Signed with device of a flower in pencil at centre left margin
Johnson 97
p 1013 V/2000

Prouvé, Victor
French, 1858-1943
Oiseaux de proie 1893
Etching, 24 × 42.2 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 55
p 1069 V/2000
L'opium 1894
Colour lithograph, embossed, 62.5 × 40 cm
Signed on stone at centre left and in blue pencil at lower centre margin
Stein and Karshan 56
p 1070 V/2000

Puvis de Chavannes, Pierre
French, 1824-1898
Fille avec chapeau
Lithograph, 47.2 × 34.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1259 V/2000
La Normandie 1893
Lithograph, 45.9 × 38.9 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 57
p 1071 V/2000
Etude de femme 1895
Lithograph, 30.8 × 15.2 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right
Stein and Karshan 58
p 1072 V/2000
Le pauvre pêcheur 1897
Lithograph, 41 × 52.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Johnson 98
p 1127 V/2000

Rachou, Henri
French, 1856-1944
Panneau décoratif 1893
Colour lithograph, 48.4 × 29.7 cm
Signed on stone at upper right and in pencil at lower left margin
Stein and Karshan 59
p 1073 V/2000

Raffaëlli, Jean-François
French, 1850-1924
Raffaëlli, son portrait par lui-même 1893
Etching, 18.9 × 15.7 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 60
p 1074 V/2000

Ranft, Richard
Swiss, 1862-1931
Trottins 1894
Etching, aquatint, 39.8 × 25.7 cm
Signed in plate at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 61
p 1075 V/2000

Ranson, Paul
French, 1861-1909
Woman with a fan 1891
Colour lithograph, 46 × 55 cm
p 1702 V/2000
Tigre dans la jungle 1893  
Colour lithograph, 36.8 × 28.3 cm  
Signed on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower left margin  
Stein and Karshan 62  
p 1076 V/2000  
Pastel/étude/pastel 1893  
Lithograph, 24.5 × 15.2 cm  
p 1672 V/2000  
La fille étendu 1894  
Lithograph, 24.3 × 32.2 cm  
p 1701 V/2000  
Paphnutius 1895  
Lithograph, 32.7 × 26.5 cm  
Aitken 109  
p 1366 V/2000  
Tristesse (Jalousie) 1896  
Colour lithograph, 23.6 × 18.5 cm  
p 1613 V/2000  
La cloche engloutie 1897  
Lithograph, 30.4 × 23.3 cm  
Aitken 90  
p 1365 V/2000  
Au chevet de la malade 1897  
Lithograph, 25 × 15.3 cm  
p 1614 V/2000

Redon, Odilon  
French, 1840-1916

Le gué 1865  
Etching, 18 × 13.5 cm  
Signed in plate at lower left; inscribed in plate at lower left under the image ‘élève de Bresdin’  
Mellerio 2  
p 1615 V/2000  
Cain et Abel 1886  
Etching, 18.5 × 12 cm  
Signed in plate at lower right  
Mellerio 18  
p 1616 V/2000  
La cellule auriculaire 1894  
Lithograph, 26.8 × 24.9 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower right margin  
Mellerio 126; Stein and Karshan 63  
p 1077 V/2000  
Cheval ailé 1894  
Lithograph, 15.8 × 11.8 cm
Mellerio 127
p 1703 V/2000
Le Buddha 1895
Lithograph, 31.3 × 24.9 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 64
p 1078 V/2000
L'intelligence fut à moi, je devins le Buddha 1896
Lithograph, 32 × 22 cm
Mellerio 145
p 1617 V/2000
Le sommeil 1898
Lithograph, 13 × 12.5 cm
Mellerio 172
p 1618 V/2000
Planche d'essai III 1900
Lithograph, 26 × 24 cm
Mellerio 188
p 1619 V/2000
Edouard Vuillard 1900
Lithograph, 20 × 15.2 cm
Mellerio 190
p 1620 V/2000
Pierre Bonnard 1902
Lithograph, 14.5 × 12.3 cm
Mellerio 191
p 1621 V/2000
Paul Sérusier 1903
Lithograph, 16 × 13.5 cm
Mellerio 192
p 1622 V/2000
Maurice Denis 1903
Lithograph, 15.3 × 13.5 cm
Mellerio 193
p 1623 V/2000
Roger Marx 1904
Lithograph, 25 × 14.5 cm
Mellerio 194
p 1624 V/2000

**Renoir, Auguste**
French, 1841-1919

Femme nue assise
Lithograph, 33 × 25.2 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1660 V/2000
Tête d'enfant 1893
Lithograph, 28.4 × 23.3 cm
Signed in red pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 65
p 1079 V/2000
Claude Renoir tourné à gauche 1904
Lithograph, 37.5 × 27 cm
p 1659 V/2000

**Renouard, Charles Paul**
French, 1845-1924
Danseuse et sa mère 1894
Lithograph, 47.3 × 34.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 67
p 1080 V/2000

**Ricketts, Charles**
English, 1866-1931
Inondation 1894
Woodcut, 8.9 × 9.4 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 68
p 1081 V/2000

**Rijsselberghe, Théo van**
Belgian, 1862-1926
Portrait d'Henri de Regnier
Lithograph, 47.6 × 31.9 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left
p 1402 V/2000
Flotille de pêche 1894
Etching and aquatint, 22.4 × 28.1 cm
Signed in red ink stamp at lower left
Stein and Karshan 77
p 1090 V/2000
Sur la jetée 1899
Colour lithograph, 24.2 × 42 cm
p 1014 V/2000
Fishing boats returning to Volendam 1900
Etching, 26 × 43.5 cm
p 1260 V/2000
Le cloître 1900
Colour lithograph, 17 × 20 cm
Aitken 106
p 1634 V/2000

**Rippl-Rónai, József**
Hongarian, 1861-1927
La fête au village 1896
Colour lithograph, 39.5 × 52.5 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right
Johnson 119
p 1128 V/2000
Famille d'artisans le dimanche 1896
Colour lithograph, 39.5 × 53.5 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right and in blue chalk at lower centre margin
p 1129 V/2000
Famille d'artisans le dimanche 1896
Lithograph, 39.5 × 53.5 cm.
Signed with initials on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
p 1130 V/2000
Woman reading under a lamp 1894
Colour lithograph, 20.5 × 16 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower centre
p 1704 V/2000

**Rivière, Henri**
French, 1864-1951
Les revenants; La pêche 1890
Colour lithograph, 20 × 29.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
Aitken 5
p 1632 V/2000
La vague 1893
Colour lithograph, 29.2 × 46 cm
Signed in green pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 67
p 1082 V/2000

**Roche, Pierre**
French, 1855-1927
La salamandre
Colour lithograph, 24.4 × 18.6 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 71
p 1084 V/2000
Algues marines 1893
Gypsograph, 17.1 × 10.8 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 70
p 1083 V/2000

Rodin, Auguste
French, 1840-1917
Portrait d'Henry Becque 1893
Etching, 15.9 × 20 cm
Signed in plate at centre right and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 72
p 1085 V/2000

Roland Hoist, Richard Nicolaüs
Dutch, 1868-1938
Anangké (Fate) 1892
Lithograph, 35.5 × 32.5 cm
p 1273 V/2000

Rops, Félicien
Belgian, 1833-1898
Le vice supreme
Etching, 47.1 × 30.6 cm
Signed in plate at lower right
p 1401 V/2000
La planche de Tzigane
Etching, 16.1 × 12 cm
Signed with initials in red crayon at lower centre margin
Mellerio 631
p 1665 V/2000
Chez les Traptistes
Etching, 22.5 × 16.8 cm
Exteens 531
p 1666 V/2000
Laveuses
Etching, 22 × 15.3 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
p 1667 V/2000
La dame au carcel 1876
Etching, 24 × 17.6 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin; inscribed at lower right margin ‘Dame au carcel, 1er état, épreuve retouchée’
Mellerio 529
p 1399 V/2000
Celle qui fait 1879
Etching, 26.8 × 16.5 cm
p 1400 V/2000
Mater Dolorosa 1893
Etching, 13.3 × 10.2 cm
Signed in red crayon at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 73
p 1086 V/2000
La ramaseuse de fagots 1895
Etching, 28.6 × 18.9 cm
Signed in plate at lower centre and in red crayon at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 74
p 1087 V/2000
L'école de l'idéal; Le petit Eyolf 1895
Photogravure, 37.5 × 14.1 cm
Aitken 71
p 1633 V/2000

Rothenstein, William
English, 1872-1945
Portrait 1894
Lithograph, 21.9 × 20.3 cm
Signed on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower centre margin
Stein and Karshan 75
p 1088 V/2000

Roussel, Ker-Xavier
French, 1867-1944
Deux nymphes au bord d'un étang
Lithograph, 22 × 33.5 cm
Salomon 82
p 1133 V/2000
Nymphes en fuguant
Etching, 18 × 22 cm
Salomon 112
p 1134 V/2000
Femme dansant
Etching, 18 × 22 cm
Salomon 115
p 1135 V/2000
Faun et nympe
Etching, 17.5 × 24 cm
p 1136 V/2000
Les centaures dans la caverne
Lithograph, 20 × 15 cm
Salomon 32
p 1446 V/2000
Les aigles
Lithograph, 20 × 15 cm
Salomon 33
p 1447 V/2000
Petit centaure au sommet
Lithograph, 11 × 16 cm
Salomon 34
p 1448 V/2000
Centaure dans une clairière
Lithograph, 20 × 15 cm
Salomon 35
p 1449 V/2000
Deux petits centaures
Lithograph, 14.5 × 21.5 cm
Salomon 36
p 1450 V/2000
Centaure nageant
Lithograph, 18 × 14 cm
Salomon 41
p 1451 V/2000
Petit étang dans le forêt
Lithograph, 6.6 × 16 cm
Salomon 46
p 1452 V/2000
Centaure sous l'orage
Lithograph, 18.3 × 14.3 cm
Salomon 49
p 1453 V/2000
Le vieux Chrion
Lithograph, 20.2 × 16 cm
Salomon 50
p 1454 V/2000
Bacchante debout au bord d'un étang
Lithograph, 18 × 14 cm
Salomon 55
p 1455 V/2000
Deux femmes assises
Lithograph, 15 × 19 cm
Salomon 59
p 1456 V/2000
Satyre courant
Lithograph, 11.5 × 19 cm
Salomon 61
p 1457 V/2000
Pan
Lithograph, 13 × 11.5 cm
Salomon 62
p 1458 V/2000
Satyre s'enlevant
Lithograph, 15.5 × 20.5 cm
Salomon 64
p 1459 V/2000
Faune enlacant une nymphe
Lithograph, 11 × 18 cm
Salomon 64
p 1460 V/2000
Le petit antre
Lithograph, 10 × 15 cm
Salomon 65
p 1461 V/2000
Dieu marin sur une rive
Lithograph, 20 × 15 cm
Salomon 67
p 1462 V/2000
Dieu marin
Lithograph, 18.3 × 14.4 cm
Salomon 68
p 1463 V/2000
Dieu marin
Lithograph, 18.3 × 14.4 cm
Salomon 70
p 1464 V/2000
Une des filles de Leucippe
Lithograph, 12 × 17 cm
Salomon 73
p 1465 V/2000
Jeune femme assise
Lithograph, 14.5 × 21.5 cm
Salomon 74
p 1466 V/2000
Euridice piquée par un serpent
Lithograph, 24.9 × 32.4 cm
Salomon 77
p 1467 V/2000
Euridice piquée par un serpent
Lithograph, 24.4 × 32.6 cm
Salomon 77
p 1468 V/2000
Euridice piquée par un serpent
Lithograph, 22.3 × 32.4 cm
Salomon 77
p 1469 V/2000
Nymphes
Lithograph, 11.2 × 19 cm
Salomon 78
p 1470 V/2000
Petit couple dansant
Lithograph, 10.5 × 18 cm
Salomon 79
p 1471 V/2000
Couple se reposant
Lithograph, 11.5 × 8.5 cm
Salomon 80
p 1472 V/2000
Satyre debout et nymphe
Etching, 14.5 × 19 cm
Salomon 118
p 1474 V/2000
Deux femmes conversant
Lithograph, 21.7 × 11.8 cm
Salomon 8
p 1705 V/2000
Noli me tangere
Lithograph, 22.5 × 14.1 cm
Salomon 9
p 1706 V/2000
Dans la neige 1893
Colour lithograph, 32.9 × 19.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower left margin
Stein and Karshan 76
p 1089 V/2000
Femmes causent 1893
Lithograph, 24.3 × 15.6 cm
Salomon 7
p 1673 V/2000
Le volant 1895
Lithograph, 30.1 × 18.2 cm
Aitken 72
p 1367 V/2000
Paysage avec maison 1897
Colour lithograph, 29 × 41.5 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Johnson 133; Salomon 13
p 1213 V/2000
Deux baigneuses 1899
Lithograph, 14 × 19 cm
Salomon 12
p 1442 V/2000
L'album de paysage: Personnages au bord de la mer 1900
Colour lithograph, 23.5 × 41 cm
Johnson 134.1; Salomon 14
p 1206 V/2000
L'album de paysage: Femme en rouge dans un paysage 1900
Colour lithograph, 23.3 × 35.3 cm
Johnson 134.2; Salomon 15
p 1207 V/2000
L'album de paysage: Femme en robe à rayures 1900
Colour lithograph, 21.4 × 32.5 cm
Johnson 134.3; Salomon 16
p 1208 V/2000
L'album de paysage: Les baigneuses 1900
Colour lithograph, 25.3 × 41.8 cm
Johnson 134.4; Salomon 17
p 1209 V/2000
L'album de paysage: Amours jouant auprès d'une nymphe 1900
Colour lithograph, 21 × 23.7 cm
Johnson 134.5; Salomon 18
p 1210 V/2000
L'album de paysage: Femmes dans la campagne 1900
Colour lithograph, 23.5 × 32.5 cm
Johnson 134.6; Salomon 19
p 1211 V/2000
L'album de paysage: Femmes dans la campagne 1900
Colour lithograph (pastel proof), 23.5 × 32.5 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Salomon 19
p 1212 V/2000
L'album de paysage: La source 1900
Colour lithograph, 31.5 × 41.2 cm
Johnson 134.7; Salomon 20
p 1214 V/2000
Nymphé assis sous un arbre 1900
Colour lithograph, 26 × 36 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin
Salomon 21
p 1215 V/2000
Copie d'un tableau de Cézanne 1913
Lithograph, 15 × 21.8 cm
Salomon 27
p 1443 V/2000
Pastorale 1926
Lithograph, 16.3 × 22 cm
Signed on stone at lower right under the image
Salomon 29
p 1444 V/2000
Personages au bord de la mer 1927
Etching, 15 × 22.2 cm
Salomon 117
p 1473 V/2000
Le monstre dans la caverne 1930
Lithograph 19.5 × 25.5 cm
Salomon 31b
p 1132 V/2000
Le monstre dans la caverne 1930
Lithograph 19.5 × 25.5 cm
Salomon 31a
p 1445 V/2000
Léda et le cygne 1931
Lithograph 19.5 × 25.5 cm
Salomon 30d
p 1131 V/2000

**Roux-Champion, V.-J.**
French, 1871-1953

Portrait de Denis
Etching, 17.7 × 23.5 cm
Signed in plate at lower right
p 1661 V/2000
Portrait de Roussel
Etching 19 × 16 cm
p 1662 V/2000
Sattler, Joseph
German, 1867-1931
Fire 1895
Lithograph, 28.5 × 29 cm
Aitken 75
p 1368 V/2000
Théâtre de L'Oeuvre 1895
Lithograph, 25.5 × 23.7 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1635 V/2000

Schwabe, Carlos
Swiss, 1886-1926
L'honneur 1890
Photo-relief, 17 × 12.8 cm
Aitken 6
p 1636 V/2000
L'Annonciation 1893
Lithograph, 25.4 × 34.9 cm
Signed on stone at lower right, reversed, and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 78
p 1091 V/2000
Seguin, Armand
French, 1869-1903
Paysage 1894
Etching, 23 × 22.7 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left margin
Stein and Karshan 79
p 1092 V/2000
La primavera 1894
Zincograph, 21.4 × 31.5 cm
Fields 84
p 1393 V/2000

Sérusier, Paul
French, 1863-1927
La marchande de marrons
Colour lithograph, 22.4 × 12.7 cm
p 1707 V/2000
Paysage 1893
Colour lithograph, 41.5 × 57.2 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Stein and Karshan
p 1093 V/2000
La marchande de chiffons 1893
Lithograph, 24.6 × 15.7 cm
p 1674 V/2000
L'Assomption de Hannele Mattern; En l'attendant 1894
Colour lithograph, 29.6 × 22 cm
Aitken 24
p 1637 V/2000
Souvenir de Bretagne 1895
Lithograph, 37.7 × 27.8 cm
p 1394 V/2000
Souvenir de Bretagne 1895
Lithograph, 25 × 14 cm
p 1395 V/2000
Hérakléa 1896
Lithograph, 30 × 48.2 cm
Aitken 81
p 1220 V/2000

Shannon, Charles Hazelwood
English, 1863-1937
La femme aux chats 1894
Lithograph, 21.3 × 25.1 cm
Signed on stone at right centre and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 81
Signac, Paul
French, 1863-1935
Charles Henry's chromatic circle (1888), used to illustrate theatre programmes for ‘Les Résignés’ and ‘L'Echéance’ 1889
Colour lithograph, 15.4 × 17.9 cm
Signed in black ink at lower right
Aitken 2

Saint Tropez 1894
Colour lithograph, 27.5 × 36.4 cm.
Stein and Karshan 82

Les démolisseurs 1896
Lithograph, 47 × 30.5 cm
Kornfeld 15

Le soir 1898
Colour lithograph, 20.2 × 26.1 cm
Kornfeld 20

Somm, Henry
French, 1844-1907
Tête de Parisienne 1894
Etching, 25.6 × 17.8 cm
Signed in plate at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 83

Steinlen, Théophile-Alexandre
Swiss, 1859-1923
La femme triste
Lithograph, 43 × 28 cm
Signed with initials on stone at lower right and in purple chalk at lower right margin
p 1261 V/2000

La soupe
Lithograph, 32 × 27.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1262 V/2000

Faufréluche
Lithograph, 19.4 × 15 cm
p 1263 V/2000

Enfins seuls
Lithograph, 32 × 26 cm
p 1264 V/2000

Mon tra deri tra
Colour lithograph, 27 × 17.5 cm
Signed in plate at left centre
p 1663 V/2000
L’ennemi du peuple 1899
Lithograph, 31.2 × 30 cm
Aitken 104
p 1221 V/2000
Nu de dos 1914
Etching, 30 × 30 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right
p 1265 V/2000

Synave, Tancrède
French, 1860-?
L’amé invisible; Mademoiselle Fifi 1896
Colour lithograph, 32.1 × 48.8 cm
Aitken 32
p 1369 V/2000

Toorop, Jan
Dutch, 1858-1928
Venise sauveé 1895
Lithograph, 44.5 × 27.7 cm
Aitken 77
p 1222 V/2000
Anarchy 1895
Etching, 33.5 × 24 cm
p 1274 V/2000
The treasury 1895
Lithograph, 37 × 27.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower right
p 1275 V/2000
The youth and old age of woman 1895
Etching, 19.7 × 24.7 cm
Signed in plate at upper left
p 1403 V/2000
The sower 1895
Lithograph, 21.8 × 33.1 cm
Signed on stone at lower right and in ink at lower right margin
p 1404 V/2000
Interior with girl knitting (Marken) 1896
Etching, 19.5 × 15.8 cm
Signed in plate at lower left, and signed and dedicated in ink at
lower right margin
p 1405 V/2000
Dolce 1896
Lithograph, 26.6 × 21.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
p 1406 V/2000

Toulouse-Lautrec, Henri de
French, 1864-1901
Adieu
Lithograph, 24 × 20.3 cm
Wittrock 124
p 1641 V/2000
‘La lithographie,’ couverture pour la première année de ‘L’Estampe
Originale’ 1893
Colour lithograph, 56 × 63.8 cm
Stein and Karshan 84; Wittrock 3
p 992 V/2000
Carnot malade 1893
Colour lithograph, 24.4 × 18.6 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left
Wittrock 12
p 1639 V/2000
Aux Ambassadeurs 1894
Colour lithograph, 30.3 × 24.8 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower
left margin
Stein and Karshan 85; Wittrock 58
p 1097 V/2000
NIB, ou le photographe-amateur 1894
Colour lithograph, 25.9 × 24 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right
Aitken 76; Wittrock 143
p 1231 V/2000
La loge au mascaron doré (programme pour ‘Le missionnaire’) 1894
Colour lithograph, 31 × 23 cm
Aitken 26; Wittrock 16
p 1330 V/2000
Carnaval 1894
Colour lithograph, 25 × 16 cm
Wittrock 61
p 1708 V/2000
Au rideau (couverture de ‘L'Estampe Originale,’ album de clôture) 1895
Colour lithograph, 58.7 × 82.4 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at upper centre and in pencil at lower centre
Stein and Karshan 86; Wittrock 96
p 993 V/2000
Un monsieur et une dame (programme pour ‘L'Argent’) 1895
Colour lithograph, 31.8 × 23.7 cm
Aitken 28; Wittrock 97
p 1331 V/2000
Prospectus-programme de ‘L'Oeuvre’ 1895
Lithograph, 21.1 × 34.4 cm
p 1332 V/2000
Raphaël; Salomé 1896
Lithograph, 30 × 48.7 cm
Aitken 80; Wittrock 146
p 1223 V/2000
Le bien d'autrui; Hors de lois 1897
Lithograph, 22 × 21 cm
Aitken 35; Wittrock 231
p 1640 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies (title page):
May Belfort 1913
Lithograph, 29.5 × 24.2 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right
p 1581 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Sarah Bernhardt 1913
Lithograph, 29.5 × 24.2 cm
Wittrock 249
p 1734 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Jeanne Granien 1913
Lithograph, 29.3 × 24 cm
Wittrock 250
p 1735 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Anna Held 1913
Lithograph, 29.2 × 24.3 cm
Wittrock 251
p 1736 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: May Belfort 1913
Lithograph, 29.5 × 24.2 cm
Wittrock 252
p 1737 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Emilienne d'Ançelon 1913
Lithograph, 29.5 × 24.2 cm
Wittrock 253
p 1738 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Coquelin Aîné 1913
Lithograph, 29 × 24.2 cm
Wittrock 254
p 1739 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Jane Hading 1913
Lithograph, 28.6 × 24.2 cm
Wittrock 255
p 1740 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Louise Balthy 1913
Lithograph, 29.8 × 24.5 cm
Wittrock 256
p 1741 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Sybil Sanderson 1913
Lithograph, 27.8 × 24.4 cm
Wittrock 257
p 1742 V/2000
Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Cléo de Mérode 1913
Lithograph, 29.3 × 24 cm
Wittrock 258
p 1743 V/2000

Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Lucien Guity 1913
Lithograph, 29.6 × 24.4 cm
Wittrock 259
p 1744 V/2000

Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Marie-Louise Marsy 1913
Lithograph, 28.9 × 24.5 cm
Wittrock 260
p 1745 V/2000

Portraits d'acteurs & d'actrices - treize lithographies: Polin 1913
Lithograph, 29.2 × 23.7 cm
Wittrock 261
p 1746 V/2000

**Vallotton, Félix**
French, 1865-1925

La sortie du bain: Les petites baigneuses IV 1893
Woodcut, 5.2 × 6.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right
Vallotton and Goerg 120c
p 1760 V/2000

L'enterrement 1891
Woodcut, 25.7 × 35.2 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 84a
p 1297 V/2000

Tête de vieille femme 1891
Woodcut, 13.1 × 10.8 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and with monogram at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 79c
p 1475 V/2000

Le beau soir 1892
Woodcut, 23 × 31.3 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 98a
p 1162 V/2000

Le Breithorn 1892
Woodcut, 14.7 × 25.6 cm

*Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001*
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 85a
p 1476 V/2000
Le Mont-Blanc 1892
Woodcut, 25.5 × 14.3 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 87a
p 1477 V/2000
Glacier du Rhône 1892
Woodcut, 14.5 × 25.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 89a
p 1478 V/2000
Le mur 1892
Woodcut, 10.2 × 19.1 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 99a
p 1479 V/2000
Les cygnes 1892
Woodcut, 13.5 × 17.7 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 100a
p 1480 V/2000
La rixe, ou la scène au café 1892
Woodcut, 17 × 25 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 101a
p 1481 V/2000
Le Mont-Rose 1892
Woodcut, 14 × 25.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and with monogram stamp at lower left margin
Vallotton and Goerg 105b
p 1482 V/2000
Les nécrophores 1892
Woodcut, 14.2 × 25.4 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 106a
p 1483 V/2000
Les amateurs d'estampes 1892
Woodcut, 18.5 × 25.3 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left
Vallotton and Goerg 107c
p 1484 V/2000
Caesar, Socrate, Jésus, Neron 1892
Woodcut, 15.4 × 30.8 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 109a
p 1485 V/2000
La manifestation 1893
Woodcut, 22.9 × 31.9 cm
Signed in block at lower right
Stein and Karshan 87
p 1098 V/2000
Les raseurs 1893
Lithograph, 18.5 × 14.3 cm
Signed on stone at lower right and in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 42
p 1295 V/2000
Dernière nouveauté 1893
Lithograph, 21.5 × 21.7 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left
Vallotton and Goerg 44
p 1296 V/2000
L'assassinat 1893
Woodcut, 14.7 × 24.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 113b
p 1486 V/2000
Le bon marché 1893
Woodcut, 20.2 × 26.1 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 116a
p 1487 V/2000
Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001
Le couplet patriotique 1893
Woodcut, 17.6 × 27.3 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 127a
p 1488 V/2000
Les petites filles 1893
Woodcut, 14.2 × 20.2 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 129a
p 1489 V/2000
Le mauvais pas 1893
Woodcut, 22.5 × 18.1 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 130a
p 1490 V/2000
A Schumann 1893
Woodcut, 15.3 × 12.4 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right
Vallotton and Goerg 131c
p 1491 V/2000
La poursuite 1893
Lithograph, 4.5 × 12.4 cm
Vallotton and Goerg 43
p 1675 V/2000
Baigneuses étendues sur l'herbe: Les petites baigneuses III 1893
Woodcut, 4 × 6.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left
Vallotton and Goerg 119c
p 1759 V/2000
Fillette enlevant sa chemise: Les petites baigneuses VI 1893
Woodcut, 4.5 × 5.8 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right
Vallotton and Goerg 122c
p 1761 V/2000
Jeux au soleil: Les petites baigneuses VII 1893
Woodcut, 4.4 × 5.8 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right
Vallotton and Goerg 123c
p 1762 V/2000
La baigneuse à l'enfant: Les petites baigneuses IX 1893
Woodcut, 4.4 × 5.8 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left
Vallotton and Goerg 125c
p 1763 V/2000
La baigneuse aux cygnes: Les petites baigneuses X 1893
Woodcut, 4.6 × 6 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right
Vallotton and Goerg 126
p 1764 V/2000
The bath 1894
Woodcut, 18.1 × 22.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in blue pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 88
p 1099 V/2000
Theatre programme for Stindberg's 'Father' 1894
Colour lithograph, 21.5 × 31.8 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 53
p 1138 V/2000
Petits anges 1894
Woodcut, 14.9 × 24.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 139
p 1492 V/2000
L'exécution 1894
Woodcut, 14.9 × 25 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 142
p 1493 V/2000
Les trois baigneuses 1894
Woodcut, 18.3 × 11.2 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left
Vallotton and Goerg 133
p 1709 V/2000
NIB 1895
Colour lithograph, 35.2 × 24.9 cm
p 1232 V/2000
Le confiant 1895
Woodcut, 17.7 × 22.4 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 161
p 1494 V/2000
La sortie 1895
Woodcut, 18 × 22.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and with monogram stamp at lower left margin
Vallotton and Goerg 162
p 1495 V/2000
La nuit 1895
Woodcut, 17.8 × 22.2 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and with monogram stamp at lower left margin
Vallotton and Goerg 164c
p 1496 V/2000
L'alerte 1895
Woodcut, 17.9 × 22.4 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 166a
p 1497 V/2000
Le chapeau vert 1896
Colour lithograph, 40 × 27 cm
Signed with monogram at lower left and in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 54b
p 1161 V/2000
Le poker 1896
Woodcut, 17.9 × 22.4 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and with monogram stamp at lower left margin
Vallotton and Goerg 170c
p 1498 V/2000
Le violoncelle: Instruments de musique I 1896
Woodcut, 22.3 × 17.8 cm
Signed in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 171a
p 1499 V/2000
La flûte: Instruments de musique II 1896
Woodcut, 22.4 × 18 cm
Signed in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 172a
p 1500 V/2000
Le violon: Instruments de musique III 1896
Woodcut, 22.4 × 18 cm
Signed in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 173a
p 1501 V/2000

Le piano: Instruments de musique IV 1896
Woodcut, 22.4 × 18 cm
Signed in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 174a
p 1502 V/2000

La guitare: Instruments de musique V 1897
Woodcut, 22.5 × 18 cm
Signed in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 175a
p 1503 V/2000

Le piston: Instruments de musique VI 1897
Woodcut, 22.5 × 17.7 cm
Signed in blue crayon at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 176a
p 1504 V/2000

La belle épinglé 1897
Woodcut, 25.3 × 31 cm
Vallotton and Goerg 187d
p 1505 V/2000

La santé de l'autre: Intimités IX 1898
Woodcut, 17.7 × 22.3 cm
Vallotton and Goerg 196c
p 1506 V/2000

L'éclat 1898
Woodcut, 18 × 22.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in blue crayon
at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 199a
p 1507 V/2000

Puvis de Chavannes 1898
Woodcut, 15.7 × 12.5 cm
Signed with monogram, reversed, in block at lower right
Vallotton and Goerg 200b
p 1508 V/2000

Le trottoir roulant: Exposition Universelle I 1901
Woodcut, 12.2 × 15.8 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower
right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 203a
p 1509 V/2000

Le trottoir roulant: Exposition Universelle I 1901
Woodcut, 12.2 × 15.8 cm
L'ondée: Exposition Universelle II 1901
Woodcut, 21.1 × 16.5 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 203c
p 1765 V/2000
La vitrine de Lalique: Exposition Universelle III 1901
Woodcut, 12.2 × 16.3 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 204c
p 1766 V/2000
Cinq heures: Exposition Universelle IV 1901
Woodcut, 16.5 × 12.2 cm
Vallotton and Goerg 206c
p 1768 V/2000
Rue du Caire: Exposition Universelle V 1901
Woodcut, 16.5 × 12 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 207a
p 1510 V/2000
Rue du Caire: Exposition Universelle V 1901
Woodcut, 16.5 × 12.2 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 207c
p 1769 V/2000
Fue d'artifice: Exposition Universelle VI 1901
Woodcut, 16.4 × 12.2 cm
Signed with monogram in block at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin
Vallotton and Goerg 208c
p 1770 V/2000
Trench 1915
Woodcut, 25 × 33.2 cm
Signed in block at lower right
p 1771 V/2000
An orgy 1915
Woodcut, 25 × 33.4 cm
Signed in block at lower right
p 1772 V/2000
Les fils de fer 1916
Woodcut, 25 × 33.4 cm
Signed in block at lower right
p 1773 V/2000
Darkness 1916
Woodcut, 18 × 22.8 cm
Signed in block at lower right

p 1774 V/2000
Le guetteur 1916
Woodcut, 25 × 33.4 cm
Signed in block at lower right

p 1775 V/2000
The citizens 1916
Woodcut, 25 × 33.4 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left and in pencil at lower right margin

p 1776 V/2000

Valtat, Louis
French, 1869-1952

Jeune femme assise au manchon
Woodcut, 40.7 × 31 cm
Signed in pencil at lower right margin

p 1266 V/2000
La maison rouge
Woodcut, 26 × 28.5 cm
p 1267 V/2000
Jeune fille assise avec un chat
Woodcut, 30 × 24.5 cm
Signed with red monogram stamp at lower right margin
p 1268 V/2000

**Velde, Henry van de**
Belgian, 1863-1957
Tropon
Colour lithograph, 35.4 × 26.6 cm
p 1668 V/2000

**Vibert, Pierre Eugène**
Swiss, 1875-1937
Le cuivre 1895
Lithograph, 32.1 × 24.5 cm
p 1643 V/2000

**Vignon, Victor**
French, 1847-1909
La vache 1893
Etching, 25.1 × 26.7 cm
Signed in plate at lower left, reversed, and in pencil at lower right margin
Stein and Karshan 89
p 1100 V/2000

**Vuillard, Édouard**
French, 1868-1940
La siesta (La reconvalescence)
Lithograph, 58.8 × 41.5 cm
Signed on stone at lower left
Roger-Marx 2
p 1101 V/2000
Frontispice de ‘Cuisine’
Lithograph, 31 × 23 cm
Roger-Marx 54
p 1308 V/2000
Le menu
Lithograph, 25 × 22 cm
Roger-Marx 55
p 1309 V/2000
Le maître d'hotel
Lithograph, 28.5 × 21 cm
Roger-Marx 56
p 1310 V/2000
La cuisinière
Lithograph, 31 × 23 cm
La flambée
Lithograph, 31 × 23 cm

Le repas
Lithograph, 31 × 24.5 cm

Couverture de ‘Bulletin du Salon d'Automne’
Lithograph, 28.3 × 39.4 cm
Signed on stone at lower centre

Monsieur Bute; L'amant de sa femme; La belle opération
Photo-relief with watercolor stenciling, 21.5 × 19.7 cm

Intérieur au canapé (Soir)
Etching, 10 × 15 cm

Le pliage du linge 1893
Lithograph, 24 × 32 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right and in pencil at lower right margin

Ames solitaires 1893
Lithograph, 32 × 23 cm

L'intérieur aux cinq poses 1893
Lithograph, 24 × 29.5 cm

L'intérieur au paravent 1893
Lithograph, 25 × 31 cm

Intimité 1893
Lithograph, 26 × 19 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower right

Rosmerholm 1893
Lithograph, 22.5 × 30.3 cm
Un ennemi du peuple 1893
Lithograph, 22 × 30 cm
Aitken 59; Roger-Marx 17
p 1335 V/2000
Frontispice pour ‘Les Nouvelles Passionnées’ 1893
Lithograph, 18.5 × 7 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left
Roger-Marx 3
p 1432 V/2000
L'Enfant couché / Les couturières 1893
Lithograph, 24.4 × 15.5 cm
Roger-Marx 5
p 1676 V/2000
Intérieur 1893
Lithograph, 19 × 12 cm
Signed with monogram on stone at lower left
Roger-Marx 4
p 1710 V/2000
Bécane 1894
Colour lithograph, 80 × 60.5 cm
Roger-Marx 49
p 1000 V/2000
Au-dessus des forces humaines 1894
Lithograph, 30.7 × 23.5 cm
Aitken 61; Roger-Marx 18
p 1225 V/2000
Une nuit d'avril (L'image) 1894
Lithograph, 31.2 × 46.5 cm
Aitken 62; Roger-Marx 22
p 1226 V/2000
Frères; La gardienne; Créanciers 1894
Lithograph, 22.6 × 31.7 cm
Aitken 65; Roger-Marx 23
p 1227 V/2000
La vie muette 1894
Lithograph, 31 × 23.2 cm
Aitken 67; Roger-Marx 20
p 1336 V/2000
Solness le constructeur 1894
Lithograph, 32 × 24 cm
Aitken 63; Roger-Marx 21
p 1337 V/2000
L'atelier 1895
Lithograph, 24.5 × 30 cm
Roger-Marx 11
p 1301 V/2000
L'atelier aux deux fenêtres 1895
Lithograph, 23 × 29 cm
Roger-Marx 14
p 1302 V/2000
Le déjeuner 1895
Colour lithograph, 25 × 16 cm
Roger-Marx 15
p 1303 V/2000
Les Tuileries 1895
Lithograph, 24 × 27.5 cm
Roger-Marx 27
p 1304 V/2000
La table au grand abat-jour 1895
Colour lithograph, 14 × 21 cm
Roger-Marx 12
p 1433 V/2000
La couturière 1895
Colour lithograph, 32.5 × 24.9 cm
Roger-Marx 13
p 1711 V/2000
Le Jardin des Tuileries 1896
Colour lithograph, 28 × 43 cm
Johnson 153; Roger-Marx 28
p 1164 V/2000
Les soutiens de la société 1896
Lithograph, 32.5 × 49 cm
Aitken 85; Roger-Marx 24
p 1228 V/2000
Maternité 1896
Colour lithograph, 19 × 22.5 cm
Roger-Marx 30
p 1305 V/2000
Jeux d'enfants 1897
Colour lithograph, 28 × 43 cm
Johnson 154; Roger-Marx 29
p 1165 V/2000
Au-delà des forces 1897
Lithograph, 23 × 29.5 cm
Aitken 89; Roger-Marx 25
p 1338 V/2000
Van Rysselberghe 1898
Etching, 10 × 14 cm
Roger-Marx 61
p 1437 V/2000
Projet de couverture 1899
Colour lithograph, 59 × 45 cm
Johnson 156; Roger-Marx 47
p 1016 V/2000
La naissance d'Annette 1899
Colour lithograph, 34 × 40 cm
Johnson 157; Roger-Marx 44
p 1139 V/2000
Couverture de l'album ‘Paysages et intérieurs’ 1899
Colour lithograph, 51 × 40 cm
Johnson 155; Roger-Marx 31
p 1192 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: La partie de dames 1899
Colour lithograph, 34 × 26.5 cm
Johnson 155 I; Roger-Marx 32
p 1193 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: L'avenue 1899
Colour lithograph, 31 × 41 cm
Signed in pencil at lower left
Johnson 155 II; Roger-Marx 33
p 1194 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: A travers champs 1899
Colour lithograph, 26 × 35 cm
Johnson 155 III; Roger-Marx 34
p 1195 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: Intérieur à la suspension 1899
Colour lithograph, 35 × 28 cm
Johnson 155 IV; Roger-Marx 35
p 1196 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: Intérieur aux tentures roses I 1899
Colour lithograph, 34 × 27 cm
Johnson 155 V; Roger-Marx 36
p 1197 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: Intérieur aux tentures roses II 1899
Colour lithograph, 34 × 27 cm
Johnson 155 VI; Roger-Marx 37
p 1198 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: Intérieur aux tentures roses III 1899
Colour lithograph, 34 × 27 cm
Johnson 155 VII; Roger-Marx 38
p 1199 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: L’âtre 1899
Colour lithograph, 34 × 27.5 cm
Johnson 155 VIII; Roger-Marx 39

p 1200 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: Sur le Pont de l’Europe 1899
Colour lithograph, 31 × 35 cm
Johnson 155 IX; Roger-Marx 40

p 1201 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: La patisserie 1899
Colour lithograph, 35.5 × 27 cm
Johnson 155 X; Roger-Marx 41

p 1202 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: La cuisinière 1899
Colour lithograph, 35 × 28 cm
Johnson 155 XI; Roger-Marx 42

p 1203 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: Les deux bellessoeurs 1899
Colour lithograph, 35.5 × 28 cm
Johnson 155 XII; Roger-Marx 43

p 1204 V/2000
‘Paysages et intérieurs’: Sur le Pont de l’Europe (variante) 1899
Colour lithograph, 31 × 35 cm
Roger-Marx 40

p 1205 V/2000
Une galerie au Gymnase 1900  
Colour lithograph, 25 × 19 cm  
Roger-Marx 48  
p 1306 V/2000  
Le jardin devant l'atelier 1901  
Colour lithograph, 63 × 48 cm  
Signed in pencil at lower left  
Roger-Marx 45  
p 1015 V/2000  
Une répétition à ‘L'Oeuvre’ 1902  
Lithograph, 29 × 20 cm  
Aitken 107; Roger-Marx 50  
p 1339 V/2000  
Portrait de Cézanne 1914  
Lithograph, 23 × 24 cm  
Roger-Marx 51  
p 1307 V/2000  
Lucien Fabre 1924  
Lithograph, 13 × 8 cm  
Roger-Marx 52  
p 1434 V/2000  
Tristan Bernard 1924  
Lithograph, 12 × 9 cm  
Roger-Marx 53  
p 1435 V/2000  
La femme au bouquet 1924  
Etching, 14 × 22 cm  
Roger-Marx 67  
p 1441 V/2000  
Paul Léautaud 1934  
Lithograph, 21 × 15 cm  
Roger-Marx 60  
p 1436 V/2000  
Le Square Vintimille 1937  
Etching, 33.5 × 25.5 cm  
Roger-Marx 66  
p 1314 V/2000  
Le Square Vintimille 1937  
Etching, 21.5 × 16 cm  
Roger-Marx 64  
p 1439 V/2000  
Petites études dans le square 1937  
Etching, 14.5 × 10 cm  
Roger-Marx 65  
p 1440 V/2000  

Wagner, T.P.
Rêve 1894  
Lithograph, 31.3 × 23.8 cm  
Signed on stone at upper left, reversed, and in pencil at lower left margin  
Stein and Karshan 91  
p 1102 V/2000

**Whistler, James Abbott MacNeill**  
American, 1834-1903  
 Danseuse 1893  
Lithograph, 18.3 × 15.9 cm  
Signed on stone at right centre and in pencil at lower right margin  
Stein and Karshan 92  
p 1103 V/2000

**Willette, Adolphe**  
French, 1857-1926  
Chevalerie rustique; L'amant de Christ; Marié; Les bouchers 1888  
Lithograph, 24 × 16 cm  
Signed on stone at right centre  
p 1644 V/2000  
La fortune 1893  
Lithograph, 27 × 25.1 cm  
Signed on stone at lower right and in blue crayon at lower left margin  
Stein and Karshan 93  
p 1104 V/2000  
Pierrot pendu 1895  
Lithograph, 27.6 × 18.6 cm  
Signed on stone at lower left and in blue pencil at lower right margin  
Stein and Karshan 94  
p 1105 V/2000  
Revanche 1895  
Lithograph, 40.2 × 37.1 cm  
Signed on stone at lower left and in blue pencil at lower right margin  
Stein and Karshan 95  
p 1106 V/2000

**Books**

*Van Gogh Museum Journal 2001*
Paris, Crès 1925
p 1780 V/2000

Reproductions of 28 pen drawings by Pierre Bonnard
p 1782 V/2000

Wittrock 18-28 (Toulouse-Lautrec only)

p 1792 V/2000

17 lithographs in black and white illustrating the catalogue of the exhibition by
Anquetin, Bonnard, Denis, Grasset, Ibels, Laugé, Maufra, Maurin, Hermann-Paul, Rouchou, Ranft, Ranson, Roussel, Sérusier, Toulouse-Lautrec, Vallotton, Vuillard
p 1677-p 1693 V/2000

p 1779 V/2000

André Gide, Maurice Denis, *Le voyage d'Urien*, Paris, Librairie de l'Art
Indépendant 1893
30 lithographs by Maurice Denis
Original vellum wrappers
p 1789 V/2000

*L'imitation de Jésus-Christ*, traduction anonyme du XVIIe siècle; bois dessinés par Maurice Denis. Paris, Vollard 1903
216 wood-engravings by Tony Beltrand after Maurice Denis
Original wrappers
p 1790 V/2000
152 lithographes in black and white
Original wrappers
p 1783 V/2000

24 transfer lithographs
p 1786 V/2000

Octave Mirbeau, *Dingo*. Paris, Volland 1924 41 illustrations in black and 14 etchings (hors texte) by Pierre Bonnard
Original wrappers
p 1784 V/2000

21 lithographs by Fernand Mourlot after Pierre Bonnard
p 1781 V/2000

18 line block illustrations from brush drawings by Pierre Bonnard.
Original wrappers
p 1778 V/2000

12 colour woodcuts, signed and dated
p 1747 - p 1758 V/2000

4 woodcuts by James Pitcairn-Knowles
Issued together with ‘Les vierges,’ with lithographs by Joseph Rippl-Ronai
Original wrappers with an outer wrapper illustrated with a woodcut design of a hand holding a flower, designed by James Pitcairn-Knowles
p 1793 V/2000

Issued together with ‘Les tombeaux,’ with woodcuts by James Pitcairn-Knowles
Original wrappers with an outer wrapper illustrated with a woodcut design of a hand holding a flower, designed by James Pitcairn-Knowles
p 1794 V/2000

Original decorated boards
p 1777 V/2000

19 lithographs in black and white
Roger-Marx 5-24  

**Francis Thompson**, *Poèmes*, traduit par Elisabeth M. Denis-Graterolle; lithographies originales de Maurice Denis. Paris, Vollard 1936  
13 colour lithographs (*hors texte*) and 56 lithographs in colour and black and white  
p 1791 V/2000  

**Félix Vallotton**, *Crimes et châtiments*. In: *L’Assiette au Beurre* 48 (1 March 1902), numéro spécial  
23 colour lithographs  
p 1608 V/2000  

108 lithographs in rose-sanguine by Pierre Bonnard and 9 wood-engravings in black by Tony Beltrand  
Original wrappers  
p 1788 V/2000  

p 1795 V/2000  

29 transfer lithographs, 17 original etchings and 178 wood-engravings  
Original wrappers  
p 1785 V/2000  

**Literature**  

Gustave Bourcard (with additions and revisions by James Goodfriend), *Félix Buhot: catalogue descriptif de son oeuvre gravé*, New York 1979  
Pierre Cailler, *Catalogue raisonné de l'oeuvre gravé et lithographié de Maurice Denis*, San Francisco 2000  
Maurice Exteens, *L'oeuvre gravé et lithographié de Félicien Rops*, Paris 1928  
Armond Fields, *George Auriol*, Layton 1985  
Una E. Johnson, Ambroise Vollard, editeur: prints, books, bronzes, New York 1977
E.W. Kornfeld, Catalogue raisonné et lithographié de Paul Signac, Berne 1974
Sylvain Laboureur, Jean-Smile Laboureur: catalogue complet de l'oeuvre, San Francisco 1989
André Mellerio, Odilon Redon: peintre, dessinateur et graveur, Paris 1923
Daniel Morane, Maxime Maufra (1861-1918): catalogue de l'oeuvre gravé, Pont-Aven 1986
Claude Roger-Marx, Bonnard lithographe, Monte Carlo 1952
Idem, L'oeuvre gravé de Vuillard, Monte Carlo 1947
Gustav Schiefler, Verzeichnis des graphischen Werks Edvard Munchs bis 1906, Oslo 1974
Maxime Vallotton and Charles Goerg, Félix Vallotton: catalogue raisonné de l'oeuvre gravé et lithographié, Geneva 1972
Works on loan to the Van Gogh Museum
2000-2001

The following is a list of paintings and drawings lent to the Van Gogh Museum between 2000 and 2001. Each work has an inventory number made up as follows: the first letter stands for the technique (s = painting, d = drawing); this is followed by a reference number and then by a capital letter (B = loan) and the year of the loan. Also included here is a list of works that have been returned to their owners since the last loan list was published (see Van Gogh Museum Journal 1999, pp. 144-46)

Paintings

Cézanne, Paul
French, 1839-1906
La montagne Sainte-Victoire 1885
Oil on canvas, 54 × 65 cm
s 237 B/2001
Loan from the Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

Gogh, Vincent van
Dutch, 1853-1890
Wheatfield with poppies (F 761 JH 2120) 1890
Oil on canvas, 50 × 65 cm
s 244 B/2001
Loan from a private collection

Sérusier, Paul
French, 1863-1927
Picking apples (Pont-Aven triptych) 1892
Oil on canvas, 73 × 133 cm
s 243 B/2001
Loan from a private collection

Sisley, Alfred
British, 1839-1899
Snow effect at Argenteuil 1874
Oil on canvas, 54 × 65 cm
Signed at lower left: Sisley 74
s 236 B/2001
Loan from a private collection

Sluijters, Jan
Dutch, 1881-1957
Woman with a liqueur glass 1912
Oil on canvas, 77 × 69.5 cm
Signed at upper right: Jan Sluijters
s 239 B/2001
Loan from a private collection
Woman fishmonger 1912
Oil on canvas, 76 × 70 cm
Signed at upper left: Jan Sluijters
s 240 B/2001
Loan from a private collection

Drawings

Bock, Théophile de
Dutch, 1851-1904
Landscape with a figure
Watercolour, 22 × 34 cm
Signed at lower left: Th. de Bock fecit
d 228 B/2000
Loan from a private collection

Loans returned 2000
Paintings

Andriesse, Erik Amaryllis
Loan from the Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage
Sunflowers
Loan from the Erik Andriesse Foundation
Gogh, Vincent van View of the Singel
Loan from the Foundation P. and N. de Boer
Trees in a field on a sunny day
Loan from the Foundation P. and N. de Boer
Wheatfield
Loan from the Foundation P. and N. de Boer
**Lepoittevin, Eugène** A young herdsman
Loan from the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

**Malevitch, Kasimir** Portrait of a young woman
Loan from the Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

**Michaud, Hippolyte** The little art lovers
Loan from the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

**Sluijters, Jan** The prophet Elisa and the son of the Sunamitic woman
Loan from the Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage

**Toorop, Jan** Old oaks at Surrey
Loan from the Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

**Drawings**

**Andriesse, Erik** Untitled
Loan from the Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage

**Gogh, Vincent van** Digger
Loan from the Foundation P. and N. de Boer
Worn out
Loan from the Foundation P. and N. de Boer
Young Scheveningen woman
Loan from the Foundation P. and N. de Boer
Sower
Loan from the Foundation P. and N. de Boer
Windmill on Montmartre
Loan from the Foundation P. and N. de Boer
Park in Arles
Loan from a private collection

**Loans returned 2001**

**Paintings**

**Israëls, Isaac** Portrait of Willem Steenhoff
Loan from the Gemeentemuseum, The Hague

**Tholen, Willem Bastiaan** Wharf in Enkhuizen
Loan from a private collection

Compiled by Monique Hageman
Exhibitions 2001

Van Gogh Museum

Camille Pissarro: Still life with peonies and mock orange (new acquisition)

3 October 2000-20 February 2001

Light! The Industrial Age, 1750-1900: art & science, technology & society

20 October 2000-11 February 2001
(ISBN 0 500 510 296)

Artists portraits: prints and drawings from the Van Gogh Museum's collection

22 November 2000-11 March 2001

Impression: painting quickly in France, 1860-1890

2 March-20 May
(Organised by the Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute in Williamstown, MA, in conjunction with the National Gallery in London and the Van Gogh Museum)
(ISBN 0 300 08446 3)

The nineteenth-century Salon: prints and illustrations from the Van Gogh Museum's collection

16 March-28 October

F. Holland Day: symbolist photographer

20 April-24 June
(Organised in conjunction with Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, the Museum Villa Stuck, Munich and the Royal Photographic Society, Bath)
Exhib. cat. Pam Roberts, Anne Havinga, Verna Posever Curtis and Edwin Becker, 
_F. Holland Day_, Amsterdam 2001 
(ISBN 90 400 9525 6)

**Paul Signac: master of pointillism**

15 June-9 September

(Organised in conjunction with the Musée d'Orsay, Paris and The Metropolitan 
Museum of Art, New York)

(ISBN 0 87099 999 0)

**Vincent van Gogh, drawings: Antwerp & Paris, 1885-1888**

28 September 2001-6 January 2002

Exhib. cat. Marije Vellekoop and Sjraar van Heugten (in colloboration with 
(ISBN 90 6611 581 5)

**The photograph and the American Dream, 1840-1940. The Stephen White 
Collection II**

28 September 2001-6 January 2002

Exhib. cat. Stephen White and Andreas Blühm, with a foreword by William Jefferson Clinton, _The photograph and the American Dream, 1840-1940_, Amsterdam 2001 
(ISBN 90 400 9640 6)

**Van Gogh's Parisian circle: prints and drawings from the Van Gogh 
Museum's collection**

7 November 2001-13 January 2002

**Museum Mesdag**

**A summer's day in Museum Mesdag**

17 August-28 October
Interior with lady: genre paintings by Albert Roelofs, Antonio Mancini, Jan Toorop and Alfred Stevens

23 November 2001-3 March 2002

Compiled by Adrie Kok
The Van Gogh Museum staff from January 2001

Supervisory Board Van Gogh Museum Foundation

Chairman
Pieter Winsemius

Vice-chairman
Truze Lodder

Members
Katharine Lee-Reid
Max Koker
Willem van Schendel

Hon. Secretary
Fien Willems

Board of the Vincent van Gogh Foundation

Chairman
Vincent-Willem van Gogh

Members
Mathilde Cramer-van Gogh
Jantine van Gogh
R.J.M. van Hengstum
(on behalf of the Minister of Education, Culture and Science)

Secretary/Research Curator
Han Veenenbos

The Van Gogh Museum Staff

Director
John Leighton

Deputy Director
Ruth Kervezee, from 1 February 2001

Secretary to the Director
Fien Willems

*Secretary to the Deputy Director*
Martine Blok, from 1 April 2001

**Collections**

*Head of Collections*
Sjraar van Heugten

*Secretary*
Esther Hoofwijk

*Curators*
Louis van Tilborgh
*(Paintings)*
Marije Vellekoop
*(Prints and drawings)*
Chris Stolwijk, until 31 March 2001
*(Research)*

*Curatorial Assistant*
Roelie Zwikker, until 30 November 2001
Nienke Bakker, from 1 December 2001

*Head of Research*
Leo Jansen, until 31 March 2001
Chris Stolwijk, from 1 April 2001

*Editors Van Gogh Letters Project*
Leo Jansen
Hans Luijten

*Special Project Researcher*
Nienke Bakker, until 30 September 2001
Roelie Zwikker, from 1 December 2001

*Head of Conservation*
Ella Hendriks

*Conservators*
René Boitelle
Natascha Duff, until 31 July 2001

*Conservation Assistants*
Alex Nikken
Frans Stive
Research and Documentation
Monique Hageman
Fieke Pabst

Librarian
Anita Vriend

Assistant Librarian
Patricia Schuil
Exhibitions and Display

Head of Exhibitions and Display
Andreas Blühm

Assistant
Roos Waterland, until 30 April 2001
Adrie Kok, from 1 June 2001

Exhibitions Curator
Edwin Becker

Senior Registrar
Aly Noordermeer

Registrars
Martine Kilburn
Sara Verboven

Head of Education and Internet
Caroline Breunesse

Education and Internet
Maud Chavannes, until 11 May 2001
Marie Baarspul, from 1 September 2001
Melanie Verhoeven

Education and School Programmes
Berber Vinckemöller

Head of Publicity, PR and Fundraising
Rianne Norbart

Publicity, PR and Fundraising
Arda van Dam

Press Officer
Heidi Vandamme

Assistant Publicity, PR and Fundraising
Saskia Beukers

Information Desk
Ineke di Gazar
Judith Goes
Yvonne Hovius
Yvonne Kuhfus
Yvonne Kuijper  
Truus Matti  
Sija Speelman  

**Finance**  

*Head of Finance*  
Wilma Vermeulen, until 31 January 2001  
Anita van der Kroft, from 1 July 2001  

*First Bookkeeper*  
Amien Salarbux  

*Bookkeeper*  
Irma van der Plas  

*Administrative Assistants*  
Yvonne de Jong-Knol  
Malika Ouled Radi  
Stefan Wladimiroff, until 30 June 2001  

*Cashiers*  
Loes Advokaat-van Amstel  
Anita da Costa Fernandes  
Bart de Graaf  
Marja Guina-Vos  
Barbra Jacobsen, from 1 July 2001  
Andrea Kammerstetter  
Truus Rouet-Borgers  
Marja Sandbergen-Tervoort  
Paula Timmer-de Jong  
Ana Rodrigues Pereira da Silva  

**Internal Affairs**  

*Controller*  
Marion de Vries  

*Personnel Officer*  
Henk Ammerlaan, until 31 August 2001  

*Personnel Advisor*
Margriet Boerma

Pay-roll Administrator
Ellen Spijkers

Assistant Personnel and Organisation
Marijke Blankman, from 1 September 2001

Facilities

Head of Facilities
Jan Samuelsz

Assistant
Heleen van Es

Reception
Dzjamilja Maigua-Bijl
Brigitte van der Meulen

Project Manager Technical Affairs
Kees Posthuma

Canteen
Bep Pirovano-Mes
Ankie Veltkamp
Gemma Visser

Cloakroom
William Amzand, from 11 July 2001
Martijn Baart, from 1 September 2001
Samira Boughlid, from 1 September 2001
Domenico Casillo
Steven de Jager
Remon Olij, until 31 March 2001
Jaime Nayem Carrasco
Ibrahim Tokalak

Head of Technical Affairs
Gerard van der Kamp, until 30 April 2001
Technical Staff
    Joost van Aalderen
    Hans Beets
    René Cairo
    Antonio Pesare
    Serge Taal
    Johan Worell
    Fehti Zammouri

Security

Head of Security
    Ton Hoofwijk

Assistant
    Arnold Veen, from 1 September 2001

Security Coordinators
    Wim Jaket
    Fred den Ouden

Security Staff
    Raymond Adhin
    Mike Aramaké
    Rina Baak
    Abdel Ben Salah
    Emke van Berkel
    Kenneth Blinker
    Cornelis Blonk
    Natascha de Boer
    Edwin Boeren
    Mohammed Bouanan
    Henk Buma
    Gerard Chin-A-Joe
    Eli Choukroun
    Kees van Dalen
    Rob Dingen
    Yvonne Döbelman
    Theo Doesburg
    Abdel Ebrahim, from 1 September 2001
    Jan de Jong
    Ria Keek, from 1 September 2001
    Marjon Kneepkens
Frank Labeij
Frans Lemaire, from 1 February 2001
Jannette Lont, from 1 September 2001
Wills van der Made
Marjan Mohr-Robbers
Saeed Osman
Mischa van Poppel
Anneke de Ridder
Dan Rosculet
Henk de Ruijter, from 1 September 2001
Marga Thijm
Sylvia Tielman
Arnold Veen, until 31 August 2001
Ko Vierbergen, until 30 June 2001
Frank Vos
Theo Wallenburg
Peter Zaal
Peter Zeldenrust
Ans van Zoeren
Ron van der Zwaan

Museum Mesdag

*Head of Collections*
Sjraar van Heugten

*Curator*
Maartje de Haan, from 1 May 2001

*Manager*
Martin Heijligers

*Assistant*
Greet Grundeler-Kuijper

*Head of Security*
Ton Hoofwijk

*Security Staff*
Tonke Dragt
Bert Lammers
Henk Zuidam
Works Council

Chairman
Antonio Pesare

Vice Chairman
Greet van Geem, until 30 June 2001
Marije Vellekoop, from 1 July 2001

Secretary
Heide Vandamme

Members
Tonke Dragt (Auditor), until 31 July 2001
Wills van der Made, until 31 July 2001
Marjan Mohr-Robbers (Auditor), from 1 July 2001
Chris Stolwijk, from 1 March 2001
Marije Vellekoop

Museum Tours (Acoustiguide)

Coordinator
Marja Damman

Van Gogh Museum Enterprises b.v.

Director
Ton Boxma

Deputy Director
Cor Krelekamp

Secretary
Greet van Geem

Bookkeeper
Bart Zeeman

Sales
Judith de Groot
Maud Chavannes, from 12 May 2001
Logistics
Karim Verkuijl, until 14 April 2001
Stefan Wladimiroff, from 1 July 2001

Warehouse
Frans Dickhoff, from 1 July 2001
Maarten Voorhaar
Ruud Voorhaar

Museum Shop Museumplein

Manager
Christa Bakker

Shop Manager
Marijke Blankman, until 13 September 2001
Mariëlle Gerritsen
Karin van der Linde
Natascha Mansvelt

Staff
Debbie Bijnies
Nita Chan
Jasper Hillegers
Marten de Jong
Marijke van der Mars
Katinka Neyen
Lieke Noorman
Erik Vroons

Museum Shop ('t Lanthuys BV)

Director
Vincent-Willem van Gogh

Manager
Frans de Haas

Adjunct Manager
Ellen van der Schoot

**Buyers**
- Ceciel de Bie
- Susan van der Schoot

**Assistant**
- Rosmarijn Weddepohl

**Manager Webshop**
- Laurine van der Wiel

**Office Manager**
- Ruud Hogerwerf

**Supervisors Shop**
- Marianna Bener
- Hester Cordes
- Janine ter Linde
- Goedele Wellens

**Staff**
- Linda van den Berg
- Alexandra Feith
- Erris van Ginkel
- Loes de Groot
- Gerbrand Korevaar
- Eva Kroon
- Marcel Oosterwijk
- Karin Parham
- Renske Pronk
- Marcus de Ridder
- Roos Stalpers
- Onno Terpstra
- Bas Velthuis
- Marijke Vincent
- Evert-Jan Wever

**Museum Restaurant (Verhaaf Groep)**

**Director**
- Hans Verhaaf