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Gerrit Dou’s *Painter with a Pipe and Book* (circa 1645) is both a painting of a painting and a painting about painting. It visually represents artistic concepts important to Dou: his manual skill is represented by the illusionistic style of the painting and his learning and imagination are represented by his clever composition, which incorporates devices from portraiture and popular prints, still-life and genre painting. Dou transforms the traditional portrait convention of showing an artist or scholar resting an arm on a ledge by portraying the artist in the *Painter with a Pipe and Book* smoking a pipe. The act of smoking recalls genre scenes, where the lower classes are shown squandering time. However, tobacco was also thought to inspire artists and appears in many self-portraits. The arched window that frames the Painter is based on both the seeming naturalistic shop windows Dou would have known from life and from Jost Amman’s prints illustrating the popular Book of Trades, *Das Ständebuch*, originally printed in 1568. This framing device also commonly framed allegorical still-lifes. Dou’s manual skill is evident in his meticulous illusionistic style. Dou presents this work as a painting of a painting: the area within the space of the niche is to be understood as a painting while the black frame, curtain and rod are presented as “real.” However, Dou deliberately confuses the “reality” of what he projects by incorporating unexpected consistencies between supposedly distinct areas of the painting.
I. Introduction

Gerrit Dou’s *Painter with a Pipe and Book* from circa 1645 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) presents itself as a painting of a painting (figure 1). Hanging from a brass rod attached to an ebony frame, an illusionistically painted green silk curtain is pulled to one side. In the seventeenth century curtains were commonly used to protect paintings from light and dust. Including one in paint signals to the viewer that the frame and curtain should be understood as “real,” while the space within the frame is a “painting.” This feigned painting is also illusionistic: it shows a man leaning through an arched window while fingering the pages of an open book and smoking. A glow of burning embers and wisp of smoke are just visible at the end of his pipe. The book laid obliquely across the ledge casts a shadow on a slip of paper fastened to the face of the niche. On this, Dou’s signature, GDov, can barely be made out. The man’s costume and book identify him as an artist.\(^1\) This identification is confirmed by the background: in a dim studio, an old man supervises a young boy who is making paint by using a grinding stone to mix pigment with oil. The figures, lit only by candle flame, are covered by a parasol that protects pigments and tools from dust, a habit for which Dou was infamous in his own time.\(^2\)

The cartellino, which seems tangible as it peels from the face of the ledge, and the man, who almost breaks through the picture plane as he leans through the window, are tropes of trompe l’oeil painting that the sophisticated seventeenth-century viewer familiar with the genre would recognize. So, too, is the curtain, which would immediately bring to mind the legendary Zeuxis and Parhassius.\(^3\)

In general, the fundamental purpose of trompe l’oeil painting is to, at once, fool the eye and invite the viewer to participate in the joke, to figure out the trick. Trompe l’oeil painting is a paradox in and of itself: supposedly it imitates perfectly a variety of surfaces and textures in
order to fool the viewer into believing that he or she gazes upon three dimensional objects; yet trompe l’oeil paintings inevitably call attention to their minutely painted surfaces, drawing the viewer close to marvel at the artist’s consummate skill in imitating nature.

However illusionistically it may be rendered, a trompe l’oeil painting on the small scale of Dou’s *Painter with a Pipe and Book* has little chance of fooling a viewer into thinking the man projects into the viewer’s space. Understanding the work as a painting of a painting is the only way to resolve the problem of scale and to make the illusion work. Yet Dou’s clever and slightly unnerving painting disturbs this projected “reality” by overlapping motifs and using a consistent style and light source, which suggests that all elements belong to a single reality, thus negating the reading of this work as a feigned painting. These ambiguities reveal Dou’s profound understanding of the genre and ability to manipulate viewer expectation; these surprises make the viewer aware of Dou’s disconcerting adeptness in crafting this purposefully ambiguous illusion.

Dou's cleverness is manifest above all in the way he has drawn upon and transformed pictorial devices and combined motifs from different genres: portraiture, genre scenes, still-lifes and popular literature. The depiction of the half-length sitter shown behind a waist-high ledge belongs to a long tradition of self-portraits and portraits of artists and scholars. Yet, that the man is shown smoking a pipe, which would be unusual in a portrait, makes the painting more like a genre scene in which the working classes enjoyed their leisure by smoking in taverns. However, in the context of an artist’s portrait, smoking symbolized inspiration. Thus, Dou has transformed the traditional artist’s portrait by showing the figure smoking a pipe, an action associated both with creative inspiration and, less directly, with genre scenes.
Further, the window had roots in the vernacular storefront and workshop architecture of the time, which Dou would have known from experience as well as from naturalistic representations of the trades. For example, Jost Ammans’s illustrations for Hans Sach’s Das Ständebuch, the Book of Trades, originally printed in 1568, depicts representative craftsmen engaged in their trades. In many of the illustrations, a craftsman is shown working in his studio, framed by a rounded window through which he would display and sell his wares. Finally, the pictorial framing device—the arched window—not only visually resembled the round-topped niche, a favored compositional device of still-life painters, but also functioned in a similar manner by focusing the viewer’s attention on the objects that closely paralleled the surface of the painting. Therefore, by combining an architectural framing motif that is associated with allegorical settings with a more naturalistic shop window that evokes a real trade, Dou displays his inventiveness in composing the Painter with a Pipe and Book.

Significantly, this witty web of motifs is woven in the service of a portrait of an artist. Through virtue of trompe l'oeil painting, Dou invites the viewer to appreciate first the painting’s surface, then its subject. The subject, the allegorical artist, echoes the occupation of the man who skillfully crafted the work, Dou himself. The figure's stance emphasizes this point: his direct gaze and his aggressive position leaning through the niche invite the viewer to contemplate what is being offered in this painting. Even though the space of manual labor is physically separated from the space of inspiration through lighting and distance, both aspects of the artist's work are represented, implying that the viewer should take the artist's manual and intellectual labor into account. The illusionistic style of the painting embodies the artist's manual skill and the clever composition which borrows from a number of genres represents his range of knowledge.
In this paper, I will argue that the *Painter with a Pipe and Book* embodies what Dou would have seen as the two key aspects of the artist: his mind and his hand. This is not only a painting of a painting, but a painting about painting. It represents the most important tools of the artist: his hand, his compositional sources, and, most crucial among them, his imagination.

II. Composing the Painter

Dou reveals his inventiveness by pushing the limits of portraiture in the service of a portrait of an artist. He does this by incorporating motifs and framing devices from genre scenes and still-lifes, and by providing his painter with a setting that resembles a painter’s workshop. A Portrait Conventions and Inventions

Though this painting presents itself as a portrait, it is unusual in that the figure is shown smoking; since this activity was more common to tavern genre scenes than to portraiture, it breaks down the barrier between the genres. Indeed, the network of framing devices borrowed from other genres undermines the *Painter*’s status as a portrait in the most basic sense. A viewer recognizing elements from still-life and emblems might rightly question whether this was a portrait at all, or something more complex and ambiguous in its function.

Although the floppy hat and split jacket, which were out of fashion in Dou’s time, indicate that the figure is a painter, it is unclear whether this is an accurate likeness of Dou himself, an idealized self-portrait, or a different painter altogether. Some scholars discern an acceptable degree of similarity between the man’s flowing locks, hazel eyes and wide, open gaze with more certain self-portraits such as that from c.1635-1638, now in the Cheltenham Art Gallery and Museums, in which he dons a similar costume (figure 2). Others disagree with this attribution, asserting that the likeness is not literal enough for such a reading. However, the
suggestive similarity in facial features and hair style support the reading of the Painter at the very least as a generalized self-portrait. The vagueness of resemblance may have been a deliberate choice on Dou’s part to make the viewer question the precise identity of the figure. This hint of duality, of being able to read the most prominent feature of the composition in two distinct ways, is the first of many elements that defy a single interpretation. This ambiguity also functions to make the figure a kind of generic painter who can stand in for all painters.

The half-length depiction of an artist shown leaning on a ledge was a well-established format by the seventeenth century that can be traced back directly through Rembrandt to the Renaissance. Only a few years before Dou completed the Painter, Rembrandt composed two self-portraits—an etching and a painting—in which he is shown close to the picture plane with his arm resting on a ledge (figures 3 and 4). The repetition of the format suggests that it had resonance as part of Rembrandt’s artistic identity, especially as the self-portraits were based unabashedly on two famous portraits by two of the most renowned artists of the Italian Renaissance: Titian’s Portrait of a Bearded Man from c.1511-1515, which was thought to represent the poet Ariosto (figure 5), and Raphael’s Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione from c.1515 (figure 6). Both portraits had passed through Amsterdam and were known through engravings. Rembrandt had sketched the latter when it was up for auction in 1639 (figure 7).

By adopting the format of the portraits of Castiglione, the great scholar and social authority of the Renaissance who penned the hugely influential code of behavior, the Book of the Courtier, and of a famous poet, Rembrandt presents himself as a knowledgeable and learned artist; the compositional similarity demonstrates not only his familiarity with the great works of art of the past, but a familiarity with the ideals the men he mimics had come to represent. Rembrandt literally fashions his own identity after the great thinkers of the previous era. In turn,
for his *Painter*, Dou adopts the composition that Rembrandt had effectively transformed into a mode for representing the artist. The emphatic pose of Dou’s artist does not echo the calm collectedness of Rembrandt’s self-portraits or Raphael’s portrayal of Castiglione. Rather, the Painter leans emphatically through the window, his whole upper body supported on the ledge by one hand and his elbow. Further, Dou refuses to definitively depict his own features, thereby turning a potential self-portrait into an allegorical artist. Dou’s artist does not sit idly gazing out at the viewer as Raphael’s and Rembrandt’s portraits do: Dou activates the portrait by showing his painter smoking a pipe.

In the seventeenth century, tobacco was thought to stimulate inspiration and artists are often shown smoking in a moment of quiet contemplation. Both Pieter Jansz Codde and Anthonie Palamedesz had previously depicted themselves smoking while sitting by their easels in their studios (figure 8 and 9). Codde’s work is visible behind him. Palamedesz gazes directly at the panel set up on his easel, perhaps scrutinizing his work in progress or thinking about his next project. Both of these artists show themselves dressed in their finest, with lace collars and elaborate cuffs, fancy shirtwaists, and high boots. Dou’s Painter is more clearly a working artist wearing more ordinary attire. Yet, he is not as visually connected to a work in progress as Codde and Palamedesz.

That Dou’s painter is disassociated from his work edges him closer to the potential danger of idle smoking. The act of smoking, like drinking, could symbolize both a thoughtful state of mind and idleness. Low-life scenes of men smoking to excess in taverns, such as Adriaen van Ostade’s *A Drinker and a Smoker* from the late 1650s (figure 10), which abounded during the seventeenth century, show the logical consequence of overindulgence. When the painter is concerned, smoking points to the fine line between creative idleness and unproductive
languor. Moderation is clearly the key. Dou’s Painter has the potential to be too idle, especially
given the juxtaposition of the momentarily idle artist against the diligently working figures in the
background.\textsuperscript{10}

Differences in lighting further invite comparison between the painter, who is lit by a
strong light source, and the figures over his shoulder, who share the low light of a single
candle.\textsuperscript{11} In turning away from the space of his studio to look out of the window onto the world
and onto nature, the painter embraces the light that bathes his features and the surrounding
window frame. The light does not penetrate the studio, the space where the hand of the artist, a
hand adept at artifice and deception, is at work. Though Dou’s Painter straddles the line between
the idle and inspired smoker, the message conveyed is that the artist has simply left his easel to
contemplate for a time.

The inspired artist engaged in various activities appears often in Dou’s oeuvre. For
example, the Violin Player from 1653 shows three artists, one of whom leans through an arched
opening playing the instrument (figure 11). Playing and listening to music were also thought to
stimulate the artist’s imagination. Of the two artists in the studio space that opens behind the
arched window, one smokes a pipe in a pose similar to that of the Painter and the other is shown
standing as he prepares materials.

In the Painter, the notion of inspiration is further emphasized by the prominent placement
of the book whose pages spill over the ledge. The composition visually links the book and pipe
since both project the same distance through the window. It is impossible to discern what type of
book this is: it appears to be an illustrated printed book, which could be an artist’s manual, an
illustrated history or Bible, or perhaps even an emblem book. In any case, the book suggests the
artist’s erudition and indicates that he actively seeks knowledge. That the artist was interrupted
while reading, the most intellectual pursuit, underscores the idea that the artist must be well educated. By making the pages of the book project as far through the niche and into the viewer’s space as the Painter himself, Dou has indicated that this specific aspect is most important of the artist’s tools: Dou’s clever composition conveys that it is this education, this knowledge that the Painter offers the viewer.

B. Setting

The setting in Dou’s picture evokes a shop window from which a craftsman would display and sell his product. Yet the ledge and arched window seem more elaborate than and inconsistent with the architecture of domestic or shop spaces in seventeenth-century Leiden. This suggests both that the space depicted is removed from everyday life and that it and the figure it frames should be understood on an allegorical or symbolic level.

It has been argued that a direct pictorial source for the imaginary arched window is to be found among Jost Ammans’s illustrations for the popular publication *Das Ständebuch*, the Book of Trades, by Hans Sachs, which first appeared in 1568. Each trade is represented by a merchant or craftsman in his workshop, many of which are shown through an arched window. Typically, the tools of the trade are visible inside the shop and the craftsman’s products are displayed on the ledge, on view to tempt the passing customer and the reader alike. For example, the ledge of *Der Holkdrechssler*, the Wood Turner, is piled with table legs, bowls and vases; inside, instruments hang on the wall and raw material is stacked against the back wall (figure 12). Each image represents a type of tradesman engaged in representative activities of his craft; thus, The Wood Turner shapes a piece of lumber, The Glasses Maker measures a lens, and The Lantern Maker pounds metal. Similarly, through the arched window format, Dou’s Painter is
identified as a craftsman whose shop opens to the out-of-doors by way of a window from which he could display and sell his paintings.

*Das Ständebuch*, along with other representations of tradesmen and, presumably, the real-life workshops of Dou’s native Leiden, supplied Dou with the stepping off point for an entirely new genre of painting, the grocery scene.\(^{15}\) For example, *The Grocery* from the 1640s shows a bunch of carrots, onions and a large jug laid out on the ledge (figure 13). Customers and additional merchandise are visible inside. It is clear that Dou conceived of the ledge as a place to lay out his wares—sometimes in a literal sense as in the grocery scenes, and sometimes in a more figural sense, as in both earlier and later self-portraits in which he lays out the tools and attributes of the artist (see figures 2 and 27). The ledge in the *Painter* works in a similar manner: Dou chose this prominent space to display the artist’s book, the symbol of his imagination.

Though customers are not always present in the studio scenes of *Das Ständebuch*, their presence or the possible presence is always implied. The construction of the stone outer walls and niche suggests that the studio faced a street and in a few examples, such as *Der Brillenmacher*, the Glasses Maker, a customer inspects the goods and interacts with the craftsman (figure 14). A similar interaction can be read in the *Painter*: as the figure leans over the ledge, directly engaging the viewer, he draws her into considering what the figure, the artist, and therefore Dou, has to offer.\(^{16}\)

Unlike Ammans’s images, which depict typical representatives of different trades naturalistically, Dou’s image in an allegory. For though the arched window recalls these shop scenes, it is visually more akin to framing devices from other, more allegorical genres. The rounded window with a ledge, which is more niche-like in form than window-like, recalls a favored device of still-life painting. For example, Jacques de Gheyn II frames his *Vanitas* from
1603 in a niche (figure 15). This is possibly the first painting to deal exclusively with *memento mori* as each element—the skull, bubble, vase of flowers and the smoking urn—refers to the transience of life and warns against squandering time. A Leiden contemporary of Dou, Johannes Hannot, also used the niche to frame his *Still Life with a Lobster* (figure 16). Further, Hannot’s composition and de Gheyn’s *Large Flower Piece* from 1615 show that the pairing of a curtain with the niche format derived from still-lifes as well (figure 17).

Evoking the inherently symbolic genre of still-life painting, the niche-like window emphasizes that the painter is to be understood as allegorical. By referring to yet another genre, Dou enhances his characterization of the ideal painter by displaying the artist’s knowledge, and therefore his own ability to meld a number of compositional devices into a single coherent whole. Dou conflates distinct genres, expanding the possible reading of what is, at the core, a portrait. Dou’s merging of motifs from genres unrelated to portraiture not only enlivens the composition, it also enhances the meaning of the scene he depicts. The ambiguities of the window-niche confirm Dou’s knowledge of the use of these forms in other contexts and the supremacy of his imagination to blend them together to serve a new purpose. The intellectual expertise of the actual artist of the painting, Dou himself, is evident through the composition, not only through the prominence of the thinking figure, but through the fact that the two forms—the allegorical niche and real-life shop window—are skillfully, seemingly effortlessly woven together into a coherent whole to the point where each refers to more than one genre.

Most importantly, the framing device of the arched window, which is both an architectural motif, a shop window, and a pictorial device, signaling an allegorical setting, serves to highlight the artificial aspects of the painting, suggesting that what the viewer sees is not *real*. Yet what is depicted is presented in the most “real” style of illusionistic painting. Dou thus
creates a tension between what is shown (a highly conceptual space) and the manner (highly
illusionistic) in which it is shown.

III. “Magic with the Brush”

The Painter not only represents Dou’s imagination; it also highlights his manual skill in a
number of ways. The figures working in the background, so emphatically juxtaposed with the
central figure, refer to the craft performed to complete the painting. That they are covered by a
parasol strengthens the identification of the Painter with Dou himself, for Dou was infamous for
his meticulous studio practices, which included using a parasol to protect his paintings and tools
from dust while working, as seen in his Self Portrait from c.1645 (figure 18). However, his
manual ability is more completely embodied by the illusionism of the painting, which is most
concentrated on the objects closest to the viewer, especially the curtain, cartellino, and book.
Dou uses these motifs to draw attention to his proficiency in illusionistic painting and to
highlight the second important tool of the artist: his hand.

The following sections analyze the illusionistic style of the Painter—considering both its
role in formulating meaning and Dou’s pivotal part in making it not only an identifying feature
of his own art, but also the representative style of his home town, Leiden. Further, I will
examine the meaning derived from the combination of certain motifs with this style. I will also
explore the role of deceptive artifice within the parameters of the portrait of the allegorical artist
and suggest ways in which it refers back to Dou.

A. Framing the Illusion

As discussed in the previous section, the window is neither truly an allegorical niche nor
a naturalistic shop window though it shares elements of each. Its close similarity to the still-life
niche is echoed in the function of this compositional element as employed in the Painter. The shallow space of the still-life niche helps focus the viewer’s attention on a limited range of objects and figures contained within. Further, since both the face of the niche and the objects shown within closely parallel the surface of the panel, close inspection of the objects naturally leads to close inspection of the finely painted surface itself. In the seventeenth century, still-life painting was inherently associated with illusionism and the genre was often a vehicle through which artists displayed their skill in surface rendering.  

Early in his career, Dou specialized in still-lifes, using them to hone his expertise in illusionism. An example that dates to approximately the same year as the Painter is a pair of pendants Still-Life with Hourglass, Pencase, and Print and Still-Life with Book and Purse (figures 19 and 20). These tightly focused compositions show off his talent as he effectively differentiates between the glass of the timepiece, the soft leather purse, and three different qualities of paper: the stained edges of the tightly closed book, the battered pages of the book resting on its edge, and an unfurled sheet bearing a print.

The framing element in the Painter similarly, though in a slightly different way, focuses the viewer’s attention on the illusionistic passages by pushing certain elements, the trompe l’oeil curtain and the cartellino in particular, into the viewer’s space. The niche format is especially conducive to trompe l’oeil effects: since the face of the niche so closely parallels the picture plane, the two practically become one and therefore, anything in front of the niche seems to belong to the viewer’s space, not the space of the painting.

The ledge of the niche is a particularly appropriate space for Dou to arrange his nexus of illusions and deceptions, for it draws attention to them by making them the most prominent elements. Dou not only combined the form and function of the arched window from Das
Ständebuch, he transformed it to emphasize his own skill in illusionism and, more generally, the artist’s ability to deceive. As the craftsmen in Amman’s prints arrange their products to capture the attention of the passerby, the “services” Dou offers on his ledge include his learnedness—represented not only by the book but also by this witty web of motifs—and his skill in illusionism, which is heightened by the format of the window niche, which pushes the most illusionistic elements of both the painting (the curtain) and the “painting” (the cartellino and book) into the viewer’s space.

The association of an illusionistic figure leaning on or over a ledge was gaining popularity at the time that Dou completed the Painter. Only a short time before, Rembrandt painted a Girl at a Window (circa 1645, Dulwich Picture Gallery, London) which shows a young maid resting her elbows on a ledge that we assume faces outside (figure 21). She gazes out at the viewer, one hand at her throat fingering a gold chain. An anecdote published in Paris by the French critic and theorist Roger de Piles in his Cours de peinture par principes from about sixty years after the painting was completed tells this tale:

Rembrandt was well aware that in painting one may, without too much difficulty, deceive the eye in representing immobile and inanimate objects; and not content with this fairly common artifice, he strove after the means whereby to trick the eye with living bodies. He tested this on others with the portrait of his servant girl, which he placed in his window so that the whole aperture was filled with his canvas. All those who saw it were deceived, until, when the painting had been there for several days and the girl’s posture always remained the same, everyone began to realize they had been tricked.22

De Piles bought the painting and it remained in his possession throughout his life, which suggests that he had a vested interest in proclaiming the painting’s charms.23 This anecdote, whether or not de Piles was recording a faithful account an event that took place in Amsterdam, shows how these tropes of successful illusionism, especially when used to laud the praises of a famous artist, were circulating and probably well known.24
Another portrait by Rembrandt of the following year also shows a figure forcefully breaking the surface of the work: the etched portrait of Jan Cornelis Sylvius (figure 22). Sylvius appears to project through the page on which the etching was printed just as Dou’s Painter bends forward through the face of the niche. Both figures also finger the pages of a book laid out on the ledge in front of them. Dou was likely aware of Rembrandt’s work, not only because the older artist was worked in Leiden for a number of years, but also because Dou had been Rembrandt’s first apprentice two decades before.

Previously in this study, we saw how the composition of Dou’s Painter looked back to Rembrandt’s self-portraits of 1639 and 1640, which in turn looked back to two of the most famous portraits of the Italian Renaissance. Through further compositional and stylistic similarities to Rembrandt’s Girl at a Window and the portrait of Sylvius, Dou incorporates a number of motifs employed independently by Rembrandt, thus displaying his imagination and his ability to emulate—to imitate and surpass—the compositions of his former master and his peers.

Dou pushes the connection between the composition (including the ledge, the window niche, the cartellino, book and curtain) and the illusionistic style further by making them interdependent on each other: the composition highlights the trompe l’oeil effects and illusionism endows the composition with a deeper meaning than each motif had in its original genre or its original source. In other words, the illusionistic handling of the elements borrowed from other compositions, such as Rembrandt’s portraits and self-portraits and the Girl at a Window, brings with it more layers of meaning than what the motifs had in their original context. Further, the way in which Dou successfully blends compositional motifs with his skillful illusionistic style results in a painting that embodies the two tools of the artist—his mind and his hand.
B. The Man behind the Curtain

The curtain is the most immediate motif both compositionally and illusionistically in the picture. Not only is it the object closest to the viewer, it is also the most illusionistic element of the painting. The rendering of the curtain is so detailed that the cloth can be identified as a kind of finely woven silk called *toers*. The fabric is attached with brass rings to a curtain rod, which is fastened on one side to the simple black ebony frame that surrounds the niche. The hinge mechanism would allow for the rod to swing out into the viewer’s space. Specks of light glinting off the rings and the slender brass rod contrast sharply with the comparatively dark niche. The visual prominence of the rod, rings, and curtain suggest that these are particularly important features of the painting. Since it is the only object to be shown life-sized, the painted curtain indicates that the entire work should be read as life-sized. Therefore, the curtain plays a vital role in signaling to the viewer that the work is a painting of a small-scale painting.

Actual curtains often covered paintings in seventeenth-century homes to protect the surface from light and dust. This added protection suggests that what is beneath is particularly valuable and worthy of that safeguard. Pulling the curtain aside to unveil the precious object underneath also heightens the sense of revelation and implies a privilege of viewing. Though perhaps not surprised by the presence of the curtain upon first glance, the viewer was likely to be taken aback by the fact that the curtain is painted, or, at the very least, slightly disoriented to see an object that usually accompanied a painting in actual practice replicated in paint.

Too, the knowledgeable viewer would immediately have associated the painted curtain with the well-known ancient legend of the competition between Zeuxis and Parrhasius. The story tells of a competition between two artists to paint the most illusionistic scene possible; though Zeuxis manages to trick a flock of birds into pecking at a painted bunch of grapes, his
skill is trumped by Parhassius, who fools even Zeuxis into trying to draw aside a painted curtain. This trope of imitation and deception was important in art theory and criticism of Dou’s time as the literal source of the painted curtain motif, as a paradigm for artists to emulate, and as a framework in which critics praised and criticized painting. The legend exemplified the accomplishment of flawless illusionism, of a trompe l’oeil painting so effective that it fooled even a human being and moreover, a fellow artist. The association of the painted curtain with Pliny’s story was clearly in the minds of Dou’s contemporaries. In a poem of 1662, Dirk Traudenius dubbed Dou den Hollandschen Parrhasius, the Dutch Parrhasius, and wrote, “If Zeuxis saw this banquet, he would be deceived again:/ Here lies no paint, but life and spirit on the panel/ Dou does not paint, oh no, he performs magic with the brush.”

Traudenius’s praise is indicative, for it was the artist’s meticulously painted illusionistic surfaces that initially earned him recognition and later came to exemplify his accomplishments. Even early in his career, Dou’s style was considered an innovation associated with his home town of Leiden in particular. Though a few early works demonstrate a reliance on his former master Rembrandt’s subject matter, Dou quickly forged his own artistic identity by specializing in small scale, finely painted, illusionistic genre pictures. Other contemporary artists and students quickly began imitating Dou’s style and scale, establishing a group of artists that are now called the fijnschilders, the fine painters. They specialized in still lifes as well as images of everyday domestic scenes such as Frans van Mieris the Elder’s The Love Letter from 1671 (figure 23) and market scenes such as Gabriel Metsu’s The Poulterer from 1662 (figure 24). Common imagery also included artists and musicians such as Willem van Mieris’s The Trumpeter from 1700 (figure 25) and Dou’s own The Violin Player from 1653 (see figure 11).
Due to his role in founding this style, Dou was highly respected in his hometown. In his time, Dou possibly enjoyed even greater fame and fortune than his painting master. Prices for Dou’s paintings rose quickly as he became the highest paid artist in the city. His success was evidenced by the fact that he was favored with semi-permanent patronage: Pieter Spiering, the son of a highly successful tapestry merchant, paid a considerable yearly fee for the right of first refusal. This arrangement suggests that Dou had freedom in choosing his subject matter since he was not strictly limited to working within the parameters of a patron’s wishes. Personal liberty in creative choice was a great privilege that few artists enjoyed and this situation denoted high status for a painter and might have been conducive to Dou’s relatively free and inventive merging of genres. Further, collectors all over Europe vied for the Leiden master’s works.

That Dou was satisfied to remain in his native town for his entire career, even supposedly refusing an invitation to paint in the court of Charles II of England, suggests that he was proud of his esteemed status in the city and perhaps of the city itself. By the end of the sixteenth century, Leiden had developed into a thriving market city due partly to its position between Amsterdam and The Hague. Further, Holland’s first Protestant university was established in Leiden in 1575. As Leiden emerged as a major cultural hub, citizens developed great pride in their homeland, and artists and scholars celebrated their roots in the city. Dou was among the most prized treasures because of his development of a new painting style that would draw attention to Leiden as a major center for artistic production.

This concern for regional promotion motivated Dou’s first biographer, Jan Orlers’s publication Beschrijvinge der Stad Leyden, Description of the City of Leiden, which first appeared in 1641. As suggested by his book’s title, Orlers was primarily interested in celebrating the city’s past and present by lauding the accomplishments of its most famous and
influential natives. Orlers specifically praised Dou’s illusionistic style. In a comparatively
detailed section on Dou’s work, Orlers claimed that “everyone seeing these same [paintings]
must be amazed at their highly finished neatness and curiousness.” In his History of Leiden of
1672, Simon van Leeuwen also singled out Dou, stating that he was “the excellent small-scale
painter who knew how to depict his living subjects…with such perfection that his work seemed
so real [that it] could scarcely be distinguished from life.”

Ultimately, it was the German artist Joachim von Sandrart, Dou’s most notorious
biographer, who most closely linked Dou’s working methods with the production of his style.
Von Sandrart claimed that Dou stored his instruments in a sealed chest and that, before
beginning to paint, Dou would allow any dust that had been kicked up to settle. Further, the
artist supposedly made his own brushes and ground his own pigments on glass. This last habit
was likely influenced by Dou’s early training in the craft of glass painting, which he studied in
the two most successful shops in Leiden, those of his father, Douwe Jansz., and Peter
Couwenhorn. These experiences probably provided Dou with the steady hand needed to
master such a fine style; further, his method of applying multiple layers of bright, saturated
colors may have been informed by the glazing technique he learned early in his career.

Because of his meticulous work ethic and style, von Sandrart exclaimed that Dou was “a perfect
master of all the principles of art; which, united with consummate skill and labor, enabled him to
produce the most perfect specimens that ever came from the easel of a painter.”

It was Philip Angel’s opinion, however, that sealed the young artist’s reputation. Dou
was only twenty-eight years old when Angel delivered a speech naming him the ideal painter.
Angel’s lecture, originally given on St Luke’s Day and later published as Lof de Schilderkonst,
In Praise of the Art of Painting, was to justify the creation of a separate guild for painters. Angel
laid out the tenets that he considered the most important for contemporary painting: he suggested that the artist “follow life as closely as possible” and elaborated that “if he [the artist] manages to imitate life in such a way that people judge that it approaches real life without being able to detect in it the manner of the master who made it, such a spirit deserves praise and honor and shall be ranked above all others.” Angel referred to “the perfect and excellent Gerrit Dou,” who embodied all of these qualities. Further, Angel believed that Dou effectively incorporated an additional quality into the fine, “neat” manner that Angel expounded: a “curious looseness” (curieuse lossicheyt). That was important in giving the work a sense of life and movement. This praise implied reproach to artists who painted very finely but in an overly mechanical style. Angel stated that “neatness without looseness does not amount to much…If, then, someone chooses neatness for his study, let him practice that which is perseveringly observed by Gerrit Dou, for whom no praise is sufficient, namely a meticulous looseness.”

The Painter exemplifies the meticulous style Dou’s biographers admired and also sets the artist firmly within the development of the burgeoning artistic trend within Leiden. Through the small scale of the feigned painting and by including the painted curtain to make the picture read as a painting of a painting, Dou highlights his ability not only to craft but also to imitate cleverly his own style. With the curtain, Dou displayed his consummate skill in illusionism, adding extra layers of associated meaning, and complicating what the viewer sees.

Even if the painting is understood as a painting of a painting, inconsistencies in the illusionism both unsettle the viewer and reveal Dou’s ability to straddle a number of levels of “reality.” Of course, the problem of the small scale of the figure is solved by understanding that portion as a painted painting. Nevertheless, the figure’s direct gaze and the illusion that he breaks not only through the surface of the niche, but also through the surface of the panel itself.
into the space of the curtain, which is supposedly outside his realm of reality, disturbs this solution. Further, the consistent light source highlights both the “painted” and “real” elements with equal intensity, and there is no distinction in style between the “painted” and “real” elements to help the viewer figure out the scheme. These elements make the viewer question the “reality” of what is represented.

The placement of the figure in the same space as the painting is deliberately ambiguous and unsettling. The painted curtain in the Painter is Dou’s only truly trompe l’oeil curtain, and, as such, it shows off not only his illusionistic painting style but also his ability to confound viewer expectation. In Dou’s other compositions, curtains belong strictly to the inner realm of the painting, where they are used simply as framing devices, as in his two early self-portraits dated c.1635-1638 and c.1645 (see figures 2 and 18), or are tied to architectural features, as in The Doctor from c.1660-1665 (figure 26) and Self-Portrait from c.1665 (figure 27). In these examples, the curtain has been pinned back to allow the viewer access to the scene as well as to facilitate the action of the figure, as the doctor inspects the flask and the artist reads the book on the ledge. The Painter even includes a curtain in the space of the studio, pinned to the inner surface of the window. Though technically part of the painting in the most literal sense, the illusionistic green curtain in the Painter is distinctly set apart from Dou’s other curtains; due to the scenario Dou sets up as a painted painting, the curtain is removed entirely from the projected space of the painting within. The removal of the curtain from the space of the window emphasizes the immediacy of revelation in the Painter, for when faced with the situation of a painted curtain as opposed to a curtained window, viewer participation is implied: since the painting would have remained covered when not in view, the onlooker has the impression that the curtain has recently been pulled aside so the viewer could enjoy the work.
Generally speaking, the function of a painted curtain shifts according to context and style in other genres as well. A comparison between Dou’s *Painter* and a similar arrangement by Rembrandt reveals two distinct conceptions of the function of the painted curtain. The *Holy Family* of 1646 is Rembrandt’s only composition to include a painted curtain (figure 28). A brass rod stretches across the span of an elaborate, almost architectural arch, revealing an intimate domestic scene with the Mother and Child in seventeenth-century Dutch costume. Joseph works in the dim background and a cat curls next to the small fire. Like the *Painter*, the curtain rod casts a shadow on the underlying “painting.” The respective dates of Rembrandt’s and Dou’s compositions render it impossible to know which came first, but it is clear that each artist used the motif for different ends. Comprised of broad brushstrokes that are visible even from a distance, Rembrandt’s curtain is neither as detailed, nor as illusionistic as Dou’s. This suggests that Rembrandt’s painted curtain was conceived primarily as a motif, and that it was not meant to trick the viewer. It acknowledges the tradition of protecting a special painting with a curtain and of illusionistic painted curtains. It could also be derived from the association of curtains for use in religious contexts, in which images and objects would be dramatically revealed at key points during the liturgy. Dou makes a much more concerted effort to fool the viewer into believing in the dimensionality of his curtain. Rembrandt’s curtain is suggestively illusionistic; Dou’s curtain is explicitly illusionistic.

The comparison of the *Painter* with Rembrandt’s *Holy Family* highlights the fact that for his portrait of the artist, Dou incorporates yet another motif employed by Rembrandt. We have seen how Dou cleverly combined several compositions in the *Painter* that Rembrandt developed independently of each other—the figure breaking the picture plane as in the portrait of Sylvius, the figure leaning illusionistically through a window as in the *Girl at the Window* (see figure 21),
and the tradition of showing an artist leaning on a ledge as seen in Rembrandt’s self-portraits of 1639 and 1640 (figures 3 and 4). Moreover, in Rembrandt’s work, the curtain motif appears in a genre unrelated to portraiture; by using it in his allegorical portrait of a painter, Dou once again displays his creativity in combining motifs. Dou’s emulation of Rembrandt was complete: by weaving these motifs that Rembrandt used separately together, Dou surpassed his former painting master. To his inventive, almost cumulative composition, Dou adds another dimension with his illusionistic style, a key component of his artistic identity.

C. Reading Deception: the Cartellino versus the Book

Thus far discussion of Dou’s illusionism has concentrated on the window frame, the figure leaning through it, and the curtain, which seems to project into the viewer’s space. As mentioned earlier, the pages of the artist’s book also project beyond the face of the window niche. The book in turn casts a shadow on the face of the niche, guiding the viewer’s eye to the cartellino attached to the front. The cartellino is the most illusionistic element in the “painting” within the painting.

The cartellino, which has a long history as a trompe l’oeil motif, has the ability to either participate in or destroy the projected “truth” of an illusion. As a trope of illusionism, the peeling cartellino dates to the Italian Renaissance where it sometimes appears attached to the surface of the canvas as, in Fra Angelico’s panel painting, Armadio degli Argenti (figure 29), or attached to an object represented within the painting, usually a niche, as in Bartolommeo Vivarini’s St James Polyptych (figure 30). In the former example, the cartellino negates the illusion of depth as it calls attention to and flattens the surface of the panel. In the second example, the paper is naturalistically attached to the face of the niche, thus confirming the three-dimensionality of the illusion.
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In the case of the *Painter*, the cartellino, like so many other elements, straddles the various levels of reality depicted, for though it is attached to the surface of the window ledge, which belongs to the painted painting, its curling edge seems to project into the same space as the curtain and is illuminated by the same intensity of light. Dou clearly conceived of the niche, and especially the face of the niche, as an apt site to both display his illusionistic skill and overtly refer to the deceptive power of illusionism. In nine works that post-date the *Painter*, Dou places a well-known frieze by Francois Duquesnoy called *Putti teasing a goat* on the face of the niche. The frieze, which shows a goat charging at a masked putto, blatantly refers to painting’s ability to deceive (figure 31). The image warns that, just as the goat is fooled by the trickery of the putti, the unwary viewer’s perception of reality can be fooled. The frieze has particular resonance in paintings that include artists, in which it refers to the artist’s ability to deceive the viewer, as, for example, in the *Violin Player* (see figure 11).

In the *Painter*, the face of the niche straddles the threshold of the space of the painting within the painting and the entire image itself, which makes it a particularly appropriate space to allude to painting’s deceptive power. Dou exploits this liminal space to construct a further ambiguity by affixing the slip of paper to the front of the ledge. As the viewer moves in to inspect the cartellino, he or she is awarded first with the artist’s signature. Then, on closer inspection, the artifice of the painting is revealed as the brushstrokes, no matter how minute and precise, come clearly into focus. Thus, Dou visually links illusionism with the most direct reference to the artist himself, his name, while forcing the viewer to participate in destabilizing the cohesion of the illusion.

The other prominent site of text, the book, is doubly emphasized by its proximity to the cartellino and its placement on the ledge, where it projects nearly as far as the Painter himself.
From a distance the pages appear legible. As the viewer moves in, however, the pseudo-writing remains obscure—nothing more than mere suggestions of text daubed onto the panel. The book retains its ambiguity despite the viewer’s logical expectation to be able to discern traces of writing or illustrations. Close inspection of the surface yields an opposite result from the cartellino. The pair of motifs perhaps allude to the fallacy of trompe l'oeil painting by reminding the viewer that all is not as it seems, that he or she should be on guard. The combination of the signed cartellino and the illegible book embodies the vagaries of illusionism as well as the artist’s ability to move back and forth between the viewer’s expectations and the reality of what he (the artist) presents. These ambiguities represent the artist’s ability to display a variety of levels of legibility.

IV. Conclusion

Successful illusionistic painting required great skill. Only the finest painters could hope to achieve the highly polished, detailed surfaces needed to fool the eye and make the viewer question reality. Dou’s meticulous working practices and steady hand stood him in good stead when painting this work, and his extensive knowledge and imagination served him well in conceptualizing the Painter with a Pipe and Book.

The style and subject matter of the Painter with a Pipe and Book also serves to elevate the status of the artist. Portraits of artists and artists’ self-portraits were made to enhance their social and intellectual status, to show off their contribution, and to insert themselves into the flow of artistic creation. Self-portraits were a space for artists to display their talents and the themes that were most important to them as artists. A portrait of the etcher Wenceslaus Hollar, an illustrator who specialized in emblem design, from c.1649 (after a painting by Jean Meyssens)
shows the artist seated at his work table (figure 32). His tools are laid out in front of him and he holds up a newly completed etched plate of a composition after Raphael’s now-lost painting of St Catherine. Hollar chose to commemorate himself associated with his profession. His art is obviously a large component, one might say the primary component, of his identity in this portrait.

The Painter with a Pipe and Book represents Dou’s artistic identity, especially his skill at illusionism. By manipulating multiple layers of “reality,” which constantly shift and surprise the viewer, Dou presents himself as the master of deceptions. Since illusionistically painted works were, on the most basic level, meant to trick the viewer, the style carries with it an inherent danger for the viewer, of making the viewer misconstrue the reality of the world around them. A work from later in Dou’s career, The Quack from 1652, takes the concept of deception as its central theme (figure 33, Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam). Both the artist shown leaning through a window overlooking a crowd and the quack in the center of the group are masters of illusion: though the quack’s products look legitimate, they are more than likely useless and a waste of money; and the painter makes an effort to deceive the eye through his attention to surface detail, skillfully differentiating between the qualities of clothing, stone, bark, fur, rugs and flesh. Though the artist is a spectator himself, through his direct engagement with the viewer he draws the viewer in, making her a member of the crowd below. However, the self-portrait here should be understood as symbolic, not naturalistic; Dou presents himself as the mediator between the viewer’s world and the painted illusion. This interaction between viewer and painter, like the artist’s pose leaning through the window harkens, back to the earlier Painter in which Dou sets up the ultimate deception in attempting to trick the viewer into believing that the curtain and frame are real.
The *Painter*, however, adds ambiguity to deception through the three motifs arranged on and around the window: the curtain, cartellino, and book. These elements relate directly to the surface of the painting both through the skillful illusionistic style Dou uses, which calls attention to the actual painted surface, and by virtue of the fact that they all appear to exist outside of their respective surfaces. The curtain illusionistically projects past the painted painting and the cartellino and book seem to project past the surface of that inner painting itself.

The sophisticated viewer of Dou’s *Painter with a Pipe and Book* would delight in the multiplicity of meanings conveyed through its incorporation of motifs and constructions derived from a number of other genres, especially those unrelated to the fundamental genre of this work, portraiture. This work embodies all that Dou has to offer the viewer: his mind and his hand. In this sense, the *Painter with a Pipe and Book* both represents his artistic identity and testifies to his skill and imagination.
Figure 1. Gerrit Dou, *Painter with a Pipe and Book*, c.1647 (oil on panel). Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum.
Figure 2. Dou, *Self-Portrait*, c.1635-1638.

Figure 3. Rembrandt, *Portait on a Stone Sill*, 1639.

Figure 4. Rembrandt, *Self-Portrait at Age (Ariosto), of 34*, 1640.

Figure 5. Titian, *Portrait of a Man*, c.1512.
Figure 6. Raphael, *Baldassare Castiglione*, c.1514-1515.

Figure 7. *Baldassare Castiglione*, after Raphael, 1639.

Figure 8. Pieter Jansz Codde, *Self-Portrait*.

Figure 9. Anthonie Palamedesz, *Self-Portrait*
Figure 10. Adriaen van Ostade, *A Drinker and a Smoker*, late 1650s.

Figure 11. Gerrit Dou, *Violin Player*, 1653

Figure 12. Jost Ammans, *Der Holksdrechssler*, 1568.
Figure 13. Dou, *The Grocery*, 1640s.

Figure 14. Ammans, *Der Brillenmacher*, 1568

Figure 15. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Vanitas*, 1603.

Figure 16. Johannes Hannot, *Still-Life with Lobster*, 1650s or 1660s.
Figure 17. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Large Flower Piece*, 1615.
Figure 18. Dou, *Self-Portrait*, c.1645.

Figure 19. Dou, *Still-Life with Hourglass, Pencase, and Print*, 1647.

Figure 20. Dou, *Still-Life with Book and Purse*, 1647.

Figure 21. Rembrandt, *Girl at a Window*, 1645.
Figure 22. Rembrandt, *Johannes Cornelisz. Sylvius*, 1646.

Figure 23. Frans van Mieris the Elder, *The Love-Letter*, 1671.

Figure 24. Gabriel Metsu, *The Poulterer*, 1662.
Figure 25. Willem van Mieris, *The Trumpter*, 1700.

Figure 26. Dou, *The Doctor*, c.1660-1665.

Figure 27. Dou, *Self-Portrait*, c.1665.

Figure 28. Rembrandt, *Holy Family*, 1646.
Figure 29. Fra Angelico, *Armadio degli Argenti*, detail of *The Three Marys at the Tomb*.

Figure 30. Bartolommeo Vivarini, *St James Polyptich*, detail.

Figure 31. François Duquesnoy, *Puttin teasing a goat*.

Figure 32. Wenceslaus Hollar, *Self-Portrait*, c. 1649.
Figure 33. Dou, *The Quack*, 1652.
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