Beweeglijkheid embodied: on the corporeal and sensory dimensions of a famous emotion term

Herman Roodenburg

In 1753, the Scottish minister James Fordyce (1720-1796) published his *Essay on the Action Proper for the Pulpit*, a tract on the bodily eloquence, the *pronuntiatio* or *actio*, of preachers. Surprisingly, one of the models held up by the reverend is Saint Paul preaching in the Athenian court of the Agora or, rather, Raphael's (1483-1520) celebrated portrayal of the event (fig. 1). Fordyce notes admiringly how, through his animated countenance and his lofty bearing and gestures, the apostle held his audience in thrall. Both he and his hearers are overcome with emotion and that, in the minister's view, was what religious oratory was about. He commends Saint Paul's 'Face of Inspiration and impetuous Ardour' and the 'silent, deep Attention and Rapture' of his audience.¹

Two years later, in 1755, a French critic praised another painting of a sermon, *Saint Augustine Preaching before Valere, Bishop of Hippo* (fig. 2) by Carle van Loo (1705-1765). He describes how the orator 'appears deeply moved by the greatness of immortal truths' and how he 'seems to be seeking in the eyes of his listeners the means fully to persuade them of those truths'. Indeed, 'one can see that they are already shaken'.² Of course, this was the age of sentimentalism – the age, to cite James Elkins, in which people 'cried in front of paintings'.³ Convinced of the salutary role of the emotions, of the importance of rousing morally good sentiments, they may even have cried looking at a painting of a preacher.

As scholars have argued, the age of Sterne, Diderot or the young Goethe introduced a 'sentimentalisation' of sacred oratory. It glorified preachers – Sterne was one of them – who knew how to bring a congregation to tears.⁴ Ministers and priests were expected to address the feelings and emotions of the faithful, and paintings such as Carle van Loo's expressed this sentimentalisation of the pulpit. But van Loo was certainly not the first to portray the eloquence of preachers: he drew on an older pictorial tradition. There was Raphael and his *Saint Paul* (Voltaire even compared van Loo to Raphael) and, to mention only one other classic example, there was Rembrandt van Rijn (1606-1669) and his *The Preaching of Saint John* (fig. 3). Like Van Loo in the age of sentimentalism, both artists had already sought to craft the viewer's emotional response in their rendering of saints and apostles with their audiences enthralled.⁵

In the following pages I will focus on Rembrandt and his fashioning of the emotions.⁶ He was, of course, a master of the art. Around 1630,

Detail figure 2
*Saint Augustine preaching before
Valerius, c. 1630*

1

Raphael, cartoon for *Saint Paul Preaching in Athens*, 1513-14, mixed media on paper, mounted on canvas (photo: Wikipedia commons)

2

Carle van Loo, *Saint Augustine Preaching before Valerius, Bishop of Hippo*, 1755, Paris, Church of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. From: M. Fried, *Absorption and theatricality: painting and beholder in the age of Diderot*, Berkeley 1980, 23

Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687) eulogized Rembrandt for his *affectuum vivacitas*, his liveliness in emotion. Similarly, his pupil Samuel van Hoogstraten (1627-1678) praised his *Saint John* for the listeners' attention and abandonment as manifested in their postures, gestures and facial expressions: 'I recall that, in a certain finely composed work by Rembrandt depicting St John Preaching, I saw wonderful attention of many different kinds in the spectators: this was extremely commendable'. Arnold Houbraken (1660-1719) agreed.⁷ In a letter written to Huygens in 1639, the master himself explained how in two paintings of his *Passion series* he had committed himself to *die meeste en de naetureelste beweeghelijkheid* (fig. 4). As the specialists now seem to agree, the term *beweglijkheid* bore a double connotation. It referred both to the liveliness of the motions depicted and to their ability to induce emotions, to touch the heart of the beholder.

Indeed, to many of his admirers Rembrandt was the *pathopoios*, the crafter of emotions, par excellence. Recently, Eric Jan Sluiter and Thijs Weststeijn have again drawn our attention to this crucial aspect of his art, relating his *pathopoeia* to the art theory of his time, and to classical rhetoric and the stage.⁸ I will draw on their valuable insights but,

3

Rembrandt van Rijn, *The Preaching of Saint John*, c. 1634-35, canvas, mounted on panel, 62 x 80 cm. Gemäldegalerie, Berlin

4

Rembrandt van Rijn, *The resurrection of Christ*, c. 1636-39,
oil on canvas, 92 x 67 cm, Munich,
Alte Pinakothek

preferring a phenomenological perspective more open to the close connections between body and mind as they were perceived in early modern Europe, I will take a fresh look at Rembrandt's striving for *die meeste en de naetureelste beweegelijkheid* in order to stress the viewer's affective and bodily response to the master's *pathopoeia*. I take my cue from developments in anthropology. Often inspired by mid twentieth-century phenomenology, especially the writings of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, anthropologists have written important studies on processes of embodiment and the full human sensorium. Part of this research has focused on the study of images. Adopting a critical stance towards Kant's disinterested (and disembodied) beholder, these anthropologists like to revert to the Aristotelian concept of 'aisthesis', which holds that the ways we engage with images are always bodily and multisensory.⁹

More concretely, I will argue that Rembrandt and his

contemporaries must have nurtured a notion of kinesthetic empathy, of such a sixth or seventh sense.¹⁰ As David Rosand observed, more than any other artist of his time Rembrandt made it his main ambition to elicit the viewers' immediate and affective response through his 'sense of the body', his 'sense of posture and of the possibilities of posturing'.¹¹ It is this proprioceptive sense of movement (or 'felt movement', as David Freedberg suggested, integrating his own investigations on the emotional impact of art with the latest research on mirror neurons), that I would like to explore in this paper, profiting from both Freedberg's and the anthropologists' research.¹² Which forms of kinesthetic empathy (facial expression included) were discussed in Dutch art theory? And how were they related by art theorists to the viewer's corporeal and affective response to art?¹³

On visual, acting and dancing skills

Essential, not only to the painters but also the actors of the *ancien régime*, was their training in classical oratory. They knew about its third department, *elocutio* or style, and its fifth, *actio* or *pronuntiatio*. Dealing with the orator's delivery, *actio* stipulated how to modulate one's voice and how to regulate one's countenance, gestures, and bearing.¹⁴ Already set forth by Cicero, Quintilian and the anonymous author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, it was taught and practiced at all Latin schools.¹⁵ Another classical legacy was Horace's *Ars Poetica* or the *Epistula ad Pisones*, especially its famous maxim *si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi* ('if you want me to cry, mourn first yourself'). As Ernst Gombrich observed, ever since Horace wrote that line, 'the idea that art effects some kind of emotional contagion has been at the basis of all expressionist aesthetics'.¹⁶

In Dutch art theory (as in Italian art theory since Leon Battista Alberti, 1404-1472), the Horatian maxim was as readily applied to painters as it was to actors or preachers. As the various texts explained, to move the beholder, to touch his heart, a painter should live the scene, he should always identify with the scene and the figures to be portrayed. To quote Franciscus Junius, painters should try to immerse themselves 'as if they were present at the doing, or saw it acted before their eyes'.¹⁷ Taking the metaphor literally, Rembrandt even included himself 'at the doing', for instance in his *The Stoning of St. Stephen* of 1625. As Perry Chapman argued, such 'participant self-portraits' should be viewed in the same Horatian light as Rembrandt's four etched self-portraits of 1630, in which he practiced what Van Hoogstraten still advised in 1678 – to draw and study one's emotions before a mirror.¹⁸

The stage provided another 'mirror' for investigating one's emotions. Dutch theorists urged the aspiring painter to observe the actors of their time, to go and watch these skilled visual performers in action. Already in 1604, Karel van Mander (1548-1606) defended the uses of 'histrionics', of studying the 'gestures, such as they are used by actors'.¹⁹ Van Hoogstraten, in discussing how to represent the 'passions or movements of the heart', concurred. If one were to excel in this 'most

5
Anon., *Several illustrations of the*
'contrasten', from: Gerard de Lairese,
Groot schilderboek, Amsterdam 1707,
Universiteitsbibliotheek Amsterdam.

noble part of art, one must reform oneself totally into an actor'.²⁰ Hence his studio practice of having his pupils act out the postures and gestures to be represented and of having them perform in plays, which their family and friends could come and see.²¹ The Italian theorists gave similar advice. Gian Pietro Bellori (1613-1696) recounted how the Bolognese painter Domenichino (1581-1641) went around 'talking to himself, crying out in pain or gladness, and then practicing the proper *affetti*'. As his master Agostino Carracci (1557-1602) maintained, painters should strive to understand their figures through 'physical imitation', through their own sense of the body.²²

Phrasing such advice in phenomenological terms or, more concretely, rephrasing Baxandall's notion of the 'period eye' in terms of Bourdieuan habitus and embodiment²³, one might say that to craft the beholder's immediate and emotional response Van Mander and Van Hoogstraten advised their young colleagues to enhance their visual skills through their acting skills or, rather, through literally incorporating the postural and gestural repertoires of the actors of their time. Conversely, inspired by the same Horatian legacy, actors began compiling portfolio's of prints and drawings to examine the emotions depicted by painters and to incorporate the corresponding postures, gestures and facial expressions into their own art – another example of kinesthetic empathy.²⁴

Van Hoogstraten even related painters' visual skills to their dancing skills, a connection also observed by Baxandall in fifteenth-century Italy. They should care about the '*welstandige* and graceful motion' of their figures, what Willem Goeree (1635-1711) referred to as 'gracefulness in bending and turning'. *Welstand*, already introduced by Van Mander and a central notion in histrionics as well, was the Dutch equivalent of *contrapposto*. It stipulated that a halting figure should be rendered such that its weight rests on one leg only. In addition, the shoulders and hips should always contrast. For example, if one shoulder is raised, the other should drop, just as the hips should move contrarily; if, for instance, the right shoulder drops, then the right hip should be raised, and vice versa (fig. 5).²⁵ But while most of the Dutch treatises on painting speak of *welstand* or the *contrasten*, Van Hoogstraten also used the term *dansleyding*, literally 'conducting of the dance', thus referring to the painters' (and the viewers') skills, incarnated through social dancing, of moving gracefully.²⁶

Kinesthetic empathy, then, was expected from every painter wishing to enhance the liveliness of his scenes and figures, but it was also expected from the viewers, who should be willing to bodily and emotionally engage with a work of art. They certainly distinguished between symbol and referent, between the canvases in front of them and the virtual realities called up by such objects. But even the most cultured viewers – the *liefhebbers* or connoisseurs (often neostoics as well) – were expected to fully immerse themselves in a work of art, to submit to being beguiled.²⁷ To quote the French theorist Pierre le Brun, 'Pour parler des riches peintures, il en faut parler comme si les choses estoient vraies non pas peintes'. Junius, also writing in the 1630s, gave similar advice: 'we should (...) suffer our mind to enter into a lively consideration of what we see

expressed; not otherwise than if we were present, and saw not the counterfeited image but the real performance of the thing'.²⁸

As contemporary sources confirm, the *liefhebbers* followed such advice. They were willing to play the game, to allow images to make them feel 'present at the scene' and 'hear the dumb speaking'. Such phrases were more than just topoi, as Sluiter cautions. A famous example is how Huygens, on visiting a friend's collection and catching sight of Rubens' *Head of Medusa*, was struck with 'sudden terror'.²⁹

Obviously, when visiting a painter's studio or a valuable collection of art in the company of a few other cultured viewers (which may well have been the norm³⁰), *liefhebbers* could display their learned knowledge, as well as the artisanal knowledge of art they had incorporated through years of painting and drawing lessons.³¹ But as Le Brun and Junius suggest and memoirs such as Huygens's confirm, these courtiers and wealthy commoners were not the connoisseurs of later times, not Kant's 'disinterested beholder'. Theirs was a different aesthetics. Acknowledging the performativity of images, their visceral and emotional sway over them, they shared a 'theory of sympathetic involvement' both with the other cultured viewers and with the painters seeking to craft their corporeal and emotional response.³² Affected by a painting's liveliness in emotion, they were 'more than willing to forget that they were looking at a fictional work'. As Weststeijn writes, at such moments 'the painting was what it depicted, looking at it was to experience it'. Imagination played a crucial role in the process. Even in the philosophy of René Descartes (1596-1650) imagination was as related to the body and the senses as understanding was to the mind.³³

The 'theory' was neatly summarised by Goeree. Addressing both the painters and the sculptors of his day, he noted: 'Since it is in the nature of figures depicted that they lack life and movement, this should stimulate us all the more to find the means to create the figures in the scenes in such a way that the spectator forgets all thoughts about canvas and panel, paint and oil, wood and stone and copper, be it cast or modelled, and to give him the idea that he sees before his eyes nothing painted or cast, but living human figures, so that he thinks they walk, move, speak, shout, fight, hear, see, think, and do all other living actions of living people'.³⁴

It is also Goeree who gives us a good insight into how thoroughly mind and body were felt to interact at the time. Take for instance the title of his *Menschkunde*, his manual on how to represent the human figure:

*Natuurlijk en schilderkonstig ontwerp der menschkunde, leerende niet alleen de kennis / Van de gestalte, proportie, schoonheid, muskelen, bewegingen, actien, passien, en welstand der menschbeelden / Tot de teykenkunde, schilderkunde, beeldhouwery, bootseer en giet-oeffening toepassen; maar ook hoe sich een mensch na deselve regelen, in allerhande doeningh / Van gaan, staan, loopen, torssen, dragen, arbeyden, spreken en andere gebeerden, bevallig en verstandelijk aanstellen zal.*³⁵

What the title suggests is that by learning how to draw, paint, sculpt or

model the human body, one may also learn how to be elegant, how to stand, walk, labour, or gesture properly. More than just a sales pitch, the title seems to illustrate what Rosand, drawing on Merleau-Ponty and the poet Paul Valéry, has described as the 'phenomenology of drawing'. As he argued, during the Renaissance and the Baroque the act of making drawings (and of perceiving them) was felt to be inseparable from the movement and sensations of the body. Rembrandt, especially, drew 'felt' figures, he 'lived the drama' of his figures 'on the paper'.³⁶

Bewegelijkheid embodied

To conclude, let us also finish with Rembrandt. Essential to his art, to his *pathopoeia*, was what he and Van Hoogstraten described as *bewegelijkheid*.³⁷ As we saw, Rembrandt used the term in 1639. Some forty years later, Van Hoogstraten employed the same notion, stressing its performative and emotional dimensions. Probably summarizing the lessons of his master, he observed: 'It does not suffice that a figure is beautiful; there has to be a certain *bewegelijkheid* that exerts power over the viewers'. Quoting Horace's *si vis me flere* (in Van Hoogstraten's translation 'Dus wilt gij dat ik schreye, schrey mij voor'), he continued, 'This is also true for painters, they do not move the soul, if they take no heed of this *bewegelijkheid*'.³⁸

Importantly, as Van Hoogstraten's comments point out, the concept centered on the viewer's immediate corporeal understanding. To make a picture 'enchant the viewer as another bystander', to 'frighten him by a violent act' or to 'make him rejoice by seeing something cheerful', he advised his colleagues to choose not just any movement but what he described as *oogenblikke beweging*. What he meant was that to instantly immerse the spectator in the picture, he should be coached, through the motions depicted, to comprehend the scene in a single moment, 'in a blink of the eye'. A perfect example of kinesthetic empathy, we see this concept employed at its most gripping and spectacular in Rembrandt's *Passion series* and such other famous paintings of the 1630s as *The Feast of Belshazzar* (with the spilling wine frozen in time), *The Sacrifice of Isaac* (the knife hanging in mid-air) or *The Blinding of Samson* (the knife entering the victim's right eye).³⁹ But in his paintings of the 1650 and 1660s, as Sluiter argues elsewhere in this volume, he exchanged *oogenblikke beweging* and the kinesthetic empathy effected by such techniques for mainly mute and motionless situations (not unlike Lessing's 'pregnant moments', which are always pre-climactic) and a more inner directed empathy.⁴⁰

Weststeijn's 'theory of sympathetic involvement' seems to embrace a phenomenological perspective similar to the one I have just sketched. But what should be added to his interpretation is a proper emphasis on aspects of embodiment, on the painter's and the viewer's corporeal comprehension. He rightly relates the notion of *oogenblikke beweging* to that of *evidentia* or *enargeia*, which in classical rhetoric, in its department of style or *elocutio*, had the same connotation of grasping the audience right away.⁴¹ But such text oriented explanations, as if Cicero

and Quintilian only wrote on questions of argument and style and not on those of delivery, may easily neglect aspects of Aristotelean aisthesis, of a period's bodily and sensory engagement with works of art, even if the evidence is there.

For instance, in explaining his notion of *oogenblikke beweeging*, Van Hoogstraten first mentioned the Greek sculptor Myron and his celebrated torso of a discus thrower, the *Discobolos* (ca. 450 B.C.). It is true that Quintilian immortalised Myron, not where he wrote on *actio* but on *elocutio*. Just as the torso's abandonment of the straight line suggests movement and elegance to the viewer, so the orator should choose an ornate style and create gracefulness and variety. But from the fifteenth century on the very same passage came to figure in another important discourse, one much closer to the department of delivery, for it was Quintilian's reference to the Greek sculptor that inspired Alberti's discovery of classical contrapposto, with all its movement and liveliness.⁴²

In other words, in discussing his *oogenblikke beweeging*, this most immediate crafting of the emotions, Van Hoogstraten thought explicitly of *welstand* or the *contrasten*: the beholder's emotional comprehension was first and foremost a bodily comprehension. Similarly, Rembrandt's *meeste en de naetureelste beweeghelickheit* must have encompassed not only an affective but also a corporeal and sensory dimension. Viewed in this way, the concept seems to be a prime example of kinesthetic empathy, and as such closely related to the empathy expected of actors, dancers or preachers. No picture of a saint or apostle preaching was just an illustration to a well-known story. Grafted onto classical *actio* and Horace's famous maxim such pictures, manifesting the transcendental in the sentimental bodies of the preachers, were meant to touch the viewers' hearts even long before the age of sentimentalism.

I would like to thank Perry Chapman, Stephanie Dickey and Ann-Sophie Lehmann for their helpful editorial comments.

Notes

- 1 [J. Fordyce], *An essay on the action proper for the pulpit*, London 1753.
- 2 [L.-G. Baillet de Saint-Julien], *Lettre à un partisan du bon goût sur l'exposition des tableaux faite dans le grand salon du Louvre le 28 aout 1755*, quoted in M. Fried, *Absorption and theatricality: painting and beholder in the age of Diderot*, Berkeley Ca. 1980, 22.
- 3 J. Elkins, *Pictures and tears: a history of people who have cried in front of paintings*, New York and London 2004.
- 4 P. Goring, *The rhetoric of sensibility in eighteenth-century culture*, Cambridge 2005; cf. H. Roodenburg, 'From embodying the rules to embodying

- belief: some contours of eighteenth-century pulpit delivery in England, Germany and the Netherlands', in: J. van Eijnatten (ed.), *Preaching, sermon and cultural change in the long eighteenth century*, Leiden 2009, 313-341; for an excellent overview of recent historical research on the period's culture of sensibility, see W. Reddy, 'Historical research on the self and emotions', *Emotion Review* 1 (2009), 302-315.
- 5 For Raphael's *St Paul*, see J. Shearman, *Raphael's cartoons in the collections of Her Majesty the Queen and the tapestries for the Sistine Chapel*, London 1972, 69-71; *idem*, *Only connect ... Art and the spectator in the Italian Renaissance*, Princeton 1992, 207-207; see also S.S. Dickey, 'The passions and Raphael's cartoons in 18th-century British art', *Marsyas* 22 (1983-1985), 33-46.

- 6 Of course, prior to the nineteenth century, there was no such umbrella concept as 'emotion'. The major distinction was between the (sensual) 'passions' and the (intellectual) 'affections', with all their various shades of meaning. 'Sentiments' were more and more distinguished in the eighteenth century. See Th. Dixon, *From passions to emotions: the creation of a secular psychological category*, Cambridge 2003, 244-247.
- 7 S. van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst, anders de zichtbaere werelt*, Rotterdam 1678, 183: 'een wonderlijke aendacht in de toehoorden van allerley staeten'; A. Houbraken, *De groote Schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen*, 3 vols., Amsterdam 1718-1721, I, 261: 'verwonderlyk om de natuurlyke verbeeldingen der toelusterende wezenstrekken

- [gelaatstrekken] en veranderlyke bekleedingen'.
- 8 E.J. Sluijter, *Rembrandt and the female nude*, Amsterdam 2006, 99-111; Weststeijn, *The visible world: Samuel van Hoogstraten's art theory and the legitimation of painting in the Dutch Golden Age*, Amsterdam 2007, 206-219; see also their contributions elsewhere in this volume.
- 9 On these recent developments, see C. Pinney, 'Four types of visual culture', in: C. Tilley et al. (eds.), *Handbook of material culture*, London 2006, 131-144; on aisthesis: S. Buck-Morss, 'Aesthetics and anaesthetics: Walter Benjamin's art works essay reconsidered', *October* 77 (1992), 3-41; J. Verrips, 'Aisthesis and an-aesthesia', *Ethnologia Europaea* 35 (2006), 1-2, 27-33; B. Meyer and J. Verrips, 'Aesthetics', in: D. Morgan (ed.), *Keywords in religion, media and culture*, New York 2008, 20-30.
- 10 On kinesthesia as a neglected dimension of the human sensorium, see e.g. K. Geurts, *Culture and the senses: bodily ways of knowing in an African community*, Berkeley Ca. 2002.
- 11 D. Rosand, *Drawing acts: studies in graphic expression and representation*, Cambridge and New York 2002, 233-234.
- 12 D. Freedberg, 'Empathy, motion and emotion', in: K. Herding and A. Krause Wahl (eds.), *Wie sich Gefühle Ausdruck verschaffen. Emotionen in Nachsicht*, Berlin 2007, 17-51; *idem*, 'Antropologia e storia dell'arte: la fine delle discipline', *Ricerche di Storia dell'Arte* 95 (2008), 5-18; for some further publications by Freedberg and some wider background to the present paper, see H. Roodenburg, 'The visceral pleasures of looking: on iconology, anthropology, and the neurosciences', in: B. Baert and A.S. Lehmann (eds.), *Iconology meets Anthropology*, Amsterdam 2011 (forthcoming); see also *idem*, *Anthropologists, historians and the pulse of the archive*, Amsterdam 2010; on kinesthetic empathy, see D. Sklar, 'Remembering kinesthesia: an inquiry into embodied cultural knowledge', in: C. Noland and S.A. Ness (eds.), *Migrations of gesture*, Minneapolis and London 2008, 85-112; for another stimulating approach using recent work in neuroscience, see U. Heinen, 'Komponieren im Affekt. Vergil – Monteverdi – Rubens', in: K. Herding and B. Stumpfhaus (eds.), *Pathos, Affekt, Gefühl. Die Emotionen in den Künsten*, Berlin/New York 2004, 161-188, and his contribution to this volume.
- 13 On kinesthesia and facial expression, see, e.g. M. Sheets-Johnstone, *The primacy of movement*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia 1999, 260-262.
- 14 W.S. Howell, *Eighteenth-century British logic and rhetoric*, Princeton 1971; A. Gooden, *Actio and persuasion: dramatic performance in eighteenth-century France*, Oxford 1986; Th. Kirchner, *L'expression des passions. Ausdruck als Darstellungsproblem in der französischen Kunst und Kunsttheorie des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, Mainz 1991; S. Chaouche, *L'art du comédien. Déclamation et jeu scénique en France à l'âge classique (1629-1680)*, Paris 2001; Roodenburg, *op. cit.* (n. 4).
- 15 S. Alpers, *Rembrandt's enterprise: the studio and the market*, Chicago 1988, 42-43.
- 16 E.H. Gombrich, *Meditations on a hobby horse and other essays on the theory of art*, London 1963, 56; cf. J. Imorde, *Affektübertragung*, Berlin 2004, 431-432n.183; H. Roodenburg, 'Si vis me flere ...': On preachers, passions and pathos in eighteenth-century Europe', in: J. Dijkstra, J. Kroesen and Y. Kuiper (eds.), *Myths, martyrs and modernity: studies in the study of religions in honour of Jan Bremmer*, Leiden 2010, 609-628.
- 17 Fr. Junius, *The painting of the Ancients in three bookes*, London 1638, 21-22.
- 18 H.P. Chapman, *Rembrandt's self-portraits: a study in seventeenth-century identity*, Princeton 1990, 19-20; cf. Weststeijn, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 211-213; see also Chapman's contribution to this volume.
- 19 K. van Mander, *Den grondt der edel vry schilderconst*, ed. H. Miedema, 2 vols., Utrecht 1973, I, 159.
- 20 Van Hoogstraten, *op. cit.* (n. 7), 109: 'Wilmen nu eer inleggen in dit allerdelste deel der konst, zoo moeten zich zelve geheel in een toneelspeeler hervormen'. I have followed Chapman's translation.
- 21 A. Houbraken, *De groote schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen*, ed. P.T.A. Swillens, 3 vols., Maastricht 1943-1953, 128-129.
- 22 Chapman, *op. cit.* (n. 18), 19; Rosand, *op. cit.* (n. 11), 223.
- 23 M. Baxandall, *Painting and experience in fifteenth-century Italy: a primer in the social history of pictorial style*, Oxford 1972; for Bourdieu's admiration of the period eye and my suggestion to rephrase the concept in more phenomenological, Bourdieuan terms, see Roodenburg, 'Visceral pleasures', *op. cit.* (n. 12).
- 24 H. Roodenburg, *The eloquence of the body: perspectives on gesture in the Dutch Republic*, Zwolle 2004, ch. 5.
- 25 G. de Lairese, *Het groot schilderboek*, Amsterdam 1707, 28.
- 26 Van Hoogstraten, *op. cit.* (n. 7), 292-293.
- 27 On the complex relationship of neo-stoicism and kinesthetic empathy, see Heinen's essay in this volume.
- 28 Both quoted in Weststeijn, *The visible world*, *op. cit.* (n. 7), 137, 160, 396n.220; see also his essay in this volume.
- 29 Sluijter, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 131; see also the essay by Ulrich Heinen in this volume.
- 30 Roodenburg, 'Visiting Vermeer: performing civility', in: A. Golahay et al. (eds.), *In his milieu: essays on Neiderlandish art in memory of John Michael Montias*, Amsterdam 2007), 385-394.
- 31 Cf. P. Smith, *The body of the artisan: art and experience in the scientific revolution*, Chicago 2004.
- 32 The phrase is Weststeijn's, see *idem*, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 139.
- 33 *Ibid.*, 133-139, 160-161.
- 34 W. Goeree, *Natuurlyk en schilderkonstig ontwerp der menscheunde*, Amsterdam 1682, 337-338: 'Nadien de Konst-Beelden uyt haar eygen Natuur het Leven en de beweging derven; dat sulx ons te meer vermaand na Middelen om te sien, waar door de Beelden in de Tafereelen soodanig kunnen voortgebracht werden, datse den Beschouwer alle gedagten van Doek en Panneel, Verf en Olye, ofte van Hout en Steen en Koper, soose mogten gegoten of Geboedseerd zijn, konden doen afleggen, en een Denk-Beeld geven dat hy niet geschilderde noch Gegotene, maar Natuurlijk Levende Mensch-beelden voor zijn Oogen meend te sien. Invoegen dat hem dunkt datse Loopen, datse Gaan, Spreken, Roepen, Vegten, Hooren, Sien, Denken en alle andere Levende Actien

- van bezielde Menschen doen'. I have followed Sluijter's translation [Sluijter, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 152], but considering Goeree's argument I translated 'beelden' as 'figures'.
- 35 Title quoted from the first edition of 1682; see also A.S. Lehmann and H. Roodenburg, 'Introduction', in: Lehmann and Roodenburg (eds.), *Body and embodiment in Netherlandish art*, Zwolle 2008, 7-13, where the authors discuss the same passage.
- 36 Rosand, *op. cit.* (n. 11), 226.
- 37 For a still helpful discussion of the term, see L. de Pauw-de Veen, 'Over de betekenis van het woord "beweeglijkheid" in de zeventiende eeuw', *Oud Holland* 74 (1959), 202-212.
- 38 Van Hoogstraten, *op. cit.* (n. 7), 292-293: 't Is niet genoeg, dat een beelt schoon is, maer daer moet een zekere beweeglijkheyt in zijn, die macht over d'aenschouwers heeft; Gelijk Horatius van het dichten zingt, "Een schoon gedicht zal mij niet licht beroeren, / Maer vriendlijkheyt kan hert en ziel vervoeren. / Men lacche, of ween", d'aenschouwer rackt op 't spoor, / Dus wilt gij dat ik schreye, schrey mij voor". Zoo is 't ook met de Schilders, zy beroeren 't gemoed niet, zoore deeze beweeglijkheyt overslaen.'
- 39 Van Hoogstraten, *op. cit.* (n. 7), 116, 178; cf. Weststeijn, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 188-191; and see Sluijter's paper in this volume.
- 40 Related to Lessing and the story of Abraham and Isaac, see for instance L.H. Kjældgaard, "The peak on which Abraham stands": the pregnant moment of Søren Kierkegaard's *Fear and Trembling*, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 63 (2002), 2, 314-37; 315 n. 25.
- 41 Weststeijn, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 185-186.
- 42 J. Shearman, *Mannerism*, Harmondsworth 1967, 85-86; see also Baxandall, *op. cit.* (n. 23), 18-19; D. Summers, *Michelangelo and the language of art*, Princeton N.J. 1981, 91-92.

Detail figure 2
*Saint Augustine preaching before
 Valerius*, c. 1630