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In 1665 the distinguished Leiden collector Johan de Bye held an exhibition of twenty-seven paintings by Gerrit Dou, including two works currently in The Leiden Collection: *Goat in a Landscape* (GD-114) and this delightful genre scene, described in De Bye's inventory as: "meysge in een venster mit 1 papegaey en koy" (a young girl in a window with one parrot and cage).[1] In this scene, a young woman leans out from behind a simple arched stone niche while holding her pet bird she has taken out of an elaborate metal cage. The girl gazes to our right with an expression of sweet anticipation enlivening her face, as though in the act of showing this rarified beauty to a companion outside of the frame. Obscuring our view into the darkened interior in which she stands is a gathered red curtain hanging from the inner edge of the niche.

The composition is known from a number of versions and copies, of which at least eleven have been recorded. This example, which resurfaced only in 1955, was unknown to early twentieth-century scholars, including Wilhelm Martin and Cornelis Hofstede de Groot, who tentatively identified other versions as Dou's original. Martin considered a now-lost painting formerly in the Gagarin Collection in St. Petersburg[2] and another version in the Musée d'Art et d'Histoire in Geneva to be autograph. The attribution of the latter work, which was also cautiously accepted by Hofstede de Groot, was later rejected by Ronni Baer, who noted that the signature was false and deemed the work to be a copy after Dou.[3]

Martin and Hofstede de Groot were correct when they questioned whether the versions they knew were the work described in De Bye's exhibition.[4] Stylistically and technically, however, the present work is characteristic of Dou's manner from the first half of the 1660s.[5] The master's versatility and boldness are evident in the overall variety of the brushwork. The modeling of the face is smooth and blended, yet distinct parallel hatching can be seen below the figure's proper right eye. The folds of the dark red curtain are modeled with short parallel lines that evoke the pattern of twill and the texture of wool (fig 1). This distinctive hatching is found often in Dou's work from the 1660s and is seen, for example, on the back of the clasping hands in *Old Man Praying* (GD-108) (fig 2).[6] In both works, the ground shows through in areas around the figures' hairline and face, and is here particularly visible along the strand of pearls around the lady's neck.

The manner in which Dou built the paint layers from the ground up, from
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![Fig 1. Detail of drapery showing hatching, Young Woman in a Niche with a Parrot and Cage, GD-105](image1)

![Fig 2. Detail of Gerrit Dou, Old Man Praying, ca. 1665–70, oil on panel, 17.8 x 12.7 cm, GD-107](image2)

![Fig 3. Detail of blue-fronted Amazon parrot, Young Woman in a Niche with a Parrot and Cage, GD-105](image3)
distant elements to foreground objects, is characteristic of his painting technique. For example, Dou painted the lower portion of the red curtain and the woman’s apron before depicting the birdcage so that the reds would show between the cage’s wires; subsequently he painted the parrot.[7] Similarly, the range of tonalities with which Dou depicted the woman’s hair at her hairline is comparable to techniques observed in his other paintings (see Portrait of a Woman in Profile, GD-110).

A final argument in favor of the painting’s status as the prime version is the anatomic-ally accurate depiction of the parrot perched on the young woman’s index finger. The species is a South American bird known as the blue-fronted Amazon (Amazona aestiva), indigenous to parts of Brazil, Paraguay, Bolivia, and Argentina.[8] Its features include a blue and yellow (or white) face with distinctive red feathers at the bend and tip of the wings, while its overall plumage is green (fig 3). Dou’s parrot probably appears blue rather than green because of pigment change or the loss of a yellow glaze covering the underlying blue paint through an overly aggressive restoration of the painting.[9] Dou must have based his image on an actual bird in captivity: parrots were often imported to the Netherlands during this period on ships belonging to the Dutch West India Company.[10] Though Dou accurately rendered the parrot’s features, in later versions of this work the bird’s distinctive markings, particularly the red on the feathers at the bend and tip of the wing, are often lacking.

In the seventeenth century, parrots were expensive status symbols, particularly those that survived the long journey from the New World.[11] Associated with luxury, wealth and prestige, they were especially favored pets because of their beautiful songs, exotic shapes, and colorful plumage. Their ability to emulate speech further enhanced their appeal and gave them a reputation for being excellent learners. In his Sinne-en minnebeelden of 1627, Jacob Cats pointed to this virtue in an emblem depicting a parrot in a hanging cage (fig 4), with a subtext that reads: “Dwanck, leert sanck” (Discipline teaches speech).[12] The accompanying text describes the bird in captivity as a symbol for the discipline and education that are necessary for an adult to lead an honorable and refined life.

Parrots became popular motifs in high-style Dutch genre painting, particularly beginning in the 1660s.[13] One well-known example is Frans van Mieris’s Young Woman Feeding a Parrot (FM-112) from about 1663 in the present collection, in which a young woman is shown feeding her pet.
bird while pausing from her sewing. Here the parrot has been interpreted as a symbol for the eagerness to learn, while the woman’s needlework refers to her domestic virtues of diligence and industry.\[14\]

The symbolism of birds and birdcages in genre scenes often had amorous and/or erotic connotations, sometimes subtle and sometimes not.\[15\] For example, Cats’s emblem cited above offers an additional reading where the encaged bird is seen as a metaphor for love’s sweet entrapment: “Bly, door slaverny” (Joy through captivity).\[16\] This same symbolism is found in Daniel Heinsius’s emblem, which makes use of the Petrarchian motto “Perch’io stesso mi strinsi” (For I have bound myself) and illustrates a recumbent cupid observing the sight of birds willingly flying into a cage(fig 5).\[17\] Another closely related tradition is the symbolism of a bird freed from its cage, often represented by an amorous couple who entice a bird out of its cage with a bite of food, or by a female whose bird has just escaped captivity. In both cases, this emblematic image was understood to refer to lost virginity and the loss of innocence.\[18\]

In light of the varied symbolic meanings associated with a bird and its cage, this work would undoubtedly have amused viewers with its ambiguity. Situated at the threshold of her domestic realm, the young woman has freed her parrot from its cage and, smilingly, presents it to the outside world. She appears unconcerned that in one fleeting instant her beloved bird could fly away, forever lost from her safekeeping. By depicting the very manifestation of the woman’s youthful innocence in this seemingly carefree moment, Dou invites the viewer to complete the story. Caspar Netscher captured this same idea a few years later in his Woman Feeding a Parrot of 1666 (National Gallery of Art, Washington), in which he staged a comparable scene at an arched window (fig 6). As opposed to Dou’s young woman, Netscher’s girl has a beguiling glance and a coquettish smile, suggesting that a loss of innocence may have already transpired.
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Endnotes


4. Wilhelm Martin believed that Dou made versions of his own compositions, which, in addition to the copies made after him by imitators, turns the question of versions into a
5. While Martin dated the composition to ca. 1665, Christopher White argued that Dou was the first to treat this subject matter and supposed that the painting probably dates before 1663, the signed date of Frans van Mieris’s Woman Feeding a Parrot (FM-112). He notes that Van Mieris clearly derived his inspiration from Dou. See Wilhelm Martin, *Gerard Dou, des Meisters Gemälde, Klassiker der Kunst in Gesamtausgaben* (Stuttgart, 1913), 112; Christopher White, *The Dutch Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (Cambridge, 1982), 70, no. 113.


7. Based on a photograph of a copy of the present painting that recently appeared on the market (probably equivalent with the painting that appeared at Bonhams in 1965), it is clear that the depiction of the apron, birdcage, and bird unfolded concurrently during the paint process. Ronni Baer, who provided a study photograph, suspects this version may be by a follower, possibly Pieter Cornelisz van Slingelandt (1640–91), one of Dou’s pupils (e-mail correspondence with Baer, 31 October 2012, and photograph kept on file, The Leiden Collection, New York).

8. The author would like to thank Dr. Luke Hunter of Panthera and Dr. Nancy Clum and Dr. Juan Cornejo of the Wildlife Conservation Society for their help in identifying the parrot species. For a discussion of its geographical distribution and habits, see Joseph M. Forshaw, *Parrots of the World: An Identification Guide Illustrated by Frank Knight* (Princeton and Oxford, 2006), 149, plate 112.

9. John Twilley notes that the possible removal of the yellow glazing can only be inferred but not proven (unpublished written correspondence between the author and John Twilley, conservation scientist, October 2012, kept on file, The Leiden Collection, New York).

10. When Prince Johan Maurits returned from his seven-year sojourn in Brazil as the governor of the Dutch colony between 1637 and 1644, he brought back with him countless exotic live specimens and hundreds of zoological drawings and watercolors that illustrated the enormous wealth of exotic fauna he encountered there. Two pioneering illustrations of the *Amazona aestiva* by Georg Marcgraf (1610–44) and Albert Eckhout (ca. 1610–65) were made directly after live birds in Brazil during the artists’ seven-year expedition with the prince. The drawings were kept in the prince’s palace in The Hague upon his return in 1644 and were bound into a magnificent album known as the *Libri picturati* (now housed in the Jagiellon University Library, Kraków) and given as a gift in 1652 to his friend Frederick Willem, Elector Palatine of Brandenburg. See Peter J. P. Whitehead and Marinus


12. Jacob Cats, *Sinne-en minnebeelden* “Dwanck, leert sanck. In dien de Papegay waer in het wout gebleven,/ Sy hadde daer geleyt een woef en beestigh leven;/ Maer nu sy door bedwang by menschen is geleert,/ Soo kom’t et datse spreekt, en in het hof verkeert./ Is iemant oyt gesint om eere na te jagen,/ Hy moet van eersten af, hy moet gewilligh dragen/ Al wat de tucht gebiet. Bedwang ontrent de jeught/ Wort eere met’er tijdt, en niet als enckel vreught.” (Rotterdam, 1627), no. 14


165, fig. 33a; Wayne Franits, *Paragons of Virtue: Women and Domesticity in Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting; Its Stylistic and Thematic Evolution* (New Haven and London, 1993), 22–26, 80–86. Other representations of women with parrots include Gabriel Metsu, *Woman with Sewing in a Niche*, oil on panel, 28.5 x 22 cm, Pushkin Museum, Moscow; Gabriel Metsu, *Young Lady with a Parrot*, oil on panel, 34 x 26 cm, Pushkin Museum, Moscow, no. 693; Godfried Schalcken, *Old Woman Feeding a Parrot*, oil on panel, 27.6 x 21.6 cm, The Leiden Collection, New York, no. GS-115; Pieter de Hooch, *A Woman Feeding a Parrot with a Man*, signed, oil on canvas, 50.8 x 43.8 cm, present whereabouts unknown; Pieter de Hooch, *A Couple with a Parrot*, ca. 1675–77, oil on canvas, 73 x 62 cm, Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne, no. 239; Pieter de Hooch, *Woman and Child with a Parrot*, signed and dated 1673, present whereabouts unknown.


16. “Bly, door slaverny. Dooen ick mijn eygens was, en mochte alomme sweven,/ Doen leyd’ ick even staegh een stil, en droevig leven;/ Maer na dat my de Min bracht in den soeten dwang,/ Doen weird mijn tonge los, en maeckte bly gesang;/ Ick lach, ick raes, ick speel, en schoon ick sta gefloten,/ Geen tijt heeft my verveelt, geen ding heft my verdroten;/ O soete slaverny, en aengenaem gewelt!/ Het is een minnaer vreught, dat ander lieden quelt.” Jacob Cats, *Sinne-en minnebeelden* (Rotterdam, 1627), no. 14.

17. “Als ick hebb’vry gheweest,/ ick hadde groot verlanghen/ Om vast te moghen zijn, ick moeste zijn ghevanghen,/ Ick sach het minnen aen/ het was een lieflick spel/ Waer dat ick henen sach/ het gingh al even wel:/ Ick sach de vryers aen/ ick sach haer soentjens gheven/ En soete prate-uytslaen; ick docht/ dat waer mijn leven./ My docht het gingh soo wel/ maer als ick ben int perck/ Nu word’ ick eerst ghewaer hoe dat het gaet te werck.” Daniel Heinsius, *Emblemata amatoria* (Amsterdam, 1608), no. 21.

Provenance

- Possibly Johan de Bye, Leiden, by 1665.
- (Sale, Galerie Charpentier, Paris, 7 June 1955, no. 34).
- Private collection, Paris; by descent to a private collector, United States (sale, Sotheby’s, New York, 8 June 2007, no. 212; [Otto Naumann Ltd., New York, 2007]).
- From whom acquired by the present owner in 2007.

Exhibition History

- Possibly Leiden, front room in the house of Johannes Hannot on the Breestraat, September 1665 [lent by Johan de Bye].
Masterpieces from The Leiden Collection and the Musée du Louvre,” 14 February–18 May 2019 [lent by the present owner].
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105; sale, Blondel d’Azincourt, Paris, 10 February 1783, no. 21; sale, Jacques Antoine van Dam, Dordrecht, 1 June 1829, no. 32; sale, P. J. and B. van der Meulen, de Coblenz, Amsterdam, 22 August 1850, no. 15); [Arti et Amicitiae, 1872]; Crommelin Collection, Driebergen; (sale, Van Gogh, Amsterdam, 25 November 1913, no. 340); Smidt van Gelder, 1931; from whom bequeathed to the Musée d’Art et d’Histoire, Geneva.


4. After Gerrit Dou, A Young Girl with a Parrot, signed “GDouw” lower left side, oil on panel, rounded top, dimensions unknown, whereabouts unknown, possibly equivalent with Version 3, above.


6. After Gerrit Dou, A Woman with a Parrot, oil on panel, 24.1 x 18.4 cm, whereabouts unknown. Previously (sale, Phillips, September 1965, no. 28).

7. After Gerrit Dou, Young Girl with a Parrot, oil on panel, 25 x 19.5 cm, whereabouts unknown. Previously (sale, Brussels, Trussart, 19 November 1956, no. 29).

8. Possibly Dominicus van Tol, after Gerrit Dou, Young Girl with a Parrot, oil on panel, 26 x 18.5 cm, whereabouts unknown. Previously E. Burg-Berger, Weenen, 1935.

9. Pieter van Slingeland, after Gerrit Dou, A Young Girl with a Parrot, oil on panel, 22.5 x 16.5 cm, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, inv. no. KMSsp454. Two Golden Ages: Masterpieces of Dutch and Danish Painting (Zwolle, 2001), 176, no. 70.

10. Attributed to Gerrit Dou, A Girl with a Parrot Cage at a Window, oil on panel, 36.5 x 29.8 cm, The John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia, inv. no. 432.

11. After Gerrit Dou, A Young Girl with a Parrot, oil on panel, support and dimensions unknown, whereabouts unknown. Previously Dr. L. Weiler, Strasbourg 1963.

Technical Summary

The support is a vertically grained oak panel made from one board from a tree with a presumed fell date after 1587. The grain is slightly skewed to the vertical axis. There are some irregular notches or gauges around the outer edges and there is a peg-hole on the left side of the reverse, indicating that the panel may have been reused timber or cut down from a larger panel. The top of the panel is arched, following the shape of the painted niche in the composition. There are no bevels on the reverse, but the panel has not been thinned.

Dou prepared the panel with a thin, light ground, which does not obscure the texture of the woodgrain. It can be seen around the edges of the panel and through the young woman’s thinly painted apron. The ground is radio-opaque, highlighting the pattern of the woodgrain in the X-radiographs and indicating that it may contain a lead-based pigment.

The paint was thinly and smoothly applied. The paint of the curtain is slightly raised in comparison to that of the sitter’s hand, indicating the hand was painted first. The bars of the birdcage were painted on top of the sitter’s apron, and the red curtain and the parrot were painted on top of the birdcage.

The X-radiograph shows that the woman was originally painted with a broader smile, and her proper right eye originally gazed upward. The X-radiograph also shows some undefined shapes in the area of the curtain, indicating a compositional change in this area. Infrared photography at 780, 850, and 1000 nm indicates that the fingers of the woman’s hand holding the parrot were originally more curled.

The painting is in excellent condition. The panel bears a slight convex warp when viewed from the front and there is a small vertical split extending 3.8 cm down from the right side of the rounded edge. There are paint losses along the edges of the panel and there is damage along the edge near the bottom right corner. The paint has become slightly transparent with age, especially in the sitter’s face and arm. It was treated in 2007–8.

Technical Summary Endnotes

1. Ian Tyers, dendrochronological report, November 2010.
2. Ian Tyers, dendrochronological report, November 2010.