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Abstract

This article deals in the main with Jacques Callot’s early life in Italy and with his later life in Lorraine where he produced his famous series of eighteen etchings which narrate his perception of seventeenth-century warfare known as Les Misères et les Malheurs de la Guerre (1633). In contrast to Callot’s point of view, the article closes with a brief account of Goya’s Los desastres de la guerra, a series of eighty-odd etchings produced in the early nineteenth-century, which can be used to explain a shift in the meaning and experience of warfare between these two centuries: from “misery” to “disaster”.

When Callot returned home to his native Nancy towards the end of July or the beginning of August 1621 after a twelve year residence in Italy, one of his first complaints was in a letter he wrote to his friend Pandolfini: “... si non fusse la speranza che io ho un giorno di tornare ... certo
credo che mi morel' [Ternois, L'art, 221] (Posner 1977: 209). Translated into English, the sentence reads: “When I see what things are like here and when I think of what they are like in Florence I get so depressed that if it were not for my hope of going back I really believe that I would die” (Young 1960: 466; see also Daniel 1974: xviii). Callot it seems, was not very happy with the circumstances in Nancy and longed for the more pleasant and joyous times he had spent in Florence (the capital of Tuscany).

The reasons for Callot’s unhappiness are not hard to find. The number of commissions from the Lorraine court was limited and the prospects for the future were not very encouraging. Callot found that he had to break into a closed preserve largely dominated by his old friend and fellow artist, Deruet. This proved a disappointment, a step down the ladder, so to speak, from the patronage and fame he had experienced in Florence under the Grand Duke Cosmo II de’ Medici (reigned 1610-1622).

Much of what Callot had learnt as an artist lay in his Italian experiences. After his schooling under the tuition of Abbé Didier Breton, Callot had been apprenticed at the age of fourteen or fifteen by his father to the court jeweller, medallist, and goldsmith Domange Crocq (fl. 1608-1634; d. 1637) for a sum of 4000 francs. During his two year apprenticeship, Callot had the opportunity to familiarize himself with the work and style of those court artists who had been influenced by the school of Fontainebleau and the Mannerists, learning from them the concept of concetti, the contrast between grotesque subject matter on the one hand and the refined style on the other. In effect, the late Mannerism of the early Baroque as an artistic style, in the words of Hauser (Daniel 1974: xvi), represented “an aristocratic, essentially international cultured class” which gave expression to the “more popular, more emotional, more nationalistic trend(s)” of the early seventeenth century. Ever since his early childhood when he had attended the funeral of Charles III, Duke of Lorraine (1545-1608) and witnessed the marriage of his successor, Duke Henry II of Lorraine, Callot had, at an early age, been introduced to the ritual world of courtly life, heightened by ceremonies, which had deeply impressed him (Melot 1981: 152; see also Young 1960: 466).

Callot’s desire to visit Italy came when Crocq sent him to Rome in order to study burin engraving under Philippe Thomassin, himself a gold- and silversmith originally from Troyes in France. Soon afterwards, an opportunity arose for him to go and work in Florence. On the death of Margaret of Austria, Queen of Spain, the Florentine court commissioned the painter-engraver Antonio

---

1. Grotesque subject matter included hybrid creatures consisting of a combination of plant, animal, and human motifs mixed with architectural elements and scroll patterns, as well as the depiction of nature’s “ugliness” such as dwarfs.

2. Included in this category could have been the elegance of dancers and acrobats.
Tempesta to make twenty-nine etchings of the Pompe funèbre de la Reine d'Espagne. Due to the urgency of the commission, Tempesta was forced to seek the help of other artists, including the young Callot. And so Callot left Rome for Florence at the end of 1611 or the beginning of 1612.

So impressed were his Italian patrons at the quality of his technique that he soon received other commissions. One of the four book illustrations for a book by Andrea Salvadori, The war of love [Guerra d'Amore] (L. 170; 1616) was done by Callot. Entitled the parade in The amphitheater and the entry of the carriages of Africa and Asia (fig. 1) the work shows the elaborate pageantry designs, the exotic vessels and machines, designed by Giulio Parigi (1571-1635)\(^4\) for the ballet Guerra d'Amore which was performed in Florence, in the Piazza Santa Croce, before the Grand Duke Cosimo II de' Medici\(^5\) at Carnival time in February 1616 (Daniel 1974: xv; see also Melot 1981: 152). Later that year, in October 1616, Callot produced another series of six etchings known as The war of beauty [Guerra di Belezza] (L. 181),\(^6\) recording an elaborate opera full of extraordinary mythological floats and machines, also designed by Parigi, which celebrated the engagement of Prince Federigo of Urbino to the Grand Duke Cosimo II's sister, Claudia de' Medici.

In these works, Callot had brought the technique of copper plate etching to perfection, being

---

\(^3\) The "L" numbers are those assigned to Callot's prints in the catalogue raisonné compiled by Lieure (Daniel 1974: xxvii).

\(^4\) Giulio Parigi was a man of many talents in charge of architecture, surveying, military engineering, engraving, and being the designer, creator, impresario, and director of court spectacles, fêtes, and ceremonies. While in Florence, Callot furthered his education under Parigi's guidance, particularly the study of pen drawing.

From Galileo, whom Callot also met at the Uffizi palace, he may have obtained some rudimentary instruction in mathematics and science, and have acquainted himself with Galileo's practical experiments with the recently invented telescope (Daniel 1974: xiv).

\(^5\) "Cosimo II, following the stellar example of his father, Ferdinando, was a strong patron of the arts, using them to glorify his rule and to entertain his subjects. Indeed, Florence was a world of spectacles and ceremonies, characterized above all by theatrical performances and festivals, many of which were held out-of-doors in various public squares, or on the Arno River, and attended by thousands of Tuscans" (Russell 1975: 33).

\(^6\) See Daniel (1974: fig. 5).
skilled in the various widths of fine line which earlier silversmiths and jewelers had achieved in their graffiti. These were merely “dry runs”, however, for his *The fair at Impruneta* (L 478, 1620) (fig. 2) etching which commemorated the festival that was held in this small town, some eight miles south of Florence, each year on 18 October. The festival took the form of a pilgrimage to worship a portrait of the Virgin Mary allegedly painted by St. Luke which had been hung in the local church constructed by the rich Florentine family of the Buondelmonti. Together with the fair, accompanying this pilgrimage, Callot’s *The fair at Impruneta* print contains some 1138 men and women, 45 horses, 67 donkeys, and 137 dogs (Daniel 1974: xviii).<sup>7</sup>

Remarkable as this achievement was, its success was due no less to the understanding and love which Callot seemed to have had throughout his life for courtly pomp and ceremony. No-one better than he understood how much the various fêtes, ceremonies, and pageants, organized by the now largely powerless aristocracy, served as a sort of opium to them, in which they could still enact some of their power fantasies. In order to accommodate the vast spectrum of the crowd in prints such as *The Fair at Impruneta*, Callot’s “wide-ranging eye” (Daniel 1974: xvi) seems to have adopted the “Bruegel view of the world” (Young 1960: 466; see also Wolfthal 1977: 222-223), of seeing the panorama of the world from a high vantage point. His adoption of scenography (perspectival scenes) enabled him to not only focus his attention on the main events of his subjects, but also to emphasize the activities of the surrounding crowd. In the spectacle of *The war of love*, for example, Callot had recorded the informal, and apparently often spontaneous entertainment, provided by acrobats, dancers, and comedians, which were an important part of the fun for the spectators outside the arena. He even featured himself very prominently in the center foreground of the print dressed as Pantaloon (Posner 1977: 209).

<sup>7</sup> See also Young (1960: 466); Pearlstein (1975: 42).
Following his interest in the popular entertainers circumnavigating the courtly world, Callot continued to record the cast of the *commedia dell'arte* in *capricci* such as the series of 24 etchings known as the *Balli di Sfessania* (L. 379-402, c. 1621-22), describing their manneristic traits as "whimsically significant, fantastically inventive, humorous, and caprice". In appreciation for his Italianate audience, Callot affectionately changed his name Jacques on the title pages of these works to Jacopo and Jacomo respectively.

Now back in Nancy, having been absent for more than a decade, Callot’s unhappiness was due no less to the sense of political and religious uneasiness which had been brewing for some time in Lorraine. During the sixty-three year reign of Duke Charles III (1545-1608) a diplomatic peace had existed between the duke and the French King Henry IV. The quarrel between them was terminated by the latter’s conversion to Catholicism in 1594. Duke Henry II, the son of Duke Charles III, continued the reign of reasonably peaceful and uneventful years between 1608-1624 until his nephew, Charles de Vaudémont became Duke Charles IV in 1624, three years after Callot’s return to Nancy. Duke Charles IV married Duke Henry II’s daughter. His political intrigues led to the invasion of Lorraine and the occupation of Nancy in 1633 by Louis XIII (1601-1643), King of France (reigned, 1610-1643), and Cardinal Richelieu (1585-1642). The intrigues and conspiracies were led by Gaston of Orleans, the brother of Louis XIII, and the beautiful and talented Duchess of Chevreuse. Being blatant in their contestation of royal power, the conspirators were involved in treasonable contacts with the English; the Duchess of Chevreuse going so far as to become the mistress of the Duke of Buckingham, the chief minister of the English king Charles I. Overplaying their hands, both she and Gaston fled France and sought refuge at the court of Duke Charles IV in Nancy. But by the time France had invaded Lorraine, Gaston had sought refuge in Brussels and Duke Charles IV was forced by king Louis XIII and Cardinal Richelieu to abdicate in favour of his younger brother, Cardinal Nicolas-François. By the following year, Louis XIII and Cardinal Richelieu had established power over the whole of Lorraine, and Cardinal Richelieu’s military governor, Brassac, was threatening to expel from the duchy, and confiscate the property of, anyone not taking the oath of allegiance to the king before the deadline of 17 December 1634. Jacques and his elder brother, Jean, held out for as long as possible, taking the oath of fealty on 9 December 1634.8

---

9 Callot’s “loyalty” to Louis XIII and Cardinal Richelieu seems somewhat questionable. Though he had claimed his allegiance on 9 December 1634, Félibien relates a story that shortly after their entry into Nancy on 25 September 1633, Louis XIII and Cardinal Richelieu had asked Callot “to commemorate their capture of his city by executing a large work in the manner of his other sieges. Callot is reported to have replied that he would cut off his right thumb before doing such a shameful thing.” Additional support is lent to this claim by Callot’s rejection of a pension from the king (Daniel 1974: xxii; see also Wolffthal 1977: 224). Callot seems to have been mercifully spared the consequences of his anti-monarchal convictions, for he died on 25 March 1635 of a peptic ulcer, “in all likelihood from peritonitis caused by the haemorrhage from the blood vessels in his perforated stomach” (Daniel 1974: xxiv).
These events, disastrous as they were for Lorraine, were part of an even greater power struggle between the Holy Roman Empire of the Hapsburgs and Bourbon France on the one hand, and the series of wars in Germany and Holland on the other, which formally began with the claim of Frederick, the Elector Palatine, to the throne of Bohemia, and which ended with the Treaty of Westphalia. Known as the Thirty Years’ War, it lasted from 1618 to 1648. Compared to the complicated nature of these macro-historical events, the Lorraine invasion must have seemed like a mere tip of an iceberg.

Yet for Callot these turbulent political events must have contributed to his unhappiness and disappointment with the Lorraine court. Callot, it seems was not an outstanding patriot or revolutionary (Wolfthal 1977: 224). In faith he belonged to the militant Counter-Reformation Catholicism (Daniel 1974: x); in social standing, Callot could be termed a member of the noble “middle class” in Lorraine; and in economic matters, Callot was keenly aware of the necessity of having financial security. When, for example, on 8 November 1623, he signed a marriage contract to marry Catherine Kuttinger, arranged by Henri Humbert, Bishop of Toul and a Lorraine adviser to the court, Callot did so because it enabled him to have financial independence. Three years later, in 1626, the court treasury allocated a special sum of two thousand francs per annum to Callot enabling him the means to remain in his own country. During the latter part of 1627 Callot signed a contract in Nancy on 29 October with the Paris dealer Pierre Chevalier giving him the right to handle the sales of his etchings (Daniel 1974: xxi). All these economic moves indicate that Callot in his later years was interested in the self-conscious of the pleasures of peace which wealth secured for him. For a humanist “middle class” member such as Callot, the senseless and wanton destruction of property which he had seen at the height of the Thirty Years’ War was the greatest of evils. The “middle class” message of “the little Trellis” was that property is to be enjoyed in moderation and dignity but that this was only possible if there was lasting peace and economic stability.

Such stability also came in the form of moneys accrued from commissions. One such commission came in 1627 when the regent of the Spanish Netherlands, Archduchess Isabella, commissioned Callot to etch six large copper plates, which, when joined together would provide the viewer with a “bird’s eye panorama of the Spanish capture of Breda by Spinola” (Mayor 1960: 26). Callot is thought to have visited the Lowlands in the autumn of 1625 not long after Breda capitulated, where he met artists who enjoyed the lavish patronage of the Brussels court including, in all probability, Van Dyck and Rubens. Many Flemish prints which Callot may have seen...
there might have served as thematic sources of inspiration, including the engraving after Bruegel, *Justice* (fig. 3), from his *De seven deugden* series of 1559 (Wolffthali 1977: 232). In this work, the paradoxical aim of the law to follow due process and to punish and correct he who is to be punished, or to improve others by means of their witnessing of the punished’s example, or to show virtue’s triumph over vice, *[Supplicium Sceleri Froenum]*, was later used by Callot to show the full range of punishments including “punishment by strappado and hanging” (Wolffthali 1977: 223).

Like Bruegel’s blindfolded figure of Justicia who does not see the punishment of individuals, Callot’s six plate *Siege of Breda* (L. 593; 1626) (fig. 4), commissioned to celebrate the victory in 1625 of the Spanish army (led by the Marqués de Spinola) over the Dutch, also turns an objective “blind eye” to human suffering. The work shows something of what war must have been like in the seventeenth century: “a little colour, bravado, and panache” along with “a great deal of violence, terror, and suffering” (Daniel 1974: xxv). Baldinucci, who published the earliest com-

---

11 Apart from the *Siege of Breda* Callot also made two siege maps for King Louis XIII of France, celebrating victories over the Huguenots: the *Siege of La Rochelle* (L. 655, 660-61) (1631) (Daniel 1974: fig. 223) and the *Siege of St-Martin-de-Ré* (L. 654, 656-9). He even did a series of thirteen etchings called *Military Exercises* (L. 1320-1332; 1632, published in 1635) (Daniel 1974: fig. 246-258) for Monseigneur Claude Charles de Bauffremont, Marquis de Senecay and Gouverner des Ville et Chasteu d’Auxonne, in which he explored the various movements of drill, harquebus and cannon firing procedures.
mentary on the Siege of Breda admired the frankness of Callot’s design, not only in the tiniest of figures who have grace and spirit, and who are done with a vivacious touch, “but also the figures of medium scale placed in certain groups” (Zurawski 1988: 621). Baldinucci’s statement shows that the composition of the print, its “grace” and its technical execution, were of greater importance to him than what we would perhaps consider important: the print’s gruesome realism.

Callot completed his work over several years, benefiting from the technical advice of the Florentine military engineers of Spinola who had been friends with him at the Medici court. The imagery of the siege was mostly based on a published account of the battle by Hermannus Hugo, field chaplin to Spinola. Such careful attention to detail suggests that Callot must have been interested in some kind of “objective reporting” of events in its many facets.

It is interesting to compare Callot's etching of the Siege of Breda with Velázquez's unsigned Surrender of Breda of 1634-1635 (fig. 5), a twelve foot wide painting which decorates the Hall of Realms in the Museo del Prado, Madrid, in which Velázquez had chosen to depict the climatic moment when the worn and defeated Dutch general, Justin of Nassau, presented Spinola with the key to Breda. The painting was intended to symbolize the epitome of Spanish honour and noblesse for Philip IV of Spain's troubled reign. Velázquez had been fortunate to have travelled with Spinola to Italy in 1629, for by the time he painted the Surrender of Breda both Spinola and Justin of Nassau were dead, and the historical event they had participated in was over (Brown 1982: 67). Velázquez's painting thus relies solely on recollection and an imaginative reconstruction of the event. Unlike Callot's rendering of the same subject, Velázquez's painting no longer seems to show any concern for the way things might have looked, only with the way they could have looked when called to mind from memory and imagination. The details of the bodegones

Fig. 5. Velázquez. Surrender of Breda. (1634-35). Oil on canvas. Unsigned. I a piece of paper on the lower right hand side of the painting was possibly th. place were a signature would have been placed. 307.0225 x 354.025 cm. Museo del Prado, Madrid. [Source: illustration, Brown (1982: 80-81); data, Brown (1982: 81, 192).]
are overlooked and the enjoyment of lively brushwork dominates Velázquez’s handling of the scene. Structurally speaking, the painting is a staged and manipulated composition: “twenty-eight upright lances in the upper right background serve as a kind of bold punctuation, interrupting the movements of the men and horses, and connecting the top and bottom halves of the painting” (Brown 1982: 67, 80-81). Despite many “errors” that the painting could have had if it could have been compared with the reality of the actual events, now passed, Velázquez mastered his subject in order to make it convincingly “real” enough to be believed; no less than Callot did in his own style and medium.

Yet there are other comparative differences between Velázquez and Callot. Velázquez’s economy of subject turns into an elaborate event in Callot’s etchings of the Siege of Breda. Callot chooses to use a “large repousoir of figures on the sides to set off the frontal plane” (Wolfthal 1977: 224) and his “individual figures are not sufficiently particularized” so as to be historically recognizable (Posner 1977: 204). This is because Callot seems to be interested in the epic sweep of his panorama; Velázquez, with the climatic moment of defeat and victory. Callot’s “eye” restlessly scans the plains and draws in as many details as possible; Velázquez selects reconstructively from his imagination, giving the climatic moment he has chosen as the dominant foreground focus of attention in his composition, while the final fires of war recede and blend into the background as if to be removed from the viewer’s immediate consideration. In this, Velázquez sacrifices everything for his climax, while Callot spares nothing from the viewer’s attention, presenting the whole scene, and all its details and sub-scenes, in one panoramic sweep of his vast “cartographic scene”. It is as if the most significant and the most trivial parts of his panorama are of equal importance, despite their scale and distance: they belong simultaneously to the world and are not exclusive to it, nor excluded from it. And they cannot be absorbed at a glance: the eye must continue to traverse the landscape, discovering new aspects of the work with each new scanning.

In many ways the details in the lower middle plate of Callot’s Siege of Breda contain the themes and subject matter which Callot was later to focus on, and to expand, in his Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre or Large miseries (L 1339-1356). These themes also appear outlined in his Small miseries of six plates etched in 1632-1633 (L 1333-1338), but not published until 1635. Callot specialists tend to treat the six plates of the Small miseries series as preliminary sketches for his Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre and consider the series to be incomplete, abandoned by Callot “either because the prints were too small, or because Callot’s conception [had] changed” (Wolfthal 1977: 222).
Callot's conception in *Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre* and in the *Small miseries* series can be regarded, from one point of view, as being a largely commonplace view of early seventeenth-century warfare. Like many other seventeenth-century writers on war, Callot seems to be preoccupied with the distinction between just and unjust conduct in war, specifically the abuses of the legitimate weapons during times of war, such as looting and rape (violation of property and/or violation of the body), rather than with actual fighting on the battlefield itself (Wolfthal 1977: 225). This may be because conquering armies often considered themselves to be part of their master’s retainers rather than as champions of a cause. As such, they plundered and burned everywhere they went, “military violence being in no way restrained by expediency” (*Encyclopaedia Britannica* 1964. s.v. “Thirty years’ war”).

Lorraine was thus invaded and ravaged annually from 1636 to 1639 in this manner. During this period the population was reduced by at least half, and life was “reduced to an almost animal [one]... characterized by robbery, murder, and even cannibalism” (Daniel 1974: x). One can gain some idea of this condition by turning to the actions of the German Protestant mercenary leader Count Mansfeld who had been in Lorraine helping the Bourbon Catholic cause, but who in 1622 had devastated Lorraine in the interests of Louis XIII. Pierre Vuarin’s eye-witness account of Mansfeld’s devastations testify to the horrors committed, and why seventeenth-century writers were so concerned about looting (and rape) during times of war:

> In transit they [Mansfeld and his mercenaries] killed everyone they encountered as if it were open warfare. They burnt villages, raped girls and women, pillaged and damaged churches and altars, carried away everything of value and did unheard of damage even though His Highness [Duke Henry II] provisioned them. Further, they cut growing corn as feed for their horses which they stabled in churches. Everywhere they did infinite damage, stealing furniture and livestock, which they managed to discover even when hidden in the remoteness of woods ...

> For five whole days they [Phalsbourg and his men] lived off the country, pillaging and extorting money like the enemy forces ... The poor villagers returning to their villages after the passing of the soldiery picked up infections from human and animal carcasses left behind by the marauders. A third died from dysentery and other infectious diseases in the village through which the soldiers had passed (Daniel 1974: xix).

Among the victims of pillage where probably “innocents” including the clergy, merchants, woman, children, the elderly, the poor, and foreigners passing through a besieged area. In a book dealing with military justice found in Callot’s library after his death, the *Instructions sur la faict de la guerre* written by the Baron of

---

12 Only in 1648, though the Franco-Spanish war continued elsewhere, was Lorraine (the Franche-Comté) spared from further pillage when it became a fief of the Holy Roman Empire (now virtually powerless) held by Spain. It was included in the “package deal” at the Peace of Westphalia, signed 24 October 1648, the series of treaties which ended the Thirty Years’ War in Germany (*Encyclopaedia Britannica* 1964. s.v. “Franche-Comté”).
Fourquevaux was discovered. In this work the lawfulness of Christians waging war was discussed. Part of the military justice at the time lists among capital offenses those “whosoever shall ravish any woman ... whosoever entering a towne taken by force shall stay to sack and not follow his ensign unto what place soever it may go ... whosoever shall misuse the people or the country where the war is made, either in body or goods, except that they be declared rebels of the king” (Wolfthal 1977: 225, 232). The Instructions, however, did not curb the devastation practices of an army from taking place, a fact to which Callot’s *Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre* also visually testifies.

In outline, Callot’s *Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre* “shows aspects of soldiers’ lives from the time they enlist until they receive rewards from their commander. They do battle with the enemy, and they murder and rape the populace. In turn, they are set upon violently by civilians and [are] punished as criminals by the military. Those who survive battle are forced to beg for their keep” (Russell 1975: 34). The series has the following narrative sequence:

- [Plate 1] Title page;
- [Plate 2] An enrollment of troops;
- [Plate 3] A battle;
- [Plates 4-8] Crimes committed by soldiers: the pillaging of an inn, of a farmhouse, of a cloister, of a village, and an attack on travellers on a road;
- [Plate 9] The capture of soldier-marauders;
- [Plates 10-14] The punishment of the soldiers: by strappado, hanging, firing squad, pyre and wheel;
- [Plates 15-17] The misfortunes of soldiers: the sick and wounded seeking refuge, dying on the road, and a vengeful attack by peasants;
- [Plate 18] Finally, awards are distributed among loyal soldiers.

After the preliminaries of a title page (Plate 1) (fig. 6), the initial enlistment of troops (Plate 2) (fig. 7) and an actual scene on the battlefield (Plate 3) (fig. 8), Callot’s *Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre* can be divided into three areas of continuity: (1) the mercilessness of ill-paid soldiers’ billeting on the civilian populace; (2) the witnessing of severe punishments on offenders in order to curb these abuses as codified...
by Fourquevaux’s *Instructions*, whether by the military or by the civilian population themselves; and (3) the rewarding of the virtuous soldier who refrained from committing wanton destruction (Wolfthal 1977: 225). The viewer is thus presented with an Aristotelian narrative sequence— with an introduction, middle, and conclusion—a progression which leads from war and one atrocity or misery after another to the restoration of peace and just reward, and the implied hope of future prosperity and honour for the survivors.

The inscribed verses attributed to Michel de Marolles, Abbé de Villiloin, accompanying each plate in the series, except the title page, bare witness to this Aristotelian narrative intent, with the added ethical concerns underlining Christian warfare. Whether or not Callot agreed with the narrative structure of the work, or with the accompanying verses, cannot be answered; but the fact of the matter is that *Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre* has an emblematic structure of *pictura* and *subscriptio* (the *superscriptio* being the title of each print in the series) and a seventeenth-century viewer would have understood that the image and the verse accompanying it would need to be interactively “read” as a unit.

As later viewers of the series, we too, are invited to “read” each print in this manner, while at the
same time keeping the Aristotelian unity of the narrative sequence in mind. The emblematic unity and the Aristotelian unity of the narrative sequence can thus be regarded as two interrelated units which together form the organising principle of the work as a whole while informing the viewer as to a possible way and means of not only approaching the work, but also interpreting it as well. In what follows I shall attempt such an interpretative approach, while consciously aware of the fact that it is but one interpretation among many others.

The narrative sequence begins after the title page (fig. 6). Plate 2’s inscribed verse (fig. 7) reads as follows:

Ce Metal que Pluton dans ses veines enferre,  
Qua taiet en same temps, et la paix, et la guerre,  
Attire le soldat sans creinte des dangers,  
Du lieu de sa naissance, aux Pais estrangers,  
Ou sestant embarque pour fuinure la Milice,  
Il faut que sa vertu sarme contri le vice.

[Prose translation in English: “That metal which Pluto encloses within his veins, / Which at the same time causes peace and war, / Draws the soldier, without fear of danger, / From the place of his birth to foreign lands, / Where, having embarked to follow the military, / He must arm himself with virtue to combat vice” (Daniel 1974: fig. 66).]

An interesting paradox can be discovered when interpreting this stanza. First, it is Pluto, the god of the underworld, and not Mars, the god of war, that is invoked in the opening line. What this suggests is that Christian warfare is not only a contradiction in terms, it is also a hellish event, wherein the god of the underworld already creates the “fire and brimstone” of war, not in some otherworldly Hades, but already on earth among humanity. Pluto is thus an emblematic figure in the poem representing the experience of warfare as a nightmarish “hell on earth” but the god of the underworld is not represented in person by Callot. The invocation to Pluto is also emblematic of evil, since in the seventeenth century Pluto was often seen as representative of the devil, dramatically presented in his kingly bearing (Bekker 1985: 114-115). It is the Prince of Darkness that is said to be the instigator of man’s evil and immoral deeds, to be the one who tempts the soldier into the confidence of going to war and legitimating his participation in whatever battles might come or whatever actions he might decide to take thereafter, and thus being in the process the “hell-raiser” of war’s miseries.

Virtue, however, must arm itself against vice. While hoping that this will be the case, the poet’s intentions can be interpreted as paradoxical: on the one hand they anticipate the “happy” Aristotelian ending of the series in which justice and virtue will prevail; yet on the other hand such a didactic intent seems to have fallen on deaf ears. Callot’s illustration of recruiting soldiers and the many that have already enlisted into
squads on the parade ground, shows them to be rather swaggish gentlemen in their plumed hats, uniforms, and "ballet stepped" marching. It is an attractive occasion which does not hint at any of the tragic consequences or "miseries" to come; it does not even show the presence of the devil, but rather presupposes a victory as a foregone conclusion as indicated in the waving banners and the vertical lances, in the manner of Velázquez's victors in the Surrender of Breda (fig. 5). The scene looks harmless and virtuous, yet the vices of war, let loose by the devil and Pluto, while seeming to be a distant possibility, nevertheless has the potential for becoming a distinctive probability, as much of the rest of the series makes clear.

The confidence in an ultimate victory of the recruited soldiers is carried over into Plate 3 where a battle takes place (fig. 8). Pluto recedes into the background as "the assaults of Mars and the blows that his arm strikes everywhere" take the lead. The accompanying verse in the words of the poet (Wolfthal 1977: 223), "does not daunt the invincible courage of those whose valour can combat the storm, and who, in order to win the name of warrior, water their laurels with the blood of the enemy." Callot draws the viewer's attention to the drama and movement of the fighting forces. He builds up his composition to his climax from both sides of the print by arranging the action into an ever increasing pyramidal structure towards the center, with a cloud of thundering smoke exploding overhead. The viewer is almost unaware of any horror taking place because the eye tends to delight in the overall design of the composition rather than in its particular details. The emphasis is on the grand movement of armies in battle, rather than on the sufferings of individuals. The heroic structure of the central motif may have reminded his viewers of Rubens' drawing of c. 1604 (fig. 9), which is a copy of the now lost black-and-red chalk study of Leonardo's Battle of Anghiari (begun in 1503, but never completed and lost by 1650), which Callot may have seen when he met Rubens in the autumn of 1625. Men and horses, smoke and lances, span the length of the scene;
and those who do not fight, lie with their horses, wounded, dead or dying on the ground beneath horses’ hooves.

From this point on in the series, war itself (Mars) also shifts into the background as Callot turns his attention to the next part of the miserable consequences of war: the actions of looting soldiers and their just punishment. “These brutal characters” we are informed in the verse below Plate 4 (fig. 10), “cloak their thefts at hostelries with the fair name of booty. Enemies of repose, they purposely pick quarrels to avoid paying the host and seize even the mugs. Thus they take a fancy to other people’s property when they have been made drunk and served as they desired.” Nothing, it would seem, “escapes their hands.” Thus in Plate 5 (fig. 11) we are told by the poet that “one invents tortures to gain gold, another instigates his accomplices to perform a thousand misdeeds, and all with one accord spitefully commit theft, kidnapping, murder and rape.” Callot here disperses the action throughout the kitchen of a raided farmhouse. While the farmer is being burnt upside down in the manner of St. Lawrence, his wife is being prepared for rape on a nearby bed. Another soldier is in pursuit of the farmer’s daughter or servant girl and has caught her by the hair, while a farm-hand who has attempted to defend her honour is being stabbed to death. Wine from the cellar vats flows freely in the background and is being liberally drunk, while food is being gusted in the foreground, and a trunk has just been opened and its contents...
are being removed as a part of the spoils of war.

No less horribly represented is the scene that follows on from the raided farmhouse. Here (Plate 6) (fig. 12) soldiers are shown “abducting nuns and removing booty from the church and loading it onto a cart” (Wolfthal 1977: 223). “These maddened, avaricious demons pillage and burn everything,” the writer of the verse informs the reader, they “ruin the altars, laugh at the respect due to the Immortals, and drag from the holy places the desolate virgins, whom they dare to carry off to be violated.” As part of the pleasure of such iconoclastic destruction, material gain, and the sexual violation of women, Callot depicts the convent aflame, while the marauders go about their business of helping themselves to other people’s property and their bodies.

The people of the inn (fig. 10), the farmhouse (fig. 11), the convent (fig. 12), the village, and the passengers on the open roads (Plate 8) (fig. 13) are all successively shown to fall victim to “these ignoble thieves [that] lead the life of assassins” until Plate 9 (fig. 14), when the premise for the next part of war’s miseries is introduced. Here the viewer is told by the poet that “the provost marshal brings them [the looting soldiers] to quarters to receive, as they deserve, a punishment commensurate with their temerity.” The viewer sees in the center of the print the captured “ignoble thieves” being marched away under armed escort, their hands tied behind their backs, while other “ignoble thieves” hidden in
the undergrowth are being sought and their weapons confiscated. It would thus seem to the viewer, as if the "ignoble thieves" who have been rounded up, and who have brought misery to the local population in the area (shown in Plates 4-8), will now receive their just reward for the crimes they have committed.

The just reward for the "ignoble thieves" is shown in Plates 10-14 which respectively shows scenes of strappado, hanging, firing squad, the stake, and the wheel. Callot separates the various punishments metered out on the disobedient soldiers by assigning each type of punishment to its own plate, thus separately building up a vivid, albeit cruel, image of military punishments that supposedly is fitting for "idlers, blasphemers, traitors to duty, quarrellers and liars, whose actions, blinded by vice, make those of others slack and irregular" (accompanying verse, Plate 10). The words of the poet (Plate 12) leaves no doubt in the viewer’s mind that the just reward carried out in these punishments for “ignoble thieves” is morally fully justifiable and just:

> Ceuz qui pour a leur mauuais Genie
> Manquent a leur deuoir, usent de tyrannie,

[Prose translation in English: “Those who, in obedience to their evil genius, fail in their duty, use tyranny, desire only evil and violate reason, and whose treason-filled actions produce a thousand bloody uproars in the camp, are thus chastised and executed” (Daniel 1974: fig. 276).]

Just as the god of war (Mars) accompanied the soldiers into battle, and the god of the underworld (Pluto) aided the “ignoble thieves” in their “evil genius” to rape, plunder, and devastate the countryside, so too, the emblematic figure of unseen Justice stands at the ready to see to it that such crimes do not go punished. Following Bruegel’s Justice print (fig. 3), the “ever-watchful eye of the divine Astraea [Justice]”, we are informed by the accompanying verse to Plate 14, "holding the sword and scales in her hands, ... judges and punishes" the "enemies of Heaven" (Plate 13). Justice toys with their wretched bodies and their remorseful souls as if they were nothing but mere playthings be to tortured and eventually put to death as their victims were.

> Ne se plaisent quai mal violent la raison;
> Et a’ont les actions pleines de trahison
> Produisent dans le Camp mil sanglans vacarmes
> Sont ainsi chastiez et pædez par les armes.
Possibly the most vivid, memorable, and horrible, of all these punishment scenes is Plate 11 (fig. 15), the famous arbor-hanging scene. Here, the “sun shines brightly on the 21 men hung by their necks from the branches of the huge tree” (Pearlstein 1975: 42). These unfortunates, described in the accompanying verse as “wretched fruit”, dangle like washing pegged to a cloth’s line. Suspended between heaven and earth, their bodies sway in the air while the ghastly event is witnessed by the “presence of a disciplined army, drawn up on parade, with banners, muskets, and lances” (Gardner 1980: 674). Priests are on duty, saying last minute prayers for the condemned, while granting them absolution for their sins. One priest has even climbed the ladder after a man that is about to be hung, and holds out a cross to him as a symbol for an eleventh hour salvation.

Two pathetic episodes of cripples, beggars, and the poor, follow the punishment scenes, thus introducing the viewer to the next phase of war’s miseries. The wounded casualties of war, having survived the bloodiness of the battlefield, or otherwise, now seek relief at a hospital camp, or alternatively, they are forced to beg for alms from passers-by. These miserable victims of war and its consequences are two of the main miseries represented in the latter part of the narrative series. Plate 16 (fig. 16) laments in the accompanying verse on the “lot of the poor soldier! When the war is over, his misfortune starts again. Then he is compelled to go begging, and his poverty arouses the laughter of the peasant, who curses him when he asks for alms and considers it an insult to see before him the object of the suffering he endures.” In sharp contrast, Plate 17 (fig. 17) shows the violent revenge upon soldiers by the peasants who, according to the poet, “await them in ambush in a secluded place, surprise them, kill them and strip them of their shirts.”
is as though Callot wanted his viewers to recognize, when adding the narrative sequence together and seeing it as a whole, that there is no difference between the diverse forms of violence portrayed in the *Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre* (whether the violence of the battlefield, the violence metered out on the civilian population [looting or rape], or the violent ends by which the perpetrators of such violent crimes are punished).

The hanging corpse in the background of Plate 17 serves as a reminder to the viewer of the just punishment already meted out in Plate 11 (fig. 15) on the one hand; while on the other, there is an eerie similarity between the travellers of the road being ambushed by soldiers (Plate 8) (fig. 13) and the peasants, who later turn on the soldiers travelling by road in order to have their way with them (Plate 17) (fig. 17). All in all, the miseries of war are shown in all their variety, to highlight the beast in humanity, along with man’s inhumanity to man.

When “peace” is again restored in Plate 18 (fig. 18), it is the king, as the absolute monarch and the emblem of God’s representative on earth, that ultimately sits upon the throne of judgment and “punishes the evil and rewards the good” as the poet tells the viewer, along “with the guard of honour, since all their happiness depends on virtue and they ordinarily receive from vice shame, scorn and the most infamous punishment.” This scene takes place in a throne-room where the monarch is seated in the center of the composition, while the guests mill around on both sides, complementing each other. The symmetry of the composition can be “read” as an emblem for the restoration of law and order, and as a fitting end to the miseries which have preceded it.

The didactic and moralizing tone of the *Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre* can be deduced from the chronology of the Aristotelian narrative sequence and from the poet’s remarks which are intended to guide the “reader” to view the series as a movement from vice to virtue, and
from injustice to the restoration of justice in the end; the vivid details and gruesome realism of Callot’s scenes notwithstanding. Even although only seven years of the seventeenth century were free of war in Europe (Young 1975: 466), according to the historian Sir George Clark (Russell 1975: 34), Callot’s series of Miseries tell of a hope in the restoration of “peace” once the atrocities of war had been committed, punished, and just reward concluded. Primarily, it seems as if Callot reflects on the ideal “grandeur” of the seventeenth-century’s glorification of the heroic and the dramatic elements of war. This is noticeable in Plate 2 (fig. 7) and in the final plate of the series (fig. 18). But the inhuman actions of all parties committed in between battles, victories, and the restoration of peace, both by looting soldiers [“immoral thieves”] and by their punishers (military or otherwise), are more telling on the misère of war and the viewer’s paradoxical responses of compassion and indignation at the sight of such consequences (Wolffthal 1977: 225) than with any of the moral didactic purposes of the series might have.

Callot’s supposed “neutrality” on such empathetic topics such as pity or outrage, however, have led critics such as Plan, Schmoll, Mayor, and Vahl, to believe that his Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre was executed with an air of “aristokratische Distanz” [courtly indifference] in order to amuse and charm the seventeenth-century viewer as a guighols divertissants. The critic Nasse, however, sees Callot as a sort of “war photographer”, a “visual journalist” illustrating the life of a soldier in as “correct” a realism as possible. Nasse’s view, however, fails to recognise that Callot has been very selective in his choice of certain subjects and in his omission of others, which have been made to conform to an Aristotelian narrative sequence and accompanying verses. Moreover, their “realism” is not entirely original: most of the punishments, for example, may have been derived from works like Bruegel’s Justicia (fig. 3) and his own observation of war and retribution in his Siege of Breda (fig. 4).

Although Callot in some respects stripped war of its glory and romance by showing with a merciless eye the distress of the common people, his view of war and its miseries, arguably remains conservative and didactic, subordinate to the accompanying Aristotelian narrative sequence and the subscriptio verses. Such an interpretation may seem foreign to a late twentieth-century viewer, who might wish to approach Callot from a Goyaesque point of view. The Goyaesque experience of war, however, is inappropriate to Callot, not only for diachronic reasons, but also for perceptual ones. Despite the fact that Callot has been called “the Goya of those wars” (Young 1975: 467), the unifying nature of the Aristotelian narrative sequence of his series and the restoration of power and honour to those that were loyal and obedient subjects to the king, who sup-
posedly pursued moral virtues while under orders, rather than the disorderly ends of "ignoble thieves" that took advantage of the civilian population and abused the war situation for their own advances (degenerate animal instinct for power over others or desire for material gain at the expense of others), frames Callot's series in conservative moralising. Goya's early nineteenth-century etchings of war stand in sharp contrast to this seventeenth-century perception of war. This can be immediately discerned from each artist's title of their respective series of etchings. Callot's Les misères et les malheurs de la guerre emphasizes the "misery and misfortune of war" as his focus of attention; Goya's Los desastres de la guerra stresses the "disaster" of war, a more disquieting view. Plate 1 of Goya's series introduces to the viewer the "sad presentiments of what must come to pass" (fig. 19). Here the viewer sees a lonely figure with a torn shirt, kneeling in the darkness, with eyes raised to heaven as if to appeal to an unseen God for intervention into what will follow. But heaven does not answer the appeal; nor does God intercede. Instead, the darkness deepens, and the background remains dark and indeterminate.

This indeterminate background recurs like a leitmotif throughout Goya's series, which focuses on the irrationality and inhumanity of humanity, and can be "read" as a universal emblem for the spirit of Modernity and Modernism and the heart which motivates such thoughts, consciousness, and action. With no moral guidance to light the way (Plate 70) (fig. 20), no moralising verse to accompany his illustrations, a disjunctive anti-Aristotelian narrative sequence, and no fixed hope in whatever should come after The death
of Truth (Los desastres de la guerra, Plate 79) (fig. 21), Goya presents early nineteenth-century warfare as an endless nightmare of infinite barbarity and cruelty governed by an indifferent and directionless Colossus-figure (fig. 22) which staggers about blindly, wondering aimlessly with no other desire than the need to witness continual fighting and to look down upon alienated individuals caught up in the circumstances of this hellish trap of despair, hopelessness, cruelty and horror.

If law and order re-establish "peace" at the end of war for Callot, sleeping Reason, for Goya, only produces monsters, without the possibility of an eventual peace. Goya's "proud monster" (Plate 81) (fig. 23) consumes the corpses of the dead, it performs "great deeds — against the dead" (Plate 39) (fig. 24) and instructs the living not to grieve for the dead, but rather to block one's nose from the stench of rotting corpses and to "bury them and keep quiet" (Plate 18) (fig. 25). Such thoughts might have been beyond the scope of Callot's world view, and this is why it may be
wrong for us to interpret him from our late twentieth-century point of view, having seen Goya. Possibly the more “positive” aspects to Callot’s vision is that his series of eighteen etchings summarized all that he was able to say, given the constraints of the Aristotelian narrative sequence of his series. Even in his most awful scenes of billeting and punishment, his wide angled panoramic view provides the viewer with differing individual’s situations and the viewer can almost take comfort in being a spectator of human suffering rather than being a participant of it. With Goya this is impossible: neither his victims nor his victors are virtuous witnesses to the events they behold or participate in. Though their context differs from Callot’s, Goya’s executioners seem more sadistic by comparison to their helpless victims (fig. 24). The atrocities are executed by both sides, and so there is little point in talking about “victors” since everyone is a victim of the conflict, circumstances, and actions. There is little sense, for Goya, of the “punishment fitting the crime” in early nineteenth-century warfare: there is no king to restore peace after war; no king to provide just reward for the virtuous and punishment for vice — only an indifferent Colossus-figure (fig. 22) and a devouring monster (fig. 23) to play with humanity, treating individuals how it will. Goya’s message is driven home in eighty-odd etchings and aquatints which could as well have been extended indefinitely, and being anti-Aristotelian (having no real narrative sequence), could be presented in any sequence. This may be the essential difference between the seventeenth-century approach to war narrativity (as exemplified by Callot and the organizing principal of a framed Aristotelian narrative sequence) and the approach two hundred years later (as exemplified by Goya’s anti-narrativity). Callot’s moral concern in the Les Miseres et les Malheurs de la Guerre occurred at a time when men were still able to believe in the dignity of the “noble” art of war. Those of us who are able to wear “moral-tinted glasses” and agree with his judgment of vision concerning war, are capable of overlooking all war’s atrocities because we
know that the Aristotelian narrative sequence ends in the eventual triumph of justice. Those who cannot, can only dwell on the disaster of war as an endless inhuman nightmare which remains both unjust and unjust.

Above all, some sense of Christian (albeit a Catholic one) justification for war is given to the viewer of Callot’s series; something which is forever lost to warfare since Goya’s observations of Modernity. For printed in very small writing within the format of Callot’s illustration is a repeated phrase overlooked by all the authors that I consulted. It constantly reminds us of the specific moral concern that Callot is interested in, and one which we should also constantly reflect upon: it says, "Israel execud cum Pruul. Reg." ("All men and nations that go to war as still part of the Kingdom of Israel"). As long as soldiers could show off their manners during war towards their enemy, and not to the people of the lands they conquered, then war could still have some moral value beyond the Christian sins ("thou shalt not kill," "thou shalt not steal", "thou shalt not covert another’s possessions") of the Church Militant. The honour for loyalty and the dignity in loss could be borne with a greater sense of relief and compassion in the seventeenth century, something which is denied to the victim of wars from Modernity onwards. This is the gulf which separates Callot from Goya (and post-Goya artists such as Manet, Picasso, Dix, Grosz, and Bacon); yet the bridge which links Bruegel and Callot to Goya (and to all war art) is that violence and cruelty remain universal by whoever commits such deeds, in whatever era, and in whatever circumstance, and it cannot really be glorified as "moral" and "just" since war’s very premise will always be grounded on being immoral and unjust.
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