INTRODUCTION

THE DUTCH BETWEEN MILITARISM AND ANTI-MILITARISM
IN THE “CENTURY OF THE SOLDIER”

Between the years 1550 and 1660 Europe hardly knew a year without war or virtual war. Any interval of peace was preparation for more war. This produced a profoundly militarist culture. War was accepted as much a part of life as death, as necessary (as Luther sadly put it) as “eating, drinking and any other business.”¹ The ideal individual, the “renaissance man” so much admired today, joined expertise and experience in war to his other virtues. And war was the primary function of the state.

War was the permanent condition of fallen man. Peace was to be found only in heaven; on earth, life was continual conflict. The “church militant” was a fighting unit. To argue otherwise, that permanent peace on earth was both possible and attainable, and that all war was wrong, was sheer cowardice, and even, as Erasmus complained, punishable as heresy.² War was part of a cycle like the seasons: “War begets Poverty, Poverty Peace/Then people will traffic and Riches increase./Riches produceth Pride, Pride is War’s ground,/War begets Poverty, So we go round.”³ War was part of the cycle of man’s life, which in the Warrior reached its zenith, according to the popular prints, where we also find war-provoking Choler (Wrath, Anger) as one of the Four Temperaments which constitute human character, associated with Fire, one of the Four Elements.

The explanations and justifications for war were legion. War was God’s punishment for sin. It was a test of Christian patience. It was a matter of Divine Providence, it was Fate, Fortune, Chance. It was a means to correct an injustice, avenge an insult, enforce a righteous claim. As for all the innocent deaths caused by war; there was a higher tribunal above. “Kill them all, and let God sort them out,” as a current U.S. Marine Corps motto goes, reviving a phrase attributed to Simon de Montfort.

It was, as the poet Fulvio Testi said in 1641, “The century of the soldier”⁴ — ten or twelve million of them. The economic consequences of war then, as in

¹ Hale 1985, p. 35.
² Russell 1986, p. 11.
³ The Quaker Spener quoted in Clark p. 141. The rigmarole goes back to the French renaissance poet Clément Marot.
⁴ Quoted in Parker 1995, p. 147.
our own war-racked century, are incalculable. They grew massively and disastrously from the moment in 1494 when the French launched the Italian wars. In Italy, until then, War had been relatively benign; more Uccello than Leonardo. The Eighty Years War in the Netherlands (1568–1648) was, at first, worse; in human and economic terms its impact is immeasurable. The Thirty Years War in Germany, says Geoffrey Parker, caused a loss of people proportionately greater than that of World War Two, and in terms of displacement of people and material damage was comparable.\(^5\) The Thirty Years War became a legend of ferocity. The Dutch saw this, and forgetting and not forgetting their own sufferings in an earlier generation, fought their own overlapping war in a more civilized way.

The early part of the Dutch Revolt had created its own legend of civilian suffering, of which this book is grim illustration. The imagery is clearly hostile to war as such — although this has been challenged — and clusters, as presented here, round the concept of a contemporary series of Massacres of the Innocents by Herodian Spain. The “Black Legend” of Spanish cruelty survived to the renewal of war in the early 1620s, when the Dutch added new genres to what was already unparalleled pictorial reportage of common life experience: battle piece, guardroom plundering and siege prints among others, while the denunciation of military abuses metastasized.

Military painting in the northern Netherlands, which spanned many modes, some quite benign, was the product of a country that institutionalized war as nowhere else. The “Belgicus Modus,” the Dutch way of war, was by the 1590s admired as the “School of Europe.” It was the best organized, the most scientific — almost civilized. But the Netherlands was also the “universal sepulchre of Europe” — of men of all nations, foreign mercenaries forming the majority of both Dutch and Spanish armies.\(^6\) Says a contemporary in 1627: “The war in the Netherlands is the biggest, bloodiest and most implacable of all the wars which have been waged since the beginning of the world.”\(^7\)

The “Belgicus Modus” marks the beginning of European militarism, according to a Dutch authority.\(^8\) This is unfair and incorrect. Militarism was a European phenomenon long before the Dutch revolt began. What the Dutch taught was how to wage a rebellious and defensive war, efficiently, systematically, and in a relatively civilized way. Unlike other nations the Dutch were supposed and supposed themselves to be not naturally warlike. Their very social structure did
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\(^5\) Parker 1984, p. 211.
\(^6\) Parker 1979, p. 171.
\(^7\) Cited in Duffy 1979, p. 58.
\(^8\) Kist 1971, p. 36.
not conduce to war. The northern provinces lacked that essentially warrior class, a prestigious, powerful hereditary aristocracy. Even before the Revolt broke out the native like Erasmus and the foreigner like Guicciardini concurred that the Dutch were industrious rather than belligerent. Erasmus had said “no race is more open to humanity and kindness, or less given to wildness or ferocious behavior . . . treachery or deceit.”\(^9\) The chief military organizer of the Revolt in his day, Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, in a famous utterance, saw his people as “by nature gentle and peaceful, not inclined to war.”\(^10\) The great Dutch historian Johan Huizinga deemed war (on land, at least, our concern here), “wezensvreemd” or essentially foreign to the Netherlandish folk character.\(^11\)

This book seems, in part, to deny that claim. Yet the iconography which sets out to glorify the land war does so in a nuanced, and I shall argue relatively untriumphalist way, leaving it to the poets (Valerius, Hooft, Vondel, and Huygens) to eulogise in the usual way the conquest of so many towns, and to the sea-painters the many victories at sea. Even the maps celebrating victorious sieges are not conceived in terms of conventional martial heroics, like those mini-epics of Dutch battle-paintings. These are strictly generic, and show courage, fury, fear and death as fundamental human conditions, the tragic drama of earthly existence and as an abiding aesthetic challenge. Unlike their ruling-class equivalent, the heroic battles of princes in palaces elsewhere in Europe, especially Italy, they do not idealize actual wars, or make them a pretext for classical erudition and artistic finesse.\(^12\) Monumental, heroic martiality is generally lacking in Dutch art. “No people is less disposed to heroism, but circumstances made the Netherlanders heroic,” said Friedrich von Schiller.\(^13\) Precisely; and it is the precision of these circumstances which the Dutch delighted to record. It was left to Rubens, the princely painter of the Spanish Netherlands, to monumentalize war and warrior.

**Protest Art? A question of audience**

More or less officially sponsored or rewarded celebration of particular victories, and a taste for generic battle-scenes, are but one aspect of Dutch war-related art and literature. Denunciation of the effects of war on the innocent, in which
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\(^9\) In the *Adages* 1508, cited by Shetter p. 20.


\(^12\) See the splendidly illustrated Patrizia.
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both Dutch and Flemish artists participated, and which occupies the major part
of this book, shows the “true face” of war as seen from lower social circles
who saw no profit or honour in it. Curiously, this iconography of denuncia-
tion, then more popular than prestigious, has since been submerged altogether,
and when noticed, its effectiveness denied and intention misread. We may
ascribe to ignorance, or the airy perception of excessive distance, in a recent,
promisingly titled Art in History survey, the view that “the war between Spanish
Flanders and Holland, which had so troubled Rubens, was a subject that was
deliberately suppressed in [Dutch] art.”14 But we cannot lightly dismiss the con-
clusion of serious specialists like Maarseveen, for whom Vranckx plundering
scenes are “not a denunciation of war,” but more “an artistic processing of
hard contemporary reality [than] any eventual moralistic, political and social
commentary;”15 or Vander Auwera’s emphasis on “the large dose of fiction” in
Netherlandish art, north and south, about the Eighty Years War;16 or more
categorically and surprisingly, the conclusion of Fishman, who ends an excel-
 lent little book on the subject of our chapter 8: “Thus the Dutch and Flemish
Boerenverdriet (Peasant Sorrow) rarely challenges, but more typically reinforces,
prevailing views on warfare and violence.” Is then this considerable body of
art, this new genre, to be reduced to the acceptance of fearful abuse as sim-
ply the natural fate of peasants, as ineluctable as the wars that caused it?

My view here clearly runs against a currently prevailing ideology of art his-
tory, which is that art obeys the prevailing ideology of the moment. Denying
the evidence that many of our pictures were made as protest, as a form of
denunciation, is in itself an ideological position. Sometimes it is just a matter
of not looking hard enough. John Hale, our premier authority on art and war-
fare in the Renaissance, finds Vermeyen’s tapestries on the Conquest of Tunis
for Charles V all very idealized, impersonal, psychologically distancing, “clean and
orderly.”17 My own conclusions (p. 79) are very different. Hale is here reading
the work as the patron wished it to be read, excluding a level of subversion
surely intended by the artist to be recognized as such.

Historiography, while it has long since abandoned exclusive concern with
war and politics, is still in the business of burnishing the haloes of heroes, and
ignoring or minimizing their abuses of power. I was unable to find a single
critical biography of that most callous, destructive and misguided of men, the
emperor Charles V. The crimes illustrated abundantly in this book, and pre-

15 Maarseveen, p. 163; cf. a similar comment p. 126.
17 Hale 1990, p. 252.
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No one disputes that the audience for print and painting in the Netherlands was different and much broader than elsewhere. The merchants, traders, artisans and even better-off farmers who bought pictures were more likely to be critical of bellicosity and its effects, than those closer to the reins of power who stood to gain by war; and the public in the Netherlands, the propaganda center of Europe, was literate and politically aware. Obviously, the different kinds of painting dealt with here appealed to different tastes. A pacifist kind of revulsion at indiscriminate killing and plundering, and the need to exorcise it, was surely one of them, as was the attraction of the warrior, both real-life and armchair, to pictures of battles and maps of sieges. Soldiers liked to look at soldiers, good and bad: in an Alexander in the studio of Apelles, one of the king’s officers kneels to examine an animated Caravaggist tavern scene with gambling mercenaries, an illustration of modern military degeneration vis-à-vis the glory days of Alexander.

At the very least, one may assume diversity of response, and its flux in time. In art of any complexity, the idea of a fixed, single meaning (starting and often ending with the artist-patron relationship), of uniformity of reading, still bedevils our discipline. Engels knew that a writer’s intentions are not necessarily a good guide to the meaning of his work. Balzac went further: “Even the most profound author does not always understand — one might say never understands — the different meanings of his work, nor its true scope, nor the harm or good it may do.” Freedberg speaks of the “potential fluidity of meaning” of art
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works, to study which as “autonomous manifestations of the individual creative spirit” would be “careless of the material processes of history.”22 “The individual creative spirit” may, I daresay, be lacking in much of the work featured here, that of lesser artists offering variations on market-proven formulas; but the “material processes of history” are very much in evidence here, I hope, explaining and explained by the art. There will be some scepticism, I fear, around my claim that the Netherlanders used the Massacre of the Innocents in order to protest military cruelty in their time, and that the Continence of Scipio raised far-reaching issues of military and civic justice, statecraft, foreign policy, taxation and so on. Examination of context, and possible contexts, and of probabilities where certainties are lacking, is indispensible.

This book is about a popular response to war, as expressed primarily in painting. The lack of engravings on the themes of the paintings is puzzling to me. There may however have been many more prints, and paintings, and of greater variety, than have survived. It has been estimated that of the several million paintings done in the Netherlands in the 16th–17th centuries, only ten percent survives.23 Small military subjects were not honored genres; common plundering was trivial, vulgar murder indecent. Many subjects of interest to us are known only through inventories.24 If only one copy has survived of Berckenrode’s map of Holland 1621, one of the greatest cartographic achievements of the 17th century, “world-famous” for its inclusion in two Vermeer paintings,25 and certainly well-known at the time, it may be that whole classes of prints as well as of painting are lost to us. The very nature of the subject-matter makes this likely. Why would a thing of such beauty and practical value like the Berckenrode map survive by only a hair? It is easier to understand that morally ugly and artistically unpretentious plunderings and small-scale ambushes with perfunctory landscapes soon fell out of favor, became casualties of time and changing taste. The 18th century preferred more pacific subjects. The military side of Dutch art remained hidden throughout most of the 19th and 20th century, disdained by major museums; even today, a large proportion remains in private hands, with dealers, and known only through old sales catalog photographs.

How partisan was the appeal of military paintings? The siege maps obviously aimed at patriotic sentiment as much as the propaganda pieces officially commissioned in Brussels and Madrid. In the generic battle and plundering pictures, were contending sides identifiable by the coloring of banners and sashes? A difficult question. The idea of the complete military uniform belongs
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to the future, but armies did for practical reasons identify themselves by means of insignia of different colors: red was firmly prescribed for the Habsburgs, yellow was adopted by Sweden, blue (or white) by France, and orange by the Dutch. The proximity of red and orange, the colors of the primary contestants, would have been an inconvenience for artists wanting a good color contrast, as it must have been for the soldiers on the field of battle. In fact, relatively few paintings identify opposing sides in this way. On occasion Vrancx in Antwerp was willing to identify his own, Habsburg side as the perpetrators of cruelties, and Martsen de Jonge in Holland occasionally showed his side as losing; but there was no consistency here. To argue that it was not in the commercial interests of the painter to take or even show sides, if he wished to sell across borders, assumes a patriotism which was not general; if Vrancx openly identifies his military murderers as Habsburgs, presumably his Flemish patrons were prepared to see the army that ruled them in this light, as Bruegel had taught them to do, long ago. Callot showed the abuses of soldiers designated as Catholic in Catholic milieux, which was of course his own; the Dutchmen Droochsloot and Wouwermans, both of whom were Catholics, tended to show plunderings committed in Catholic villages, but without designating the religion or nationality of the plunderers.

“War is good business: invest your son” (U.S. poster against the Vietnam war)

The great Dutch Revolt confronts us with the stirring spectacle, not unfamiliar in our own age, of a small nation not naturally given to war winning against the world superpower. More surprising still is the way the Dutch made the war pay, despite the enormous costs of a permanent war-footing. The idea of a profitable “war-economy” familiar from the 20th century American experience, was not at all the wisdom of earlier times. What started as rag-tag local guerrilla and ad hoc foreign hireling bands fighting on land and sea, far from impoverishing the land, benefited from an economic rebirth, and matured by the 1590s into a professional army of 30–35,000. This had doubled by 1607 (while actual costs tripled), and rose to 48,000 when the war was renewed in 1621, reaching 58,000 in 1627, and peaking in 1629–43 at 70,000 and more. By

27 Maarseveen pp. 151, 295, 304 and 324. A Vrancx plundering scene in Liège of c. 1630 (one of three nearly identical versions) includes apart from red feathers and breeches, a Spanish/Imperialist Golden Fleece emblem on a trumpeter’s instrument.
28 Lynn 1990, p. 33; similar figures are given by Zwitzer 1991, p. 175. Anderson 1988, p. 37 puts the figure for 1629 at 128,000. See also, in general, Marco van der Hoeven 1997.
around 1640 over half the national budget went to the army, over a quarter to the navy.\textsuperscript{29} To be sure, armies grew in size everywhere: the increase in aggregate numbers of men under arms in western Europe in the 16th–17th centuries has been put as high as ten- to twelvefold, and the number of men under arms in the empire at a given time has been put at a quarter of a million.\textsuperscript{30} But the Dutch Republic was a very small country with a small population, bearing a burden twice or three times as great as a country could "theoretically" support; if we put the "bearable" proportion of soldier to population at a norm of one percent, the Dutch with one and a half million people could "normally" have supported an army of no more than 15,000. If the Dutch army reached at critical moments, notably in July 1629 for the siege of 's Hertogenbosch, close to 129,000, this was half of the total Spanish army in all of Europe.\textsuperscript{31} This multitude was moreover paid relatively promptly, and not left, like so many other armies, to live off the land. In the garrison towns, there was a soldier in every home.

The towns of Holland, producing about sixty percent of the total wealth of the republic and more than this share of taxes, did not see much of this army in reality. But they paid for it. \textit{Pecunia nervus belli}, money is the sinews of war, was the preferred Dutch motto, as against the conventional \textit{bellum se ipse alet}, war feeds on itself. Unheard of prosperity and economic growth enabled the Dutch to take a huge military budget out of taxes, which were recognized as being the highest in Europe, and willingly paid. Even then the tax revenues in Holland in the 1630s, at eleven million guilders annually, were exceeded by war expenditures at twelve million.\textsuperscript{32} The Dutch capacity to increase wealth while fighting continuously on land and sea was accounted a miracle then and still astonishes today.\textsuperscript{33} "It is known to all the world," said the contemporary Dutch magistrate C.P. Hooft, "that whereas war...[tends] to ruin land and people, these countries on the contrary have been notably improved thereby."\textsuperscript{34} The Dutch also profited from war elsewhere: they reaped a palpable economic advantage from the European conflicts, the Thirty Years War in Germany and north Italy, and the civil wars in France and England, capturing a global trade from countries otherwise occupied. So there were good economic arguments against suspending the war in 1609 and ending it in 1648.

\textsuperscript{29} Frijhoff 1999, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{30} Tallett 1992, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{31} Parker 1988, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{32} Parker 1988, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{33} Swart 1967 is a excellent summary.
\textsuperscript{34} Parker 1998, p. 45 and in Winter 1975, p. 60.
Certain Dutch business men acquired great riches by supplying the armies. Elias Trip exported arms to neighbouring countries and as far as Russia and Venice. The Trip family, remembered for their patronage of Rembrandt in his late years, flaunted the origin of their wealth by fashioning the chimneys of the Trippenhuis, the fanciest in Amsterdam, in the shape of mortars. Louis de Geer also of Amsterdam enjoyed something of a monopoly over arms production, the metal for which he got from mines he exploited in Sweden. There is no doubt that the merchants of Amsterdam profited hugely from the war, which affected all branches of the Dutch economy, involved huge financial transactions, and landed them with well-founded accusations of trading with the enemy. None got as rich as the greatest war-profiteer of them all, imperial generalissimo Albrecht von Wallenstein in Bohemia; he ran his own war industries and became in the empire second only to the emperor in wealth.

Did artists profit directly from war? In the later period, obviously, in more ways than one, including the increased demand for military subjects of various kinds. While the general economic disruption of the wars in 16th century Italy does not seem to have much injured art production there, the military repression and the war-related (and -provoking) iconoclasm in the Netherlands certainly did. This helps explain the hostility to war manifested by a painter and writer such as Karel van Mander writing at the turn of the century (see below), for whom war and art were simply inimical, the commonplace obverse to the saying *pax foveat artes* (peace favors the arts). But subsequently art and artists shared in the war-related economic boom. There may even have been an economic slump just after the Peace of 1648, causing a (short-lived) crisis for artists. The many military genres which arose were clearly products of war; the ending of the war probably sent them into a slow, relative decline.

**Rembrandt: an artistic militant**

It is deemed an inescapable truth (or truism) that the violence of war is related to the violence of so much baroque art, notably that of Rubens. But what of Rembrandt, where the violence, although very different, is also physical, emotional and stylistic, and seems, unlike Rubens, to pit the very forces of light and darkness against each other?

A special case or a test-case? Rembrandt, born and raised in Leyden, perhaps the most militant and Calvinistic town in Holland, was fifteen years old
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when war was renewed. He may have been entered at the Leyden university
to absolve him from civic guard duty, while continued exemption was guar­
anteed by both his father and brother having a hand seriously crippled in acci­
dents caused by military service-related musket practice. Rembrandt’s first
paintings date from the very years, 1625–26, when the loss of Breda caused
alarm throughout the nation and the economy slumped. His work as long as
the war-fever endured — until around 1637, when Breda was recovered and
the economy with it — has a markedly militarist character. In the late ’20s
and early ’30s he did a number of portraits of burghers as civic guard officers,
“types” (tronies) wearing a military gorget or collar, and self-portraits thus accou­tred. No less to the taste of the time were his violent biblical and mytholog­
ical subjects. The small Abduction of Europa dated 1632, and recently acquired
by the Getty Museum, is turned into a kind of highway robbery, with promi­
nent coach and coach-driver and (female) guards looking on helpless shock. His
work of this period, when his career went into orbit, stands under the aegis of
Bellona, the war-goddess, a hefty Rubensian figure he painted in 1633, which
has been seen as the embodiment of Dutch liberty. Rembrandt’s career is that
of a combative spirit, to the point of the reckless and even lawless; at times he
seems to be at war with patrons and rivals alike. The recently mooted notion
that sees not just Rembrandt, but Netherland artists (and Art?) generally in a
martial or at least minervan mood, battling enemies in imitation of the father­
land itself, is attractive but would take us too far afield. Art and War join
hands; war is art and art is war. The sense, which has its sinister aspect, that
skill in warfare, extended to mean the conquest at once of places and appear­
ances, was perceived at the time as a primary cultural characteristic of Europe,
is embodied in Jan van Kessel’s painting in Munich of the Four Continents. There the European conquest of nature by painting and of the world by force
of arms are given a certain equivalence. Metaphorically, art-as-warfare had its
antecedents: Vasari, about to paint the Battle of Lepanto, hoped to win “such
a victory with my brushes as the Christians did with their weapons.”

Just one more example from Rembrandt: his Blinding of Samson (FIG In-1),
possibly done (says Schwartz) for that war-like youth, the future Great Elector

41 Chapman pp. 36–44.
43 Cited by Hale 1990, p. 139.
44 Schwartz 1985, p. 177, with the more general hypothesis that “tingles with promise and pines
to be proved” that the Dutch liked to use the story of Samson to allude to war.
In:1 Rembrandt. The Blinding of Samson. 1636.
of Brandenburg when he was a student at Leyden university, is excruciatingly militarized. The usual moment chosen by artists in this highly popular story illustrates the sexual encounter, emphasizing Samson’s sexual weakness, with him asleep on Delila’s bosom while Philistines lurk behind. To take the moment of blinding by heavily armed, professional-looking military thugs who have ambushed the leader of the enemy tribe in a cave, and render it with a gruesomeness amounting to artistic sadism, is, I think, quite apart from Rembrandt’s predisposition to shock tactics, a reaction to the growing military violence of the age. As the triumph of a corrupt military female holding up her capillary trophy, the composition bears comparison with the camp-followers flaunting their pearls in our Transacting the Plunder (ch. 12). The bloody naturalism of this sort of picture, inaugurated in the drama by Jan Vos’s Aran en Titus (1641) would generate much criticism at the time. After 1648 a classicizing decorum and dignity set in, inimical to Rembrandt’s temperament but responsive to a cooling of the national belligerence.

The Truce Years: no respite?

The years of the Twelve Years Truce (1609–1621) were those of a renewed iconography of military crime. The Truce was achieved with much pamphleteering and art — cartoons, allegories — pro and con, which continued throughout the period. Was the new wave of plundering pictures received as a warning against terrors returning with an expiry or breakdown of the Truce? The Truce was anyway relative. While fighting was largely suspended on land, it continued at sea, where war and piracy were indistinguishable. The ideological war went on unabated. Patriotic illustrated histories kept the sufferings and victories of the past alive. At the bottom end of the market we may single out the tiny (13 × 9 cm), cheap volume called Spiegel der Jeught. Dedicated to the Directors of the East and West India Companies who opposed the Truce, and intended for children, with its sixteen dramatic woodcuts of Spanish atrocities, it was first published in 1609 (“lest we forget”) and reached its nineteenth edition in 1631. The adult reader used one of the perennial editions of the famous Spanish Tyranny in the West Indies by Bartolomé de las Casas (first published 1552), a larger volume enriched with seventeen gory illustrations and twinned with the equally well-illustrated Spanish Tyranny in the Netherlands (numerous editions

45 Toth-Ubbens, pp. 402–411.
sixteen items from the two sets of illustrations were reunited in a most uncomic broadsheet "comic strip"\(^{48}\) around 1620 (FIG In-2). The Dutch were the Amerindians of Europe.

Historiography of a less obviously polemical kind played its part as well: the first part of Pieter Bor’s great official history of the Revolt appeared in an expanded form 1621 (–1634), with its gory frontispiece (FIG In-3), and there had been published meanwhile many more or less popular, patriotic-Orangist, and well-illustrated works on the subject: Wilhelm Baudartius’ \([\text{Spaensche Tiranye diendende tot een} \text{ Morghenwecker der vrye Nederlantsche Provintien} \text{ (Spanish Tyranny serving as an alarum for the free Netherlandish provinces, sixteen editions 1610–50)}\), was written to “cause revulsion against the Spaniards;”\(^{49}\) and the \(\text{Nassausche Oorloghen} \text{ (Wars of Nassau, many editions 1612–19)}\) with over 280 illustrations is virtually a picture book, with an accent on righteous battles.

The historiographical propaganda war was not of course entirely one-sided; but the nearest, relatively isolated Catholic equivalent, Richard Verstegan’s \(\text{Theatrum Crudelitatum Haereticorum Nostri Temporis} \text{ (1587), which also knew French editions, was not translated into Dutch, and only five illustrations pertain to the Netherlands (the remaining 24 relate to France and England)}\).\(^{50}\) The book can hardly have gained credibility by its perpetuation of the absurd, like the libel that Calvin was branded for sodomy, and the grotesque, that French Huguenots played bowls with severed heads. This may be projection of the kind of thing that happened in reverse: in real life, gruesome play (and commerce) with body parts was characteristic of French Catholic, not Huguenot mobs, for reasons having to do with religious superstition.\(^{51}\) It speaks for the veracity of the Netherlandish illustration of military abuses that concerns us here, that it almost entirely avoids the more revolting mutilations (like that of the corpse of Coligny, for instance, FIG 7–4), contenting itself with straightforward killing. Netherlandish painting does not aspire to that great and variegated panorama of military crime and punishment presented by Callot.

\(^{47}\) [Spiegel der] \(\text{De Spaensche Tyranie} \text{ (Tiranye) geschiet in Nederlant, and same title . . . in West Indien.}\)


\(^{49}\) \(\text{Oosthoek’s Geillustreerde Encyclopaedie} \text{ 2, 295, s.v. Baudartius.}\)

\(^{50}\) See Petti 1959–60, pp. 64–90; and Kunzle 1973, p. 44.

\(^{51}\) Davies 1974, p. 233.
In-3 Frontispiece to Pieter Bor, *Nederlantsche Oorlogen* (Netherlands Wars), Leyden 1621. On scroll below picture: “If you are a true Netherlander, be preserved from the Spanish yoke.” The Inquisition, figured as a harridan bearing the torch of War, tramples Policy and Justice. Her soldiers attack Truth, torch Liberty, steal Wealth and Privileges. In the background, characteristic forms of execution.
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The Reticence of Orangist propaganda

Creating by force of arms a new nation, the Dutch never built up a national militarist tradition. The government and its propaganda apparatus were never under the control of the generals, much less admirals; nor was there an identity of interest between government and military, as in the U.S. today. The victories (especially at sea, but also on land) were as much national as personal to the commander. The Orange dynasty for all its prestige was not fetishized as princes — and princes much less successful militarily and politically — were in Europe generally. No Rubens appeared in the north to celebrate conquest and conqueror. Nor was one required. Having erected just one free-standing public monument, to Erasmus of Rotterdam, a literary figure who was significantly the best-known pacifist in Europe, the Dutch made no more.

In the churches the Dutch preferred to put monuments to their sea, not land captains. Civic buildings were spare in their praise of Orange-Nassau. There is not a single painting surviving (although there were prints) of any of prince Maurice’s sieges and battles, except for his pyrrhic victory at Nieuwpoort. Painted equestrian portraits of Frederick Henry tended to be small and of low quality; they appealed, curiously, to burghers of little account, or even now unidentifiable. There was in The Hague nothing like the machinery for the production of princely and court portraits such as existed in Madrid, London, Vienna or Paris. The first full-length portrait of Frederick Henry was actually commissioned from abroad: by Charles I (painted by Honthorst, in Windsor). The first statues of the Orange dynasty (discounting the tomb of William I) did not appear until 1651. They were made for the Huis ten Bosch in the Hague, the major, posthumous monument to Frederick Henry which was erected ironically at the start of the “stadholderless period” when Orange power was in eclipse. Although much was inevitably made of the prince as warrior in the extensive decorations of the Oranjezaal, the centrepiece of the Huis ten Bosch palace, in an inscription on the climactic Triumph scene (by Jacob Jordaens) he is extolled as the bringer of Peace; and in a significant substitution, the original plan for a design to show the prince seated on a conquered cannon receiving the homage of the conquered towns, was changed at the wish of the canny widow Amalia van Solms to Frederick Henry receiving the survivance (right of

52 See Feld 1975, pp. 419–442.
54 Dumas 1980, pp. 15–16.
55 Tiethoff-Spliethoff 1978, p. 113.
succession) for his son William II.\textsuperscript{56} The various palaces he acquired or built (most of them now lost to us) were not conspicuous for their Orangism; at Rijswijck, characteristically, he had a gallery dedicated to his hero and godfather, Henry IV of France.\textsuperscript{57} At the castle of Buren, where there was a carefully planned roomful of small (lacklustre) pictures of sieges, the commander-in-chief is quite inconspicuous, absent or hardly identifiable. Where one would have expected a large equestrian portrait, there hung an \textit{Allegory of the Republic} (or \textit{Liberty}). In matters of personal propaganda as in others Frederick Henry always maintained a “cautious, modest pose.”\textsuperscript{58} Even post mortem, there is no Orangist equivalent for the sumptuous album celebrating Louis XIII as warrior, the \textit{Triomphes de Louis Le Juste} by Jean Valdor (1649). It is in the siege maps (ch. 14), which record the victories of Frederick Henry, that one would expect outright Orangist propaganda. These prints certainly redound to his glory, but their intention is rather patriotic in a broader sense, and visually the credit goes to the engineers and the ant-army of soldiers. Rather than heroic deeds of individuals, which were indeed lacking and might have been hard to invent, in the manner of ancient Roman historiography, the Dutch printmakers and painters recorded a collective science of war for which their nation was famous.

\textit{Military genre: a Netherlandish specialty for home and export}

The military genre specialties created in the Netherlands were generated from experience and hatred of war, and simultaneously from a continuously expanding tradition in the depiction of common life. This phenomenon is unique to the Netherlands on both counts. Italian Caravaggism, which from the early years of the 17th century put a new emphasis on low-life tavern scenes that often included soldiers, spread quickly across the Alps, impacting the French painter Georges de la Tour and a number of Dutch artists, notably in Utrecht. The typically largish paintings with relatively few, large-scale and half- or three-quarter-length figures placed close to the spectator, can hardly be regarded formally as models for the Netherlanders who depict their soldiers small and numerous, fighting or plundering in small-format landscapes. Here they are really at war, whereas in the Italian and Italianate pictures we seem to be seeing them merely at recreation, habitués of tavern and brothel in military garb.

\textsuperscript{56} Hallema 1941, p. 114.
\textsuperscript{57} Hudig 1928, pp. 23 f.
\textsuperscript{58} Ploeg and Vermeeren 1997, pp. 47 and 226–30.
Small, multi-figured landscapes, with the military themes they incorporated, flowed from the Netherlands into Italy, partly through expatriates, a major group of whom in Rome were called the Bamboccianti. They are credited with breaking through the wall of Italian classical decorum, the general disdain for ‘vile’ subjects, and dragging the “comely and noble dame Painting into the gutter.” Their leader, Pieter van Laer of Haarlem, whose physical deformity gave the contemptuous name to the group, brought to Rome themes of travel, brigandage and looting in the manner of Esaias van de Velde. Cornelis de Wael from Antwerp brought to Genoa various kinds of military genre, some quite original (FIG IN-COLOR 4) and dealt such pictures all over the peninsula. Michelangelo Cerquozzi, one of the few native-born Romans who took up the low life genres, became known as “Michelangelo delle Battaglie” for his battlepieces, relatively few of which survive, and left a *Sack of a Town* described as a “subject without precedent in Italy.” Italian baroque military painting generally sought to raise its status by using the rhetoric of renaissance and antique examples; this was not the intention of the Netherlanders.

As a battle painter Cerquozzi was soon overtaken by Jacques Courtois, known as Le Bourguignon (the Burgundian), who again under stimulus from Netherlanders he could have met in Florence or Rome, became the only military specialist who as such bears comparison with the Netherlanders. Extravagantly praised in his time and in the 18th century, for his “expression of the terrifying reality” of battle (according to Bernini), encompassing formats large and small, Courtois offers gruesome and touching moments which may derive from actual experience of war as a youth with the Spanish army in northern Italy in the 1630s. Episodes of combat, especially those involving a flag-bearer, are rendered close and particular, and on occasion we detect a compassion for the wounded on the part of fellow-soldiers generally missing from the Netherlandish battle-pictures (FIG IN-5). It is odd that Salvator Rosa, who flirted with Bamboccianti modes before denouncing them, and became synonymous in the 18th century with banditti, treats his robbers as a tribe apart, unrelated to armies, and left no pictures of battle-related plundering.

In engraving, the name of Jacques Callot will always stand apart. It remains to be proved whether this Italian-trained artist of Lorraine received much stimulus from the Netherlands in his military subjects. It seems likely, but his series *Miseres et Malheurs de la Guerre* (1633), of which a few etchings are reproduced for comparison in this volume, but which is otherwise, alas, geographically hors
In-5 Jacques Courtois, *Respite in the Battle, with dead Ensign*. The group peering down and gesturing towards the dead ensign, who is stripped naked but wrapped in his flag after his horse was killed under him by a pike (right), and a living ensign looking back as he rides off, do so, surely, in admiration for an exemplary death. (In reality, the flag would have been carried off by the enemy as a trophy.)

de concours, in its narrative coherence, moral power, precision of motif and intensity of vision, seems to transcend all that the Netherlands did in this domain, peculiar to them as we deem it to be. Callot’s famous series is a mini-epic, compared with which the Dutch give mere reportage. The intensity of his vision of military cruelty and its retribution must have to do not only with his superiority as artist and etcher, but also the closeness of his contact with the vainglorious militarism of his patron (duke Charles IV of Lorraine), and the frightful licentiousness of the troops, local and foreign, which ravaged his country.
Certainly no Dutchman attempted to emulate Callot’s war-related etchings in that medium. Some conceptual echo of Callot’s series, as well as the Dutch genres, may be found in the album incorporating designs of plunderings, captured peasants and military types by the Swiss Rudolf Meyer (1605–1638) done in the 1630s but not published until 1650, and in the remarkably impressionistic etchings done in 1643 and 1655–56 by Hans Ulrich Franck (1603–1675), painter and organist of Kaufbeuren. The subjects extrapolate incidents from Callot and the Dutch: ambushes, hostage-taking, attacks on and murders of peasants and women (FIG In-6) as well as revenge on the soldiers by the peasants, and gambling and fighting of soldiers, peasants, and women severally among themselves.
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61 Matt 1948.
62 Filser 1923. Six of the 25-plate set of war designs are dated 1643, half of the rest are dated 1655 and 1656; reproductions in Langer figs. 92–96 and 100–101.
Our summary account of contemporaneous military genre outside the Netherlands reveals its paucity. The only precursor, to be sought in the Germanic renaissance, is by contrast abundant and richly varied. It is also quite different, in medium and character. As John Hale has splendidly shown, the life and appearance, in camp and on battlefield, and indeed something of the tormented soul of the mercenary soldier is first revealed to us by German and Swiss artists, and especially in prints and drawings. While for the Italians the soldier was still largely the formulaic ancient Roman soldier, in the north he became the German Landsknecht and the Swiss Reisläufer, the colorful mercenary, an object of fascination, fear, dread — and respect. The work of two prominent Swiss artists and draughtsmen, Urs Graf and Niklaus Manuel, is imbued with their military persona, stamped on their monograms, into which a dagger is woven. Unlike our Netherlanders, they knew military life from the inside, for both fought in armies. The disposition of Urs Graf to personal violence and public scandal is well-documented. His soldiers are exotic, terrible and pathetic; one drawing in particular, showing a monstrosely mutilated young woman, stands apart as a condemnation of war (FIG In-7). Generally speaking, Hale concludes,
art “heeded the summons of the drum and followed the flag.”63 One of the few exceptions to this rule recognized by Hale, apart from the odd Urs Graf drawing, is that great body of illustrations attributed to Hans Weiditz for the 1532 German edition of Petrarch’s *On both kinds of Luck, Fair and Foul*, which is imbued with an Erasmian kind of revulsion against war, and ruling-class oppression of the poor (FIG In-8). More typical in its general acceptance of military abuse as the inevitable concomitant of war is the inclusion of a scene of soldiers burning down a village in the *Triumph of Maximilian* suite of woodcuts, painted as it were on the side of the war-chariot in which the emperor is shown giving peace to the Netherlandish provinces (FIG In-9). The contradiction, or irony, so obvious to us, would have passed largely unnoticed at the time.

For all its variety and eloquence, the German woodcut seldom condemns war and its effect on civilians. Much of it was produced as propaganda for the imperial armies, and in praise of their Christian courage, functioning in effect like a recruitment poster. A certain critical distance and disillusionment may
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be detected on Erhard Schön’s *Baggage Train with Death* (1532), with its straggle of soldiers, whores and baggage, but the artist’s intention was hardly akin to that of Johan Theodor de Bry in the Netherlands at the turn of the century, who in the caption to his copy after the Schön print characterizes the soldiers as “pitiless,” “prepared to devastate houses, cities and flourishing landscapes, a troop of pernicious thugs and villains,” out to kill others and destroy themselves.⁶⁴

In the 16th century the primary means of expression of hostility to the contemporary soldier lay in that bottomless iconographic repertoire on the Passion of Christ. Northern artists vented social fear and artistic skill in the representation of the twisted torsoes and grotesque physiognomies of the military torturers and executioners of Jesus. The Romans’ cruelty was the model for that of their latter-day descendants towards those as innocent and defenceless as Christ was, who were like him hunted down and persecuted, down to the post-mortem stripping of their paltry clothing. But Calvinist regimes forbade the public pictorialization of Christ’s passion. The military sadism that had afflicted Christ was acted out, instead, in Netherlandish fields and farms.

⁶⁴ See Moxey 1989, pp. 80 and 87, figs. 4, 10 and 16.
It was not until the 1550s, our starting point here, that under the impact of “new forms of terror and patriotism” we find military genre striking root in the Netherlands and becoming “an exhalation of public concern with war and its agents.” From the great tapestries by Jan Vermeyen on *The Conquest of Tunis* by Charles V, (ch. 2) to the pictures of the Holy Innocents massacred by Herod and Herod-like Spaniards, a new moral dimension emerges: a real sympathy for the victims of war, which endures down to the French invasion of 1672. Romeyn de Hooghe’s amazing dramatization of civilian suffering in that “Year of Disaster” (and later, 1685–86, of the effects of Louis XIV’s Revocation of the Edict of Nantes) revives a tradition which had started over a century before. Romeyn de Hooghe lies outside the scope of this book, but I have dealt with this aspect of his work elsewhere.

*Travellers on lonely road, seeing gallows: “Ah, civilization at last!” (Traditional)*

From a distance, viewed philosophically, pictures of soldiers killing and dying satisfied the public need for expiation of original sin; the pictures, like the reality of public execution, satisfied the need for social retribution. The soldier was the arch-sinner, violent death his just reward. But sudden, random, obscure death on the battlefield was too good for him; rather, he should meet his death on one of the those gallows erected by artists over scenes of battle and plunder. The moral message here is clear. But the sprouting of gallows in mid-16th century, and increasingly in the 1560s, on the hilltops of Ways to Calvary and in Crucifixion scenes accompanying the traditional crucifixes, carried a very different association. Bruegel’s *Triumph of Death* (Prado, about 1562) and his *Way to Calvary* (dated 1564, FIG In-10) bristle with gallows that have reminded some scholars of contemporary execution of heretics. The commonplace punishment of hanging had a strictly contemporary reference; virtually no traditional Christian martyrs suffered thus. The spectacle of heretics dying in the innocence
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65 Hale 1990, p. 249.
67 For example: by Pieter Aertsen in Berlin (destroyed 1945, repr. Franz fig. 134; fig. 409 ibid. gives a Beuckelaer); an engraving after Lambert Lombard by Pieter van der Heyden dated 1555, (repr. Denhaere c. 1990, no. 31); and by Maarten van Heemskerck (repr. Freedberg 1987, fig. 4). Note particularly the addition of a gallows wheels to the engraving dated 1565 after Michael Coxie’s copy of Roger van der Weyden’s *Deposition* in the Prado (repr. Sellink 1994, pp. 68–69, cat. 20).
In-10 Pieter Bruegel the Elder, *Calvary*, 1564, detail of gallows.
and with the courage of Christ but in the manner of the worst common criminals, was particularly shocking.

In the later 16th century the gallows in its various forms, pi-shaped, triangular, cantilevered and wheel, became an iconographic signifier not of sin, but of martyrdom. It may even function as the ironic product of injustice in Bruegel's *Justice* engraving of 1559. From a kind of semaphore of suffering under Spanish tyranny, as we see it in allegorical cartoons (ch. 6), the gallows metastasized into “innocent” landscapes, particularly mountainous ones, starting with Bruegel's otherwise unmoralized *Large Landscapes* engravings of 1553–57 (where they have passed unnoticed, so tiny are they), and in his *Return of the Herd* (before 1566). Gallows surface more conspicuously in the mountainscapes of Joos de Momper and Sebastian Vrancx around the turn of the century. They culminate, with over-evident monitory intent, in scenes of battle and brigandage by Vrancx' pupil Snayers (FIGS 11–21, 25, and 26 etc.). At this time, in the 17th century, gallows break out like a pox of human sinfulness on the face of all sorts of Dutch topographical prints: maps, town views, siege engravings (FIGS 14–8 and 9), landscape panoramas (11–39, among many others not illustrated here). How far they are included as observed fact, and how far added for moralistic effect remains to be researched. Depicted with such exaggerated emphasis or in exotic multiples ranged on a hilltop like the devil's own artillery (appropriately, for artillery was deemed an invention of the devil) as in the examples illustrated, their function as a warning against military crime is beyond doubt.

Gallows are the judicial link between civilian and military. Criminals fled from the civilian gallows into the armies, and from the military gallows back into civic life. The army erected its own gallows, which soldiers were expected to salute as they passed. For a soldier to be hanged on a civic gallows was additional disgrace, and civic authorities who caught military criminals tried to avoid handing them over to army provosts as required. The army was correspondingly quick to hang noncombatants — usually unfortunate peasants, bribed or coerced — suspected of acting as couriers or spies. The presence of army gallows sought to deter this, and what army commanders considered the real, internal offences: cowardice, desertion, and fighting within the army. Abuse of civilians was a relatively minor matter and usually practised with impunity. The gallows in the paintings, be they civilian or military, are the civilian's curse upon the soldiers' crimes.

The gallows commonplace in Europe on roadways, coastlines, city walls, and market squares, were accepted as normal and even welcomed as evidence of justice done, of crime punished, and security assured. The incidence of gallows in the peaceful topography of Holland might lead us to suppose that province to have been as plagued by the same level of violence as other countries; this
is belied by the evidence. Dutch prosperity and social controls were able to contain the worse forms of civil unrest and violent crime. Amsterdam did not even have its own executioner, and averaged four executions and four brandings per annum in the century 1650–1750; only four persons were broken on the wheel in the whole second half of the 17th century. The corpses hanging from gallows in the middle of the ice-field on which the crowds are unconcernedly disporting themselves, are, I believe, occasional moralistic embellishments of the painter, Hendrick van Avercamp. Gallows in or near towns were not normally popular. Dutch burghers (burgomaster Adriaen Pauw and Constantijn Huygens among them) were apt to demand the removal of what seemed to cast an evil-omened shadow over their lives.

In Germany and France it was common for the peasants to take terrible revenge against their military oppressors, but not (in the 17th century at any rate) in the Netherlands. There are a few, not very distinguished Dutch pictures showing peasants defeating soldiers in battle (FIGS 11–50 through 59); but they do not furiously massacre them and hang them from trees as in Callot’s penultimate plate of the Misères (FIG 11–55). The example of Vinckboons (see below) which shows the violent (and symbolic) eviction of soldiers from a peasant home, had no following. Peasant Revenge was a frightening prospect for all propertied classes; it threatened revolution, as it had in the German Peasant War. The Dutch trod here gingerly. Exceptionally, one does find the master hung upon the gallows, as in a curious allegorical painting by Paul Potter, much admired by Goethe, threatening the huntsman retribution from his prey. The judiciality of the proceedings seems very Dutch, and the painting has, probably, a fell political purpose: to denounce the tyranny of William II (FIG In-11).

The Revenge of the Animals motif is common in folk-prints of The World Upside Down, where animal prey and human predator reverse roles. The socially subversive potential of this kind of reversal can be traced back to the German Peasant War, and via the Dutch Revolt, into the Thirty Years War, when Grimmelshausen in his novel Simplicissimus exploits it to the full. As a young soldier the author sees and describes a World Upside Down print that causes him to dream of a world where the animals would slay the hunter, the peasant would fight and the soldier be made to plough. The suppressed dream
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70 Spierenburg 1984, pp. 36 f. 53, and 186. Figures for the earlier period are lacking.
71 Welcker 1976, pl. V A, and figs xxvi and xxxii. See also Gillis van Scheyndel’s Winter Scene frozen river before a town (Hollstein 24, p. 239, no. 124).
73 Buisen in Walsh 1996, p. 129.
74 Kunzle 1978, pp. 61–64 and 77–82.
In Paulus Potter, *The Revenge of the Animals*, detail of center. Smaller surrounding scenes show conventional hunts of different animals. After sentencing by the lion-judge, the huntsman is roasted alive on a spit and his dogs are hanged. The painting was probably done in the circle of count John Maurice of Nassau ("The Brazilian") and in the wake of the coup attempt of prince William II, as a warning against the absolutist, tyrannical tendencies of that prince.
of reversal and revenge lies under the consciousness of many of our pictures of common people being hunted down and slaughtered and stripped like beasts. Potter’s painting and the World Upside Down print subverts Rubens’s use of the hunt as a metaphor of war (see p. 404) to enforce social hierarchy and princely rule. In their aversion to princely authority the Dutch reversed the rules of the game, as we can judge by an example of the World Upside Down broadsheet that Potter might have known, using the theme of the Revenge of the Animals to warn “Lords who are too severe [and] turn respect into hatred”, as the title goes (FIG In-12). Here it is the more realistic aristocratic prey, a deer, rather than the lion of fable, who gets to judge, roast and hang the oppressors. Lest this appear too revolutionary, and an incitement to popular revolt, an ambivalent inscription is added summoning the “sweet animals” to patience, to forget the hunting “that feeds the blood of the noble court,” and to realize that violent resistance will not profit them. Historically, however, it had done: the Dutch geese (gans, a word sounding like geus or Beggar, revolutionary) got to eat the Spanish wolf, and the beggar or poor man prevailed over the rich man (these are both World Upside Down motifs). While permanent reversal of roles was hardly imaginable, least of all in internally quiescent Holland, Netherlanders did harbor a lively sense of the injustices suffered by those least able to protect themselves, whether the deserving poor or the undeserving victims of military abuse.

From Criminal to Courtier

When does the transition of the soldier from criminal to courtier take place? The first popular visual promotion of the soldier, coinciding with the accelerating depiction of him as plunderer and killer of innocents, may be termed a kind of courtship of public support: Goltzius’s and Jacques de Gheyn’s engravings of model officers of the new model Dutch army in the later 1580s. This is an isolated, time-bound phenomenon. The Dutch army will reappear in a very different guise with the renewal of war in 1621, virtually in its total collective glory, crystallized into siege maps; now it is a city which is being courted, as well as public opinion. This courtship, personalized in allegorical nuptials between the commander, Frederick Henry, and the maiden-town he has wooed and won, is joined by another kind, that of the civic guard groups, burgher-soldiers parading before their fellow citizens and courting their good opinion.

75 See Buijsen in Walsh 1996, pp. 129 and 131.
These, together with the siege maps (for obvious reasons), become extinct after 1648, making way for the entrance, in a curious kind of military-moral vacuum, of officers (painted by Gerard Ter Borch and others) into the drawing room, trying to court ladies imagined to be real. At both these levels the end of the land war in 1648 causes a clean break in iconography. The decline in production of pictures of criminous soldiers on the field of battle and in guardrooms, after 1648, is less abrupt, although also apparent. Outright glorification of war, which we track in the oeuvre of Rubens (who died in 1640), is also superseded by more pacific subjects, after the Peace of 1648. It would revive chiefly in France, with Louis XIV, and in Holland in “siege-like” documentary prints and paintings of the sea-battles.

Embracing these two eras, of war and post-war (1648), we find that protean subject, surely the most popular of all in painting from ancient history, the Continence of Scipio, a constant plaidoyer for peace. Here is your typically murderous Roman transformed by the magic of art and the filter of a highly selective reading of Livy, into the military courtier par excellence. Here is war and killing turned into peace and marriage. The Scipio story in art is the visual stage for one of the most constant dynamics of the theater — indeed, the very thinking — of the age. At its simplest it represents the triumph of love over war, of romantic dream over harsh reality, of the quality of mercy unstrained by law and custom permissive of cruelty. And the triumph of true love, wherever one looks in European culture, is the triumph of an ideal political order. In drama and poetry the ultimate union of the star-crossed lovers is always in some sense a metaphor of desirable political union, the resolution of social conflict in harmony, of war in peace. The personal is political. The upper classes, whose own marriages in principle put economic interest before love, all dreamed of marrying love with interest; this is what Scipio does. Unitng others in love he marries them to his interest, which he identifies as that of his country, like all those princes in plays who facilitate the marriage of significant subjects in order to restore harmony to fractured realms. In Scipio, the resolution of the dichotomy, the desired transformation inherent in our title is enacted.

Scipio and our “gallant soldier” enter that process of post-war domestication in town and court which affected all Europe, and was encouraged by an absolutist prince such as Louis XIV as a means of quieting a fractious nobility. The transition to a more orderly, disciplined society, traceable also in Holland, was not sudden; it took the age of the Enlightenment to advance and refine it. The continuing market in the third quarter of the 17th century for pictures of military criminality served as a reminder of that barbarism that could easily recur — and would in fact recur with the French invasion of the Netherlands in 1672. The Massacre of the Innocents (Dulwich Picture Gallery), an early work by Charles
In-12 Pieter Nolpe (engr.) with Pieter Potter (des.?), “Lords who are too severe turn respect into hatred.” Etching. While sentencing the hunter to the direst penalty, the verse summons the “sweet animals” to be patient, and not to complain.
Lebrun, who would become Louis’ favourite court painter, with its “real-life” novelties of women biting soldiers and horses trampling babes, would have stood for the Dutch as a metaphor of that invasion, and for the French Huguenot as a metaphor of their persecution. Louis was able to attract the new Dutch specialist military painter such as Adam van der Meulen into his service; and it was the fiercely patriotic and Protestant engraver Romeyn de Hooghe who remained to render the behavior of soldiers under the French Herod.