
BOOK REVIEW FORUM

Stephen F. Eisenman, *Gauguin's Skirt*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1997.
Pp. 232, 110 illus., notes, index. US\$29.95 cloth; \$24.95 paperback.

Review: ELIZABETH C. CHILDS
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
ST. LOUIS

OF STEPHEN EISENMAN'S RECENT BOOK, two important things need to be said. First, this is a book any scholar interested in Paul Gauguin should read, as it is an ambitious effort to counter modernist hagiographies of the artist by placing his art and life in the specific cultural moment of fin-de-siècle colonial Polynesia. This may also be a book best read twice, as Eisenman engages and provokes the reader, and some of his stimulating interpretations expand under a second read; others become less convincing upon reflection. In short, this is a book with which to have an extended conversation.

Second, it must be observed that while Eisenman's style as a writer is engaging, his methods are somewhat inconsistent, perhaps because his audiences and scholarly goals are multiple. Depending on the readership of the volume, this diversity may be seen as either evidence of authorial creativity or a stumbling block to communication. I have heard the book variously described as a revisionist monograph, a theoretical sampler with a monographic focus, and a romantic, personal travelogue of a postmodernist art historian.

In fact, it is some of each of these things. Eisenman's goal has been to make his text accessible across the disciplines of art history, anthropology, and biography. The author's evident sympathy and passion for his subject are very much to his credit. Nonetheless, at times his text seems more diffuse

than synthetic as it strives to speak on levels both general and particular to so many audiences. As the students in one of my seminars on Gauguin unanimously observed, Eisenman's insights might have been better served in the format of a few focused scholarly articles, rather than in an eclectic group of chapters. Yet whatever one's taste in modes of scholarship, Eisenman's ambitious text clearly deserves our considered appreciation.

In his introduction, Eisenman sorts out the complex strains of Gauguin scholarship over the last thirty years. Such a survey of the literature, especially in an area as rich as Gauguin studies, necessitates abbreviating generations of work, or one's own study would become nothing more than a bibliographic essay. (The regrettable absence of a scholarly bibliography in the book attests, no doubt, to the editor's desire to market the book to a general audience.) Yet Eisenman moves past a few key authors too quickly. He rightly lauds the late Bengt Danielsson as the first author to debunk the artist's idyllic views of Polynesia and to track down substantial primary evidence of the historical Gauguin. Indeed, Danielsson is the only author before Eisenman to seriously consider the fascinating evidence of the growing anticolonialism of Gauguin's later years.¹ But Eisenman's conclusion that Danielsson found Gauguin "a keen and insightful observer of Polynesian society" (p. 17) stretches the point too far, in an effort to help establish Eisenman's own goal of recuperating Gauguin as sensitive to native culture.

Danielsson, a Swedish anthropologist who lived in Tahiti from 1953 until his death in 1997, delighted, both in person and in print, in measuring the precise distance between Gauguin's artistic representations of Polynesia and the historical and cultural reality of fin-de-siècle Tahiti. Danielsson's work as Gauguin's historian surely does not so much position the artist as "a committed protagonist of Tahiti and its people," as Eisenman claims (p. 17), but rather seeks to clarify the specific biographical, geographical, and ethnological facts surrounding the life and career of the most mythologized European to live in fin-de-siècle Tahiti.²

Another key figure who deserves more nuanced credit in Eisenman's introduction to Gauguin scholarship is the British scholar Griselda Pollock. Cited by Eisenman for "failing to heed the post-colonial injunction to listen to subaltern voices" (p. 19), Eisenman faults Pollock for treating Gauguin's Tahitian *vahines* as a mere variation of a European formula of orientalism (p. 19). For Pollock, Gauguin substantially overwrites his model with his art: "Teha'amana's body [in Gauguin's art] is not represented in its social and historical and cultural particularity."³ Although Pollock, unlike the more sympathetic Eisenman, reads Gauguin as an uncompromising sexual imperialist, her essay nonetheless opened the very debate about Gauguin and postcolonial theory that Eisenman pursues. Although the text of her published lecture

lacks original research into the culture of fin-de-siècle Tahiti, Pollock does respectfully consider the position of the subaltern—raising questions of what we can and cannot know about the historical Teha‘amana (Gauguin’s young Tahitian lover) in the face of a limited historical account.⁴ She also achieved in much earlier work a groundbreaking reading of the cultural context of Gauguin’s Breton primitivism, in an essay published in 1980 with Fred Orton.⁵ Although Eisenman does not cite this article, his own discussion of Gauguin’s encounter with the modern Brittany of the fin-de-siècle—where villages held religious pardons that were at once observations of faith, invitations to tourism, and rituals that were modern expressions of “local kinship ties and a newly emerging ethnic solidarity” (p. 36)—clearly benefits from Pollock’s historicist debunking of the antimodernism of the school of Pont-Aven.

Finally, in Eisenman’s review of those writers who have studied “the iconographic particularity and formal specificity of Gauguin’s Tahitian artworks” (p. 19), he rightly praises the work of Richard Field, Ziva Amishai-Maisels, Jehanne Teilhet-Fisk, and others. But to then implicitly underscore the originality of his own project by saying those authors have “little recognized Gauguin’s success in representing fin-de-siècle . . . Tahiti” (p. 20) is unfair, particularly in the case of the distinguished work of Teilhet-Fisk, whose published dissertation appears only once thereafter in Eisenman’s endnotes. Teilhet-Fisk made numerous extended research trips to French Polynesia (as well as to Rapa Nui, Aotearoa, the Cook Islands, and western Polynesia) over the period 1970 to 1981, and her work on Gauguin was informed not only by considerable firsthand research, but also by her knowledge of the work of anthropologists Bengt Danielsson and Robert Levy, and of Ralph White, who assisted her with the Tahitian language. Her firsthand experience of the Tahitian culture thus far exceeds that of any other American art historian writing on Gauguin. In her careful observations of the many aspects of Polynesian religion and social practice that Gauguin represents in his art, in her exploration of what remnants of traditional practice might have been available to him in the 1890s, and in her discussion of the popular diffusionist theories of the origins of the Polynesian race, Teilhet-Fisk clearly grounds the artist in the specific historic milieu of late nineteenth-century, or neo-traditional, Tahiti. Her discussion is not framed by the use of any postcolonial theory, as is Eisenman’s, but her ethnographic and historical research is superb and deserves to be ranked with that of Danielsson as a key secondary source for Gauguin studies. Her book, for example, makes the important connection that also served as a launching point for Eisenman’s first chapter (p. 28), and a key point used to ground his interpretations in his second chapter (p. 94ff.)—namely, that when Gauguin descended the plank at the port of Papeete, his dress and long hair inspired locals to mock him as a *mahu*, or

“third-sex figure.”⁶ Given his scholarly generosity on so many other points, it is surprising that Eisenman omits any reference to Teilhet-Fisk’s earlier discussion of this crucial episode of Gauguin’s interaction with indigenous culture.

The first chapter of *Gauguin’s Skirt*, “Exotic Scenarios,” is a hybrid, a condensed biographical narrative of Gauguin’s life up to his second departure from France for Polynesia in 1895 woven into a survey of popular nineteenth-century scientific theories of racism. This heady *mélange* strives to introduce the general reader to large areas of specialized knowledge, as Eisenman elucidates the complex hybrid that was Gauguin himself: “at once esthete, bohemian, decadent, colonist and ‘an Indian from Peru’ ” (p. 77). The biographical narrative is the essential ground for this eclectic mosaic, and as in any condensed version, Eisenman has had to select the salient facts from a rich and diverse life. His lively account is useful in its context but passes too lightly over a crucial episode in the formation of Gauguin’s exoticism. Eisenman characterizes Gauguin’s trip to Martinique and Panama in 1887 as a brief visit curtailed by illness (p. 44). He subsequently dismisses it in favor of a lengthy discussion of Brittany, which was in his view “Gauguin’s most significant flirtation with the exotic prior to his trip to Polynesia” (p. 33).

While a discussion of Brittany is essential for this artist who worked there over a five-year period, Gauguin’s excursion to Martinique with the artist Charles Laval merits greater attention in any analysis of Gauguin’s exposure to the ideology of colonialism and to the practice of racism. Indeed, from this trip Gauguin emerged with firsthand knowledge of the pleasures and hardships of an artist confronted with colonial life. The intense tropical light, and the native population of Martinique, inspired numerous works by Gauguin between 1887 and 1891, from paintings to sculptures, ceramics, pastels, and prints.⁷ Vincent van Gogh’s letters offer rich and varied testimony to the central position of Martinique, and the Caribbean generally, in Gauguin’s emerging formulation of the ideal life of a European artist in a “Studio of the Tropics.” Gauguin’s fantasies prior to his departure for Tahiti thus fed on exotic travels to Arles, Brittany, and Martinique, as well as on the earlier memories of his Peruvian childhood (now better understood due to the biographical research of David Sweetman),⁸ and the crucial period he spent as a young man in the French merchant marine. In Eisenman’s necessarily brief overview of Gauguin’s development, the complex origins of Gauguin’s, Bernard’s, and van Gogh’s evolving concept of the Studio of the Tropics begs for expansion. This should be achieved in the catalogues of two forthcoming exhibitions.⁹

In seeking to link Gauguin’s enterprise with fin-de-siècle preoccupations with race, nationality, and imperialist nostalgia for seemingly “vanishing” cultures, Eisenman suggests that Gauguin adopted some methods of the modern

ethnographer: “Less intellectually and financially prepared than Bronislaw Malinowski for ethnographic immersion, Gauguin nevertheless undertook to surround himself with native life and culture” (p. 62). In support of Gauguin’s sensitivity to native culture, Eisenman offers examples of how the artist depicted Tahitian women wearing both missionary dresses and *pareu* (p. 20); how in a particular painting, Gauguin depicts the way women weave baskets (p. 64); how “like the twentieth-century ethnographer undertaking fieldwork, Gauguin surrounded himself with native life and culture and began to collect materials” (p. 62). These observations can be understood as part of a continuing effort to correct a modernist art history that for too long isolated Gauguin as the Parisian artist, the Symbolist, the Frenchman—an art history that before the 1960s largely ignored Gauguin’s interactions with Polynesian culture. A forceful correction of this type was previously advanced by Teilhet-Fisk, who has argued at length that Gauguin was a “lay-anthropologist” who understood that “Tahitian society at the turn of the century was rich in the use of myth, metaphor, superstition, and the personification of natural phenomena.”¹⁰

Yes, at the heart of Gauguin’s modernist primitivism lay his radical decision to live and work in what to him was an exotic world. But Eisenman, perhaps in his desire to rescue Gauguin from the ire of postcolonial critics, makes these points at the expense of occasionally losing sight of the obvious, namely, that Gauguin was, in spite of the impact of his Tahitian experience, still also a Symbolist European artist, whose primary aesthetic goals were generally quite far from those of ethnography. Unlike Catlin or Bodmer earlier in the century, who consciously strove for exactitude in recording details of the indigenous populations they encountered, Gauguin’s practice was simply not guided by scientific goals of precision, documentation, consistency, statistical sampling, or comprehensiveness; nor was his overall goal, in spite of some of his rhetoric, to educate his French audience about the “vanishing” cultural patrimony of their colonies. He aspired perhaps to attract, mystify, intrigue, titillate, shock, confuse, or to conjure dreams—but surely not to educate. Moreover, as has been openly recognized since Danielsson, any skills of daily living Gauguin developed in the traditional Tahitian milieu (language, food acquisition, and so forth) were marginal and inconsistent at best. His native retreat at Mataiea on the southern coast was hardly a choice made in search of pure “ethnographic immersion”; it was in fact a colonial center (as Danielsson pointed out at length), literally in the shadow of the Catholic church, and a crossroads of Chinese commerce.

Furthermore, we are now learning that rather than staying there a full two years after his arrival in 1891, as has long been presumed by Danielsson and subsequent scholars, within a few months Gauguin soon moved back again

to Paea, only thirteen miles south of Papeete on the western coast, where he had spent several weeks with his French colonial friend Gaston Pia just after his arrival in Tahiti in 1891.¹¹ In short, to position Gauguin, particularly in his first Tahitian trip, as an early ethnographer is to give him too much credit and to mythologize him once again on new grounds. Contemporaries such as the bishop Monseigneur Tepano Jaussen (who collected oral histories as well as the native objects he displayed in the Mission Museum in Papeete until 1892) fall far more appropriately into a model of late nineteenth-century ethnography.¹² Eisenman comes closer to the mark at the end of chapter 2, where, on the one hand, he claims Gauguin functioned as an ethnographer “recording mentalities and cultural practices . . . today . . . dismissed as extinct,” but on the other admits that to call him an ethnographer “is not quite right, for it implies the passive stance of a spectator” and Gauguin strove to combine his European and Polynesian ideas into “a hybrid art” (p. 147).

If one seeks an example of a Euro-American undertaking a specifically ethnographic enterprise in Tahiti in the same years, a fascinating case study is the American historian Henry Adams, who privately published the memoirs of the royal Teva clan following his four-month stay in Tahiti in 1891.¹³ His traveling partner, the American painter John LaFarge, could also be fairly described (albeit in limited terms) as more of an ethnographic painter than Gauguin, as he often made notations in the margins of his watercolor studies of the names and even the exact body measurements of his Polynesian models. Gauguin, as an artist, openly fused the data he gathered in colonial Tahiti with the imaginative vision of a Symbolist. What clearly separates Gauguin from the larger agenda of early modern ethnography was his desire not only to make evident, but to celebrate the subjectivity of his observations and knowledge.¹⁴

Eisenman’s central chapter, “Sex in Tahiti,” contributes one of his provocative arguments as well as the rationale for the striking title of the book. Eisenman argues that Gauguin had no fixed sexual identity in Polynesia and that he freely compared the Polynesian *mahu* with its European counterparts, such as the *inverti* and the androgynes. In this milieu, Gauguin created a hybrid art “that mirrored his own liminal stance on the contested border of sexual and colonial identity” (p. 147). In considering Eisenman’s evidence here, several questions arise. He has done a fine job of canvassing early European travel accounts in search of the *mahu*, and he also makes a plausible suggestion that the photograph from the Miot Album (reproduced on p. 105) may represent two *mahu*. Yet he vaults past Gauguin’s era to the present to position the *mahu* in Tahitian society, citing his own observations of *mahu* in a bar one evening in a luxury tourist hotel (p. 106). I will leave to the professional anthropologists the question of whether or not this “field”

method of gathering contemporary evidence to interpret the historical record is valid; I will just note my own position as a historian that such experience seems irrelevant to determining the meaning of the *mahu* to Gauguin in rural Tahiti in the 1890s and also that it lends a tone (from my point of view, an unfortunate one) of romanticized travelogue to the argument.

Moreover, in evaluating the impact of the *mahu* on Gauguin's work, one would wish for more visual evidence to be found in the art. The two paintings that best support his argument visually come not from the first Tahitian period, when he is first mocked as a *mahu* and occupies an obviously liminal position between the Tahitian and the French colonial world; nor do they come from his return trip to Tahiti, when he is refining the text of *Noa Noa* with his account of his passing desire for his native guide. Rather, the *Bathers* of 1902 and *Marquesan Man in a Red Cape*, also of 1902, were painted not in Tahiti at all, but near the end of the artist's life in the Marquesas, when he was most successfully "immersed" in a native culture and was frequently seducing, as Eisenman later points out (p. 176), teenage girls whom he had "saved" from the Catholic church. Is there other evidence for his continued interest in the *mahu*, or even for the presence of any *mahu*-like figure in Marquesan society? Eisenman's leap from sexual practice in one Polynesian society to that of another needs more justification.

Eisenman proposes that because Gauguin was perceived as displaying some *mahu*-like behavior (he had long hair for a few weeks; he spent a lot of time with native women; he worked as a craftsman), his sexuality was in question by the Tahitians from "the moment he stepped off the boat" (p. 111). It follows, continues Eisenman, that his "sexual indeterminacy . . . may thus have permitted him a form of cultural intercourse . . . a chance for rich and compelling artistic engagement . . . that few male colonials were ever granted" (p. 112). Perhaps Eisenman is here assuming too much about how "sexually liminal" Gauguin would have appeared to the locals. The verbal jests showered on him by a few Tahitians in Papeete upon his arrival were surely balanced, if not outweighed, over the course of the next months, and the next twelve years, by the ample evidence he soon gave to his heterosexual preferences—cutting his hair almost immediately, he took up in Papeete with one *vahine*, and then lived openly with several Tahitian women. He allegedly bragged to local models of being the *tane*, or husband, of the nude in Manet's *Olympia*, and he exhibited pornographic photographs on his door to frighten off pious Catholics. Even if other behavior may have led him to be perceived as "effeminate" by locals, that would not necessarily have marked him as *mahu*. Tahitian *mahu* neither lived with nor married women. As anthropologist Robert Levy has pointed out:

an effeminate man can be described as *huru mahu* or *mahu-ish*, but he nevertheless is assumed to be in general an “ordinary” kind of man, involved in standard male activity and, if not engaged in normal heterosexual practices (although most are assumed to be), certainly *not* engaged in the *mahu*’s type of homosexual behavior. Either one is a *mahu*, or one is not.¹⁵

Eisenman’s proposal that Gauguin was intrigued by the open presence of the “third sex” in Tahiti is a largely convincing idea. Yet his related proposition that locals received Gauguin as a sexually liminal being after his arrival, and thereby he experienced greater “cultural intercourse,” seems much harder to accept.

Eisenman’s final chapter, “Death in the Marquesas,” opens by addressing not death but the prevalence of colonial resistance in fin-de-siècle Polynesian life. Indeed, in Gauguin’s surprisingly neglected career as a journalist contributing to *Les Guêpes* (1899–1901) and *Le Sourire* (1899–1900), there is ample evidence of his growing antagonism to colonial authority. These texts comprise a rich index to Gauguin’s participation in colonial culture and still are in need of extended analysis. Eisenman pries open the contradictory position of Gauguin, the colonist who both enjoys some of the prerogatives of his position (a government job, colonist friends, a forum in the white newspaper) and, yet, like Albert Memmi’s classic formulation of the left-wing “colonizer who refuses,”¹⁶ longs to escape his colonial identity by assimilation, but must instead settle for a state of perpetual compromise.

One of the best contributions of *Gauguin’s Skirt* comes in Eisenman’s discussion of Gauguin’s liminal position as an anticolonial Frenchman living in the Marquesas in 1901–1903. Here, Eisenman’s research in the Archives d’Outre Mer in Aix-en-Provence and in police archives and journals in Tahiti greatly enriches our understanding of Gauguin’s swan song in his tropical paradise. His fresh accounts of the colonial government’s disapproval of Marquesan practices of sexuality and marriage, and its irritation with the anti-clerical and tax-evading “bad colonist” Gauguin, open our eyes to the complexity of that much mythologized episode of the artist’s final “escape.” This is a welcome expansion of Danielsson’s first assertions of Gauguin’s anticolonialism.

In the final three sections of his third chapter, Eisenman produces what is perhaps his most controversial text. Here, as he makes an abrupt shift into dramatic narrative, we discover the reason for the journalistic chapter title, “Death in the Marquesas.” These sections, which trace the final months of the artist’s life, reassert the study not only as a monograph, but as fictionalized biography. Sample sentences include: “Beneath the rhythmic clang of

mission bells, the artist heard his own irregular heartbeat; amid the ambient perfume of frangipani, he smelled the rankness of his own body" (p. 177); and "Gauguin's eyes drifted away from the mirror before him. . . . His eyelids became heavy and he fell into a waking dream" (p. 191). Why such a histrionic focus on his final days, and in particular, on the day of his death? Doesn't this reinscribe the artist back into the very modernist canon of solitary dead geniuses from which the author strove to distance him in the first two sections? Why does Eisenman partake of the very strain of celebratory, romantic biography critiqued so passionately by Abigail Solomon-Godeau in 1989?¹⁷

This is not to say that biographical speculation cannot be a powerful tool for the historian. I can think of no more compelling entry into the creative dilemma faced by the historian in establishing the relative meaning of facts than the hall of mirrors constructed by Simon Schama around Benjamin West's painting *The Death of Wolfe* in the volume *Dead Certainties (Unwarranted Speculations)*.¹⁸ But there the historian openly reveals both his own subjectivity and that of historical accounts as he offers us multiple representations and points of view of the same key events, and forces us to weigh the multifaceted potential of representation.

As one concludes *Gauguin's Skirt*, one wonders why, after so many excursions into theory, colonial history, and analyses of works of art, we are brought back with almost morbid relish to the point of the body's decay and the disintegration of the artist's spirit. These pages are haunted with previous literary conjurings of Gauguin by Somerset Maugham, Victor Ségalen, and other Gauguinophiles. A death scene may be an obvious conclusion to a novel, but as rendered by Eisenman in the previous two chapters, Gauguin's is a tale that should be read only partly—and even then advisedly—as biographical. The author's return to the larger issues of his study (the connections between colonialism and primitivism) and to the status of present-day Tahiti in his brief conclusion only partly ameliorates his voyeuristic rendering of the death of an artist apparently done in by his own patterns of excess. One had hoped here for more studied reflection on Gauguin's ambivalent anticolonialism and for less of a literary invasion of a moment that was ultimately a private one, even for a famous artist.

Eisenman's interesting final pages, which attempt to link the Gauguin of 1903 with that of 1995 (the time of his research trip to Papeete) are, alas, too brief to address the diverse measures of Gauguin's meaning to today's Tahitian. His anecdote about a Tahitian's adapting to local use the title of Gauguin's painting *Where Do We Come From?*⁹ merely opens up for us this intriguing question. The legacy is surely partly aesthetic, as demonstrated by the Musée Gauguin, funded by the French government, that now displays a few

original paintings and stages occasional exhibitions to the obvious pleasure of locals and visitors alike. But there is also the crass and pervasive presence of the bottom-line Gauguin business, the economic exploitation of the legend, to the benefit of both Tahitians and French bureaucrats. One observes this in the local market that proffers Gauguin T-shirts, the stores that market reproductions of his paintings printed on folding fans and *monoi* oil bottles, the dozens of Gauguin stamps on sale as philatelic souvenirs. The bounty of such patrimony is not without its costs, which can be witnessed in the visibly ambivalent local response to the new luxury cruise ship bearing the artist's name that capitalizes on the artist's fame and the Western myth of paradise to attract wealthy clients, bringing a much-needed infusion of foreign cash into a sagging tourist economy. A proposal now circulating for a new gallery of contemporary art, featuring modern art by indigenous artists and visitors alike, would make a more fitting tribute to the artist. But for now, that remains as much a dream as Gauguin's "Studio of the Tropics."

It is a pleasure to teach Stephen Eisenman's book, as it continues to provoke a great deal of discussion in seminar, more than most of the Gauguin scholarship published in the last decade. On the eve of the many forthcoming centennial observations of the artist's life, *Gauguin's Skirt* leaves us well poised to ask further important questions about this exceptional artist and his "tangled colonial dance" with the vibrant culture of fin-de-siècle Polynesia.

NOTES

I would like to thank my students, who participated in my Gauguin seminars during the falls of 1997 and 1998; I have profited greatly from our lively discussions of *Gauguin's Skirt*. I would also like to thank my research assistant Nicole Myers for her work on the Tahitian *mahu*.

1. More information on Gauguin's anticolonialism is found in the later revised, French edition of Danielsson's book, *Gauguin à Tahiti et aux Iles Marquises* (Papeete: Les Editions du Pacifique, 1975). In this volume, see also bibliographic entries under Danielsson (Bengt, and Bengt with Marie-Thérèse) for essays and exhibition catalogues published in the late 1960s and early 1970s that also address Gauguin's anticolonialism.

2. For examples of Danielsson's pointed exposure of the ethnographic inaccuracies in Gauguin's representations of Tahitian mythology and practices of daily life, as well as his malapropisms of the native language, see his *Gauguin in the South Seas* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1966), 109, 122, 134, 168, 169, 203, 206.

3. Griselda Pollock, *Avant-Garde Gambits 1888–1893: Gender and the Color of Art History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1992), 48.

4. *Ibid.*; see, for example, her caption to illustration 3, or note 39, in which she stresses Teha'amana's agency in rejecting Gauguin upon his return in 1895.

5. Griselda Pollock and Fred Orton, "Les Données Bretonnantes: La Prairie de Représentation," *Art History* 3, no. 3 (1980): 314–344.
6. Jehanne Teilhet-Fisk, *Paradise Reviewed: An Interpretation of Gauguin's Polynesian Symbolism* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1983), 29.
7. See Karen Kristine Rochnitzer Pope, "Gauguin and Martinique," Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1981.
8. Although the account by Sweetman is somewhat flawed by its sensationalist psychosexual interpretations of some of Gauguin art and behavior, there is fine original research here into the early periods of Gauguin's life. See David Sweetman, *Paul Gauguin: A Complete Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996).
9. In 2001, the St. Louis Art Museum organized *Vincent van Gogh and the Painters of the Petit Boulevard*. In the fall of 2001, Douglas Druick and Peter Zegers of the Art Institute of Chicago will curate a major exhibition on the relationship of van Gogh and Gauguin.
10. Teilhet-Fisk, *Paradise Reviewed*, 174.
11. Evidence for this move is found in letters soon to be published by Victor Merlhès. Oral communication with Gilles Artur, director of the Musée Gauguin, Tahiti, June 1998.
12. See, for example, Jaussen's treatise based in part on the *rongo rongo* boards he had collected in Tahiti: "L'Île de Pâques: Historique et écriture," *Bulletin de Géographie Historique et Descriptive*, no. 2 (1893): 240–270.
13. Henry Adams, *Tahiti: Memoirs of Arii Taimai e Marama of Eimeo, Terirere of Tooarai, Terrimui of Tahiti, Tauratua I Amo* (Paris, 1901).
14. On the tendency of classic ethnography to deny the subjectivity of the writer/observer, see James Clifford, "On Ethnographic Authority," in *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), 21–54.
15. Robert Levy, *Tahitians: Mind and Experience in the Society Islands* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), 133.
16. See Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (Paris, 1957; reprint Boston: Beacon Press, 1991), esp. 41–44.
17. Abigail Solomon-Godeau, "Going Native: Paul Gauguin and the Invention of Primitivist Modernism," *Art in America* 77 (July 1989): 118–129.
18. Simon Schama, *Dead Certainties (Unwarranted Speculations)* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991).