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Abstract

This thesis’ main goal is to answer the question: from where did Peter Paul Rubens’s *Life of Marie de Medici Cycle* come? Previous literature has focused on the content of the twenty-four canvases of the *Medici Cycle* and their meanings. However, they have not viewed the *Medici Cycle* as part of a bigger whole and thus part of a larger agenda that was symbolised through Marie de Medici’s construction and patronage of her own palace in Paris, the Luxembourg Palace. Originally planned to emulate the Palazzo Pitti in Florence in which Marie was raised, the Palace represents the Florentine agenda that was prevalent throughout Marie’s patronage after her first exile at the hands of her son, Louis XIII, in 1617. By viewing the Luxembourg Palace as a whole and exploring the *Medici Cycle*’s placement there, this thesis will show that Marie was looking back to Florence for guidance when constructing her own image as wife, widow, mother and regent. The first chapter places the *Medici Cycle* firmly within the Luxembourg Palace and the themes prevalent throughout the decoration there, acknowledging Marie’s dependence on Medici architectural and pictorial projects when developing her own programme of praise. The second chapter looks to how the other Medici queen of France, Catherine de Medici, portrayed herself when faced with the same obstacles as Marie, fifty years prior: motherhood, widowhood, regency, foreignness, gender and power. In this chapter it becomes evident that Marie used many of the same strategies as Catherine, yet far surpassed her in her own aggressive self-promotion, as evidenced by the nature of the *Medici Cycle*. Chapter three focuses on the similarities between the *Medici Cycle* and sixteenth and seventeenth century entries and festivals, especially those in Florence staged in celebration of dynastic marriages. The chapter answers the question of whether the *Medici Cycle* was in fact, finally, Marie’s triumphal entry into Paris. The final chapter looks to Marie and her image following her final exile in 1630. It highlights the importance of the *Medici Cycle* on Marie’s public image and how it influenced later depictions and laudations of Marie, specifically in her entries into Brussels, Antwerp, Amsterdam and London. This chapter will show that Marie still had the same patronage agenda following her final exile and how the imagery of the *Medici Cycle* became part of the symbolism and vocabulary in Marie’s patronage and image that shaped opinions of Marie far past her death in 1642 to how her image is perceived today.
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Introduction

“But Italian and Medici, Marie de Medici was not a woman to suffer in indifference and silence.”

Louis Batiffol

Louis Batiffol’s observation of Marie de Médicis (1575-1642) almost three hundred years after her death accurately sums up the reputation that followed Marie de Médicis from her first arrival in France in 1600 to her death in Cologne in 1642 to modern day. A victim, perhaps, of male dominated history and gender politics of the seventeenth century, Marie has often been viewed as a failure and an embarrassment to the French monarchy – a woman who had no idea what she was doing and who was easily influenced, “as women will be”, by her own moods and those with whom she surrounded herself. However, this was not necessarily the case. Recent scholarship has instead begun to focus on the facts of Marie’s regency instead of the contemporary pamphlets and discovered that France was economically successful and peaceful during Marie’s reign as regent from 1610 to 1617. That was the precise message Marie de Médicis was attempting to convey about herself and her regency in her Luxembourg Palace in Paris and specifically in Peter Paul Rubens’s cycle of twenty-four paintings, The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle, when she returned to Paris from exile in 1620. Marie was very much in charge of her own image, and that image came to be represented in the Luxembourg Palace, a palace that served as her manifesto of power. This thesis will answer the questions from where did the Médicis Cycle come and what its placement in the Luxembourg Palace says about the Luxembourg Palace as a whole and Marie’s patronage as a wife, widow, mother and regent. It attempt to locate the Médicis Cycle as part of larger agenda that was symbolised through Marie de Médicis’s construction of her own palace in Paris. It will also demonstrate that the Luxembourg Palace displays a Florentine agenda that persisted throughout Marie’s patronage after her first exile at the hands of her son, Louis XIII, in 1617, and would continue to be used during her final exile in 1630. By viewing the Luxembourg Palace’s decorations as a whole and exploring the Médicis Cycle’s placement there, this thesis will show that Marie de Médicis was looking back to Florentine examples of political propaganda for guidance on how to construct her own image as a powerful wife, widow, mother and regent.

3 Jean-François Dubost, Marie de Médicis, la reine dévoilée (Paris: Payot, 2009).
Marie de Médicis

This introduction will now give a brief biographical sketch of Marie to provide the background of the protagonist of the thesis. Born in Florence on the 26th of April 1573, Marie de Médicis was the sixth of eight children born to Francesco I de’ Medici (1541-1587), the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and his wife, Archduchess Joanna of Austria (1547-1578). Francesco wrote to his brother Cardinal Ferdinando de’ Medici of the happy occasion of Marie’s birth: “Today at about [midday] Your Excellency acquired a pretty little niece, brought forth by Her Most Serene Highness, the Grand Duchess; and because oftentimes female creatures conduce to great things in states, to me this was very pleasing indeed.” Although Francesco still held hopes for a son and heir, ironically it would be two of his daughters who would become powerful European figures through advantageous marriages. They were the only two of Ferdinando and Joanna’s eight children who would survive into adulthood: Eleanora (1567-1611), who married Vincenzo I Gonzaga (1562-1612) and became the Duchess of Mantua, and Marie. Marie’s mother Joanna of Austria died during childbirth on 11 April 1578. Francesco de’ Medici quickly married his mistress, Bianca Cappello (1548-1587). Although history has loved to paint a very dire childhood for Marie it was probably not as unhappy as previously thought. Marie spent most of her childhood in Florence at the Palazzo Pitti, under the tutelage of Giovanni Arighi, the First Gentleman of the Chamber to Joanna of Austria, and Giulio Ferri. The evidence suggests that the Grand Duke and new Grand Duchess were attentive parents who often spent time with their children. She was raised with her sister, Eleanor, her younger brother, Filippo, and many Orsini and Medici cousins. However, at the age of twelve, Marie would again experience a family tragedy when her father and stepmother died within one day of each other on the 19th and 20th of October 1587. Francesco was succeeded by his brother, Ferdinando (1549-1609), who gave up his red cardinal’s hat and quickly arranged his own marriage to the granddaughter of Catherine de Médicis, Christine de Lorraine (1565-1637). After Christine’s arrival in Florence in 1589, she would become a surrogate mother to Marie who would influence and guide her even after her departure from Florence in 1600.

Soon after his own marriage in 1589, Ferdinando began looking to arrange an advantageous marriage for his niece, Marie. It would take a decade before the arrangements for Marie’s marriage were solidified. In early 1600, Ferdinando was in the midst of negotiating a

---

5 Batiffol (1931), 1.  
6 Millen and Wolf (1989), 40.  
7 See, for example, ASF Mediceo 5984, ins. 16, published in Deborah Marrow, *The Art Patronage of Marie de Medici* (University of Pennsylvania: 1978), which describes one of the frequent family get togethers in Pisa.  
8 These cousins included Virginio and Leonora Orsini, Virginia de’ Medici, and Antonio, the illegitimate son of Francesco and Bianca Capello, whom Marie insisted accompany her to France upon her marriage to Henri IV in 1600. For more on the Medici and Orsini cousins, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 39.  
9 Legend has it that Francesco and Bianco were both poisoned, however, modern research points instead to malarial fever. Rossella Lorenzi, 14 July 2010, "Medici family cold case finally solved". http://news.discovery.com/history/archaeology/medici-mystery-cold-case.htm.  
10 In fact, both Ferdinando and Christine were surrogate parents to Marie, and Marie often addressed her letters to Ferdinando to “my father more than my uncle.” Millen and Wolf, 41.
marriage of Marie to the king of France, Henri IV (1553-1610). Henri IV had previously been married to Marguerite de Valois (1553-1615), however their marriage remained childless and was eventually annulled. Henri was looking for a wife who would provide him with many heirs, specifically male heirs. Many portraits were exchanged during the marriage negotiations, and Marie's portrait reportedly "pleased His Majesty exceedingly." Marie was twenty-five when her marriage to Henri IV was announced in April 1610. Although Henri had initially wanted a wedding in person in Marseilles, their marriage was celebrated by proxy in Florence Cathedral on 5 October 1600. The ceremony was officiated by Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini (1571-1621), the nephew of Pope Clement VII. Marie's uncle, the Grand Duke Ferdinando, served as the proxy for Henri IV, while Nicolas Brulart de Sillery, the French ambassador to Rome and Roger de Bellegarde, Grand Ecuyer of France, served as witnesses from the French court. Less than two weeks later, Marie de Médicis left her home in Florence to travel by sea to her new home in France accompanied by her aunt, the Grand Duchess Christine, and her dear friend Leonora Galigai (1571-1617). The fleet landed in Marseilles on 3 November 1600, with all of the pomp and ceremony expected of the arrival of a new queen.

It would take another five weeks for Marie de Médicis to finally meet her bridegroom, as Henri IV was preoccupied with a war and his current mistress. Marie de Médicis and Henri IV met in Lyons on 9 December 1600. Upon their initial meeting, the Venetian ambassador reported that Henri had found Marie "beautiful in truth, not only for wife, but for mistress, and that she was high-spirited and that that is something that counts even more." Cardinal Aldobrandini again confirmed their marriage, this time in person, at Lyons Cathedral on the 17th of December. The newly married couple stayed in Lyons until mid-January 1601, when Marie de Medici first started showing the signs of pregnancy. Only then did Marie and Henri, albeit separately, make their way to Paris. Marie arrived in Paris to no official welcome on the 8th of February 1601.

The dauphin Louis (1601-1643), was born at Fontainebleau Palace on the 27th of September 1601. Henri IV finally had his heir, and Marie de Médicis had done what she had

11 Baccio Giovanni, ASF, Mediceo 4615, fol. 269r.
12 Millen and Wolf (1989), 50.
13 For more on Henri IV's desire to have the wedding in Marseilles and the eventual event in Florence, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 64.
14 Little is known about the history of Leonora Galigai. It is believed that she was raised with Marie in Florence as the daughter of Marie's wet nurse. However, this has never been confirmed. It is known that she travelled with Marie to France and served in her entourage there. The Grand Ducal secretary Belisario Vinta listed those who would accompany Marie to France. Leonora was listed as "a girl called Leonora who had served her perpetually ever since the time of the Grand Duke Francesco, her father." ASF, Mediceo 4616, fol. 552. For more on Leonora, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 39.
16 From the Venetian ambassador Cavalli, BNF, Ms. Italien I 749, fols. 149v, 158r, translated by Millen and Wolf (1989), 75.
17 Millen and Wolf (1989), 75.
been brought to France to do. Marie would go on to give birth to five more children: Elisabeth was born in 1602, Christine in 1606, Nicolas Henri in 1607, Gaston in 1608, and Henrietta Maria in 1609. Out of her six children, five would survive into adulthood and each play their parts as political pawns.  

Between 1601 and 1609, Marie de Médicis was somewhat preoccupied with childbirth and played a small role on the political stage of France. However, in 1603, Henri did appoint her to the Council of State. She spent this time learning as much as she could about the politics of France and often was called upon to respond to the criticisms of her rivals and eventually earned the respect of Henri IV as a wise political participant. This would seem to be why, as Henri prepared to go to war to help settle the succession dispute of the duchies Cleves, Berg and Jülich in 1610, he placed the regency of the underage dauphin in Marie’s hands. The seventeenth century French historian, François Eudes de Mézeray (1610-1683), recounted this development in Marie and Henri’s relationship, confirming that Henri IV had begun to rely more on Marie’s council To solidify Marie’s role as regent, Henri IV decided to have Marie crowned in an elaborate ceremony in the abbey of Saint Denis on the 13th of May 1610. Little did both Marie and Henri know that the solidity of Marie’s role as regent would be tested the following day.

On the 14th of May 1610, one day before her scheduled triumphal entry into Paris, Henri IV decided to visit the Arsenal. As his carriage made his way through the crowded Parisian streets, a Jesuit, François de Ravaillac, lunged into the carriage and fatally stabbed Henri IV. Although Marie de Médicis initially fainted at the sight of the dead king, she quickly composed herself and established herself as regent before the Parlement of Paris. Henri’s most faithful allies gathered around the queen and told her, “Madame, this is not the moment to weep, but to take courage, because all of us here are for you, who now must be man and king alike.”

In the years that followed, Marie attempted to continue her husband’s policies during her regency. Although Marie had hoped to negotiate peace without military action, one of her first military acts was to resume Henri IV’s intervention in the Jülich-Cleves succession issue. The
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19 Nicolas Henri, a sickly child, died in 1611.  
20 Millen and Wolf (1989), 27.  
21 Millen and Wolf (1989), 96-106.  
22 For more on the succession issue in Julich-Cleves, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 99-100. Not knowing how it would please God to dispose of him, he resolved to leave the regency to the Queen so as to assure his state and the crown to his children. He discussed this project many times with the Queen, and along with many general matters needful to observe in order to reign happily, of which he spoke to her often and on various occasions, he gave her some particular precepts necessary for governing this state...”, François de Mézeray, Histoire de la regence de la reine Marie de Médicis, femme d’Henri IV (Paris: Haye and Francfort, 1743), 10.  
23 For more on the details of this day and Ravaillac, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 122.  
24 Millen and Wolf (1989), 123.  
25 In a letter to the Grand Ducal secretary Belisario Vinta to Matteao Botti on the 5th of July 1610, it is evident that Marie hoped to maintain peace instead of begin a war and had attempted to negotiate this
French army, along with its allies, was successful in returning Jülich-Cleves to the Protestant princes.\(^{26}\) Even though she had very little to do with the actual circumstances of the battles, Marie would later use this as evidence of her own military might. Within France, she managed to maintain peace between the Catholic and Protestant factions, continuing Henri’s policy of tolerance. However, she often faced opposition from the Princes of the Blood, Henri de Bourbon, Prince de Condé, Alexandre de Vendome and César de Vendome, three of Henri’s illegitimate children. They eventually rebelled in 1614.\(^{27}\) Marie de Médicis’s response was appeasement. She generously paid off the princes and peace was restored. Louis XIII came of age on the 27th of September 1614. This was when Louis was to take over the government and Marie would step down as regent. In reality, however, this is not what happened. Marie continued to act as regent, although seemingly with Louis’s consent. Louis and Marie met with Parlement for Louis’s \textit{lit de justice} ceremony when he would declare himself of age.\(^{28}\) During this ceremony, Louis accepted the reins of government and praised his mother’s successful regency.\(^{29}\) Louis added that “he intended that the Queen his mother should assist him with her good counsel as she had done up to that day, declaring her Chief of his Council and adding that in any case he would always give heed to what his chancellor would say.”\(^{30}\) Thus, Marie continued to maintain her regency role \textit{de facto}. Although Marie later would receive harsh criticism for this continuation, history would prove that Louis was not yet ready to be king and his mother’s intervention steadied the first years of his majority.\(^{31}\) As Millen and Wolf confirm, “Marie would need to hold the tiller for some years after her son’s declaration of coming of age. When her hand was ripped from it, France only narrowly escaped flounder.”\(^{32}\) In Marie’s continuation as regent in all but name, her foreign policy was a hoped-for alliance with the Spanish Habsburgs, which she sealed with a major political victory – the double marriage of Louis XIII to Anne of Austria (1601-1666), and Elisabeth de France to Philip IV of Spain (1605-1665) in 1615. Although this marriage arrangement was previously discussed by Henri IV, it was Marie de Médicis who successfully brought it to fruition.\(^{33}\) It would prove to be one of her most successful political coups. A dramatic and lavish exchange of the princesses took place on an island in the middle of the Bidassoa River on the Spanish and French border on the 25th of November 1615. Marie was now the mother of the King of France and mother-in-law to the King of Spain.

Despite these successes, Marie’s rule was to come under fierce attack in 1617 at the hands of her son and his favourite, Charles Albert, the duc de Luynes (1578-1621). Marie had made the mistake of too obviously relying on her Florentine favourites, Leonora Galigai and her husband Concino Concini, the Maréchal d’Ancre (1575-1617), whose power and influence grew by the

\(^{26}\) Millen and Wolf (1989), 156-157.
\(^{27}\) For more details on the actions of the Princes of the Blood, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 151-153.\(^{28}\) Letter from Matteo Bartolini to Grand Duke Ferdinando, 7 October 1614, ASF Mediceo 4629, unnumbered, translated by Millen and Wolf (1989), 169.
\(^{29}\) For details on this ceremony, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 169-170.
\(^{30}\) Millen and Wolf (1989), 169.
\(^{31}\) See note two for the biographies of Marie that criticised her regency.
\(^{32}\) Millen and Wolf (1989), 170.
\(^{33}\) Millen and Wolf (1989), 143-144. Apparently, a year before his death, Henri IV was already investigating the potential of a Spanish match for Louis XIII. Henri was deterred by the demands of the Spanish ambassador.
day. From Marie’s arrival in France, her Florentine companions had been viewed suspiciously by the French. At one point, Henri IV threatened to send them back to Florence, as their influence on the Queen was becoming more apparent. They became even more disliked by the French as Marie, now widowed, bestowed more titles upon her Florentine favourites and gave Concini important political positions. Despite warnings from Henri’s former counsellors, Marie kept Leonora and Concini close. At the same time, Louis XIII was growing ever closer to his falconer, Luynes. Luynes was instrumental in instilling Louis with a growing fear of his mother’s Florentine circle and, ultimately, of Marie as well. Reportedly, when Louis was ill, Luynes filled his mind with the idea that his mother had poisoned him so as to put her “favourite son” Gaston on the throne instead. This culminated on the 24th of April 1617, when Louis ordered the assassination of Concini in the courtyard of the Louvre Palace. At the news of the assassination’s success, Louis was reported to have shouted, “Now, I’m really the King!”

This was a statement that betrayed that Louis felt he was still ruled by his mother and her favourites. Louis then sent the order for his mother to be kept under house arrest. Leonora was arrested under the charges of witchcraft and lèse majesté and eventually executed at the Place de Grève in Paris on the 8th of July 1617.

Marie was exiled to the Château de Blois in the Loire Valley, far from the court and far from her children. Louis’s actions were not wholly supported, however. To punish the overreaching foreigners was one thing, but to exile his own mother who had so recently served as his regent was perhaps a step too far, even for the king. As Marie was ordered to leave Paris, throngs of her admirers gathered outside the Louvre to show their support. Mézeray recounts the scene: “She quit the Louvre dressed simply, accompanied by all her domestics who wore sadness painted on their faces; and there were scarcely any with so little sentiment of human matters who were not moved to compassion by the sight of this almost funeral display.” Marie was already playing the role of wounded mother. She would remain under house arrest at Blois for almost two years before she escaped in the night with the aid of her supporters on the 21st of February 1619. Marie’s escape forced Louis’s hand and negotiations for a truce between mother and son began at Angoulême, the duc d’Épernon’s estate. A treaty was signed on the 30th of April. However, it was not until the 3rd of November 1620 that Marie de Médicis was allowed to enter Paris again. Soon after the death of Luynes, on the 15th of December 1620, Marie was invited back into the Council of State. Marie had stipulations of her own, however. Documents from Florence summarize what Marie expected from Louis upon her return: “the safety of her person, the right to daily association with her son and other children, the assurance

35 Millen and Wolf explain in more detail the growing sphere of influence of the Concinis, 174-175.
36 Luynes was a “nobody” who managed to climb the ranks and become part of Louis’s inner circle. For more on his background see Millen and Wolf (1989), 175.
37 Millen and Wolf (1989) recount this rumour on 175.
38 Millen and Wolf (1989), 176.
40 One of her staunchest supporters who is thought to have organised the escape was Jean Louis de Nogaret de La Valette, the duc d’Épernon. For more details on the escape, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 180.
of a return to her position at court, and a guarantee of her status as dowager queen along with the confirmation of her political and other rights.” Exile had done little damage to her ego.

Soon after her return to Paris and the Council, Marie commissioned Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) to paint twenty-four paintings based on her life to decorate her Luxembourg Palace in Paris. Rubens came to Paris in January 1622 to sign the contract and negotiate the subject matter of *The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*. As she felt comfortable enough to commission a series of paintings that would enhance her image and tell her side of the story, it would seem that Marie was back on track with her son and re-establishing her place in Paris and the Council. While Rubens was working on the Médicis Cycle, the negotiations for the marriage between Marie and Henri’s daughter, Henrietta Maria, and Charles I of England (1600-1649) were being finalized. Henrietta Maria and Charles were married in a proxy ceremony in Paris on the 11th of May 1625. Marie was now the mother of the King of France, and the mother-in-law of the King of Spain and the King of England. She was truly a mother of kings.

After Marie’s return to Paris in 1622, her counsellor, the Cardinal Richelieu (1585-1642), became more and more influential in Louis XIII’s inner circle. Eventually this led to Marie’s final clash with her son in 1630. Marie challenged Richelieu and urged Louis to essentially make a decision between his mother and the cardinal. This all came to a head on the Day of the Dupes, in November 1630. Unfortunately for Marie, Louis chose Richelieu and she was again exiled from Paris to Compiègne. Marie eventually fled to the haven of the Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia (1566-1633) in the Spanish Netherlands in 1631. She stayed in Brussels at the court of Isabella until 1638, at which time she moved on to Amsterdam. After a brief stay there, she was finally allowed to visit her daughter Henrietta Maria in England on the 28th of October 1638. Marie stayed in London until 1641. She then travelled back to the Low Countries, stopping in Antwerp and staying at the home of the man who had created her powerful image, Rubens. She then travelled on to Cologne where she would die on the 3rd of July the following year. Her body was returned to Paris where she was buried in the Basilica of Saint-Denis.

It is important to understand the history of Marie de Médicis’s life when answering the questions of this thesis: from where did the Médicis Cycle come and what does its placement in the Luxembourg Palace say about the Luxembourg Palace as a whole and Marie’s patronage as a wife, widow, mother and regent? As the Médicis Cycle was ultimately a pictorial biography of this Queen, it is obvious that her own personal history played a major role in her patronage agenda both during and after her regency. As will be seen in the thesis, Marie’s biography and
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42 Contract in New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Department of Literary and Historical Manuscripts, MA 386.1. The contract will be discussed further in the following chapters.
family history account for many of her patronage choices when she was attempting to create an image for herself.

**Methodology**

The methodology for establishing Marie’s Florentine agenda in her patronage and the Luxembourg Palace firstly concentrates on primary sources: the contract for the Médicis Cycle signed between Marie and Rubens on the 26th of February 1622; the MS Baluze, the document that listed the subjects for each canvas and how they were to be depicted; the correspondence between Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580-1637) and Rubens, as well as correspondence between Marie and her family in Florence; the inventories of both the Luxembourg Palace and St James’s Palace in London; the seventeenth century architectural plans of the Luxembourg Palace and the Pitti Palace; the entry books published to document Marie’s entries into Paris, Brussels, Amsterdam and London.43

The contract for the Médicis Cycle is an extremely important document as it clearly states what Marie’s intentions were for Rubens and the Médicis Cycle. It shows that she was in control of her own image and was not afraid to tell an artist of the calibre of Rubens how she should be portrayed. Although the contract is specifically for the Médicis Cycle and the Henri IV Cycle that was to accompany it, it also represents Marie’s ideas for the entire Luxembourg Palace. Rubens was to “to draw and paint with his own hand twenty-four pictures in which shall be represented the histories of the very illustrious life and heroic deeds of the said Queen...”44 Marie wanted to be represented heroically, as clearly stated in that document from 1622. The Luxembourg Palace itself, as will be seen, was her own majestic monument to her heroic self, regardless of what seventeenth century expectations of females were. The contract is used in this thesis to determine what the official documentation of this commission can tell us about what Marie wanted from Rubens and what that can reveal about her intentions for her own image in the Luxembourg Palace.

---


The document that followed the contract and was presumably sent to Rubens in Antwerp as he prepared the canvases is the MS Baluze. At the time of the signing of the contract, Rubens and Marie had already discussed some of the subjects to be included in the Médicis Cycle, and the rest were to be sent to him once he had returned to Antwerp: “...according to the specifications [in subjects up to the number of nineteen] which, as has been said, have been given to the said Sieur Rubens by the said Majesty [who will transmit to him the other five subjects while he is working on the first ones].”45 The identification of the remaining subjects were included in a letter from Peiresc to Rubens of the 22nd of April 1622.46 Four months later, on the 16th of August 1622, a document, now known as the MS Baluze, listed the subjects, how they were to be depicted, and, most importantly, who was to be included in the canvases.47 Although Rubens strays from some of the specifications in this document, Marie's initial intentions for each canvas are clear, and thus the MS Baluze is used in this thesis to determine Marie's intentions for her image. The MS Baluze is indispensable to Médicis Cycle research as it takes away a lot of the mystery surrounding the canvases by identifying the characters and their meanings which had for so long eluded art historians.48 As a result of this document, many of the previous assumptions and identifications of the canvases have been proven wrong and the correct identifications have finally allowed for a clearer understanding of the Médicis Cycle.

It is very fortunate that much of the correspondence between Rubens and Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc survives. It provides an invaluable insight into the Médicis Cycle commission, how Rubens kept in contact with the French court and the expectations of Rubens and of Marie and her advisors. Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc was a well-known French humanist and antiquarian and close friend of Ruben's.49 He served as Rubens's correspondent at the French court in Paris, acting as intermediary relaying the demands of Marie de Médicis (usually via Marie's advisors, Claude Maguis, the Abbé de Saint-Ambroise and Cardinal Richelieu) to Rubens at his studio in Antwerp. Initially, it was Cardinal Richelieu, Marie's close advisor and superintendent of her household, who organised much of the Médicis Cycle commission. As Richelieu's attention was taken more and more by politics, this role was passed on to Marie's almoner, Claude Maguis, the Abbé de Saint Ambroise (1600-1658).50 Much of their correspondence is referred to throughout the thesis to help explain how Rubens and Marie, with the aid of Peiresc and Marie's advisors, chose some of the subject matter of the Médicis Cycle and Marie's current situation and the sensitivity of her image.

45 Pierpont Morgan Library, Department of Literary and Historical Manuscripts, MA 386.1.
47 MS Baluze. Ms. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Baluze, 323, fols. 54-57. The programme was in the collection of Etienne Baluze.
49 For more on the relationship between Peiresc and Rubens, see Kristen Lohse Belkin, Rubens (London: Phaidon, 1998), 193.
50 Richelieu became the chief minister under Louis XIII in August 1622.
As much of this thesis focuses on the decorations and contents of the interior of the Luxembourg Palace, it was imperative to have a clear idea of Marie's collection there. Unfortunately, the inventory taken shortly after Marie's death in 1642 has never been found. Fortunately, there is an inventory that survives from the year 1645. This inventory lists which paintings were in each room and generally describes how the rooms were decorated. Two other inventories of the Luxembourg Palace also survive. The Paillet inventory has been given the date of 1686-1693, and the inventory taken by Nicolas Bailly is dated 1709-1710. It is from the combination of these inventories that we not only get a clear idea of how the interior of the Luxembourg was decorated, but also the location of the rooms in relation to each other. The location of the rooms is used in this thesis to determine the sequence of the rooms in the apartment of Marie de Médicis. The sequence then helps to determine which rooms were public and which were private, and thus how their public or private nature influenced the decoration of the rooms and what this says about Marie's image in these rooms – what could be seen and what was to be concealed. To clarify what is meant by public and private, it is necessary to understand how this was differentiated in the seventeenth century. The Luxembourg Palace would not have been "public" in the contemporary sense. The "public" who would have been able to see and understand the nuances of the imagery of the Luxembourg Palace were an elite public consisting of mostly nobility and those within the royal circle. "Private" thus refers to an even more elite group that consisted of those chosen from the elite "public" of nobles that Marie deemed worthy of seeing her "private" spaces that all nobles would not have been able to view. Another indispensable inventory utilised in this thesis dates from Marie's sojourn in London in 1639. It is an inventory of Marie's cabinet in her apartments in St James's Palace while she lived there. This inventory reveals much about how Marie still wished to be viewed after her second exile and the issues she still faced and how she approached them through her patronage.

To aid in the identification of the sequence of rooms in Marie's apartments of the Luxembourg Palace, the architectural plans of this palace are obviously extremely important. Since Marie was looking to the Florentine example of the Palazzo Pitti when she commissioned the Luxembourg Palace, it is also important to view the Pitti's architectural plans for a comparison. The architectural plans of the Luxembourg Palace by John Thorpe of 1621, Jean Marot from 1696, and Jacques-François Blondel of 1752 provide descriptions of the layout of the rooms of the apartment at the time of Marie de Medici, even they were completed years after her death. In comparison to the plans from 1621 and 1696, the Blondel plan reveals that little had changed concerning the plan of the rooms. However, none of these plans identify the role of these rooms. The Blondel plan and a key provided for the 1696 plan combined with the correspondence of Florentine ambassadors and contemporary travel guides, such as Claude
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51 The inventory was from the 8th of August 1642. Marie-Noëlle Baudouin-Matuszek, “La succession de Marie de Médicis et l’emplacement des cabinets de peintures au palais du Luxembourg.” Bulletin de la Société de l’histoire de Paris et de l’Île de France 117 (1990), 290
52 Ms 6613 Bibliothèque Arsenal, Paris.
54 Oxford, Bodleian, MS Ashmole 1513, 92.
Malingre’s *Antiquités* of 1640 and Germain Brice’s *Description de la ville de Paris* of 1752, help to piece together the sequence of the rooms in Marie’s apartments that have for so long eluded historians.\(^{56}\)

As the third chapter, “From Ephemeral to Permanent: the *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle as a Triumphant Entry into Paris*”, and the fourth chapter, “*Le temps revient: Marie de Médicis’s Image during her Second Exile*”, both focus largely on a comparison of entry imagery to the Médicis Cycle, the entry texts published to commemorate entries in celebration of Marie de Médicis and other members of her family were an extremely beneficial tool. The third chapter uses as its main comparison the planned 1610 entry into Paris of Marie de Médicis that was to follow her coronation. Even though this entry never happened, the Paris Town Council wanted to commemorate it. They therefore recorded every detail and published Mathurin Régnier’s accompanying text in their *Registres et Deliberations de la ville de Paris* of 1610.\(^{57}\) The 1610 entry and the Médicis Cycle are viewed in close comparison to significant entries staged in Florence, such as the entries of Marie’s mother, Joanna of Austria, in 1565 and Christine de Lorraine in 1589. In the final chapter, the entry books published commemorating Marie’s entries during her exile in Brussels, Amsterdam and London are also viewed closely and compared to Marie’s image in the Médicis Cycle.\(^{58}\) The aforementioned primary sources combine with the secondary sources, to be discussed below, to create the foundation upon which I build my hypothesis that Marie de Médicis had a Florentine agenda for the Luxembourg Palace and the Médicis Cycle, and that this agenda followed her throughout her final exile as well.

**Previous Research**

The cycle of paintings dedicated to the life of Marie de Médicis was an achievement by Rubens, an achievement within the art world that had never been previously accomplished- an entire cycle based on the life of a secular, still-living female. Rubens was familiar with creating imagery of the life and the apotheosis of male heroes, whether secular or religious, but new to him was the creation of a cycle of heroic imagery for a female, and an extremely controversial

---


\(^{57}\) The details of the entry are preserved in *Registres et Deliberations de la ville de Paris*, no. 11, ed. Alexandre Tueley, (Paris, 1902), pp. 426-504. Mulryne and Goldring maintain that the Paris Town Council did not want to see its money go to waste: “The Town Council had expended so much money on the preparations that it wished to leave a comprehensive record of its generosity”, Elizabeth Goldring and J.R. Mulryne, eds., *Court Festivals of the European Renaissance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 34.

female no less. Therefore it seems fitting that such a unique series within the seventeenth century deserves a thorough examination by modern art historians. Previous research is, however, lacking. This thesis therefore aims to address those areas that have been overlooked by previous scholars. Overlooked subjects include how the sequence of rooms in the Luxembourg Palace influenced the decorative choices in each room, and more specifically, how the Médicis Cycle fits into this sequence, and how the Luxembourg Palace and its interior decoration were a manifesto of power for Marie. Previous research also has not adequately addressed the influences of Marie's image and the Médicis Cycle, including her Florentine heritage and triumphal entry imagery. Marie's use of the image of herself created in the Luxembourg Palace and the Médicis Cycle following her final exile from France has been previously neglected and forms a large part of this thesis. The principal secondary source consulted in this thesis for Médicis Cycle material and references is Historic Deeds and Mystic Figures: A New Reading of Rubens's Life of Maria de' Medici written by Ronald Forsyth Millen and Robert Erich Wolf in 1989. In 1989, no such study of the Médicis Cycle had ever been written. It promised to be a "new reading" on the cycle, introducing into the study of this cycle multiple sources which had not previously been considered in reference to these works, a close examination of emblems and medals related to the figures involved in the commission, and an extensive analysis of the use of strong symbolism and allegory present in the works. Historic Deeds and Mystic Figures promised to provide the "key" to the mysteries surrounding the series-the perhaps secret meanings hidden amongst the profusion of symbolism and the allegorical and mythological creatures mixed with the history of Marie's life. Millen and Wolf do in fact uncover many possible explanations for many of these mysteries; however, at times, their "keys" are somewhat far-fetched and just as unlikely as the previous sources' explanations that they themselves criticize. The need for a study such as Historic Deeds and Mystic Figures was borne out of Robert Erich Wolf's observation whilst translating the fundamental text on the cycle, Jacques Thuillier and Jacques Foucart's Rubens' Life of Maria de' Medici (1967), that although there was, and still is, numerous literature on the Marie de Médicis cycle itself, there yet still remained to be a comprehensive study of the entire cycle published in English. Thuillier and Foucart's study, although an indispensable resource, has no critical analysis of the canvases of the Médicis Cycle. It simply provides descriptions and the relevant letters and contracts written surrounding the Cycle's commission. Many details within the cycle had yet to be explained. The incredibly sensitive political subject matter within the cycle had confounded scholars for centuries, constantly causing problems of interpretation. It has previously been seen as a cycle commissioned to illustrate the reconciliation between Marie de Médicis and her sometimes estranged son, Louis XIII, a Baroque apotheosis of a ruler, and a classical panegyric, amongst other interpretations. Millen and Wolf, however, argue that Marie's main intention in commissioning this cycle, aside from a justification of her actions and the assertion of her right to the throne and her right to remain within her son's court, was a vindictive account of her

---

“side” of the story. It was a narration of all of the wrong done to her by her son and others within the French court and also a challenge to Louis XIII’s ruling policies as she was re-welcomed into the French court after years of exile. Millen and Wolf argue that the prevalence of symbolism and allegory, when read correctly, point to the vindictive nature of Marie. They even go so far as to blame the Médicis Cycle for her eventual downfall: “If her fall can be attributed to any single misstep, it would be the overconfidence with which she commissioned and conceived the Luxembourg paintings. By using them not for vindication, but for vindictiveness, Maria de’ Medici fell from her own grace.”

I would question, however, that if this commission was so controlled, as they suggest, how could the vindictive implications of the cycle make it past Marie and her advisers and be approved for the walls of the Luxembourg palace for all of the accused to see, and in that case why did not one spot them previously? When discussing each work, Millen and Wolf give sufficient historical background, closely analyse each painting, leaving no detail not investigated, offer the sources for these images and figures, and develop the actual meaning of each work based on the preceding discussion. Through this process, Millen and Wolf make significant contributions to the study of the cycle and do, in fact, solve some of the mysteries surrounding the works hidden beneath Rubens’ language of symbolism, iconography and allegory. In addition, Millen and Wolf examine at length the importance of emblems used by Rubens to convey meaning to the figures within the paintings. These emblems are taken mainly from those previously associated with Marie and her family, whether her Medici or her French family. It has been suggested that Millen and Wolf assert that Rubens was the inventor of the use of emblems to convey meaning, however that is not the case. What is the case, however, that would lead one to believe such a statement is Millen and Wolf’s lack of placing the work within the wider context of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century art, therefore not looking to other contemporaries who used emblems for just such a purpose, and also not looking to contemporary art for other possible correlations. There is also a lack of investigation into Rubens’ own works as “keys” to interpreting the figures and subjects. While this study is extremely extensive and serves as a more than adequate starting point and background for studies of the Marie de Médicis cycle, it falls short in multiple respects. In addition to its inadequate consideration of the wider context of sixteenth and seventeenth century art, the assertion that this is a “new reading” based on the actual theme of vindictiveness rather than reconciliation also lacks sufficient evidence. However, the discussion of the historical situation that is the background to these works and their commission and the extremely detailed discussion of each of the twenty-four paintings provide an incredibly useful study for this enigmatic cycle that was used in this thesis to lay the groundwork for my hypothesis.

**Thesis Structure**

The thesis begins with a chapter that focuses on the Luxembourg Palace, its interior decoration and the *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle’s* placement there: “The Luxembourg Palace: the ‘Palais de Medici’ in Paris.” This chapter begins to explore how Marie constructed her own identity through her cultural patronage in the Luxembourg Palace. The Luxembourg Palace’s interior decoration is examined as part of Marie’s Florentine and Medici agenda. The Médicis

---


Cycle itself is placed within the same programme that encompassed the entire Luxembourg Palace’s decorative scheme. To establish this Florentine and Medici agenda, this chapter will look to Florentine palatial sources that Marie also looked to when commissioning her palace in Paris. The architecture of the Palace is compared to that of the Palazzo Pitti, as this was originally upon what Marie wanted the Luxembourg to be modelled. The chapter then moves to the interior of the palaces. The interior decoration of the Luxembourg is examined next to the interior decorations of the Medici’s Palazzo Vecchio in order to establish a precedent for the Médicis Cycle and the rest of the Luxembourg’s decoration. This will offer a reflection on how Marie was influenced by her Medici ancestors when creating an image for herself. The Medici were very adept at political propaganda through cultural patronage, therefore, there can be no doubt that Marie was looking to them when creating her own image. The interpretation that the interior of a house was a reflection of the self is applied to the Luxembourg Palace decoration to aid in establishing that Marie’s Palace was built to assert her own image. David Warren Sabean and Malina Stefanovska’s *Space and Self in Early Modern European Cultures* provides a way of understanding how interiors expressed the personality of their owners. By comparing the notion of one’s personal space and one’s sense of self, their work may allow a new reading of interiors and their contents as more than just decorative. They are now a reflection. Using this theory as a starting point, this chapter therefore examines if it can shed light on the decorative scheme of the Luxembourg Palace in terms of Marie’s identity and her own concept of herself and her image. The Luxembourg Palace therefore becomes a concrete expression of herself. This leads to the associations of females and interior space as the traditional role of the female was domestic.62 To obtain an understanding of seventeenth century interior spaces, Peter Thornton’s 1978 *Seventeenth Century Interior Decoration in England, France and Holland*, Monique Chatenet’s 2002 *La cour de France au XVI siècle: vie sociale et architecture and Le prince, la princesse et leurs logis: Manières d’habiter dans l’élite aristocratique européenne (1400-1700)*, edited by Monique Chatenet and Krista de Jonge of 2014 were all vital. Chatenet’s work, especially, gives a clear understanding of the interior spaces of early modern palaces and how court etiquette dictated their use. She supplies an in-depth analysis of the different sequences of rooms and the public and private/ceremonial and functional nature of the rooms. This is used in this chapter and applied to Marie de Médicis’s apartments at the Luxembourg Palace in an effort to explain how the decorative programme of each room reflects its public or private nature, and therefore how the rooms reflect Marie’s public or private nature. Although early plans do exist, the specific identifications of each room in Marie’s apartments are not included. Historians such as Deborah Marrow, Marie-Noëlle Baudouin Matuszek and Sara Galletti have all attempted to piece together the sequence from inventories and contemporary sources.63

---

62 Erik Erikson’s ground-breaking 1968 psychological theory that women were historically domestic and focused more on interiors is allows for a different reading of the Luxembourg Palace and Marie’s use of it as a symbol of her own identity, Erik Erikson, *Identity: Youth in Crisis* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968).

further investigating what the sequence might have been in the 1620s. Galletti and Baudouin Matuszek look not only at architectural plans, but also contemporary sources, such as the account of the Day of the Dupes, to try to determine the sequence of the rooms, but reach different conclusions. I propose that while they have correctly identified some of the rooms, some remain incorrect. When taking a fresh interpretation of these sources and considering the nature of the paintings that decorate each room, I conclude that the sequence of rooms is actually a combination of Galletti's, Baudouin Matuszek's and Blondel's plans that has not been previously considered. This new sequence speaks volumes about the choices Marie made for the decoration of each room in her apartments, and they are investigated in depth in this chapter. What proves to be most interesting is what Marie reserves for her more private rooms, especially her cabinets and the gallery that housed the Médicis Cycle. Dora Thornton's study from 1997, *The Scholar in his Study*, views cabinets and private rooms as inner sanctums where the occupants are allowed to be themselves. With this in mind, the cabinets at the Luxembourg Palace reveal Marie's most personal aspects of her identity that were not acceptable in more public spaces. There are therefore different public and private layers of Marie's image in the Luxembourg. The full force of Marie's Florentine agenda at the Luxembourg Palace really become apparent when one views the decoration of her more private spaces.

The second chapter, “The Foundation of the First Medici Queen of France: Catherine de Médicis and Marie de Médicis”, discusses the issues surrounding female regencies in sixteenth and seventeenth century France. This chapter will look at Marie's Medici predecessor at the French court, Catherine (1519-1589), to understand how she constructed her own image through her cultural patronage at a time when females were not allowed to be overtly powerful or masculine in a kingdom that followed the Salic Law, preventing females from inheriting the throne. Both Catherine and Marie were faced with similar situations when they were made regents for their underage sons. They each created images for themselves that addressed the issues that plagued a powerful, foreign female who was regent, queen, mother, widow of the king, and a Medici. Although faced with similar situations, this chapter will explore how Catherine’s and Marie’s approaches to their own images were similar, yet ultimately different as Marie surpassed Catherine in her aggressiveness. Their images had to support their positions without overstepping the boundaries of gender expectations. As will be seen, both capitalised on their roles as widows and mothers to create an unimpeachable image. Katherine Crawford's exceptional work on early modern powerful females and regency forms the basis for our study of Marie’s regency, introducing and defining such terms as political motherhood and maternal affection as a justification for female regency.64 Originally Crawford applied her theories to her study of Catherine de Médicis and her regency, as will be seen; however, these theories can easily be applied to Marie de Médicis years later and aid in our understanding of Marie’s situation and the complications of her image creation in the seventeenth century. Little had changed in France between Catherine’s and Marie’s regencies, therefore the same struggles still plagued them both. For the discussion of how gender expectations influenced Marie’s and Catherine’s images, Judith Butler’s theory on gender roles is applied to these two early modern

Both Catherine and Marie adhered to defined gender roles of loving mother and dutiful wife. The performance of these roles was an integral facet of their roles as regents. Both regents' gender roles were displayed through their cultural patronage. This chapter then looks to both Catherine’s and Marie’s cultural patronage and how they each performed their gender roles as loving mothers and doting wives/widows in their cultural patronage. Catherine de Médicis’s patronage focused on portraiture of her family, displaying her “maternal affection” through portraiture. The example of the two queens Artemisia, Artemisia I of Caria (circa 480 BC) and Artemisia II of Caria (circa 350 BC), widow of Mausolus, was used in a series of drawings and poems commissioned by Nicolas Houel (1524-1587) and drawn by Antoine Caron (1521-1599) to praise Catherine’s virtues as the ideal regent and widow. This series will be discussed in reference to its example of an ideal regent and widow and how it was then applied to Marie de Médicis when Henri IV commissioned a set of tapestries from the same series by Houel. Another series commissioned by Houel in praise of Catherine de Médicis and her ancestors is L’Histoire des rois de France, which will be discussed in comparison to the Médicis Cycle as this was the closest similar series of images in praise of a still living secular female. The discussion then moves to the ultimate differences between the patronage of Catherine and Marie. Although Marie did follow in Catherine’s footsteps in promoting the image of herself and loving mother and widow, she ultimately surpassed Catherine in her aggressive self-promotion. No longer was Marie praising her role as mother, and ultimately praising her son, she was now focused purely on praising herself and her “heroic deeds” that were achieved during her regency. This aggressive self-promotion is exemplified by the Luxembourg Palace and its decorations, specifically Rubens’s Médicis Cycle. This aggressive self-promotion ultimately contributed to Marie’s downfall as she was criticised for grasping for the throne of her son.

Chapter 3: “From Ephemeral to Permanent: The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle as a Triumphal Entry into Paris” compares the Médicis Cycle and the planned Henri IV Cycle to the Renaissance and early modern tradition of festivals and triumphal entries. Through the spread of printing and the publication of entry books, these ephemeral events had the potential to become more permanent forms of propaganda and created a common thread that linked most entries. The iconography for entries thus became recognisable throughout Europe. The two most prolific European courts that utilised festival culture for propaganda purposes were the Valois in France and the Medici in Florence. Marie de Médicis never received an entry into Paris. After her coronation on the 13th of May 1610, a triumphal entry for Marie was scheduled and contrasted to take place in Paris on the 15th of May. However, as fate would have it, Henri IV was assassinated on the 14th of May and the entry was thus cancelled. For her entire life in Paris, she was never officially welcomed into the city, an insult that was surely not overlooked by a woman raised in one of the most prolific entry and festival courts in Europe. As stated previously, when Rubens accepted the commission for the Médicis Cycle, no artistic precedent for a cycle praising a still-living secular female existed. What did exist, however, was the ephemeral praise of females in the festival arts. Festivals and entries were the rare occasions when much attention and praise were directed at the most important roles of females: wife, widow and mother, three of the roles emphasized in the Médicis Cycle. In light of this information, is it possible, therefore, that Rubens looked to festival and entry traditions when constructing the Médicis Cycle, and that the Médicis Cycle is, finally, Marie’s triumphal entry

into Paris, albeit one made permanent on the walls of the Luxembourg Palace? The comparison of the Médicis Cycle to entry imagery has never before been discussed by Médicis Cycle scholars. This chapter will compare the Médicis Cycle imagery to festival and entry imagery utilised in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries throughout Europe. As Roy Strong contends, there was a common visual and iconographical language used throughout Europe for entries. Vincenzo Borghini developed a programme for the iconography and language of entries at the Medici court when preparing for Joanna of Austria’s entry in 1565 that would be used in all later Medici entries, such as the 1589 entry for Christine de Lorraine, at which Marie would have been present. As will be seen, the same language was used by Rubens in the Médicis Cycle. Helen Watanabe-O’Kelly, Roy Strong, J.R. Mulryne, Elizabeth Goldring and Ute Daniel provide incredible studies on the tradition of Renaissance and Early modern festivals and entries and outline the commonalities that pervaded throughout them all that made their language instantly recognisable and readable for even the uneducated viewer. With this language at hand, this chapter will attempt to further answer from where did the Médicis Cycle come? As will be seen certain details and iconography bears a striking resemblance to the triumphal entry tradition. Marie’s planned 1610 entry, helpfully preserved in the records of the Paris Town Council, will also be compared to the Médicis Cycle, as this was the only entry planned for Marie into Paris and she had a strong desire for it to happen, therefore it is possible that the Médicis Cycle looks to this entry for precedents. This entry would have marked a huge turning point in Marie’s public life as she was crowned Queen and would soon be made regent. Therefore the imagery of this entry was extremely important when considering the later development of Marie’s image.

The final chapter fittingly focuses on Marie’s image during her second exile: "Le Temps Revient: Marie de Médicis’s Image during her Second Exile." This chapter will explore something that has not been discussed by Marie de Médicis scholars nor Médicis Cycle scholars: Marie’s image and patronage after her second exile and the Médicis Cycle’s influence on her later image and patronage. The image that Marie created for herself in the Luxembourg Palace, specifically that of the Médicis Cycle, had a profound influence on Marie’s image during her second and final exile in 1630. This chapter will examine how the Médicis Cycle became part of Marie’s political programme as her almoners, Jean Puget de la Serre (1594-1665) and Mathieu de Morgues (1582-1670), used the same imagery and themes to promote Marie as she moved to the courts of Brussels, Amsterdam and London. The entry texts and images for Marie’s triumphal entries into these courts are examined and used to support this hypothesis. Marie was facing the same issues during her second exile that she also faced when she returned to Paris after her first exile in 1617. It is more than likely that she thus approached her circumstances in the 1630s in a similar way with imagery created for the Médicis Cycle and imagery that pervaded throughout

---


the Luxembourg Palace. Also considered are the contents of Marie’s cabinet at St James’s Palace in London. These contents also contribute to the revelation that Marie was still concerned with the same issues that she attempted to combat with the Luxembourg Palace imagery. The Médicis Cycle and the Luxembourg Palace decorations did not just influence Marie’s later patronage. This chapter will also demonstrate the Médicis Cycle’s and the Luxembourg Palace’s influence on her daughter, Henrietta Maria’s patronage at the Queen’s House, Greenwich, and on the final Caroline court masques. The image that Marie created in the Luxembourg Palace, with the help of Rubens, would define Marie throughout her exile to after her death in 1642. Toby Osborne’s work on exile in early modern European courts aids in our understanding of not only Marie’s choice of exile locations, but also her actions during her exile, including the cultivation of her public image. His work contributes to our knowledge of Marie’s exiles in Brussels, Amsterdam and London and Marie’s insecure status at each of these courts that signalled the need for the establishment of such a strong image. Even in exile, Marie de Médicis “was not a woman to suffer in indifference and silence.” Her image remained focused and strong throughout, perhaps, as will be shown in this thesis, because such a clear vision of how she wanted to be portrayed was created in the Luxembourg Palace.

68 MS Ashmole 1513, 92.
70 Batiffol (1931), 227.
Chapter 1

The Luxembourg Palace: the “Palais de Médicis” in Paris

“Buildings have lives in time, and those lives are intimately connected with the lives of the people who use them.”

In 1649, Richard Symonds, an exiled English Royalist, kept a diary of the sights he saw while in Paris, including Marie de Médicis’s impressive Luxembourg Palace. As a foreigner touring one of the homes of the French royal family, he summed up the nature of the palace of the former Queen Mother perfectly: “At each end of ye first building under an arch stand the statues in white Marble of. Hen: 4 & his Queene Sister to ye Duke of Florence. Behind each of them is a Peacock. She, in her pride, built this.” Perpetually in control of her own image and its construction, Marie's Luxembourg Palace (Figure 1.1) was to be a symbol of her power and success in Paris. It was to be a home befitting this foreign Queen who was in a constant battle to prove her legitimacy and power. Never straying far from her Florentine and Medici heritage, Marie turned to the tradition of her forebears to enhance her magnificent image through cultural patronage. The Luxembourg Palace and its interior decoration were to be Marie's Florentine palace in Paris. It was, from the inside out, an allegorical and symbolical representation of Marie as a Medici princess, queen of France, mother, regent, and widow. The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle by Peter Paul Rubens was the focal point of the interior decorative programme of the palace. Often seen as standing alone, the Médicis Cycle is in fact part of a much broader programme that conforms to the theme of the glorification of this Queen that pervades throughout the whole palace. Although perhaps not as overtly Florentine and Medicean because of its more public location within the Luxembourg, the Médicis Cycle is very closely related to the other more private decorative programmes within the palace that portray Marie’s agenda. This chapter will examine Marie’s construction of her identity as a Florentine, a Medici, a woman and a regent through her cultural patronage in the Luxembourg Palace. The Florentine and Medici nature of the Luxembourg Palace’s interior decorations will be reviewed, and the Médicis Cycle will be placed securely within the same programme that encompassed the palace as a whole. The sequence of the rooms in Marie’s apartment at the Luxembourg will be examined, with special attention being paid to how the decoration of these rooms reflects their public or private nature and how the subject matter of the decoration was tailored to these locations. With this in mind, the nature of the Médicis Cycle will be reviewed in reference to its public or private location. The sensitivity of the subject matter of the Cycle will be considered in comparison to the more overt statements made in the decorations of the more private rooms.

---

71 Patricia Waddy, Seventeenth Century Roman Palaces: Use and the Art of the Plan (New York: the Architectural History Foundation, 1990), xi.
Although begun in 1615, the Luxembourg Palace did not fully come into shape until 1620, the year of Marie’s return to Paris after her exile to Blois in 1617. Marie was reportedly never fond of the Louvre. Spurred on by the marriage of Louis XIII to Anne of Austria in 1615 and Anne’s subsequent move into the Queen’s apartments, Marie decided to relocate. She purchased a parcel of land in 1612 from the Duc de Pinay-Luxembourg outside the city walls in the Faubourg-Saint Germain, south of the Seine, which also included his hôtel, the Petit Luxembourg. Marie had previously spent time at the hôtel, using it to receive ambassadors and other esteemed guests, as well as a place for the royal children to retreat from court life when ill. It not only kept them from infecting the other royal children, but it was also believed that the air outside the city walls was healthier. It was not uncommon for royal courts to be relocated to outside the city. In fact, it was a precedent already set in Florence, as the Medici relocated from the city location of the Palazzo Vecchio to the Palazzo Pitti outside the city limits. Distance from the urban centre did not necessarily mean that Marie was stepping away from her son’s court or the power that she wielded there. Instead, moves outside the city were often done for economic reasons. Sara Galletti asserts that “economics, not politics, pushed queens to the margins of the city.” However the proximity of Marie’s two Florentine favourites in the Faubourg-Saint Germain, Leonora Galigai and Concino Concini, must have also been a factor. Not only had the Faubourg-Saint Germain become somewhat of an Italian colony, but this had also been the first place that Marie had visited upon her unceremonious arrival in Paris in 1601.

Shortly after the deciding to purchase the duc de Pinay-Luxembourg’s land, Marie de Médicis wrote to her aunt, the Grand Duchess Christine de Lorraine in Florence, asking for the architectural plans of the Palazzo Pitti (Figure 2.2). She wrote,

74 Deborah Marrow, The Art Patronage of Marie de Medici (University of Pennsylvania: 1978), 20: “In addition to having to cede her apartments to the new Queen, she had never found the Louvre particularly habitable, and the idea of building her own palace both as retreat and a monument must have especially appealed to her.” Louis XIII married Anne of Austria on 24 November 1615. See also Geraldine Johnson, in Cynthia Lawrence, ed., Women and Art in Early Modern Europe: Patrons, Collectors, and Connoisseurs (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 135.
76 Galletti (2012), 198: “…the Medici moved their main residence...to the Pitti around the time they were granted the title of Grand Dukes of Tuscany.”
77 Galletti (2012), 198.
78 Galletti (2012), 198.
79 Marrow (1978), 20: “She chose to build on the south side of the river where the air was healthier and where the Hotel de Gondi and the home of Leonora Concini were located.”
My aunt. Being of the desire to have built...a house in Paris to accommodate me and wanting in some way to regulate myself on the form and the model of the Piti [sic] Palace (which I have always esteemed for the order of its architecture and the great comforts esteemed there), I [ask if]...you would have made for me a plan of its entirety with the elevations and perspectives of the buildings as much from the front...as from the back.... I ask you to send me...the measurements and proportions of the courts, terraces, halls, chambers, and other rooms of the said house to help and serve me in the structure and decoration of my [palace].82

Anxious to get the building underway, eight days after writing the first letter, Marie sent another informing her aunt that she was sending her own architect, Louis Métezeau (1560-1615), to Florence to obtain the plans himself because he must have “a full understanding of the model” of the Palazzo Pitti.83 From the beginning of the commission of the Luxembourg Palace, Marie was looking to Florentine architecture. The Pitti Palace had come to represent the power of the Medici family as the Grand Dukes of Tuscany.84 It is therefore not surprising that when searching for a model for her own seat of power in Paris she should look to the example of Medici architecture.

However, a French architect was chosen to build a palace that was to copy a Florentine precedent. As the official royal architect, it is possible that Louis Métezeau was originally slated to be the Luxembourg’s architect, especially as he was the one sent to Florence. However, he died in 1615, and Salomon de Brosse (1571-1626) was chosen in his stead. It has long been thought that de Brosse was chosen after winning a competition for the commission based on the discovery in Florence of a drawing of the plans of the Luxembourg Palace by de Brosse.85 However, there is insufficient evidence to support this claim. The plans were most probably sent to Florence to impress the grand ducal court with French architectural talent.86 It is more likely that de Brosse was chosen upon the basis of his success in France and his inheritance of the successful dynasty of de Brosse architects. Although de Brosse would have seen the plans of the

82 Florence, ASF Med., 5933, 6, fol. 27r, October 6, 1611, Maria de’ Medici to Christine of Lorraine: “Ma tante. Je vous ay écrit depuis quelques jours enca et fait savoir le desir que j’ ay de faire bastir une maison a Paris, et que mesmes ayant toujours estime le palais de Piti a cause de l’ordre de ses bastimens. Je desirois que vous m’en envoyassiez le plan avec les eslevations pour le faire imiter en ce que je trouveray plus a propos. Mais comme j’ay du depui advise que pour avoir une entiere intelligence du modelle de lad. maison et des mesures et proportions de toutes les pieces et stances qui en dependent, et que pour me servir plus utillement de ce desseing pour la structure et ornament de la mienne, il est besoin d’envoyer sur les lieux une personne qui soit bien entendu et experimenté en tells affaires, je vous ay depesche ce porteur nomme Metezeau Architecte du Roy monsieur mon filz avecq celle cy que je vous faiz de rechef, pour vous prier d’avoir agreeable.” Reproduced and translated by Marrow (1978), 192.


85 Marrow (1978), 22. “Maria’s principal architect for the Luxembourg and many of her projects of the early period was Salomon de Brosse, the most important master of the first quarter of the seventeenth century.” For more on de Brosse, see Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), Coope (1972). Others involved included Charles Bitterne (mason), Pierre Scellier (carpenter) and Etienne Regnauld (roofer).

86 Galletti (2012), 38.
Palazzo Pitti sent from Florence, the final Luxembourg Palace design displays little of the Pitti’s influence in its design. However, both the Pitti Palace and the Luxembourg Palace are U-shaped in plan, which would have been unusual for the Pitti in an Italian context. The U-shape allowed for twin apartments on each side of the pavilions, which provided state and private rooms. It has also been suggested by Galletti that the twin apartments in the pavilions were used for summer and winter apartments. This was unusual in French palaces, and upon consideration of the plans of the Pitti Palace’s twin apartments, it is possible that it was from the Pitti Palace. In addition, the external surface details and the rustication bear the mark of Bartolomeo Ammannati’s (1511-1592) sixteenth century design of the Pitti courtyard’s rustication. Rosalys Coope explains the relationship of these two palaces, noting the similarities between the facades and rustications. Coope believes De Brosse borrowed the rustication style of the Pitti to enhance its sculptural effects. The rusticated frames are also thought by Coope to be direct references to the Pitti’s courtyards, as is the rustication and doric order of the pilasters and columns in the entrance pavilion. Although it has often been asserted by Luxembourg Palace historians, such as Marrow, that the Luxembourg did not recognisably resemble the Pitti, Henri Sauval still commented in the seventeenth century that “some had complained that a woman had built a Tuscan villa, but their complaints ceased when they remembered that it was a Tuscan princess who wanted to exhibit in France the order of her homeland.” The Luxembourg Palace exterior was evidently recognisable as a derivation of Tuscan architecture.

Building of the palace slowed while Marie was exiled in 1617, only to pick up at a much faster pace upon her return to Paris in 1620. Marie was determined to see this palace built, even when she had major financial difficulties that led the remainder of the work to be financed by her Medici relatives in Florence. This was Marie’s opportunity to create a grand monument in honour of herself and her image. No longer was she a resident in the Louvre attempting to

87 Coope (1972), 110.
88 Galletti (2012), 151.
89 For more on the lack of French precedent for twin apartments, see Galletti (2012), 151.
90 Coope (1972), 111. Courtyard of the Palazzo Pitti was built by Ammanati from 1558-1570. For more details on the architecture of the Luxembourg Palace, see Coope (1972), Marrow (1978) and Galletti (2012). Marrow gives a brief summary of the architecture: “The original design of the Luxembourg Palace was based on a traditional French château. The corps-de-logis, two wings and a screen surround a large courtyard. Double pavilions are at each end of the corps-de-logis, single pavilions flank the screen, and the entrance pavilion is domed. These features caused the side facades to be asymmetrical, an effect which is heightened today”, Marrow (1978), 45.
91 Coope (1972), 113-114.
93 Marrow (1978), 23 and 42.
94 In 1623 Marie was short on funds for this project. She wrote to her Florentine relatives for help, requesting the money that had gone back to Florence in her dear friend Leonora Galigai’s name. According to Marrow, “Through Gondi [the Florentine ambassador in Paris] the Queen therefore pleaded with her relatives for a quick repayment of their debts so that she might continue her projects.” The Florentines repaid the debt of 200,000 Florentine scudi with the condition that Marie never ask for Medici money again. Marrow (1978), 43-44.
95 Marie’s first architectural project, the Château de Montceaux-en-Brie was a gift from Henri IV as an already built château that had previously belonged to his mistress, Gabrielle d’Estrées, and Catherine de
establish her image amongst that of those who came before she did. Marie built the Luxembourg from the ground up, which allowed her to be in complete control of its imagery and message. Now it was her turn to create her own “Palais de Médicis”, as the Luxembourg came to be known during this time. If Marie already had Florentine precedents in mind when commissioning the architecture of the palace, they must also be behind the interior decoration, including Rubens’s Médicis Cycle. If she had instructed de Brosse to follow the Florentine example of the Pitti, is it safe to assume that, in addition to all of her other instructions for Rubens, she also instructed Rubens to act similarly when illustrating a cycle of paintings based on her “illustrious life and heroic deeds?”

**Architectural Magnificence**

Marie de Médicis’s image, particularly that which was constructed in the Luxembourg Palace, was borne out of her reactions to her trials and tribulations as a foreign female regent of France. As Marie returned to the French court following exile in 1620, it was important that her image expressed her power and legitimacy as former regent and Queen Mother, especially as she wished to be re-welcomed into the royal council and Louis XIII’s inner circle. Marie refocused her attention on the Luxembourg Palace as a means to assert her own image. The building of grand monuments of architecture was, especially in Marie’s birthplace of Florence, a means of displaying magnificence, power and status symbolically. Marie’s grandfather, Cosimo I de’ Medici (1519-1574), came to be known as the most prolific exemplar of this theory. He was the heir to a strong Medici tradition that dates back to Cosimo de’ Medici the Elder (1389-1464) and Lorenzo the Magnificent (1449-1492) in the fifteenth century. It was then that architectural patronage came to be associated with the virtue of magnificence, particularly under the building programmes of Cosimo de’ Medici in Florence. Giovanni Pontano, the Medici. Marie’s effect on the château were additions and amendments to what was already there. See Johnson in Lawrence, ed., (1997), 130. For more see Marrow (1978), Coope (1972).

96 Marie did attempt to assert her Florentine agenda on the Louvre. Shortly after the death of Henri IV, she commissioned several paintings celebrating her Florentine heritage or portraits of “héros des Médicis” according to Nicolas Bailly’s inventory, Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 175. Painted by artists from the Second School of Fontainebleau, the canvases that survive include Henri IV meeting the Medici Pope Leo XI, The Wedding of Maria de Médicis’s Parents, and Marie de Médicis’s Proxy Wedding, Johnson (1997), 135, Marrow (1978), 21, and Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 174-175, and 213. For more see Alain Erlande-Brandenburg, ‘Les appartements de la Reine Mère Marie de Médicis au Louvre,’ Bulletin de la Société de l’histoire de l’art français (1965); Anthony Blunt, “Three Paintings for the ‘Appartement’ of Marie de Médicis in the Louvre,” Burlington Magazine 112 (1970): 166-169.

97 For more on Marie’s patronage at the Louvre, Fontainebleau and Château-Montceaux-en-Brie, see Marrow (1978) and Baudouin-Matuszek (1991) 211.

98 Gondi, in a letter dated November 14, 1623, mentions “suo [Maria-Medici’s] Palazzo, che ella ha intitolato il Palazzo de’ Medici in lettere d’oro sopra marmot nero”, Johnson in Lawrence, ed., (1997), 138. ASF Med., 4637, not paginated, November 14, 1623, Gondi to Picchena. Letter reproduced in Marrow (1978), 194. When referring to Richard Symonds’s diary of Paris and his referring to the sign above the entrance to the Luxembourg Palace reading “Palais d’Orléans” – reflecting the current owner – Marrow hypothesises that the Medici title was probably what the sign originally read and was erased upon Marie’s final exile from Paris in 1631, Marrow (1978), 75.

99 The contract of 26th February 1622, Pierpont Morgan Library. Department of Literary and Historical Manuscripts. MA 386.1.


court secretary for the Aragonese kings of Naples, explains in his *De Magnificentia* of 1498 how building projects enhanced Cosimo de’ Medici’s magnificence years before the reign of Cosimo I:

   In our days Cosimo of Florence has renewed the ancient magnificence, both in building temples and villas and in founding libraries...he was the first to renew the custom of turning private money to public good and using it for the embellishment of his country.... Cosimo’s prestige was greatly enhanced both by the villas he built with extraordinary magnificence...and by the palace whose construction renewed an ancient and almost forgotten style of building.\textsuperscript{102}

Building projects came to be very public statements of power and status, however, new to this was the justification of such grandeur in moral terms.\textsuperscript{103} Influenced by Aristotle and his Christian interpreters such as Thomas Aquinas, there began to be a move away from the negative connotations of great wealth to the need for outward displays of magnificence and power in establishing one’s role as monarch.\textsuperscript{104} Magnificence shown through cultural patronage and grand building projects was expected of rulers and associated with their magnanimity.\textsuperscript{105} “For princes and cardinals to spend money was nothing new,” as Syson and Thornton state, “Ground-breaking, however, was the link between conspicuous expenditure and classical virtue and, in particular, the extension and adaptation of the concept of magnificence to a new ruling elite.”\textsuperscript{106} In fact, magnificence came to be associated with the display of inherent virtues, specifically those of females.\textsuperscript{107} Marrow contributes that “Tasso had said that although they should not go to excess, royal women should dress with silk and golden clothes and should decorate their houses magnificently to indicate that they were above other women.”\textsuperscript{108} Leon Battista Alberti in his *De re aedificatoria*, written in the 1440s and first printed in 1485, discusses the association between the magnificence of a building and the status of the owner:

   The magnificence of the buildings should be adapted to the dignity of the owner. Since we all agree that we should endeavour to leave a reputation behind us...for this reason we erect great structures, that our posterity may suppose us to have been great persons.\textsuperscript{109}

It was not just the exterior that was to reflect the virtue of magnificence; the interior decoration was just as important. As Marie returned to Paris after exile, there was no better time to assert her virtues through the magnificence of her building project.


\textsuperscript{104} For more on magnificence, see Syson and Thornton (2001), 24.

\textsuperscript{105} Syson and Thornton (2001), 24.

\textsuperscript{106} Syson and Thornton (2001), 24.

\textsuperscript{107} Marrow (1978), 144.

\textsuperscript{108} Marrow (1978), 144 and Carroll (2008), 112. From Torquato Tasso’s *Discorso della virtù feminile, e donnesca* (Venice: Bernardo II Giunta & fratres, 1582), 5-6.

Marie’s Medici predecessors decorated their Florentine palaces in the sixteenth century in a very similar manner to the way Marie decorated the Luxembourg Palace a century later. Much has been made of the similarities between the Luxembourg Palace’s decorative painted interior and the pictorial cycles of the Palace of Fontainebleau built under François I (1494-1547). However, ultimately the interior decoration of the Luxembourg Palace owes much more to Medici precedents in Florence in its purpose, themes, and subject matter. While both Fontainebleau Palace and Florentine palaces, namely the Palazzo Pitti and the Palazzo Vecchio, are decorated with pictorial cycles, the difference between them is the depiction of history. Antoine Laval, the Géographe du Roi, asserted in 1600 in his pamphlet *Des peintures convenables aus Basiliques et Palais du Roy, memes à sa gallerie du Louvre à Paris*, that history painting was a suitable form of decorative painting in royal palaces. This emerged in Medici patronage as a means of political propaganda in Florence under the patronage of Cosimo I de’ Medici during his reign as Grand Duke of Tuscany from 1537 to 1564. In sixteenth century Florence, as well as in France, cultural patronage had become an important aspect of political propaganda. Out of this environment came François I’s desire to build Fontainebleau Palace. He in fact turned to the tradition of the Medici in using his palace as a symbolical tool to enhance his image of political power. The majority of Fontainebleau’s elaborate decorative pictorial cycles use myth and allegory to symbolise the French monarchy. These are scenes that do not explicitly illustrate an historical event, but illustrate allegorically the condition of François’s rule. It is the use of history by Marie de Médicis and her family in painted decoration that makes the Luxembourg Palace’s decorative scheme linked to Florentine precedents, especially
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113 Kathleen Wilson-Chevalier, “Women On Top at Fontainebleau,” *Oxford Art Journal* 16 (1993), 34: “Such was one important aspect of the general historical process underway in France in 1527, when Francois I first resolved to break with the itinerant lifestyle of feudal times by creating, if not the sole, at least one pre-eminent royal residence at Fontainebleau.”
114 Wilson-Chevalier (1993), 34.
115 Fontainebleau was begun under François I in 1528. Rosso Fiorentino and Primaticcio were the lead artists working there on the frescoes and stuccos from 1534 to 1539. For more on Fontainebleau, see *Fontainebleau: Art in France, 1528-1610*. Volume I and II (The National Gallery of Canada: Ottawa, 1973). Giancarlo Fiorenza, “Penelope’s Web: Francesco Primaticcio’s Epic Revision at Fontainebleau.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (2006): 795. For example, Primaticcio compared France and the kings of France to the strength of Ulysses in his celebrated Galerie d’Ulysses of the Fontainebleau Palace. The Galerie de François contains images of François I in allegorical scenes symbolising his rule, such as Rosso Fiorentino’s *Ignorance Overcome* (Figure 1.3) and the *Unity of the State* (Figure 1.4). The Medici Cycle also includes similar allegorical scenes, such as *The Triumph of Truth* and *The Council of the Gods*.
116 As Jacques Foucart and Jacques Thuillier, translated by Robert Erich Wolf, *Rubens’ Life of Marie de Medici* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1970) note, “always prone to erudition, the Renaissance employed an allegorical language so complex that, before unravelling the enigmatic symbols, one’s attention is caught by such themes as the *Death of Idoniser*, the *Fountain of Youth*, the *Revenge of Nauphilis*, or the *Education of Achille*.,” 32.
Marie’s use of contemporary history.¹¹⁷ For an outright biographical programme, Marie would look to Medici precedents in Florence.

By highlighting their biographies in pictorial cycles the Medici were able to show the great importance of their own circumstances and emphasize the legitimacy and continuity of their dynasty.¹¹⁸ Common practice in France in the seventeenth century suggested biography as a means of pictorial decoration, and funeral decorations in Florence under the Medici in the sixteenth century focused largely on celebrating the deceased through their illustrious biography.¹¹⁹ Medici patronage focused on all aspects of their biography, including both triumphs and failures. Lorenzo de’ Medici adopted the motto “Le Temps revient” during his rule in the fifteenth century, referring to the return of felicitous times to the Medici after periods of misfortune.¹²⁰ It was under Cosimo I de’ Medici that the cultural patronage of the Medici began to truly reflect this motto.¹²¹

When establishing the decorative programme for the Palazzo Vecchio in 1555 under the instruction of Cosimo I de’ Medici, Giorgio Vasari (1511–1574) explained that the upper rooms would be dedicated to “celestial gods” as they were closer to celestial spheres, whereas the lower rooms would be dedicated to “terrestrial gods” – human men who had achieved greatness that made them almost divine.¹²² The Palazzo Vecchio was to be a symbolical statement of power for the terrestrial god Cosimo I de’ Medici in the sixteenth century.¹²³ Marie, born and raised in Florence, would have been familiar with Vasari’s programme. Vasari chose to illustrate history “thus unadorned” in the Palazzo Vecchio, using their very human biography to illustrate their divine and mortal nature and the justification of their role as rulers.¹²⁴ Kurt Forster explains the effectiveness of history painting for Cosimo: “In history painting the vicissitudes of

¹¹⁷ The Salle du Livre d’Or included Neptune, Minerva; the Cabinet des Muses included Apollo and the Nine Muses, another Minerva, David with the Head of Goliath; the “Second Room” included Hercules and Omphale. For more see Anthony Blunt, “A Series of Paintings Illustrating the History of the Medici Family executed for Marie de Médicis – II,” The Burlington Magazine 109 (1967): 560+562-566 and Marrow (1978). According to Thuillier and Foucart (1970), “At most then, the examples of François I and Catherine de Medici could have done no more than suggest to Marie the idea of devoting an entire cycle to her own glory and another to the memory of her late husband, but neither could provide the model for such an outright biographical programme.”
¹¹⁸ Barbara Caine, when discussing biography and history, asserts that “individual lives have come to appear more and more important because of the many ways in which they can illustrate how differences of wealth and power, of class and gender and of ethnicity and religion have affected historical experiences and understanding. Within this framework, biography can be seen as the archetypal ‘contingent’ narrative and the one best able to show the great importance of particular locations and circumstances and the multiple layers of historical change and experience.” Barbara Caine, Biography and History (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 2. Janet Cox-Rearick, Dynasty and Destiny in Medici Art (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 6. Major Medici themes of patronage were dynasty, destiny and legitimacy.¹¹⁹ Marrow (1978), 146. Elizabeth McGrath, “Tact and Topical Reference in Rubens’s Medici Cycle.” The Oxford Art Journal 3 (1980), 15.
¹²¹ McGrath (1980), 16.
fortune and accidents of biography were linked into a chain of evidence for Cosimo's divine appointment which traces through the chaos of history a path of will."125 Cosimo used history painting to reaffirm his legitimacy, and Marie de Médicis used history painting in the Luxembourg Palace for the same purpose.126 Each room in the Palazzo Vecchio celebrated the events that sealed the Medici's role in Florentine history and legitimated their rise to power, such as coronations, weddings, military triumphs, and diplomatic missions.127 Marie de Médicis chose similar events to be included in The Médicis Cycle. These events all highlighted Marie's legitimacy and triumphs. The Médicis Cycle begins with *The Fates spin the Destiny of Marie de Médicis* (Figure 1.5), allegorically confirming that Marie de Médicis's biography led to her destiny as the Queen of France. Marie must have known that the best precedent for this style of glorification was the decoration of Medici palaces. Susan Saward also believes that the Médicis Cycle's dependence on Medici precedents is "purposeful, for it places the rule of this Queen [Marie de Médicis] directly in line with those golden years of her illustrious forebears."128

The first project in the Palazzo Vecchio was the decoration of the Salone dei Cinquecento. Assisted by Don Vincenzo Borghini (1515-1580) and Cosimo I himself, Vasari was to compose a decorative programme that celebrated Cosimo I and the Medici victories in Florence.129 It was planned that the Salone dei Cinquecento would serve as the setting for the wedding festivities of Francesco de' Medici and Joanna of Austria in 1565.130 Nearly forty years later, the room would serve again as the setting of wedding festivities for Marie de Médicis's proxy marriage to Henri IV.131 It is known that Rubens was in Florence in the service of the Duke of Mantua at the time of Marie's wedding celebrations.132 Later letters exchanged with Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc, who was also in Florence, indicate that he was possibly at the banquet; however this has never been confirmed. However, it is very likely that Rubens would have been aware of the incredible decorations provided for such an occasion. Included in Vasari's decorative scheme is one of the most important moments in the life of Cosimo I: *Pius V crowns Cosimo Grand Duke of Tuscany* (Figure 1.6) painted by Jacopo Ligozzi, a version of which was located in Marie's Cabinet Doré of the Luxembourg Palace to be discussed later. This painting illustrates the coronation in 1570 of Grand Duke Cosimo in Rome. As one of the Medici's
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125 Forster (1971), 89.
127 Forster (1971), 93.
129 Muccini (1997), 106: "The drawing up of the vast pictorial scheme was the first thing Vasari had actually confronted. ...In 1560 he had already submitted a first scheme to Michelangelo and obtained the latter's approval. He continued working on that first draft, helped by the Prior of the Foundling Hospital, Don Vincenzo Borghini, who suggested stories to him, and by Cosimo himself, assisted by his secretary, the historian Giambattista Adriani. An abundance of correspondence was established between the three of them, lasting until the completion of the final painting, through which the decorative and celebratory scheme became minutely defined. In August 1563 Vasari embarked upon the pictorial work." From Forster, 100: "There is even a division of labour: Bartoli and Borghini collected historical data and proposed the concetti of the programme, the Duke modified and approved it; Vasari in turn evolved the pictorial invenzione."
130 Muccini (1997), 111. It would serve again as the setting for the festivities after Marie de Médici's proxy wedding to Henri IV in 1600.
131 Marrow (1978), 11-12.
concerns during their rise to power as Grand Dukes was legitimacy, it was imperative that such a scene be included in the celebration of their triumphs. Similarly, when establishing the subjects for the Médicis Cycle, *The Coronation of Marie de Médicis* was among the first chosen. Marie was also attempting to prove her legitimacy at the French court as the crowned Queen of France. It was an honour rarely conferred on a French consort that Henri IV utilised to seal her legitimacy as queen and regent as he prepared to embark on military campaign in 1610. Marie made sure that it was not forgotten by having it illustrated in the grand west gallery of Luxembourg Palace.

In addition to the Salone dei Cinquecento, the Apartment of Leo X in the Palazzo Vecchio was divided into rooms that each celebrated illustrious members of the Medici family: Cosimo the Elder, Lorenzo the Magnificent, Cosimo I, Giovanni delle Bande Nere (1498-1526), and Pope Clement VII (1478-1534). The decoration of each room had a clear political message. Low points in the history of the Medici are highlighted in the Room of Cosimo the Elder, the founder of the Medici dynasty, such as *Cosimo exiled from Florence* (Figure 1.8) and *Cosimo the Elder returns from Exile* (Figure 1.9). By highlighting how far their family had fallen, the Medici could also emphasize how far they had subsequently risen and their determination in fulfilling their destiny as the Grand Dukes of Tuscany. Misfortunes in Marie’s life were also intended to be included in the Médicis Cycle. These scenes include *The Expulsion from Paris* (Figure 1.10) and *The Flight from Blois* (Figure 1.11). These were two of the most embarrassing moments in Marie’s history: the exile from Paris imposed by her own son and her desperate measures to escape her prison at the Château de Blois. Many theories have been proposed for the reason Marie chose to include these scenes. Otto von Simson assumed that Marie wanted to play the helpless victim, whereas Thuillier and Foucart hypothesised that it shows her as a "belle guerrière." Millen and Wolf suggested that Marie wanted to vindicate herself after the abuses she faced at the hands of her son, and Carroll believes that they display Marie’s heroic virtue of constancy in the face of these abuses. However, Nicola Courtright correctly looks to Medici examples as the precedent for Marie’s emphasis on her own defeat: "From a Medici vantage point, exile may be regarded as a badge of honour, proof of the triumph over adversity through personal virtue and public acclaim that validated his leadership.” Cosimo de’ Medici did not shy away from the illustration of the turbulent times in Medici history. What was different in Marie’s depiction of her own history was just how current it was. She was illustrating events that had happened very recently while still struggling to regain her position in her son’s court. Marie had taken the Medici precedents one step further and perhaps a step too far, as these moments were still very fresh in the memory of the Médicis Cycle’s viewers. This is
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133 Thuillier and Foucart (1970), 131.
134 For more on the separate rooms in the Palazzo Vecchio, see Muccini (1997).
135 The *Flight from Blois* illustrates Marie’s treacherous escape in the night from the Château of Blois. For more on these two canvases, see Millen and Wolf (1989).
136 For more on these, see Millen and Wolf (1989).
138 Nicola Courtright, "Artistic Invention", in Carroll (2008), 150.
139 As McGrath (1980) asserts, “But subjects like the departure into exile of Cosimo il Vecchio had been suitably and safely remote from the period in which they were presented. The reconciliation of Marie with her son that Rubens had to illustrate was under constant threat of dissolution, 16.
perhaps best exemplified by the fact that *The Flight from Paris* was replaced at the last minute by uncontroversial *The Felicity of the Regency* (Figure 1.12). The exile from Paris at the order of her son was eventually deemed, perhaps by Louis himself, as too controversial to be shown.  

The Palazzo Vecchio's decoration did not just focus on Medici misfortunes; it also celebrated contemporary events of triumph. The Room of Cosimo I focuses on these events. This includes *Cosimo's Victory at Montemurlo* (Figure 1.13) when Cosimo I defeated the exiles Baccio Valori, Filippo Strozzi, and Anton Francesco degli Albizi in 1537 and was a turning point in Cosimo's rise to power. This room also houses *Cosimo de' Medici is elected Duke of Florence* illustrating when Cosimo was elected duke of the republic in 1537 following the assassination of Alessandro de' Medici (Figure 1.14).  

The Room of Clement VII celebrates the tradition of Medici political victory through marriage in *The Wedding at Marseilles of Catherine de Médicis and Henri II* (Figure 1.15), which took place in Marseilles in 1533, a subject that also decorated Marie's Cabinet Doré in the Luxembourg Palace.  

The decoration of the Luxembourg Palace also celebrates Marie’s victories. As an affirmation of its political importance, Marie de Médicis included her own wedding in *The Wedding-by-Proxy at Florence Cathedral* (Figure 1.16). As a response to the predominantly male depictions of military triumphs, Marie's first military triumph is captured in *The Victory at Jülich* (Figure 1.17), when she sent troops to intercede in the Jülich-Cleves succession issue in which Henri was preparing to intervene before his assassination in 1610. *The Consignment of the Regency* (Figure 1.18) marked the moment when Henri IV entrusted the regency to Marie. It was her version of *Cosimo de' Medici is elected Duke of Florence*. In this canvas Marie is receiving the regency represented by the orb from Henri IV. This was the turning point in Marie’s rise to power. She was now beginning her journey as Queen Regent. It was imperative that this scene of her first triumph be included in a cycle celebrating her successes.

While the Palazzo Vecchio's decorations may have made a huge impression on Marie de Médicis, it is interesting that she specifically asked her architect to copy the Palazzo Pitti. Previous historians have just looked to the exterior similarities between the two. However, when Marie’s aunt, the Grand Duchess Christine’s decorations for her apartments, an interesting parallel appears. The decorations of Christine’s apartments are a celebration of her biography. Christine’s sala was decorated with her coat of arms and some of the canvases that were painted in 1589 for her triumphal entry into Florence. The images included Cosimo Gambarucci’s *Caterina de’ Medici surrounded by the French and Florentine Members of her Family* (Figure 1.19). This image would have celebrated Christine’s legitimacy as the heiress to these illustrious French and Florentine figures. Further rooms in Christine’s apartments included paintings of Christine’s cherished family members. Also included were images depicting her departure from France and her arrival in Italy. In her bedroom, she had portraits of her parents, her husband.
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141 Muccini (1997), 74.
142 Muccini (1997), 83.
and “a dead pope from the house of Lorraine.” In her more private cabinet, she had a portrait of her grandmother, Catherine de Médicis.

Upon the death of Ferdinando de’ Medici in 1609, Christine and Ferdinando’s eighteen year old son, Cosimo II (1590-1621), succeeded to the title of Grand Duke. However, Christine had been made regent in 1592 and took over the reins of government again in 1609, a year prior to the start of Marie de Médicis’s regency. Cosimo II died in 1621 after a long illness. His will named his wife Maria Magdalena of Austria (1589-1631) and his mother Christine de Lorraine as the joint-regents for his under-age son Ferdinando. Christine instigated a series of building improvements in the Palazzo Pitti in the 1620s, including the decoration of the vault of the “Galleria del Poccetti” in the north wing (Figure 1.20). The vault is an iconographical celebration of Maria Magdalena and Christine de Lorraine. Their coats of arms hang in the middle of two sides of the vault. Religion, holding a cross and a temple. She is surrounded by four female allegorical figures holding lightning, a bow and arrow, a shield and pike, and a sword. At either end of the vault are two female personifications of Florence and Siena wearing crowns. The symbolism of the vault decorations celebrates the women’s successful regency. The Sala delle nicchie, the space used for public events in the Palazzo Pitti, also received a new decorative scheme. In May 1626, a painting by Justus Suttermans was placed over the main door (Figure 1.21). It was a depiction of the start of the regency in March 1621 when the Senate paid homage to the Grand Duke Ferdinando, accompanied by his regents, Maria Magdalena and Christine de Lorraine. Similar to Marie de Médicis’s representations of her own regency, the regents here also take centre stage. Maria Magdalena is the highest figure in the trio of rulers, and the figure of Florence ambiguously hands the sceptre in that direction, unsure of who is to lead. Christina Strunck hypothesises that this ambiguity was actually a reaction to the negative connotations associated with Marie de Médicis’s self-congratulatory Médicis Cycle. The Médicis Cycle was installed only a year before Suttermans’s painting. It is unlikely that news would have travelled so fast about the reception of Marie’s gallery, and there is little evidence that it was viewed negatively in its infancy. It is true that the Parisian and Florentine courts were very close, however it is more likely that Christine de Lorraine was following the modesty of her grandmother, which was ultimately ignored by Marie, instead of doing the opposite of the Médicis Cycle. Stunck is correct in noting that “while Marie de Médicis was immortalised as Juno, the Florentine regents appeared as normal and approachable human beings, in a seemingly realistic rather than panegyrical rendering.” It is more likely that when devising her plans for the decorations of the Luxembourg Palace that Marie looked to the examples of Christine’s biography that dotted the walls of her apartments in the Palazzo Pitti.

Domestic Architecture: Reflection of the Self in the Seventeenth Century

Although the entire palace was to reflect Marie’s identity, it was mainly the west wing of the palace that could be said to be “Marie’s.” Not only was this where Marie’s apartments were located, but it was also the only wing of the palace that was completely finished upon her final exile from Paris in 1631. The east wing of the Luxembourg Palace was to have as its focal point the Henri IV Cycle by Rubens in the east gallery. However, this was never completed. Houses in the early modern period were a centre and focus of personal identity. Early modern Europe thus saw the emergence of interior space as being a reflection of the inner self. David Warren Sabean and Malina Stefanovska, in Space and Self in Early Modern European Cultures, illustrated how in early modern cultures, “space and place play a fundamental role in producing the self, framing it, situating it, giving it concrete expression.” The court and its architectural surroundings provided a space for “self-fashioning.” This was especially true for females, whose power during the early modern period rested mostly within the home. As Erik Erikson wrote of the history of space and its gender relations: “History in the meantime has offered a slogan for it: girls emphasised inner and the boys emphasised outer space.” The role of the female in the early modern period was typically thought to be viewed as domestic, as exemplified by one of the passive heroic traits of the female, domesticity. It has been argued that it was women who exerted a great influence over the development of seventeenth century French interiors. Marie’s new home, the Luxembourg Palace, was to be a concrete expression of herself. Self-fashioning herself through the home was therefore fulfilling her gender role, to be discussed further in the following chapter, that was acceptable in the early modern period. However in addition, as Deborah Blocker wrote, “the vicinity of the monarch was, in early modern Europe, the primary symbolic space where political power was exercised and represented.” Marie’s new palace was not just to be an exemplar of her heroic trait of domesticity; it was to be an exemplar of her heroic power as a regent. This was powerfully exhibited through the interior decorative programme that celebrated Marie’s Florentine and Medici origins and attempted to empower Marie’s legitimacy and success as queen and regent.
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152 David Warren Sabean and Malina Stefanovska, Space and Self in Early Modern European Cultures (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011).
155 Erik Erikson, Identity: Youth in Crisis (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), 270: “But how does the identity formation of women differ by dint of the fact that their somatic design harbours an ‘inner space’ destined to bear the offspring of chosen men and, with it, a biological, psychological, and ethical commitment to take care of human infancy? The differences themselves were so simple at first they seemed a matter of course. History in the meantime has offered a slogan for it: the girls emphasized inner and the boys outer space.”
156 Rubin (1977), 12.
159 Blocker, in Sabean and Stefanovska (2011), 115.
Even though greatly influenced by their Italian counterparts, French interiors developed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to eventually become the predominant influence on the developments in European interiors of the time.\textsuperscript{160} A pattern for the layout of palaces emerged in the early modern period as court style became a "European phenomenon," and many courts began emulating the patterns of others.\textsuperscript{161} It was the Italian example of formal planning that initially influenced the layout of palace apartments.\textsuperscript{162} Italian clarity and order were transported to France where great advances were made in pairing the clarity and order with comfort to create harmony.\textsuperscript{163} The Italian formula consisted of a large hall for socialising, the principal bedchamber that also could be used as a reception room followed by smaller more private rooms.\textsuperscript{164} Scamozzi described the Italian formula in his 1615 treatise on architecture:

Let the principal parts of the palace be the sale, salotti, and large rooms, followed by the medium sized ones, and the smaller ones; so that people who accompany the owner may remain in the first type of room; and his intimate friends in the second. Those who come to negotiate with him may go into the more withdrawn rooms. Let this disposition of rooms be observed not only in Princes’ palaces, but adapted in accordance with proportion in the well-governed houses of private gentlemen.\textsuperscript{165}

The more public rooms gave way to the private camerini and studii, the prototypes of the English closet and the French cabinet.\textsuperscript{166} The adaptation of these sequences of rooms reflects the traditions of ceremonial at each individual court: the sequence of rooms could be used to create a hierarchy as entrance to the separate rooms depended upon status and etiquette.\textsuperscript{167} Nowhere could this be more clearly displayed than in the apartments of the monarch, where the king or queen not only resided, but often conducted business. Early modern French palaces followed a similar progression. Peter Thornton describes the layout of a typical seventeenth century palace, “[It] would be entered via a hall, which was no longer used for dining, up a grand staircase on which architects now began to bestow much ingenuity, through a saloon, a withdrawing room, an antechamber, to the bedchamber with its great bed and its small private rooms beyond – closets, garderobes and dressing rooms.”\textsuperscript{168} As one progressed deeper into the apartments of the king or queen, entry into the rooms became more exclusive. Sir Edward Stafford explained the progression of rank into the rooms to Sir Francis Walsingham at the court of Henri III in France in 1584,

The King begineth to reform marvellously the order of his house and maketh three chambers afore they come to his inner bedchamber; in the first, gentlemen to be

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Thornton (1978), 25.
\item Chatenet, in Elizabeth Goldring and J.R. Mulryne, eds., Court Festivals of the European Renaissance (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 94.
\item Syson and Thornton (2001), 27.
\item Thornton (1978), 10.
\item Syson and Thornton (2001), 27.
\item Vincenzo Scamozzi, L’idea dell’architettura universale (Venice: Scamozzi, 1615), 307, translated by Syson and Thornton (2001), 27.
\item Thornton (1978), 55. Chatenet (2002), 179. See also Waddy (1990) for more information on the public and private nature of specifically Roman palaces and how the linear characterisation of Roman palaces reflected palace etiquette.
\item Thornton (1978), 60.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
modestly appareled; in the next, men of great quality; in the last, Princes and knights of the Holy Ghost, with himself when he cometh abroad. Into his private bedchamber nobody to be allowed, unless called in, but Épernon and Joyeuse.\textsuperscript{169}

Henri III made reforms in the layout of rooms in the king's apartments in an attempt to not only restore order, but also to draw a clearer division between himself and his court.\textsuperscript{170} The French monarchy was previously notoriously accessible, and Henri III was attempting to move away from this tradition to create a court that mimicked the hierarchy of the English court, which in turn was influenced by Italian and Spanish examples.\textsuperscript{171} This hierarchy of rooms was influenced by the addition of more antechambers, thus making access to the monarch's private chambers even further away and more difficult.\textsuperscript{172} Monique Chatenet explains Henri's attempts at privacy: "Being completely at odds with the familiarity which had been current up to this time, Henri III dreamt of a monarchy enhanced by distance, of a sovereign placed inaccessibly at the far end of a sequence of rooms, of a complicated ceremonial regulated with clockwork precision."\textsuperscript{173} The rooms became more private as one progressed from the very public State Bedchamber to the monarch's personal bedchamber. Ceremonial visits often took place in the State Bedchamber.\textsuperscript{174} Therefore, beyond the bedchamber, were located rooms that offered much more privacy. These were the rooms where the monarch lived rather than performed. Apartments could thus be divided into public and private, or ceremonial and functional. In 1625, the balance of the state rooms and domestic rooms was commented upon by Francis Bacon: "You cannot have a Perfect Pallace except that you have two sevrall Sides; a Side for the Banquet...And a Side for the household; the One for Feasts, and Triumphs and the Other for Dwelling."\textsuperscript{175} Often the move further into the domestic rooms was reflected in the decoration of the rooms as well. Thornton comments that the inner rooms became less opulent than the state ceremonial rooms, however, the more private domestic rooms, "depending on the inclinations and circumstances of the owner, might still be furnished with considerable opulence."\textsuperscript{176}

The Luxembourg Palace interior reflects these patterns in its sequence of rooms and their decoration. Unfortunately, however, it is impossible to completely reconstruct the sequence of rooms in Marie's apartments at the Luxembourg Palace from the time when she lived there. A fire in the royal archives in 1690 most likely destroyed architectural plans of the Luxembourg from the time of Marie de Médicis.\textsuperscript{177} There is a drawing of the plans of the

\textsuperscript{169} Historical Manuscripts Commission, Salisbury (Cecil) MSS, 1889, iii, 75, Sir E. Stafford to Sir F. Walsingham, 8 December 1584.
\textsuperscript{170} Chatenet in Goldring and Mulryne (2002), 86. Chatenet (2002), 159-186.
\textsuperscript{171} Chatenet in Goldring and Mulryne (2002), 94.
\textsuperscript{172} Chatenet (2002), 179. Strunck in Chatenet and Gady (2014), 211.
\textsuperscript{173} Chatenet in Goldring and Mulryne (2002), 89.
\textsuperscript{175} Francis Bacon, \textit{Essayes}. XLV. “Of Building” (London: Iohn Haviland, 1625).
\textsuperscript{176} Thornton (1978), 57.
\textsuperscript{177} Galletti (2012), 33. Galletti goes on further to confirm that “from 1778, when the new owner of the Palace, the Comte de Provence, brother of Louis XVI, searched for graphic reproductions for the restoration and expansion work that he had planned, the designs were not found and the keeper of the archives of buildings of the king of that period thought they had disappeared in the fire that damaged its collection in 1690 or that of the Chambre des Comptes in 1737.”
Luxembourg made by English architect John Thorpe from 1621 (Figure 1.22). It shows that the general layout and size of the rooms corresponds with later plans, although the rooms are designated in English and we cannot be sure if they reflect what he saw on the French originals. The first inventory of the Luxembourg Palace made shortly after Marie’s death in 1642 has never been found. Marie’s will was revealed in 1643, bequeathing everything to her sons, Louis XIII and Gaston d’Orléans. Two years later in 1645 an inventory was again done of Marie’s possessions. This is the most precise description of the apartments at the time of Marie’s death. This inventory only identifies which paintings were in each room and provides little indication of the location of the rooms in relation to each other. Historians have attempted to piece together the sequence through the plans that do survive and the correspondence of Florentine ambassadors and contemporary travel guides, such as Claude Malingre’s *Antiquités of 1640* and Germain Brice’s *Description de la ville de Paris* of 1752. Plans from after the death of Marie include a 1661 plan by Jean Marot (Figure 1.23), an Antoine Desgodets plan from 1696 (Figure 1.24), an anonymous plan from around 1725-1742 (Figure 1.25), and another anonymous plan from 1747 (Figure 1.26). Unfortunately, none of these plans offer identifications of the west wing which was where Marie’s apartment were. As one can see from all of these plans, the rooms had not changed much, in terms of size, over the period of one hundred years. An architectural plan by Jacques-François Blondel of 1752 (Figure 1.27), although made over one hundred years after Marie’s death, provides a plan of the apartments that would have most resembled that sequence when Marie lived there. Blondel used Marot’s plan from 1661 as guidance. Previous room identifications hypothesised by historians, such as Deborah Marrow’s (Figure 10) and Thuillier and Foucart’s, have been discovered to be lacking as she did not refer to the aforementioned materials when reconstructing her interpretation of the sequence. Marie-Noëlle Baudouin-Matuszek and Sara Galletti are the most recent scholars to base their findings on the evidence provided by these sources.
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180 Testament de la très virtueuse Reyne Mere du Roy Louys XIII, à Paris, 1643.
181 Ms 6613 Bibliothèque Arsenal, Paris.
182 Baudouin-Matuszek (1990), 288.
185 There is a manuscript in the Archives nationales, Paris, that holds a key for the numbers listed on the 1696 plan. Unfortunately, the key does not include the identifications of the numbers of the right side of the plan, the side that includes Marie de Médicis’s apartments. For the key, see Memoire de l’estat du palais, bassecourts et jardins de Luxembourg, 13 avril 1696, AN 01 1687B, 707, Annexe 11, ibid. 702, 708. Memoire des personnes regugiez dans le palais de Luxembourg, 16 mai 1696, ibid. 703. Memoire des personnes logees dans le palais de Luxembourg qui n’étoient point domestiques 21 mai 1696, ibid. 701. Memoire des personnes qui sont logees au dessus des entraits au palais de Luxembourg 21 mai 1696, ibid, 705.
187 Blondel (1752), 52, note c. See also, Galletti (2012), 69.
be a combination of Baudouin-Matuszek's reconstruction (Figure 1.29) and Galletti's (Figure 1.30) based on evidence provided by contemporary seventeenth century letters, inventories, travel guides and Blondel's eighteenth century plan (Figure 1.31). What can be seen in the west wing's sequence is that the Luxembourg Palace's interior layout, specifically the queen's apartments, follows the French pattern that grew from the Italian example introduced by Scamozzi that was eventually exported to France via England through Henri III. One would enter the palace through the courtyard into the ground floor, where one would ascend a grand staircase and turn right into the salle (hall) that led to the Queen's apartments. The salle was ornamented with friezes running along the wall and cartouches with corbels and Marie de Médicis's arms on the ceiling. After proceeding through the salle, the first room of the queen's apartment was the antechamber. Both are named in Blondel's plan; it is also confirmed by Brice that the antechamber is the room in between the two pavilions of the southwest corner of the Luxembourg Palace and the location of Orazio Gentileschi's Public Felicity. This is further confirmed in Nicolas Bailly's inventory of the paintings in the Luxembourg Palace of 1709-1710. Baudouin-Matuszek and Galletti agree on this location. The antechamber divides the apartments into two, ceremonial and functional: the state apartment to the north of the antechamber and the private apartment to the south-west corner. Both Malingre and Brice state that the first room to the left (south) of the antechamber is the Cabinet Doré, which led to the Queen's bedchamber. Brice states, "Before arriving in that chamber (that of the Queen), you have to cross a grand cabinet where are situated the paintings of Medici Marriages." Baudouin-Matuszek follows them in identifying these rooms as the Cabinet Doré leading to the Queen's bedchamber. Galletti, however, looking at Marie's previous apartment at the Louvre which contained a petit cabinet and a grand cabinet, labels what others agree was the Queen's bedchamber as the petit cabinet. At the Louvre the petit cabinet served as the room in between the private and grand cabinet. However, as Galletti readily admits, the sources describing the layout of the apartment do not confirm this at the Luxembourg, where the Queen's apartment is split into two halves. The petit cabinet would more than likely have actually been the room tucked away to the left of the Queen's bedchamber. Crossing over to the north pavilion, the state apartment, identification of the rooms gets more complicated. However, by relying on contemporary descriptions, the sequence can be uncovered. The first room, entered from the antechamber, Blondel identifies as the State Bedroom, confirmed by Florentine ambassadors as a public area. Baudouin-Matuszek, however, argues that it was the Cabinet des Muses based on the description that the private chapel of the queen is located "at the exit of the Rubens's gallery". While it is correct that the chapel was located at the exit of the Rubens's gallery, there were two exits from the Rubens's gallery, and Baudouin-Matuszek chooses the wrong one. Galletti accepts Blondel's identification of this room as the State Bedchamber and correctly labels the subsequent room as the Cabinet des Muses based on information from François de
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188 Baudouin-Matuszek (1990), 292.
189 Brice (1752), tome III, 371-407.
191 Malingre (1640), 401: "Chamber of the Queen...entered by a cabinet the most rich he had seen."
194 Galletti in Paola Bassani Pacht, T. Crépin Leblond, and N. Sainte Fare Garnot (2003), 130.
195 Galletti in Paola Bassani Pacht, T. Crépin Leblond, and N. Sainte Fare Garnot (2003), 127.
196 Baudouin-Matuszek (1990), 288.
Bassompierre describing the Day of the Dupes on 11 November 1630. This description reveals the location of the Cabinet des Muses and the chapel:

Marie de Médicis and Louis XIII were found in the cabinet [des Muses] of the queen, where Richelieu, whom they wanted to keep from entering, arrived from the other side by the gallery: ‘The cardinal, having found the door to the antechamber and chamber closed, entered in the gallery and knocked at the door of the cabinet and no one answered; finally, impatient and knowing the different locations of the house, entered by the small chapel.197

Both the chapel and the Cabinet des Muses have a door that opens into the gallery that contained Rubens Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. Luckily, the location of the gallery has never been disputed.

Each room of the west wing of the Luxembourg Palace had an agenda that enhanced Marie’s image. (See Appendix at the end of this chapter for a list of the individual rooms and the paintings located within them.) The theme of the Palace was Marie’s success as a ruler: the Queen Triumphant. Great attention was paid to the peace, prosperity, and public felicity that flourished in France as a result of her good government. In addition, it was to also be a celebration of her Medici and Florentine origins and her legitimacy as the wife of Henri IV, mother of the Dauphin, and regent. To establish this, she turned to interior decorative programmes of historical and biographical pictorial cycles. Unfortunately the interior decoration of the palace does not exist today as it did in Marie’s time. Much of it has been destroyed or moved to separate locations.198 Some of the paintings and sculptures remain in the Luxembourg and have been reassembled in the Salle du Livre d’Or.199 Nevertheless, the decorative programme can be discerned from the seventeenth and eighteenth century inventories of Paillet and Nicolas Bailly and the 1645 inventory that details the contents of the Luxembourg bequeathed to her relatives in Marie’s will.200 The earliest inventory, the Paillet inventory, lists all of the paintings in each room, and has been given the date of around 1686 to 1693 by Arthur Hustin.201 Although compiled over fifty years after her exile, this inventory presents the most accurate description of the decorations installed under Marie’s patronage.202

198 The Médicis Cycle is in the Louvre, whereas the rest of the decorations are scattered throughout different museums and galleries in France and elsewhere.
199 Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 201. Marrow (1978), 53: “Furthermore, it is no longer clear where all of the original rooms were located because the early nineteenth century restorations greatly changed the appearance of the interior. At that time all of the seventeenth century decorations which remained in the palace were transferred to a room known as the Salle du Livre d’Or.”
201 See above note.
202 Marrow (1978), 59: “The inventory includes any additions or changes which were made between 1631 and 1686 when Madame de Guise occupied the Queen’s former apartments.”
Work on the Luxembourg Palace's interior decoration was to begin on 1 May 1621. A contract was signed in 1621 between the painters Renault Latrigues, Nicolas Duchесne, and Pierre de Hansy, and Marie de Médicis, Cardinal de Richelieu, Claude Bouthillier as Marie’s secretary, and two notaries. The contract detailed the overall decoration of the palace, starting with the great hall.203 Similar to the contract signed between Marie de Médicis and Rubens in February 1622, Marie reserved the right to have the works changed or appraised if they did not suit her standards.204 Marie was the driving force behind these commissions, with the assistance of some of her advisers. Her two most important and active advisors in the decoration of the Luxembourg were the Cardinal Richelieu and Claude Maugis, the Abbé de Saint-Ambroise.205 Maugis was highly influential on the development of the Luxembourg Palace, a fact that calls into question previous assumptions that Richelieu was Marie’s most important advisor for the construction and decoration of her palace.206 As evidenced from Maugis’s extensive correspondence with Peiresc and Rubens concerning the decoration of the palace, Maugis was supervising the decoration of the Luxembourg from 1621 as Richelieu focused more on politics.207 Although Marie had the final say and approved each suggestion, Richelieu and Maugis oversaw the projects, kept in contact with the artists, suggested topics, and purchased works of art for the palace.208 Baudouin-Matuszek goes so far as to suggest that Maugis was in fact the one who suggested Rubens as a painter for the Médicis Cycle to Marie.209 Marie was in constant contact with Maugis and was constantly kept up to date with the development of the Luxembourg Palace.210 In a letter of 15 September 1622, Peiresc wrote to Rubens of the Queen’s active role in the palace:

The Sr Abbot [Maugis] told me that the Queen has a chest in which she has placed together all the drawings and plans for the entire building of her palace, and of all the statues to be located there, down to the smallest detail of the ornaments, wainscoting,

203 The contract is summarized by Marrow (1978), 54-55, and it includes details for the decoration of twenty-five bays of the ceiling, twenty beams, eighteen casement windows and their shutters, and the panelling of the rooms. The contract, which is in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, was published for the first time by Thuillier and Foucart (1970), 94-95.

204 Pierpont Morgan Library. Department of Literary and Historical Manuscripts. MA 386.1. From the contract specifying Marie’s control over changes: “...que lad. dame Royne s’est réservée le pouvoir d’augmenter ou diminuer les subjects desd. tableaux avant quilz seront commancés et de faire retoucher et changer les figures qui ne luy seront agréables....”. See also Max Rooses, “Les contrats passés entre Rubens et Marie de Médicis concernant les deux galeries du Luxembourg,” Bulletin Rubens 5 (1910), 218.

205 Marrow (1978), 56.

206 Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 198: “Richelieu...coordinated the works of the palace. He was in contact with Salomon de Brosse, le Mercier, Guillaume Berthelot, Philippe de Champaigne and Rubens.”

207 Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 198: “But his [Richelieu’s] ambitions and his entry into the Council in 1624 monopolized his time and he unloaded it more or less on his second reliable and enlightened, Maugis, for site supervision and even the decisions.”


209 This is among other suggestions proffered throughout Medici Cycle studies, such as the Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia, which will be discussed in a later chapter. Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), “His chief glory is having made the suggestion of Peter Paul Rubens to the queen...”, 200.

210 Marrow (1978), 42.
and gardens, and that she wished to add to them all the drawings of your paintings, which she would have put all together in a book in proper order and carefully bound.\textsuperscript{211}

Giovanni Battista Gondi also wrote in 1624 after a trip to Paris of Marie’s attentiveness to the decorations:

The Queens [Marie de Médicis and Anne of Austria] being eager to see Paris again (particularly the Queen Mother on the account of the building of her palace which Her Majesty is having brought to a finish with much solicitude and therefore she enjoys seeing it often by herself and ordering many things, particularly for the interior ornaments) have also come to this city.\textsuperscript{212}

Marrow echoes Gondi and notes that Marie was perpetually looking for more art to fill her palace, sending her advisors all over Europe searching for treasures.\textsuperscript{213} Marie did not just control the overall image. Her influence was also felt in specific commissions, especially the Médicis Cycle and the decorations for her apartments. As stated previously, the contract asserts her right to direct changes to the canvases if they did not suit her taste. By the time the contract for the Médicis Cycle was signed between Marie and Rubens in February 1622, a list of subjects had already been presented by the Queen to Rubens.\textsuperscript{214} It was indicated in the contract that the remainder of the subjects were to be determined, presumably by the Queen, and sent to Rubens.\textsuperscript{215} In a letter of 22 April 1622, Peiresc sent to Rubens a programme detailing the subjects to be included.\textsuperscript{216} A document of 16 August 1622, the MS Baluze, lists the subjects and the manner in which they were to be depicted.\textsuperscript{217} Rubens had very little control over the subject matter of the Médicis Cycle.\textsuperscript{218} As Marie was in control of the creation of her image, it can thus further be ascertained that she must have had precedents in mind when instructing her artists and designers.

The Decoration of Marie’s Apartments

After ascending the grand staircase and crossing the grand salle, before proceeding into the private rooms of Marie’s apartment, one had to first traverse the antechamber. The antechamber was a public room, open to almost all guests of Marie de Médicis. The theme of the decoration was the peace and prosperity that Marie’s rule brought to France, an allegorical

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{212} Med. 4637, not paginated, 6 July 1624, Gondi to Picchena, translated by Marrow (1978), 52 and 202.
\item \textsuperscript{213} Marrow (1978), 52.
\item \textsuperscript{214} The contract clearly indicates that Rubens had already been given nineteen subjects and five more were to follow. It states that Rubens will “drawn and paint with his own hand twenty-four pictures in which shall be represented the histories of the very illustrious life and heroic deeds of the said Queen according to the specifications [in subjects up to the number of nineteen] which, as has been said, have been given to the said Sieur Rubens by the said Majesty [who will transmit to him the other five subjects while he is working on the first ones]”, Pierpont Morgan Library, Department of Literary and Historical Manuscripts, MA 386.1.
\item \textsuperscript{215} Pierpont Morgan Library, Department of Literary and Historical Manuscripts, MA 386.1.
\item \textsuperscript{216} Letter reprinted in Rooses and Reulens, tome 2, (1887-1909), 388-390.
\item \textsuperscript{217} Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS Baluze, 323, fols. 54-57.
\item \textsuperscript{218} Carroll (2008), XIX.
\end{itemize}
message that would have been welcome in such a public setting. Three ceiling panels held images of Minerva and two female allegorical figures with a cornucopia and a torch and olive branch. The centrepiece of the decoration of this room was Orazio Gentileschi’s *Public Felicity Triumphant over Dangers* (Figure 25). Gentileschi (1563-1639) was one of the foremost Florentine painters of his time, and Marie de Médicis invited him to Paris “as a countryman: Gentileschi, in fact, took pride in signing his works under the name of ‘Florentine.’” Gentileschi worked for Marie in Paris between 1623 and 1625. Marie chose multiple Florentine painters to work on the decoration of the Luxembourg. She also frequently sent her French painters to be trained in Florence. Public Felicity Triumphant over Dangers is an allegorical painting celebrating Marie’s regency that illustrates Felicity seated on a crumbling stone balustrade before a stormy sky, perhaps symbolising Marie’s precarious situation with her son at the French court. Felicity holds multiple gold and laurel crowns in her right hand, and in her left she holds a caduceus with two intertwined and balanced serpents representing harmony and peace. The caduceus was the symbolic attribute of peace that belonged to Mercury and Césare Ripa’s symbol of Felicitas Publica. It appears multiple times in the Médicis Cycle as a symbol of Marie’s triumph of peace. It appears in eight of the canvases, and as explained by Millen and Wolf, became the most significant symbol in the paintings as it. Millen and Wolf refer to it as a “political key”: “It can be wielded by Maria or one of her avatars as readily as by its prime possessor – but never anyone else. Which should be enough to tell us, even if we had no further evidence, that its significance in the cycle is not mythological but emblematical.” A letter from Maugis to Richelieu of 14 August 1621 that discusses the decorations that Marie had approved specifically lists the caduceus. It reappears throughout the Luxembourg Palace and in the Médicis Cycle. The presence of the caduceus indicated Marie’s triumph. In the Médicis Cycle and in Public Felicity Triumphant over Dangers, Marie succeeds despite setbacks.
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219 In the Paillet inventory, it is sited as by Monier. Source Paillet, Archives Nationales, O’ 1966, dossier 5, published by Hustin (1904), 54-56.

220 For more on this and Gentileschi see Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 206; Charles Sterling, “Gentileschi in France,” *The Burlington Magazine* 100 (1958), 112-121. Marrow (1978), 60: “Gentileschi had come to Paris on Maria’s invitation after sending her a painting from Genoa.”

221 Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 206. Gentileschi left in 1625 to work at the court of Marie de Medici’s son-in-law, Charles I, in England. Sterling, 112: “His journey to France is confirmed by himself. In a letter addressed to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, dated 18 July 1633, he says he was been absent from Tuscany for fifty-five years, that he has spent this time in the service of royalty, partly in that of Her Majesty the Queen Mother (Marie de Medici), with whose gracious consent he was permitted to remain about ten years in the exclusive service of the King of England (Charles I).”

222 Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 197. Marrow (1978), 25. She perpetually wanted to employ the Florentine school. Rubens had also worked in Florence previously and was influenced by what he saw there. Sterling (1958), 113. Belkin (1998), 39-66. Rubens was in Italy from 1600-1602.


Following the safely allegorically decorated public antechamber, to the right was the state bedroom dedicated to the glorification of Marie’s success as a ruler, a room that embodied the theme of the decorations of the entire palace, including the Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. The decorations included six paintings by Jean Monier of female allegorical figures or putti with decorative motifs.225 The attributes of the allegorical figures included a steering oar, a globe, sceptre, crown of France and an olive branch – all allegorical symbols that reappear throughout the Luxembourg Palace that represent Marie’s aptitude for rule and her success as regent. These appear multiple times as Marie’s accoutrements in the Médicis Cycle that support Marie’s claims as a glorious and successful queen regent.

Opposite the state bedchamber, the first room approached was the Cabinet Doré. The Cabinet Doré was one of the rooms that served as the link between the public side of the queen’s apartments and the private side.226 The Cabinet Doré’s decorative scheme displayed a strong glorification of Marie’s Medici family through pictorial biography. It is in fact the decoration of her cabinets that reveals much of her personal agenda. Cabinets were notoriously private rooms, thus their decoration could reveal much more about the owner. The cabinets were often located past the bedchamber; those closest to the monarch were typically the only ones allowed into the cabinets. It was specifically a place for “withdrawal” from the publicity of the court to undertake more intimate activities.227 The cabinet is closely related to the study as a place for private contemplation, a place for resting, reading, studying, writing and socialising with close friends.228 This space became extremely exclusive, and came to be, under Louis XIV in France, where the select few of his privy council met.229 In his 1586 The English Secretary, Angel Day explains the significance of the private nature of the cabinet:

By this reason, we do call the most secrete place in the house, appropriate unto our owne private studies, and wherein wee repose and deliberate by deepe consideration of all our weightiest affaires, a Closet, in true intendment and meaning, a place where our dealings of importance are shut up, a roome proper and peculiar to our selves. And whereas into each other place of the house, it is ordinary for every neere attendant about us to have acces: in this place we doe solitarie and alone shut up our selves, and the use thereof alone doe onelie appropriate unto ourselves.230

The cabinet thus came to be thought of as an “inner sanctum”, a place where the owner could reveal their true self. This was often displayed through the interior decoration. As Peter Thornton reiterates, “One could not only behave in them in a more relaxed manner, one could have them decorated and furnished in quite a different way. All formality was thrown to the winds and one could rig up these small rooms as one pleased, indeed, in as fanciful a manner as one liked.”231 Due to the fact that this space was only seen by a select few, anything that the

225 Source Paillet, Archives Nationales, O’ 1966, dossier 5, published by Hustin (1904), 54-56.
226 Marrow (1978), 71.
229 McKeon (2005), 229.
231 Thornton (1978), 296. Thornton goes on to explain that “thus, it was often in closets that forms of decoration and furniture were first tried out that were subsequently to become widely fashionable....”
The owner wanted to display could be displayed. It was protected from the judgement of the public. The 1748 Memoirs of the Life and Time of Sir Thomas Deveil differentiates the cabinet from the more public rooms of the apartments and associates the cabinet with the most intimate space of the owner: “yet follow them close, enter with them into their cabinets, or, which is still more, into their private thoughts, and the dark recesses of their minds, and they will be found pretty much on level.”

The decoration of Marie de Médicis’s cabinets in the Luxembourg Palace reflects Marie’s identity in a more obvious manner than the more public rooms of the palace. The decoration reserved for these rooms is tailored to the privacy of these rooms; many subjects that would not have been suitable to the more public rooms of her apartments are housed here. The subject matter of this decoration reveals the need to conceal these paintings from the public and only display them for a select few in Marie’s inner circle. Due to the privacy of the cabinets, owners often were able to express themselves and honour their families and aspects of their identity that was private. This was thus the space where Marie de Medici was allowed to place herself within her foreign heritage without anxiety over repercussions from those who feared her foreign nature. According to Marrow, “There seems to be only one other room in the Luxembourg which was completely decorated by the Queen and this was the Cabinet Doré....” Also referred to as the “cabinet of Medici Marriages”, the Cabinet Doré was decorated with ten paintings. Marie requested the paintings to decorate her cabinet as gifts from her relatives in Italy, including those in Florence, Mantua and Savoy. These paintings all came to Marie through the efforts of the Florentine ambassador in Paris, Gondi, and the Florentine Secretary of State, Curzio Picchena, in December 1627. Marie initially suggested the subjects that she wanted in the paintings. However, correspondence went back and forth between Paris and Florence concerning the subject matter in 1624. Eventually the subjects were chosen between Marie and her Florentine contacts. Marie made her own suggestions and approved the list of subjects. The Cabinet Doré included The Interview of Leo X de’ Medici and
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232 McKeon (2005), 339.
234 Marrow (1978), 71.
235 Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 208. For more details on its decoration, such as the cornicing and coffered ceiling, see Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 208-209.
237 Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 213: “The Queen spoke to the Italians by way of Gondi who transmitted her demands to the Secretary of State Curzio Picchena;” “Gondi gave many details about the execution of her commission, the presentation of the paintings, their transport by sea to Marseille, and from there, to Lyons and Paris. His ambition was to present them himself to the Queen Mother. The delays accumulated, and it was not until July 1627 that the Queen knew that the paintings were finished and only in November, that Gondi learned of their arrival in Lyons. It was unfortunately not in Paris until December when they at last arrived and his absence deprived him of the fruit of so much labour, the presentation of the works to the Queen.”
238 For more details on the correspondence, see Baudouin-Matuszek (1991) and Marrow (1978), 74. Marrow also publishes the letters in the appendix to her study.
239 Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 213: “First she wanted six paintings of unspecified subjects, which she asked for the painter Domenico Passignano; then it appears that in March 1624, the first four subjects had already been selected....” The only problem that Florence had with the subjects Marie chose was the Château d’If controversy. According to Elizabeth McGrath, “Tact and Topical Reference in Rubens’s Medici Cycle.” The Oxford Art Journal 3 (1980): 16: “She embarrassed her Italian relatives with at least one of the subjects in another series of historical pictures she commissioned from artists in Florence. Choosing the theme of the Château d’If, presumably because of a connection with her own marriage, the queen quite obtusely ignored the obvious discomfort in Florence over the possibility of the permanent commemoration of this event in Paris”.

55
François I at Bologna by Giovanni Bilivert (Figure 1.33), The Marriage of Catherine de Médicis and Henri, Duke of Orléans by Francesco Bianchi (Figure 1.34), The Marriage of Francesco de’ Medici, Father of Marie, and Joanna of Austria by Jacopo Ligozzi (Figure 1.35), The Aid sent by Troilo Orsini to Catherine de Medici and Charles IX by Anastasio Fontebuoni (Figure 1.36), The Coronation of Cosimo, First Grand Duke of Tuscany, by Pius V by Zanobi Rossi (lost), The Marriage by Proxy of Marie de Médicis by Jacopo da Empoli (Figure 1.37), Embarkation Scene: the Embarkation of Marie de Médicis by Domenico Passignano (Figure 1.38), The Siege of Bona by Jacopo Vignali (lost), The Defeat of the Turks at Sea by Jacopo Ligozzi (lost), The Marriage of Louis XIII and Anne of Austria [The Exchange of the Princesses at the Bidassoa Border] by Valerio Marucelli (Figure 1.39).

240 Marie had chosen many subjects that touched on the theme of France’s indebtedness to the Medici and marriage scenes in which marriage settled a conflict.241 During the Medici’s rise to power as Grand Dukes of Tuscany, marriage arrangements of their offspring to powerful European families became a lucrative political ploy.242 Through marriage, Medici status rose even higher. It is therefore not surprising that in their decorative schemes they chose to glorify these significant marriages.243 The Marriage of Catherine de Médicis to Henri II also decorated the walls of the Room of Clement VII in the Palazzo Vecchio. It highlighted a Medici princess marrying the future king of France, a political triumph for the Medici. Marie de Médicis carried on this tradition both politically and decoratively, and the theme of marriage perpetually played a role in Marie’s patronage. Two of her most significant political triumphs were the marriages of her children, Louis XIII to the Spanish Infanta, and her daughter, Princess Elisabeth, to the future Philip IV of Spain. The Médicis Cycle included both Marie’s proxy marriage to Henri IV in Florence and The Exchange of the Princesses (Figure 1.40). The latter painting depicts allegorically the exchange of Princess Elisabeth of France and Anne of Austria at the Bidassoa border on the occasion of their double marriage to Philip IV and Louis XIII respectively. As both Blunt and Marrow discuss separately, there were Florentine models for many of the subjects in the Cabinet Doré and the Médicis Cycle, including the marriage scenes of Catherine de Médicis, Marie, and the double marriage of Marie’s children.244 The scenes of Marie’s and Catherine’s weddings were taken from two paintings by Jacopo Empoli of the same subjects completed for Marie de Medici’s wedding festivities in the Salone dei Cinquecento of the Palazzo Vecchio in 1600. Two other versions of the double marriage, Exchange of the Princesses, exist.245 One is in the convent of the Encarnacion in Madrid, possibly in Spain as a gift from Florence on the occasion of the wedding in the seventeenth century. Another exists in the ceiling of the “Volticana” at Poggio Imperiale.246 This subject appeared twice in the Luxembourg Palace, in both Rubens’s Médicis Cycle and the Cabinet Doré. Marie

---

240 The paintings of Medici marriages were attributed to François Clouet by Nicolas Bailly in his inventory of 1709-1710. However, as they were commissioned and executed in Florence, the paintings were done by Italian artists. For more details of these individual paintings, see Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), Marrow (1978), and Anthony Blunt, “A Series of Paintings Illustrating the History of the Medici Family executed for Marie de Medici – I,” The Burlington Magazine 109 (1967): 492-498. Anthony Blunt, “A Series of Paintings illustrating the History of the Medici Family executed for Marie de Medici – II” The Burlington Magazine 109 (1967): 560, 562-566.


243 Marrow (1978), 156: “Marriage scenes were common in Florentine art as they were part of the tradition of pictorial biography which developed in the late sixteenth century.”

244 Blunt (1967), 565. Marrow (1978), 73.

245 Marrow (1978), 127.

246 Marrow (1978), 127. Blunt (1967) suggests that they were all based on an original, now lost, by Pablo van Mulen.
certainly knew the importance of this event, as originally, Marie wanted four scenes in the Médicis Cycle to be dedicated to it. Eventually dwindled down to one canvas, perhaps Marie had always known that the double marriage would again be illustrated in the Cabinet Doré. The Marriage of Marie de Médicis asserted her own legitimacy as the bride of Henri IV, and thus Queen of France. It was important that this event was illustrated as part of a decorative scheme that was striving to prove her legitimacy. Two related events that occurred soon after her proxy wedding in Florence are also included in the Médicis Cycle and the Cabinet Doré. Marie’s Embarkation from Livorno, located in the Cabinet Doré, depicts the journey that led to The Disembarkation at Marseilles (Figure 1.41) in the Médicis Cycle. Her departure from Italy and arrival in France symbolise the moment when Marie finally began to fulfil her destiny as she perceived it as queen of France. It was not just Marie who was praised in the Cabinet Doré. The Coronation of Cosimo I was also chosen for the Cabinet Doré, a repeat of the subject in the Salone dei Cinquecento at the Palazzo Vecchio. However, Marie chose for her own coronation at Saint Denis on 13 May 1610 to be illustrated in the Médicis Cycle. Both exemplify the importance of the coronation scene in asserting legitimacy. The moment of Cosimo’s coronation was a triumph for the Medici. It would perhaps not have been appropriate to celebrate Cosimo’s coronation as the Grand Duke of Florence in the Médicis Cycle’s more public location within this French palace. Marie’s coronation was illustrated in The Médicis Cycle to remind the French viewers of her consecrated role as the queen of France, just as Cosimo’s coronation was to remind viewers of his powerful place in Florentine politics and thus Marie’s inheritance as the daughter of the Grand Dukes of Tuscany. After twenty-seven years in France, Marie de Médicis was ordering Florentine pictures that had a specifically “Medicean” theme. Despite all that time, she had not lost her allegiance to her home.

The Apotheosis of Marie de Médicis (Figure 1.42) by Jean Monier adorned the ceiling of the Cabinet Doré. Here the entire theme of the Queen Triumphant of the Luxembourg Palace is culminated as Marie is gloriously made divine, much like her ancestor Cosimo I de’ Medici before her on the ceiling of the Salone dei Cinquecento in the Palazzo Vecchio. Paillet describes the painting in his inventory: “A painting...representing on the ceiling Marie de Médicis sitting on a cloud, supported by an eagle holding a sceptre in her hand, the other clutching a cord that binds a faisceau of arrows that the woman presents to her....” This painting symbolises Marie’s triumph of peace through the union of the state of France after the wars of religion, symbolized by the faisceau of arrows that Marie ties together. The woman who presents the arrows to Marie is Concord, symbolising harmony in France. It is in fact Concord kneeling next to Marie who presents another bundle of arrows to her as a symbol of her work towards peace in France in The Council of the Gods (Figure 1.43) in the Médicis Cycle. The Council of the Gods allegorized Marie’s political expertise that led to peace in France and double marriage with

---

247 Thuillier and Foucart (1970), 131. Millen and Wolf (1989), 160-163. It should be noted that references to her daughter Christine’s marriage to the Duke of Savoy or Henrietta Maria’s marriage to Charles I do not appear in the Luxembourg Palace decorations. Christine’s marriage most likely does not appear because Marie never approved the marriage of her daughter to Henri IV’s staunchest enemy and occurred during her exile in 1619. Henrietta Maria’s marriage to Charles I may not be included as it took place in 1625, when most of the decorations for the Luxembourg Palace were already commissioned.

248 Paillet, Archives Nationales, o’ 1966, dossier 5, published by Hustin (1904), 54-56.

249 Paillet, Archives Nationales, o’ 1966, dossier 5, published by Hustin (1904), 54-56.
Spain, as symbolised by the yoking of the doves and the globe.\textsuperscript{250} It is interesting then that an image of Marie achieving apotheosis and concord through her rule should be placed on the ceiling of a room celebrating Medici marriages and political triumphs. The eagle at her side perhaps refers to Henri IV's frequent identification with Jupiter, Henry/Jupiter often appears alongside Marie personified as Juno in the Médicis Cycle.\textsuperscript{251} This painting has also been called Marie de Médicis in the Guise of Juno receiving a Bundle of Arrows, confirming the relation of the eagle to Jupiter and Juno and perhaps placing it even more in line with Marie's image as Juno in The Médicis Cycle. Yet its more popular title is The Apotheosis of Marie de Médicis.\textsuperscript{252} In the Médicis Cycle, however, it was Henri IV who was first apotheosised. In The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency (Figure 1.44), Henri IV is carried heavenward by Jupiter and Saturn. After Henri's death, Marie never succeeded in building a memorial to him. Galletti believes that the Luxembourg Palace was perhaps her attempt.\textsuperscript{253} However, the Luxembourg Palace was Marie's celebration of Marie and Henri, as a royal couple, which thus draws attention to the main theme of Marie as Henri's queen. The Henri IV Cycle, commissioned from Rubens at the same time as the Médicis Cycle, was never completed.\textsuperscript{254} Perhaps then his apotheosis in The Death of Henri IV is his memorial in the Médicis Cycle. Apotheosis was the ultimate recognition of a monarch, defined as “the elevation of someone to divine status.”\textsuperscript{255} Here is Henri, demi-god on earth, being carried to heaven finally receiving divinity. Marie is not apotheosised in The Médicis Cycle until Time unveils the Truth (Figure 1.45), and even in that canvas, she shares her apotheosis with her son Louis XIII.\textsuperscript{256} It is possible that in light of the inclusion of Henri IV's apotheosis and her fragile situation with her son, a full-on apotheosis for Marie in the public forum of the Médicis Cycle would have been too egotistical, even for Marie. It may have thus needed to be tucked further into her private chambers in the Luxembourg Palace, in her Cabinet Doré. It is true that Cosimo's apotheosis was in the very public Salone dei Cinquecento, but Cosimo was the Grand Duke; there was no doubt concerning the power he could exhibit. Marie was the Queen Mother who had been regent and then accused of wielding far too much power and punished for it. To achieve divinity when she was so newly restored into her son’s graces

\textsuperscript{250} Millen and Wolf (1989), 142: “The globe gives the specific explanation. In the sketch the hemisphere alongside Juno shows two French lilies, and it can be presumed that the other half would bear the arms of Spain. Though neither set of arms is visible in the final canvas, they were mentioned in the Baluze text as an integral element of the picture....”

\textsuperscript{251} For more on Marie as Juno, see Millen and Wolf (1989). Marie appears as Juno in The Marriage consummated in Lyons.

\textsuperscript{252} This title was perhaps given after Marie’s death as it was unusual to be glorified through apotheosis before death. It is possible that Marie is planning for her eventual apotheosis and also making herself "divine" before her death, acknowledging that she was on a higher level in the world than everyone else. However, as noted above, Marie was apotheosised before death in other paintings such as Time unveils the Truth in the Médicis Cycle.

\textsuperscript{253} Marrow (1978), 53. For more on the Henri IV Cycle, see Julius S. Held, The Oil Sketches of Peter Paul Rubens. A Critical Catalogue 1 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 123–133; Daniel Schecter, Rubens' unfinished gallery of Henry IV: one half of 'un bel composto', Master of Arts Thesis, (Montreal: McGill University, 2000). Galletti in Bassani-Pacht, Crépin, Sainte Fare Garnot (2003): Galletti believes that the two identical wings housing grand cycles by Rubens – one housing the Life of Marie de Medici and the other housing the Life of Henri IV – affirm her hypothesis that the Luxembourg Palace was in fact a monument to Henri IV and Marie de Medici: “...the Luxembourg is a royal palace dedicated to the couple Henri IV and Marie de Medici like a sort of memorial, and not, as is often claimed, a double palace for the queen and her son, Louis XIII”, 124. Perhaps the Luxembourg Palace has never really been perceived this way because the Henri IV wing was never completed.

\textsuperscript{254} For more on this, see Schecter (2000).


\textsuperscript{256} Millen and Wolf (1989), 220-221.
and stripped of much of her power would have been overstepping the boundary of her station. In the Cabinet Doré, there was enough privacy for Marie to be apotheosised without criticism that she had risen too heavenward. The fireplace of the Cabinet Doré was surmounted by Simon Vouet’s Hercules and Omphale, a subject that suggested gender role subversions in the early modern period. It seems an interesting choice of subject matter for a female former regent who was often accused of vying for the male role of king. Again, perhaps this explains its location in this private cabinet.

The cabinet opposite the Cabinet Doré was the Cabinet des Muses, located in the ceremonial pavilion between the state bedchamber and the gallery. It held the paintings that Marie de Médicis solicited from her Mantuan relatives in 1624. They sent an already completed set of ten paintings of Apollo and the Nine Muses by Giovanni Baglione (Figures 1.46 and 1.47). This series originally belonged to Marie’s nephew, Ferdinando Gonzaga, the Duke of Mantua, and were originally meant for Gonzaga’s Villa Favorita. However, Ferdinando had an ulterior motive. He was looking for Marie’s approval of his title of Altezza. It was recommended to him that the paintings would help sway Marie’s opinion. Situated in the public half of the queen’s apartments, this room would have served as the intermediary between the state bedchamber and the Medici Gallery, suggesting that it was somewhat public. Galletti believes that this room would have in fact been strictly private, citing letters of Florentine ambassadors and referencing the private nature of the iconography of the paintings. Despite Galletti’s example of similar decoration in the studiolo of Leonello d’Este, there is nothing to suggest that these images would have been controversial and require privacy. A popular Renaissance subject, these images were often used as public proclamations of praise. Previously, Apollo and the Muses had been illustrated during Marie’s wedding festivities in Florence in 1600. Marrow even suggests that this series of Apollo and the Muses “may have set the precedent for the use of the Muses in early seventeenth century decorative schemes to flatter the patron”, which suggests a public rather than private location. Their original intention at Ferdinando’s Favorita was to assert Ferdinando’s dynastic policies publically. The paintings included the nine muses seated individually on black capitals, and one of Apollo with his lyre. Pamela Askew explains the symbolism of these paintings, “These paintings for over life-size figures...affirm

---


258 Pailet misidentified Apollo as Orpheus in his inventory. Pailet, Archives Nationales, o’ 1966, dossier 5, published by Hustin (1904), 54-56. According to Marrow (1978), the original correspondence concerning these paintings is in the State Archives of Mantua and was published by Alessandro Luzio, La Galleria dei Gonzaga vendetta all’Inghilterra nel 1627-1628: Documenti degli Archivi di Mantova e Londra (Milan: 1913).

259 Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 211: “The Duke, in fact, seeking to obtain from Marie de Médicis the recognition of the title of Altezza, which was already honoured in the other courts of Europe, became anxious with his ambassador of the best means to achieve it. Priandì [the ambassador of the Duke of Mantua in Paris] assured him that the means was of ‘the regalement of paintings’ for decorating her new palace.” Marrow (1978), 63.

260 Galletti (2003), 127.


262 Marrow (1978), 64.

263 Askew (1978), 295.
Ferdinando’s wish that his villa exemplify the heroic power and triumph of Gonzaga rule.”

The paintings also celebrated Gonzaga’s patronage of the arts, as Askew adds, “It could not but have attested to Ferdinando’s love of the arts; indeed the Favorita itself may be said to have been a monument not only to Ferdinando’s ducal aspirations, but to his personal cultivation of the arts as ruler and patron.”

It was thus appropriate that these paintings came to be housed in the Luxembourg in semi-public room. Apollo, the god of music and poetry, was often identified with the Sun. He therefore represented an allegory of a “Sun-King,” as he was used for both Ferdinando Gonzaga and Louis XIII.

Apollo’s presence is noted in the scene of Louis XIII’s birth in the Médicis Cycle in The Birth of the Dauphin (Figure 1.48). Apollo flies across the sky in his chariot marking the arrival of a new Sun King. Apollo appears again symbolising Louis XIII in The Council of the Gods assisting Minerva in the defeat of the Vices, as he also appears in The Return of the Mother to the Son (Figure 1.49) and in Time unveils the Truth. However, this subject could equally represent Marie’s successful regency, as the arts of music and poetry of Apollo flourished under her peaceful rule. Depicting Louis as Apollo was perhaps a favourable nod from Marie to Louis XIII after the accusatory nature of the rest of the Médicis Cycle. It could also symbolise one of her greatest achievements in that she gave birth to the new Apollo – Louis XIII. The subject of Apollo and the Muses is in keeping with the theme of Marie triumphant in the Luxembourg Palace decorations, including that of the Médicis Cycle. Priandi wrote of Marie de Médicis’s delight at these paintings upon their arrival in Paris in December 1624: "The Queen Mother came yesterday to her palace purposely to see the paintings; she found them bellisimi and said to me two times that she was very happy and she thanked your Highness very much. She was accompanied by many lords and ladies, princes and princesses, who all judged the work of the chevalier Baglioni greatly esteemed among others of his time.”

It is perhaps the public and private nature of the rooms of the Luxembourg Palace that marks the differences between The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle and its somewhat veiled allusions to Marie’s Medici and Florentine agenda and the more audacious Medici and Florentine references and praise of Marie in the Cabinet Doré and the Cabinet des Muses. Although on an everyday basis, the gallery that housed the Médicis Cycle was a private room, it could also serve a public function.

Galleries in seventeenth century Europe were typically private rooms for exercise and contemplation, but had the potential to be public if the owner of the house allowed it. Galletti maintains that this would have been true for the Luxembourg Gallery as well: "...this gallery, decorated with the history of the life of Marie, therefore remains in daily use a private space.”

---

264 Askew (1978), 284.
265 Askew (1978), 295.
266 When first informed of the paintings, Marie was concerned that the Muses may be presented too provocatively. Thus, the Mantuan ambassador, Giustiani Priandi, wrote to Mantua saying that “the Muses should not be totally nude, nor too lascivious, something which the queen mother has signalled to me.” Baudouin-Matuszek (1991), 213.
267 Askew (1978), 295; Millen and Wolf (1989), 83, 148: “Throughout his reign no image would be pressed into service for his emblems and other propaganda more often than that of the sun-king Apollo.”
271 Galletti (2003), 130.
served as a waiting area for access to Marie’s apartments, as a sort of antechamber.\textsuperscript{272} This has long been stated as the role of the gallery. However, Marie’s apartments already had an antechamber, which, as Galletti explains, “played a role of distribution...between the two sequences [of rooms].”\textsuperscript{273} It also would have made no sense in terms of the location of the gallery in relation to the main entrance into the apartments. One would have had to traverse the apartments to enter the waiting room first. In 1625, the gallery served as the very public setting for the banquet celebrating the marriage of Henrietta Maria to Charles I of England.\textsuperscript{274} It is possible that the gallery could be both public and private, as suggested by Jean Guillaume, open to a large audience of courtiers and visitors when Marie de Médicis wished.\textsuperscript{275} The subject matter still therefore had to be extremely sensitive to Marie’s position at court. When Marie overstepped her position and commissioned \textit{The Flight from Paris}, which truly highlighted her plight at the hands of her son, the painting was removed.\textsuperscript{276} Crawford discusses the power of the gallery's potentially very public location: “Marie de Médicis intended for the gallery decorated by Rubens to make a very public statement, albeit one aimed at a very elite public.”\textsuperscript{277} While the Médicis Cycle was influenced by Medici and Florentine precedents, the Medici and Florentine connection is not as visible as the paintings in the Cabinet Doré. It seemed safer for Marie to be viewed as a heroic woman, a controversial idea at the time, in the more public Médicis Cycle than to glorify her foreignness and her pride in her Medici family. What Marie ultimately excluded from the Médicis Cycle and included in the more private rooms of her apartment speaks volumes about the fine line Marie was ultimately walking with her image. While the Luxembourg Palace was to be symbolical of Marie’s image, there were layers to this image and levels of public and private that not every viewer would have been able to see. The gallery was separated from the private apartment by the state apartment and the antechamber and was thus anomalous within French architectural tradition. To enter further into the Queen’s private apartments was to enter Marie’s inner sanctum, where all of her secrets were held. To enter one’s inner sanctum became in the early modern period a way of accessing one’s soul. Sabean and Stefanovska explain that the soul was said to have “hidden folds” and “inner recesses” that allowed one to go into themselves, through these different layers, to their “inner sanctum.”\textsuperscript{278} To travel further into Marie’s inner sanctum in the Luxembourg Palace was to reveal fully Marie’s Florentine agenda and theme of the Queen Triumphant.

Marie de Médicis would, unfortunately, only be the Queen Triumphant for a short time. In 1631 Marie was exiled from France for a second and final time by her son. Marie only lived in her Luxembourg Palace for five years before being forced to leave. Upon her departure, Marie

\begin{enumerate}
\item Marrow (1978), 66. Crawford (2004), 89. Thuillier and Foucart (1970), 32: “In point of fact, her gallery was not intended solely for show, to be reserved for great ceremonies as was often the case with Italian galleries. Instead, it was designed as a functional room, a sort of waiting room leading to the Queen’s apartments, where her intimates and courtiers could meet, stroll about while awaiting her pleasure, gossip at their ease in the window-recesses.”
\item Galletti (2003), 131.
\item Guillaume (1993), 39.
\item Millen and Wolf (1989), 178-181. It is unclear who ordered the removal of this picture. I would suggest that it was either Maugis or Richelieu who suggested this removal, as they seemed to have been aware of the nature of some of the subjects and the security of allegory that was missing in this picture.
\item Crawford (2004), 89.
\item Sabean and Stefanovska (2011), 4.
\end{enumerate}
bequeathed her grand palace to her son, Gaston d’Orléans. However, the palace was very much Marie de Médicis’s. It was ingrained with her identity – from the request for Palazzo Pitti exterior architecture to her decorative scheme celebrating her heroic nature and successful regency. The decorative scheme of the interior had a clear agenda of Maria Triumphant, and each room fits into this agenda, including the Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. Posterity would not remember it as such, however. The Luxembourg Palace eventually became a government building and the Queen’s apartments were destroyed and renovated, thus losing their cohesive statement. When one considers what a magnificent sight this must have been in the seventeenth century, it is easy to imagine that Marie’s message was clear: this Medici princess had triumphed over adversity and deserved the title of queen.
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Appendix

List of works in Marie de Médici's apartments in the Luxembourg Palace:

**Hall (Public)**

Decorative paintings by Renault Latrigues, Nicolas Duchesne (painters of the Queen Mother) and Pierre de Hansy (Master painter of Paris)

Statues by Berthelot

**Antechamber (Public)**

Theme of Peace and Prosperity

Three ceiling panels: Minerva, two female allegorical figures: one with a cornucopia, one with a torch and an olive branch.

Wall paintings *Public Felicity Triumphant over Dangers* by Orazio Gentileschi

**State Bedchamber (Public)**

Theme of the glorification of Marie's success as a ruler

Six paintings by Jean Monier of female allegorical figures with the following attributes: steering oar, globe, sceptre, crown of France, olive branch. Paintings also of putti with decorative motifs.

Oval painting of female in yellow drapery holding a cornucopia and caduceus with two putti and a laurel crown at her feet.

Female leaning on an altar.

Four figures seated below some columns with putti carrying a crown of flowers.

**Cabinet des Muses (Semi-public/semi-private)**

*Apollo and the Nine Muses* by Giovanni Baglione

*Minerva with the Arms of France and the Medici* by Philippe de Champaigne

Chimney: *David with the Head of Goliath* by Guido Reni

Oval ceiling panel of fame holding two trumpets to which were attached the initials and arms of Marie.
Ten landscapes in the wainscoting

**Chapel/Oratory (semi-public)**

Ten paintings of virtues in cartouches

Representations of the Apostles and Christ

Two sets of twelve paintings on the *Life of the Virgin* and the *Sibyls*

Eight females

Two angel musicians by Philippe de Champaigne

**Gallery (semi-public)**

*Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle* by Peter Paul Rubens

**Cabinet Doré (private)**

Ceiling: *The Apotheosis of Marie de Médicis* by Jean Monier

Seventeen panels of divinities and five of obelisks in landscapes by Jean Monier

Ten scenes from Medici history, including the Medici marriage paintings

Chimney: *Hercules and Omphale* by Simon Vouet

**Petit Cabinet (private)**

Female figure on a cloud, helmeted with her hand on a globe holding a laurel branch, and a Hercules on a cloud holding three golden apples

Seventeen small panels of divinities

Wainscoting- five obelisks in landscapes

Five paintings “in the Flemish manner” of royal residences
Chapter 2

The Foundation of the First Medici Queen of France: Catherine de Médicis and Marie de Médicis

The first documented visual comparison between Catherine de Médicis and Marie de Médicis was during the celebrations for the proxy wedding of Marie de Médicis to Henri IV on 5 October 1600 in Florence. At Marie's nuptial banquet in the Salone dei Cinquecento in the Palazzo Vecchio, Marie sat underneath mirror images of Catherine's 1533 nuptials in The Wedding of Caterina de' Medici and Henri of Valois (Figure 2.1) and an image of her own wedding to Henri IV (Figure 2.2), both by Jacopo di Chimenti da Empoli.279 Before Marie even made her journey from Florence to France, Catherine de Médicis was seen as Marie's predecessor as the Medici Queen of France and subsequently its regent. Catherine also paved the way for Marie as she was the first Medici to marry royalty.280 Although the circumstances of their regencies were somewhat different, they both created images that responded to the issues that were specific to their unique circumstances: a foreign female regent, queen, mother, widow, and a Medici. This chapter will look at Marie's image as a mother and regent and compare Marie's image to that of her most immediate predecessor, Catherine de Médicis. Catherine and Marie found themselves in very similar situations. How they each responded through their image making says much about their agendas. Catherine, ultimately, had a profound influence on Marie's image. Marie, however, made her image markedly more assertive than Catherine ever made her own.

Marie de Médicis as a Mother and Regent

The creation of the image of a powerful queen regent in seventeenth century France would have been difficult to achieve successfully without crossing too many boundaries. Regency of a young male heir was one of the rare occasions when a female, typically the queen mother, was allowed almost full control of the crown. However, it was a mistrusted and strongly guarded role in which females had to prove their capabilities.281 As she became regent for Louis XIII upon Henri IV's death in 1610, Marie de Médicis was fighting against the doubt of the capabilities of a female ruler and fear of powerful women in seventeenth century France.282

279 Claire Innocenti, *Women in Power: Caterina de' Medici and Maria de' Medici. The Return to Florence of Two Queens of France* (Florence: Mandragora, 2008), 52. "As described by Michelangelo Buonarotti the Younger, the two canvases – whose compositions are mirror images – were placed in an architectural setting designed by Bernardo Buontalenti to decorate the south side (facing Via della Ninna) of the Palazzo Vecchio’s Salone dei Cinquecento, where the banquet was held."
282 For more on the assassination and coronation, see the Introduction and Vincent J. Pitts, *Henri IV of France: His Reign and Age* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).
was therefore imperative that Marie created an image of herself that challenged this notion without overstepping the boundaries of the traditional female roles of wife, widow and mother. As Katherine Crawford has noted of the seventeenth century reception of female regents:

"Commentators expressed anxiety over gender in terms of who could be regent, why they were qualified, what they were expected to do, and how government would function with them in charge."283 Often granted the title of regent by their husbands, the legitimacy, competency and trust of female regents was in reality based on their role as loving mothers and their naturally protective instinct over the dauphin and his future kingdom.284 Pierre Dupuy discussed regency in his *Traité sur la Majorité de nos Rois* in 1655:

Many of our kings often named their queens to have guardianship and tutorship of their child Kings, and with this, the governance of the realm. The principal reasons for this choice were founded...on the natural affection of mothers toward their children, and because they cannot fall under presumption or suspicion of presenting any danger to the Princes who are committed to their care.285

It was deemed better to choose a mother who could never inherit the throne than a male relative who could potentially usurp the young king.286 Marie de Médicis capitalised on the notion of her "natural" role as loving mother. This became a policy of Marie's government during her regency, and she used maternal affection as a political tool.287 Claire Innocenti explains the maternal nature of regency: "The regent thus had to present to the public a varied and ambivalent image of herself and her duties, revolving around three main themes: preserving the memory of the dead sovereign, consolidating regal power and demonstrating maternal love."288 Defined gender roles, such as that of loving mother and dutiful wife, and the ceremonial performance of these roles became an integral facet of regency image.289 As Judith Butler discusses the performance of gender roles, "Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance."290 Part of Marie's gender performance was in fact displayed through her cultural patronage. By enforcing her image as a loving and protective mother, she combatted the suspicion that she was in fact vying for the throne of her son. Images of Marie as a mother and comparisons of Marie to other famous mothers began to appear in Marie's imagery. It has been reported that Marie was interested in female regents of France who came before her even prior to the death of Henri IV and contemporary manuscript sources note

---

284 Maternal affection emerged as a political logic in the sixteenth century, Crawford (2004), 3.
286 Crawford (2004), 3. Catherine de Médicis, Marie de Médicis's precedent as Medici queen of France, used maternal affection to aid her claim as regent: "In 1560, Catherine de Medicis offered a logic unifying the regency functions. This caused several transformations because of the entitlement she claimed and how she claimed it. She utilized the idea of maternal affection to combine guardianship and administration, and tended off attempts to decouple them."
287 Crawford (2004), 4: "Against this position, Louis XIII and Cardinal Richelieu organized very different notions of political governance." Crawford hypothesizes that, as a reaction to Marie's policy of gendered family roles, Richelieu and Louis XIII gave birth to the theory of absolute monarchy.
289 Innocenti (2008), 9: "Marie consulted the regency several times, more than two years before the death of Henri IV."
that Marie discussed politics the Comtesse de Sault, her friend and counselor. According to one manuscript, Marie asked “of the Regency of Queens, of the means which they served themselves in order to attain it.” The Maître des Requêtes, du Tillot, was ordered by Marie de Médicis to search in the records for information regarding the regencies of Catherine de Medici and other former queen regents. Marie was particularly interested in both Catherine de Médicis’s and Blanche of Castile’s (1188-1252) images as queen mothers and regents.

Following the death of Henri IV, Marie began to compare herself to Blanche of Castile, mother of Louis IX, who became regent for her son twice during his reign. She rearranged portraits in the Louvre and commissioned new works of art to enhance her image and that of her son in light of Henri’s recent assassination. It was in fact a portrait of Louis IX that took pride of place under Marie’s new display, a nod to not only his origins from Henri IV’s house of Navarre, but also to Louis IX’s mother and regent, Blanche. At the Luxembourg Palace, however, it was to be a much more overt statement. Marie commissioned from Guillaume Berthelot eight statues of illustrious women and mothers to be placed around the outside of the central dome of the palace (Figure 2.3). This commission is documented in a letter from Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc to Rubens of 26 May 1622 in which Peiresc writes to Rubens on behalf of the Queen asking for suggestions of illustrious women. Peiresc was already prepared with the names of mothers of great kings, listing Olympias, Berenice, Livia, Julia Mammæa, St Clothilde, Berta, and, of course, Blanche of Castile. Rubens replied offering further suggestions such as Artemisia, queen of Caria and loyal wife of Mausolus. Unfortunately the women who were chosen to decorate the dome are unknown as the original statues have since been replaced and no known documentation of their identities exists. However, this commission is a clear

293 Blanche of Castile became regent in November 1226 upon the death of her husband, Louis VIII when his heir, Louis IX, was only twelve years old. Her first regency was marred by the discontent and rebellion of French nobles, whom she eventually managed to subdue. Even when Louis came of age in 1234, Blanche remained extremely influential upon his rule. She was again made regent in 1248 when Louis joined the Crusade. For more on Blanche, see Margaret Wade LaBarge, Saint Louis, Louis IX Most Christian King of France. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co, 1968.); B. Wheeler and J. Parsons, Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
294 Jacques Foucart and Jacques Thuillier, translated by Robert Erich Wolf, Rubens’ Life of Maria de’ Medici (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1970), 17: “A few days at Henri’s death, Marie arranged to have the portrait of King Philippe VI of Valois removed from the gallery in the Louvre and replaced by that of Saint Louis IX, ‘in order that Louis XIII should imitate the virtues, the valor, and the devoutness of the sainted king,’ adding further, ‘as, for our part, we desire to follow and imitate the commendable virtues of Queen Blanche of Castile, his mother’.” Marie was compared to Blanche by the First President of the Parlement shortly after the death of Henri IV: “Louis, tenth of that name, and of Saint Louis, who were assisted in the success of their reigns by the judicious counsel of Queens Blanche and Marguerite,” Jacques Gillo, “Relation faite par Maître Jacques Gillo conseiller d’Eglise à la Grand’chambre du Parlement de Paris de ce qui se passa audit Parlement, sçant aux Augustins, touchant la régence de la reine Marie de Medecis, mere du roi Louis XIII, les 15 et 15 mai 1610” (Nouv. Coll., ser. I, vol. XI, 1838), p 480-481.
296 Marrow (1978), 49. Peiresc refers to Rubens’s reply in a letter of 9 June 1622.
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indication of Marie’s desire to align herself with illustrious females, specifically mothers, and reveal their similarities through the decoration of the Luxembourg Palace. The interior of the palace also celebrated this claim. Marie de Médicis’s role as a mother is one of her “heroic deeds” that was chosen to be illustrated in the Médicis Cycle by Rubens. Eight of the twenty-four panels explicitly give emphasis to Marie’s role as a mother. It is in the Coming of Age of Louis XIII (Figure 2.4) that Marie’s dual role as mother and regent of France is celebrated. In this scene, Marie de Médicis is at the helm of the ship of state, guiding her son, hand on rudder, as he prepares to take power and direct the ship himself. She is the protector of the state, who has guided this kingdom since the death of Henri IV, and thus Louis XIII’s protector who guided the state for his benefit. The virtues that enabled Marie to be a protective mother and successful regent, Prudence, Fortitude, Piety, Justice and Concord, row the ship of state. This canvas seems to reaffirm the statement made by Louis at the Estates General in 1614 when he reached his majority: “A widow happily governs the people, a widow sends the armies, a widow chooses the captains, a widow goes on campaign, a widow directs the triumphs.” This painting reaffirms Marie’s belief that her actions during her regency were all for the benefit of her son and the kingdom of France – a belief that Louis XIII claimed to have held in 1614.

Despite the belief that mothers were duty-bound to protect the crown of their sons, there was still an extreme mistrust of any female regent who wielded an unfeminine amount of power and influence in France, as in the case of Marie de Médicis. It was believed that not only were women incapable of ruling, but once given even a small amount of power, they would always strive for more. The distrust of Marie was in part due to the almost masculine image of power that she created for herself through cultural patronage. Katherine Crawford wrote of Marie’s predecessor, Catherine de Médicis, as a female and regent, “But Catherine had to walk a fine line. Whereas a good woman was obedient, deferential, and dependant, a good politician was commanding, aggressive, and independent.” Catherine’s reputation in sixteenth century France thus set the precedent for subsequent images of female regents. Marie equally had to tread carefully between her gender role and her role as regent. However, she was never one to shy away from aggressive self-promotion. Marie defined herself as a strong heroine. This is made clear in the 1621 contract for the Médicis Cycle signed between Marie, Rubens, and her advisors. Marie instructs Rubens “to draw and paint with his own hand twenty-four pictures in which shall be represented the histories of the very illustrious life and heroic deeds of the said
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However, heroism in the seventeenth century was a typically male trait. The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise* of 1694 defines hero:

> According to pagan antiquity this title was given to those who by great valour distinguished themselves from other men.... It is said still today of men who perform actions of extraordinary valour. THIS GENERAL IS A TRUE HERO. It is also said sometimes for a man who excels in virtue. THIS IS A HERO IN PIETY.

The heroic image was a powerful propaganda tool in seventeenth century France and became strongly associated with the monarchy. However Elaine Rubin makes an alternative suggestion that the tradition “must be viewed as a means to strike at the roots of historic allegiances and sexual beliefs established in the French psyche.” Rubin goes on to list the active and passive attributes of a seventeenth century hero that applied separately to men and women. Active traits included courage, magnanimity, virtue, wisdom, prudence, justice, energy, the sword, vigour, force. Passive traits included chastity, modesty, piety, dutifulness, obedience, temperance, soberness, domesticity. The active heroic traits were thus associated with males, whereas the passive heroic traits were associated with females. However, Marie de Médicis decided to manipulate the traditional notions of female and male behaviour and combine both active and passive heroic traits in the creation of her own image. This practice had the potential to be negatively perceived, as these images that praised women could equally be used to slander them, and to either enhance or humiliate the French monarchy in the seventeenth century.

Katherine Crawford sums up this conundrum by asking, "An 'excellent' woman overcomes the weakness of her biological sex, but doesn't that make her unwomanly?"

This environment of opposed ideas of female heroism affected the success of Marie de Médicis's heroic image that she created within the Luxembourg Palace, for the Médicis Cycle embodies through paint Marie’s identity as a *femme forte*, an active hero. Not only does Marie appear as a military victor in *The Victory at Jülich* (Figure 2.5), but the Médicis Cycle’s climax in the final canvas, *The Queen Triumphant* (Figure 2.6), sees Marie in the guise of Minerva Victrix. *The Queen Triumphant* was symbolically placed above the peak of the fireplace at the end of the long gallery in the Luxembourg Palace. It concludes the Médicis Cycle by representing Marie as the
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wise warrior Minerva holding a victory in her right hand and a sceptre in her left hand, trampling over trophies and arms. Marie as an active triumphant hero hung on the walls of the palace as a defining image. Marie did not adhere to the passive female heroic trait of modesty. As discussed in the previous chapter, her self-glorification was to reach higher levels as one journeyed further into her private apartments in the Luxembourg. In one of her cabinets, Marie reaches the highest fulfilment for a monarch – apotheosis (Figure 2.7).

The criticisms of Marie were not solely based on the aforementioned images of Marie as a powerful female. Marie had two traditionally mistrusted elements working against her: she was a woman and she was foreign. She was not just any foreigner though; she was an heiress of Medici bankers. Mistrust of foreigners throughout the early modern period was widespread, and France was not immune.313 It was believed that foreign queens would exert too much of their foreign influence upon the monarchy.314 The Salic law was enacted to not only protect the crown from the inheritance of women, but more specifically to protect the crown from the inheritance of a foreign woman.315 It was widely believed that foreign nationality equalled infidelity towards the crown, which could even throw doubts upon the legitimacy of the foreign queen’s children.316 Like Catherine de Médicis before her, Marie was almost instantly mistrusted upon her arrival in France from Florence, which only increased in ferocity after the death of Henri IV.317 Immediately following Henri’s assassination, Marie and her advisors looked to the political example of Catherine de Médicis as a female regent, while also attempting to distance Marie from the negative memory of Catherine as an evil foreign queen.318 Crawford notes that at the time of Catherine de Médicis, “some of the anxiety about foreigners was the result of Italians dominating cultural matters at the French court in this period.”319 Marie de Médicis did not learn from the example of her predecessor and ignored the previous complaints about a strong foreign presence within her court circle. To protect herself from the abuses of the rest of the French court, Marie perpetually surrounded herself with her Florentine relatives and friends. Her two Florentine favourites accompanied Marie to France in 1600.320 Leonora Galigai was a
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315 Rubin (1977), 57.
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317 Thuillier (1970) wrote of the dangers of association with Catherine: “Not everyone remembered Henri II’s Catherine de Medici with kindness, and a good many Frenchmen regarded with small favour ‘the new Florentine’. They were hostile in advance to the race of the Medici ‘who had done so much to harm France’”, 17.
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childhood friend who grew up with Marie in Florence who later married Concino Concini, a Florentine in Marie’s entourage, on 9 February 1601. They quickly rose to power in the French royal court through the favouritism of Marie, who made them the Maréchal and Maréchale d’Ancre in 1610. Marie was accused of being easily manipulated by her Florentine favourites who used their positions to transform the French court. Crawford elaborates, “The evil (but clever) foreign queen [Catherine] became, with Marie de Médicis, the stupid foreign queen. She became the instrument of evil rather than its immediate source.” Marie was the pawn of her manipulative favourites. Concini’s “worst sin”, as explained by Millen and Wolf, “was to have enriched himself without even being French.” Louis XIII became fearful of the growing power of the Concini. Encouraged by his favourite Luynes, Louis XIII ordered Concini’s execution in 1617 and had Leonora Galigai tried for witchcraft and eventually executed in the same year. Louis then exiled his mother to the Château de Blois, over one hundred miles from Paris in the Loire valley. However, Marie did little to combat her foreign image upon her return to Paris in 1620, instead restarting her project of a Florentine palace in Paris. The Concini were even illustrated in 1622 in Rubens’s Médicis Cycle that served as the focal point of the decoration of Marie’s Florentine palace. Concini and Galigai are among the group of Florentines who accompany Marie as she embarks upon her new life in France in The Disembarkation at Marseilles (Figure 2.8).

The Foundation of Catherine de Médicis

Catherine de Médicis was born in Florence in 1519, the only child of Lorenzo de’ Medici, the ruler of Florence and the Duke of Urbino, and his wife, Madeleine de la Tour d’Auvergne (1498-1519). Orphaned shortly after her birth, Catherine was destined to play a role in Medici marriage politics. At the age of fourteen, she was married off to Henri (1519-1559), the second son of François I and Claude de France (1499-1524), in 1533, to seal the political alliance
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between her uncle, Pope Clement VII, and François I.²²⁸ Henri, however, was the spare to the throne. This all changed when his older brother, François, died in 1536, and Henri became the Dauphin, and thus Catherine the future queen of France. Childless for the first ten years of their marriage, Catherine finally gave birth to a son, François, the first of ten children, in January 1544.²²⁹ After the death of François I, Henri II became king of France in 1547.³³⁰ Despite being the crowned Queen of France, Catherine’s power was eclipsed by that of Henri’s mistress, Diane de Poitiers, maîtresse en titre.³³¹ However, on the 30th of June 1559, Henri II was wounded during a jousting tournament celebrating the arrangement of the marriage of his and Catherine’s daughter Elisabeth to Philip II of Spain.³³² Henri eventually died from his wounds on the 10th of July 1559.³³³ Their fifteen year old son, François, became the king of France and Catherine’s role as consort quickly shifted to become that of the queen mother of France. Technically of majority age, François II did not need a regent; however, Catherine served as one of his advisors. Catherine’s importance as an advisor is indicated by the fact that all of François’s official decrees began with “This being the good pleasure of the Queen my lady-mother, and I also approving of every opinion she holdeth, am content and command that....”³³⁴

François II ruled for almost a year and half before his sudden death in 1560. His ten year old brother, Charles IX, succeeded to the throne.³³⁵ As a female, the tradition of the Salic law prevented Catherine and any other female from inheriting the throne, but as the mother of the king, Catherine could offer her protection of the throne as regent in the interest of her son.³³⁶ Charles IX named his mother as his regent in letters to Parlement on the 10th of December 1560: “the queen our very dear dame and mother who we have entreated to take in hand the administration of our realm.”³³⁷ Parlement responded with a letter two days later to Catherine asking her “because of [Charles IX’s] young years...to take over the administration of his kingdom and to govern with the wise counsel and advice of the king of Navarre.”³³⁸ As Katherine Crawford explains of Catherine’s position after François II’s death, “No one expected Catherine to retire to grieve for her son as she had for her husband. Instead, she subsumed her grief under a desire to protect her children.”³³⁹ In her own words, Catherine explained the role she planned
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to play as regent in a letter to her daughter Elisabeth: “God and the world have had occasion to be content with me, because it is my principal goal to have the honour of God in all before all eyes and to preserve my authority, not for myself but to help preserve this realm for the good of all your brothers whom I love. [God] has left me with three young sons, and in a realm which is divided. There isn’t one sole person whom I can completely trust, who does not have some particular passion.”

Due to the ambiguity often surrounding regency, Catherine made her role official in an edict issued by the Royal Council on 21st December 1560 instructing “all governors, officials and military officers report to the Queen Mother…. All information regarding justice, royal finances, and administration [is] to be read by Catherine first.”

Catherine was thus appointed *gouvernante de France*, an unprecedented authoritative role. Even as Charles IX reached his majority, Catherine de Médicis still retained all the powers of the regent, as Charles IX confirmed in his *lit de justice* in 1563. Similarly, fifty years later, Louis XIII would go on to support the continued power of his mother and regent, Marie de Médicis, when he reached his majority in 1614. As Pierre Dupuy wrote in his 1655 treatise on regency, *Traité de la majorité de nos rois*, Charles IX’s and Louis XIII’s...

...intention was, to continue to avail themselves of the counsel of their mothers, the queens, even though they had now reached the age of majority, just as they had done in the past, when they were minor children and their mothers had acted as regents of the kingdom…. Because of this, it seems that these solemn acts performed in public turn out to have served the interests of the Queen Mother and to legitimize their continued authority in governing the state rather than announce the coming of age of the princes, something no one could be unaware of.

Charles IX died at the age of twenty-three on 30 May 1574. His younger brother, Henri, had recently been elected the king of Poland. Due to his absence, Catherine de Medici again became regent of France. Henri eventually returned to France to claim his throne and was crowned at Reims Cathedral in 1575. Although Catherine was no longer regent, Henri III still instilled her with certain powers as the queen mother, which included a seat on the Conseil d’État.

By the time of her death in 1589, Catherine had, in one capacity or another, played a major role in ruling France for almost forty years.
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Both Catherine and Marie had to develop a representational strategy that would support their roles as regent. They capitalised on their feminine virtues as widows and mothers. Catherine and Marie were two of the most important patrons of art and architecture in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is through this patronage that Catherine and Marie developed their images that they each disseminated to their public. This was perhaps a skill that they both inherited from their Medici ancestors. Although this Medici heritage often worked against them in France, as both Marie and Catherine were ridiculed for their Medici name, it gave them an innate understanding of the power of images that they took to France with them. For Catherine, in particular, her adolescence coincided with the Medici’s rise to power and their development of propagandistic myth making in support of their rise. Sheila ffolliot even wonders if there was “a Medici practice...through which palace decorations and portraits serve, among other things, to instruct the young about their family identity.” For there can be little doubt that Catherine was aware of the dynastic imagery around her in palace decorations and portraiture. As discussed in the previous chapter, Medici propaganda through cultural patronage had a profound effect on Marie which can be seen in her own patronage.

Befitting Medici standards, both Catherine and Marie were very much in control of their patronage. Letters from Catherine to intermediaries, such as ambassadors, arranging art and architecture commissions show that she was very specific in what she wanted, and thus in control of the outcome. As Kathleen Wilson-Chevalier wrote, "Like a strategist facing the battlefield, Catherine controls the arts on all fronts...." Catherine’s primary focus for patronage was portraiture. Following in the footsteps of François I of France and her Medici ancestors, Catherine saw the power of portraits in supporting the desired image of the dynasty. Sheila ffolliott notes the power of portraiture in Renaissance ideology and their talismanic use in a time when death rates were high. Portraits were often exchanged with other ruling dynasties, thus the image exchanged represented the power and prestige of its sitter throughout Europe. Catherine was one of the most prolific portrait exchangers in the sixteenth century. She mainly used portraiture in aid of marriage negotiations for her children. The proposal of marriage of her daughter, Elisabeth, to Philip II of Spain spurred on
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the production and exchange of multiple portraits. The proposed marriage of her son Henri III with Queen Elizabeth I of England also instigated many portraits of Henri in 1571. Catherine often went to great lengths to send portraits to other ruling houses, even hastily sending a half-finished portrait to Elizabeth the first in eager anticipation. Ffolliott details the lengths to which Catherine would go to send a portrait. She also used portraits to check on the wellbeing of her children who did not always live with her, often writing to her children’s governor, Jean d’Humyères, asking him to send portraits of her children. Catherine’s collections held in her palaces also tended to focus on family portraits of both her French and Italian family members.

Although Catherine’s regency was not often met with praise, the way she approached it paved the way for Marie de Médicis, and the other regents who followed. Catherine used her “maternal affection” as the basis for her power as regent. Katherine Crawford explains that Catherine used typical female traits to her advantage and used her gender as a political tool. Catherine’s claim to power was thus based on her assumed authority as a wife, widow and mother. Even though she used these traits to her political advantage, she was still within the boundaries of gender norms in the sixteenth century. By capitalising on her female qualities, Catherine established the queen mother as a major political role. This would be an example that was followed by subsequent queen mothers and regents. By establishing herself as the loving mother protecting the interests of her son, Catherine de Médicis was not a threat. The logic was simple: Catherine was performing her appropriate gender role of her maternal duty. Catherine thus emphasised her role as mother in her imagery. Her royal seal read, “Catherine, par la grâce de Dieu, Royne de France, Mère du Roy” (Figure 2.9). This was quite an unusual statement to be included on the mother of the king’s seal. It had not appeared before on the mother of the king’s seal. Catherine was the first queen mother to draw attention to the
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fact that she was the mother of the king in such a public way. Catherine was aware of her entitlement to the role she was playing as the mother guardian of the estate of her son as she advised her cousin, Laudamine de’ Medici, who found herself in a similar situation in Florence in the 1540s after her husband Piero Strozzi fled to France, to take over as the mother guardian for her under-age son. Marie similarly capitalised on her gender role as mother of the king when establishing her entitlement for the regency of Louis XIII after Henri IV’s assassination in 1610. In the immediate aftermath of Henri’s assassination, Marie’s actions showed that Louis XIII and his wellbeing as the future king were her only concern. As she took hold of the reins of government, she also increased the number of his attendants and had him sleep in her bedroom for fear of his safety. This demonstrated to all that her role of regent was a continuation of her role as mother: selfless protector of the king. Marie believed that the king’s well-being depended on his family. Therefore, parental authority was the most obvious solution for a regency, and thus the queen as mother and regent of the king. Contemporary treatises, such as Jean du Tillet’s Pour la Majorité du Roi Très Chrétien contre les Rebelles of 1560, supported this idea. Tillet wrote,

...according to written and natural judgement, a mother loves her children with more piteous love, and with a sweeter heart and lovingly nourishes them more tenderly, and carefully guards their bodies and their possessions more than any other person whatsoever, no matter how close in lineage: and with regard to tutorship, they ought to be preferred above all others.

Catherine de Médicis specifically used family portraiture to support her claim as loving mother protecting her children. One of the most famous images displaying Catherine’s maternal affection is the 1561 portrait by François Clouet of Catherine de Médicis and her Children (Figure 2.10). In this image, Catherine, dressed in her trademark widows’ weeds, puts a protective arm around Charles IX, the child king under her regency. The gesture of Catherine’s hand suggests that Catherine is guiding the future of France by protecting the king, and thus the kingdom. Charles IX grasps Catherine’s right hand, implying that he, in turn, is relying on her for her protection and wisdom as his regent. Also present in this portrait are the other Valois heirs: the future Henri III; Hercule, the future François, duke of Alençon and duke of Anjou; and Marguerite de Valois, the future queen of France and first wife of Henri IV. In a sense, this image was the manifesto of her power, for through her progeny and through her role as the mother and protector of kings, she was one of the most powerful women in the sixteenth century.
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Marie de Médicis was also aware that her power came from her motherhood and thus a display of her maternal affection would help support her claim to the regency. This is especially evident in The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle which was Marie de Médicis’s own manifesto of power that hung on the walls of the Luxembourg Palace for all of her visitors to view. Rubens includes multiple images that represent Marie’s role as mother of the king of France, the future queens of Spain and England, and the duchess of Savoy. As queen of France, her most important role was to produce a male heir for France, and hopefully some spares as well. It was especially important for Marie as she was Henri IV’s second wife. His first wife, Marguerite de Valois, Catherine de Médicis’s daughter, remained childless and thus the couple was granted an annulment in 1599.377 Luckily, about nine months after the first meeting of Henri IV and Marie in Lyons, Marie de Médicis gave birth to the dauphin Louis on the 27th of September 1601. This happy occasion was commemorated by Rubens in The Birth of the Dauphin (Figure 2.11). Greatly allegorized, Marie is depicted having just given birth to Louis in a wooded area representing Fontainebleau, where Marie gave birth to Louis in the palace. Behind Marie stands Cybele, the Magna Mater, while at her right is Fecundity holding a cornucopia of abundance. To the left of Marie is the Genius of Good Health, represented as a winged youthful man, who holds the infant dauphin.378 Next to him is Justice with her scales. The entire scene is crowned by Apollo, with whom Louis XIII would eventually be identified. This image not only celebrates Marie’s success at producing the dauphin, but also all of the Bourbon heirs, just as Clouet’s painting of Catherine de Médicis and her Children does. Within Fecundity’s abundant cornucopia, five baby heads appear representing Marie and Henri’s five other children.379

The Médicis Cycle’s The Birth of the Dauphin celebrates Marie’s role as mother of the dauphin, but her role as mother as guardian of both the dauphin and the kingdom is depicted in The Coming of Age of Louis XIII, another highly allegorized version of the same message of Clouet’s image of Catherine and Charles IX. This image allegorizes the event in September 1614 when Louis XIII reached the age of fourteen, the age of majority in France.380 It was then that Marie was expected to step aside as regent and allow Louis to rule on his own. At the lit de justice ceremony on the 22nd of September 1614, Louis XIII claimed his throne, while also praising the wise guardianship of his mother. He then went on to declare that she should remain his most trusted advisor, a declaration that seemingly continued her regency: "He intended that the Queen his mother should assist him with her good counsel as she had done up to that day, declaring her Chief of his Council and adding that in any case he would always give heed to what

377 For more on Henri IV and Marguerite de Valois’s annulment, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 112-113.
379 The five heads represent Elisabeth, Christine, Nicolas Henri, Gaston and Henrietta Maria. Millen and Wolf, 87.
380 Millen and Wolf (1989), 169: “On October 7, 1614, Matteo Bartolini reported from Paris to the Tuscan Grand Duke that ‘on the 27th of last month, this most Christian King entered his 14th year, and although by the laws of the kingdom followed in past ages it was not necessary any declaration concerning this, His Majesty did make a public ceremony in the Parlement on the 22nd of this month, declaring himself of age.’ (Letter from M. Bartolini to the Grand Duke, October 7, 1614: ASF, Mediceo 4629, unnumbered, translated by Millen and Wolf (1989), 169.)
his chancellor would say.”

Obviously, Marie humbly accepted this new role. Therefore, in this image, Marie is seen at the helm guiding the ship of state, while Louis XIII takes control of the rudder, still looking to his mother for guidance. The ship is rowed by Fortitude, Piety, Justice, and Felicity, all Virtues that Marie de Medici handed down to her son. Above the ship are the twin stars, Castor and Pollux, representative of Louis and his brother, Gaston. Rubens has therefore included a reference to another heir to the throne should Louis die early. Marie has so fulfilled her role as mother that she has supplied France with two heirs, just as Clouet included Catherine’s spare, Henri.

Catherine’s and Marie’s regencies ultimately attempted to withstand criticism by being seen promoting the interests of their sons. To further withstand criticism, their role as regent was also based on the traditional view that they were a continuation of their deceased husbands. They were the link between the father and son. Crawford explains the importance of this continuation in securing the Queen Mother’s regency: “Continuity depended on power passing intact from father to son. Because of the King’s minority, the Queen Mother had to pass on the policy preferences of the King’s father.” Who else could form this link besides the Queen Mother, the wife and mother of the king? Often this link was alluded to in Catherine and Marie’s imagery. In The Consignment of the Regency (Figure 2.12) in the Medici Cycle, Henri IV is seen literally handing over the kingdom to Marie, in the form of an orb. Marie is the continuation of Henri’s power.

After the death of Henri II in 1559, Catherine’s representations emphasized her role as grieving widow of the king. This also reinforced the idea that Catherine was the continuation of the deceased Henri II. Her widowhood helped to legitimize her role as regent. Catherine’s royal seal, mentioned above, also included an image of Catherine wearing widows weeds. From 1559 until her death in 1589, Catherine continuously wore the all black widows weeds. However, it was not the first time she had worn black out of respect for her husband. During his military campaigns, Catherine wore all black to publically show her concern for him. After Henri’s death, François Clouet’s Portrait of Catherine de Médicis (Figure 2.13) of 1560 became the standard image of Catherine that was distributed throughout Europe. In this drawing, Catherine is pictured three-quarters length, angled toward the viewer, her gaze looking to the
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381 Millen and Wolf (1989), 169.
382 Millen and Wolf (1989) discuss the multiple interpretations of the rowers, 170-171.
383 Louis’s health as a teenager was often poor. It was therefore assumed by some that he would die early, and his brother Gaston would inherit the throne. Marie was often accused of attempting to overthrow Louis in favour of Gaston. Millen and Wolf (1989), 173.
384 Crawford (2004), 78.
385 For more on this, see Gosman (2003), 106.
386 Gosman (2003), 106.
387 Gosman (2003), 107, also suggests that this was perhaps not just a reference to her widowhood, but also a reference to power, as “the colour black was also worn by European rulers such as Charles V, Philip II, and, even more important, by the late Henri II. In this manner, Catherine could present herself as a stand-in for her deceased husband and as one who could measure up to her male counterparts.”
left distance. Her face is sombre, which is reflected by her widow’s garments, but her presence is strong. It is a simple, yet effective portrait of a grieving, but powerful widow who is less concerned with adornment and more concerned with the situation at hand.\textsuperscript{390} The image of the perpetual mourning widow became the image of what female widowed regents were supposed to be in their continuation of their husband’s work. According to Crawford, after Catherine de Médicis’s consistent presentation, “The iconography of the Queen Mother assumed a canonical status, as the sombre, pious widow was the stuff of which regents were made.”\textsuperscript{391} It is from this image of Catherine that Marie de Médicis drew her image as grieving widow of Henri IV in the seventeenth century.

In the immediate aftermath of Henri IV’s assassination on the 14\textsuperscript{th} of May 1610, Marie de Médicis established herself as the grieving widow who was the link between the dead king and the future king, her son, Louis XIII. In The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle, Rubens illustrates the passing of power from Henri IV to Marie de Médicis in three paintings: The Consignment of the Regency, The Coronation of Marie de Médicis (Figure 2.14) and The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency (Figure 2.15). In the first image, Marie is seen receiving the power of regency from a very much alive Henri IV. In The Coronation of Marie de Médicis, Rubens has depicted the day when Marie’s power as queen was sealed: 13 May 1610. On this day, Marie was crowned queen of France in the Basilica of Saint Denis in the presence of Henri IV and the most important members of the French nobility. A rare event for a queen of France, the coronation ceremony instilled Marie with the power as the crowned and consecrated queen which could not be questioned by any of the witnesses.\textsuperscript{392} Catherine de Médicis was also one of the few queens who was formally crowned queen of France. Her coronation took place on the 10\textsuperscript{th} of June 1549 at Saint Denis.\textsuperscript{393} Much like Marie, the coronation was an event that helped to bolster Catherine’s role as regent during the two absences of Henri II in 1552 and 1553. Leonie Frieda, in discussing Catherine’s coronation, explains of the importance of a coronation ceremony for queens such as Marie and Catherine. Through the act of coronation, “Catherine was wedded, just as the king had been, to the kingdom of France and had been ordained by God to lead the French people if the sovereign were indisposed.”\textsuperscript{394} In the following image, The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency, the aftermath of Henri IV’s assassination is depicted with Marie seen as his grieving widow dressed in all black with a widow’s veil. She is enthroned surrounded by her supporters and Minerva, Providence and France who would endow Marie with the characteristics that are vital to a successful rule as regent in the place of the deceased

\textsuperscript{390} Crawford (2004), 34: “Her plain visage and heaviness of body indicate her lack of frivolity or feminine weakness.”
\textsuperscript{391} Crawford (2004), 37.
\textsuperscript{392} As Millen and Wolf (1989) explain of the rarity of the coronation ceremony for a queen of France, “In theory and by tradition, the queen of France did not need to be specially crowned. Catherine de Medici, however, had received the distinction in the early years of her reign, though with it came no power and scarcely more than consolation for having to share him with a rival more formidable than any Maria had to put up with. Out of political necessity the honour was granted in 1571 to Elisabeth of Austria, Marie’s cousin who married Catherine’s son Charles IX, so as to give needed reinforcement to the royal Catholic party weakened by the accession of a young and sickly king. For Henri IV, both of these motivations played part”, 111.
\textsuperscript{393} C’est l’ordre et forme qui a este tenue au sacre [et] couronneme[n]t de treshaulte [et] tresillustre dame, Madame Catherine de Medicis, royne de France, (Paris: Jean Dallier, 1549).
\textsuperscript{394} Frieda (2005), 45.
Marie is again dressed as the mourning widow in *The Flight from Blois* (Figure 2.16). In this painting, Rubens is depicting the night that Marie attempted to escape from her imprisonment at the Château de Blois following her exile at the hands of her son in February 1619. Dressed in widow’s weeds, Marie is very much the wronged widow of Henri IV. Her costume enhances the dramatic effect by reminding the viewer of her role as widow. Therefore, to banish Marie was to banish the wife of the king, who lived on in her. Millen and Wolf agree that Marie’s costume aided in “[making] her the embodiment of the wronged princess, the heroine who by fate and circumstances could do no less, but no more, than defy her ingrate son’s orders confining her to what was, in fact, merely a more spacious prison than the Bastille.”

Catherine de Médicis capitalised on the ambiguity of her role as wife, widow, mother and regent, yet unable to fully inherit the throne. This ambiguity ultimately supported her claim to political power, as Catherine never formally defined her role which meant she never overstepped gender boundaries of power. She was almost always depicted as the serene widow, perpetually mourning the death of her husband. Marie, however, exceeded the norms of accepted gender behaviour. She began promoting her own individual abilities that made her the perfect candidate for the regency. She became a heroic woman, a *femme forte*. Even in the wording of the contract signed to commission the *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*, Marie asks that all of her “heroic deeds” be depicted. Most significantly, the final image in the series, *The Queen Triumphant*, is an image of Marie as a *femme forte* trampling arms and trophies in the style of great Amazonian warriors. Instead of protector of the monarch, it appears as if Marie is the monarch herself. As a result, Marie’s self-promotion was in conflict with the maternal role of regent as the protector and promoter of the king, her son. This is never more apparent than in a comparison between the patronage of the two women and the images that Catherine and Marie created for themselves.

Catherine’s use of her widowhood to confirm her allegiance to France and her role as the link between Henri II and his heirs was not just confined to painted images of her widowhood. Catherine also emphasized her devotion as a widow through public architectural and sculptural projects dedicated to Henri II. Soon after Henri’s death, Catherine commissioned Florentine sculptors to erect an equestrian monument of Henri II by Daniele Volterra (Figure 2.17). Unfortunately, the sculpture was not completed before Catherine’s death in 1589. However, the plaster was sent to Catherine who erected it in the Cour du Cheval Blanc at Fontainebleau. Interestingly, the sculpture eventually arrived in Paris in 1622, when Marie de Médicis was in the midst of Luxembourg Palace commissions. It was eventually positioned in the Place Royale.
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in 1639 by Richelieu.\textsuperscript{400} When Marie de Médicis decided to erect an equestrian monument to Henri IV (Figure 2.18) from Florentine artists Giovanni Bologna (1529-1608) and Pietro Tacca (1570-1640), there can be no doubt that she was looking to the precedent of Catherine’s commission.\textsuperscript{401} Marie actually commissioned the statue of Henri IV while he was still living, but it was not finished and installed on the Pont Neuf until 1614, four years after his death.\textsuperscript{402} As Marie wrote to Tacca of the sculpture’s arrival in Paris on the 13\textsuperscript{th} of October 1614, “After our return…the King, Monsieur my son [Louis XIII], and I found the Bronze effigy that you have sent. It is raised in a place so eminent and frequented that I cannot think that there is a location where more people could see [it].”\textsuperscript{403}

Ultimately, however, Catherine’s image as the devoted widow was more apparent than Marie’s image. This was in part due to the fact that Catherine followed in the footsteps of one of the most famous widows of all time: Artemisia II, queen of Caria. Widow of Mausolus, Artemisia built the Mausoleum to hold Mausolus’s remains between 353 and 350 BC. It became one of the Seven Wonders of the World.\textsuperscript{404} Catherine commissioned the Valois Chapel at Saint-Denis (Figure 2.19) from Francesco Primaticcio (1504-1570) as a royal mausoleum in the 1560s.\textsuperscript{405} Therefore, almost immediately after the death of Henri, Catherine was called the new Artemisia by Louis Le Roy.\textsuperscript{406} Commissioned as a monument to her husband Henri II, the Valois Chapel would hold both Henri’s and Catherine’s tombs, as well as those of their children.\textsuperscript{407} The Valois Chapel brought many comparisons to the Mausoleum and thus many comparisons of Catherine de Médicis to Artemisia II.\textsuperscript{408} As mentioned previously, Marie de Médicis was criticised later for not erecting a similar monument for Henri IV.

The most conspicuous comparison made between Catherine de Médicis and Artemisia was the Artemisia Series. Prominent pharmacist and philanthropist whose services were used in Catherine’s court, Nicolas Houel commissioned this series of drawings from Antoine Caron to honour Catherine de Médicis.\textsuperscript{409} Artemisia II of Caria became the archetypal royal widow. So

\begin{footnotes}
\item[401] Johnson in Lawrence (1997), 131-132. Giovanni Bologna was the sculptor originally commissioned to execute the sculpture. After his death in 1608, however, his assistant Pietro Tacca took over and finished the work.  
\item[402] Johnson in Lawrence (1997), 131-132.  
\item[403] As quoted by Johnson in Lawrence (1997), 133.  
\item[404] Gosman (2003), 107-108.  
\item[405] Wilson-Chevalier (2007), 461-462. Due to the magnitude of the project, the Valois Chapel was not complete before Catherine’s death in 1589.  
\item[406] Louis Le Roy, Ad illustrissimam reginam D. Catharinam Medicem (Paris, 1560).  
\item[408] Gosman (2003), 109: “The Italian artist and architect Francesco Primaticcio designed a spacious twelve-sided Renaissance chapel, known as the rotonde des Valois, which was attached to the north transept of the church [Saint Denis]. The chapel had three levels with six chapels each, and it was to be crowned by a dome with a lantern.”  
\item[409] According to Sheila ffolliott, “The author’s [Houel’s] services were retained at court, an indication that Catherine probably found his work useful,” in Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, Nancy J. Vickers, eds., Rewriting the Renaissance: the Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 230. Innocenti (2008), 93. For more information on Antoine Caron,
\end{footnotes}
distraught was she after the death of Mausolus that she drank her husband’s ashes mixed with her own tears and wine. Thus it was said that the king Mausolus lived on in Artemisia. For Caron, both Artemisia and Catherine were the ideal widowed queens. Houel deliberately combined Artemisia II with Artemisia I to create one ideal queen whom Catherine could emulate. Artemisia I, also of Caria, was a fifth century BC warrior queen, widow and grandmother of Lygdamis who was left to ensure his princely education. This combination allowed the Artemisia of the drawings to not only be the devoted widow, but also the regent in charge of the kingdom and education of the young heir. The two queens united male and female qualities to create a strong woman, who was a regent and a warrior. Innocenti also observes that “the image that emerges is that of a female warrior who is also a sovereign, a woman armed with inner courage and intent on saving the state from the direst of threats.” Houel had planned to give the drawings to Catherine as a gift celebrating the wedding of Charles IX in 1570. However, it has been noted by Innocenti that Houel still had the drawings in his possession in the 1580s. That they eventually made it to Catherine, is evidenced by the fact that when Henri IV acquired the drawings in 1599, when they were found in Catherine’s personal collection and library. The drawings were to be accompanied by a four-book biography of Artemisia that Houel wrote himself. The fifty-three drawings depict moments from the two Artemisias’ lives, encircled by symbols of mourning and Catherine de Médicis’s emblems. The events in Artemisia’s life represent events in Catherine’s life. Caron illustrates Artemisia/Catherine as a capable regent in charge of the kingdom in the place of her husband and protector of the child king. The images include illustrations of the funeral of Mausolus, the building of the mausoleum, the education of the young prince, Artemisia’s regency, and the war against Rhodes. La remise du livre et de l’épée (Figure 2.20) showing Lygdamis being educated under the watchful eye of Artemisia, served as an allegory of the education of Charles
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416 Innocenti, 107. Thirty nine of the drawings are held at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Estampes et de la Photographie, while the others are held at the Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts Graphiques. Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Estampes et photographie, EST RESERVE AD-105.
418 The Artemisia Series includes of The Riding Lesson, The Fencing Lesson, Exercise in the Assault and Defence of a Bastion, The Manoeuvres of the Armies, which all depict the education of the young prince, and The Colossus of Rhodes, The Two Statues, The Queen distributing the Booty, which all depict moments during Artemisia’s regency and the war against Rhodes, Innocenti (2008), 104.
IX. The education of the young king was one of the most important parallels between the stories of Artemisia and Catherine. By depicting Catherine’s regency through Artemisia, Houel was representing the imperative role of the female regent in a sensitive way that would not overstep the sixteenth century notions of female power. This is where Marie and Catherine greatly differ. Whereas Catherine’s images carefully maintained their safe presence within defined gender roles, Marie’s images strayed past this boundary and became too masculine.

The Artemisia Series remained in the design stage during Catherine de Médicis’s lifetime only to be resurrected and turned into tapestries by Henri IV. Henri IV commissioned the tapestries as a gift to Marie de Médicis for the birth of the dauphin in 1601 (Figure 2.21). The tapestries were eventually woven between 1607 and 1609. Instead of focusing on the widowhood of Artemisia, the series of fifteen tapestries focused on the education of the young prince, Lygdamis, clearly an analogy for the new dauphin, Louis. Henri IV kept eight of Caron’s original drawings and added seven new subjects by Henri Larembert. Ironically enough, however, the cycle would again claim its original meaning as Marie de Médicis was widowed after the assassination of Henri IV in 1610. Like Catherine de Médicis, after Henri’s death, Marie compared herself to Artemisia as being the embodiment of Henri’s living tomb.

In another series under Houel’s commission, L’histoire des Rois de France of around 1580, he instead focuses on historical events in the history of the French monarchy and Catherine’s regency. Houel employs the artistic talent of Antoine Caron once more in this series. It is not clear if Catherine played any part in this commission with Houel. Regardless, though, as Innocenti remarks, “…he was unquestionably the faithful interpreter of her propagandistic demands.” It is this series that in subject matter and composition most resembles the agenda of Marie’s decorations in the Luxembourg Palace and The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. Although a series illustrating the reigns of François I and Henri II, it was in fact dedicated to
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424 Anne of Austria also had the Artemisia Series woven into tapestries as she became regent after the death of Louis XIII, Karen Britland, Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 190.
425 Britland (2006) writes, “Marie, though (adopting the alternative version of the Artemisia story), liked to represent herself as Henri’s living tomb, writing of her welcome into England in 1638 that ‘those things, which were prepared for my delight...made me thinke, that the late King, my lord, appeared yet living in my person.’ Marie adopted the idea of Artemisia’s physical incorporation of her husband’s body to legitimise her use of monarchical power in a state operating under Salic law,” 191.
426 Innocenti (2008), 35.
Catherine de Médicis and features many important events from her life.\(^{427}\) Innocenti suggests that these drawings were intended for tapestries for Catherine’s Tuileries Palace.\(^{428}\) It is very probable that when approaching an unprecedented project such as *The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*, that Rubens would look to Marie’s most immediate predecessor and how she was depicted in a similar series such as *L’histoire des Rois de France*.

*L’histoire des Rois de France* glorifies again two of Catherine’s most important roles, that of widow and mother of kings. For a close comparison between the depictions of these two regent queens in these pictorial cycles, this chapter will focus here on the images from *L’histoire des Rois de France* that specifically pertain to Catherine de Médicis. As the poem on the title page addresses Catherine de Médicis:

```
Madame, you have with your prudence
So bravely chased the discord from France,
As well as Pallas, that by means of Peace
The beautiful Golden Age will shine on us forever.
And if we may have some quite strong proof,
We must see only the blind discord
As you’ve opened the door
Closed of the two temples of Honour and Virtue.\(^{429}\)
```

The first image in the series is *Les anciens rois de France* (Figure 2.22). In the centre of this drawing surrounded by previous kings of France is a female figure, perhaps France or Catherine herself, who sits on a pile of arms, trophies, and defeated men. She is holding in her right hand a winged victory and a sceptre in her left hand. France/Catherine is clearly triumphant over all her enemies. This central image bears many striking resemblances to *The Queen Triumphant* in the *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*. *The Queen Triumphant* shows a helmeted Marie de Médicis as Minerva Victrix standing on a pile of arms and trophies, greatly resembling an Amazonian warrior. In her right hand she, too, holds a winged victory, while in the other a sceptre. She is nearly identical to the figure of France in *Les anciens rois de France*, and the message is similar—here, Marie de Médicis has vanquished all of her enemies as well.

The eighth image in the series is *The Marriage of Henri II and Catherine de Médicis* (Figure 2.23). Caron has drawn the event that took place on the 28 October 1533 in the Église Saint-Féreol les Augustins in Marseilles in the presence of François I, noted by his stature behind a young Henri.\(^{430}\) Pope Clement VII performed the ceremony, and is recognisable in his

\(^{428}\) Innocenti (2008), 35.
\(^{429}\) Guiffrey (1920), 17-18.
\(^{430}\) Frieda (2005), 52.
pontiff attire uniting the newlyweds. This scene would have been very important within a series promoting Catherine de Médicis and her children. The marriage to Henri II legitimated her role as Queen, Queen Mother and thus Queen Regent. It is for the same reasons that Marie de Médicis wanted her marriage-by-proxy to Henri IV included in The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. Rubens uses a common Renaissance marriage setting in The Marriage-by-Proxy in Florence (Figure 2.24), similar to Caron’s setting. The betrothed stand in the centre, joined by the officiant, Pope Clement VII, flanked by members of their entourage, women behind Catherine, François I and other male members of the court behind Henri. It is the same line-up of characters for Marie’s wedding: the officiant who legitimises the nuptials, Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini, the papal legate, stands in the middle, behind Marie are her sister, Eleanor de’ Medici, duchess of Mantua, and her aunt, Christine de Lorraine, Grand Duchess of Tuscany. Behind her uncle, Ferdinando de’ Medici, who stood in for Henri IV, stand two Frenchmen: Nicolas Brulart de Sillery, the French ambassador to Rome, and Roger de Bellegarde, Grand Ecuyer of France. They are all included, as Millen and Wolf wrote, “to ensure that the viewer of the picture will appreciate both the prestige and the unchallengeable legitimacy of the marriage....” The whole point in including these images in two cycles dedicated to regent queens is to ensure the “unchallengeable legitimacy of the marriage”, which would have been important to both Catherine and Marie.

Catherine’s Medici heritage is celebrated in Les Médicis (Figure 2.25), the twelfth image in L’histoire de Rois de France. It must have been important for Catherine to acknowledge the prestigious family from which she came, otherwise Houel would not have included this image. In this image, Catherine is very much the heiress of a long line of powerful Medicis. She stands at the left between her father, Laurent de’ Medici, duke of Urbino, and her mother, Madeleine de la Tour d’Auvergne. Three women, perhaps the three Graces, present her with a crown, and other gifts. Surrounding this scene are seventeen illustrious members of the Medici family such as Cosimo de’ Medici, Lorenzo de’ Medici, Pope Leo X, Pope Clement VII, and Alessandro de’ Medici. The central scene of Catherine with her parents and the three Graces is extremely reminiscent of The Education of the Princess (Figure 2.26) in The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. In that painting, Marie is seen reading a book from Minerva’s lap while Apollo plays the viola da gamba, with the three Graces looking on and offering her a crown of flowers. Symbolically, this image is also very similar: both Catherine and Marie are seen as the recipients of a preparation for their later duties as queen regents. They were each given gifts by the three Graces to contribute to their capabilities as queens. Both young princesses are looked on by parents or parental figures who also instil in them the power that it takes to rule. Catherine is surrounded by her real parents, whose lineage speaks for itself in preparing her for her future role. Rubens instead turns to allegory to illustrate the education of Marie in Florence under the guidance of her Medici relatives. Minerva serves as Marie’s guide throughout the Médicis Cycle, almost as her guardian. Minerva, like a parent, teaches Marie the wisdom and strength it will take to fulfil her future duties. Millen and Wolf even suggest that perhaps Minerva here

\[431\] Guiffrey (1920), 23.
\[432\] Millen and Wolf (1989), 54.
\[433\] Millen and Wolf (1989), 54.
\[434\] Millen and Wolf (1989), 53.
\[436\] Millen and Wolf (1989), 38.
represents Christine de Lorraine, Catherine de Médicis’s granddaughter who married Ferdinando, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, in 1589 and subsequently became a mother figure for Marie. Millen and Wolf suggest, “For all our insistence on the non-literal interpretation of the Luxembourg paintings, it may not be entirely out of line to think of the Minerva in The Education of the Princess as not only emblematic but also reminiscent of the Grand Duchess Cristina in idealized guise.”

Whether or not Minerva represents Christine or Marie’s own mother, she nonetheless represents a mother figure guiding Marie and teaching her the art of government. Apollo also represents Marie’s Medici upbringing, representing “the culture and love of the arts that came naturally to a princess born of such a passionate patron as Francesco I de’ Medici and cradled in the city of Florence.” Both Catherine and Marie are seen in the midst of their destinies as the future queens of France being endowed with the gifts from their ancestors. In fact, throughout the Luxembourg Palace, it remains important to Marie that her Medici heritage is recognized and honoured. The entire decoration of the Cabinet Doré in her private apartments is dedicated to images of the Medici that help remind France of their power and her role as their descendant. In fact, the Cabinet Doré even held images of Catherine de Médicis, as Marie embraced Catherine as her Medici predecessor. The images of Catherine included The Marriage of Catherine de Médicis and Henri II (Figure 2.27) and The Aid sent by Troilo Orsini to assist Charles IX against the Huguenots (Figure 2.28).

La Renaissance des Arts et des Lettres (Figure 2.29), the sixteenth drawing in L’histoire, commemorates the flourishing of arts and letters under the successful reigns of François I, Henri II, Catherine and François II. The busts of these monarchs encircle the figure of arts and letters seated in the middle, crowned by Apollo, surrounded by females reading various books, artists painting canvases, and musicians playing instruments. The emphasis on the thriving of arts and letters under these reigns was very important for Houel, and Catherine. If these thrived under a monarch, it often indicates that the country flourished due to the magnanimity of its ruler. This image is thus suggesting that through the wise regency of Catherine de Médicis, France was able to flourish. The same idea was used again by Rubens in The Felicity of the Regency (Figure 2.30) in The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. Similarly, Marie is seen enthroned in the centre, surrounded by references to arts, music and letters, and allegorical figures who all attest to her felicitous reign. In both images, evidence of arts, sciences and letters are strewn along the stairs in the foreground: books, scrolls, compasses, shawms, squares.

In a letter of 13 May 1625, Rubens himself explains the meaning of The Felicity of the Regency, which could equally be applied to La Renaissance des Arts et des Lettres,

I believe I wrote you that a picture was removed which depicted the Queen’s departure from Paris and that, in its place, I did an entirely new one which shows the felicity of her regency and the flourishing of the Kingdom of France, with the resuscitation of the
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437 Millen and Wolf (1989), 41, go on to suggest that if it is not Cristina then perhaps it is Marie’s governess who also played a large role in raising her and whose early death was a devastating loss to Marie.
438 Millen and Wolf (1989), 43.
439 From Marrow (1978), 784, “In short, the Queen would be most pleased by those subjects which would remind the French that France was not without obligation to her family.”
440 Guiffrey (1920), 29.
L’histoire des rois de France’s twenty-first image is that of The Coronation of Catherine de Médicis (Figure 2.31). Catherine is seen in the middle of the image kneeling before the Cardinal de Sens and her husband, Henri II, who crowns her in Saint-Denis. In the background can be seen all the members of the court who bore witness to this crucial event. In the Médicis Cycle, it was imperative to include the image of Marie’s coronation as she struggled to prove her place within her own son’s court. It was dictated by Marie that the cardinals who crowned her, the royal children and the members of the court who swore an oath to their queen be identifiable in this picture. In both images of Catherine and Marie’s coronations, it seems to have been very important to emphasize the presence of the cardinal, as it was only through him that these queens could be legitimately crowned. Rubens painted a very near likeness of Cardinal de Joyeuse who crowned Marie, so his identity could not be called into question. In L’histoire des Rois de France, Cardinal de Sens’s identity as a cardinal cannot be mistaken as his hat rests on the altar to the right of the drawing. Similarly, Rubens uses the hat in The Marriage-by-Proxy in Florence to identify Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini. In the image of Marie’s wedding, the Cardinal’s hat is hung behind on the altar for all to see. This was to confirm the legitimacy of the ceremony presided over by a Cardinal who was a stand-in for the pope. When speaking about the placement of the red cardinal’s hat in The Wedding-by-Proxy in Florence, Millen and Wolf agree that there was a “political need to insist on the ceremony’s having been performed by a prelate of such high and unimpeachable authority.”

One of the same issues that Marie and Catherine both faced was the fact that they were foreign. Upon arrival at their adopted court, foreign queens were expected to renounce their heritage and adopt the French court’s customs. They were not just any foreigners, though, they were Medicis. The Medici criticism often implied that they were not “royal” enough. Both fought this idea by emphasizing the identities of their very “royal” mothers. Catherine de Médicis’s mother, Madeleine de la Tour d’Auvergne (Figure 2.32), was a French princess from one of the oldest and noblest families in France, with ties to the Bourbon line through Louis IX (1214-1270). Madeleine, along with other members of her family, was included in the portrait

442 Letter quoted in Millen and Wolf (1989), 165.
443 Guiffrey (1920), 32.
444 MS Baluze. Ms. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Baluze, 323, fols. 54-57. As Millen and Wolf (1989) summarize, “His assignment, spelled out in the Baluze manuscript, was to depict the scene with, in addition to the two indispensable principals, recognizable likenesses of three of the royal children, three cardinals and eleven members of the nobility all specified by name, and an entire constellation of unnamed but no less identifiable archbishops and bishops, ambassadors, princesses ‘not of the blood’ and duchesses, gentlemen and officials”, 107.
446 Guiffrey (1920), 32.
447 Millen and Wolf (1989), 53-54.
448 For more on this, see Lawrence (1997), 107, and Wilson-Chevalier (2007), 462-464.
collection that decorated Catherine’s Hôtel de la Reine.\textsuperscript{449} Marie’s mother was Archduchess Joanna of Austria (Figure 2.33), the daughter of Ferdinand I, the Holy Roman Emperor and Anna of Bohemia and Hungary. Joanna of Austria’s portrait hung alongside her husband’s at the beginning of The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle, illustrating Marie’s illustrious lineage. Despite her royal background, the criticism of her “banker” family did not stop. As the Venetian ambassador, Michele Suriano, described of the reputation of Catherine in 1561,

\begin{quote}
...first I will speak of the queen, and suffice it to say that she is female: but I must add that she is a foreigner; and I can further add that she is Florentine, born into private wealth and unequal to the greatness of such a kingdom as France. Consequently, she has neither the prestige nor the authority she would have had she been born in the kingdom or been of nobler blood.\textsuperscript{450}
\end{quote}

Following the bloodshed of the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, Renaud de Beaune, the archbishop of Bourges, blamed all of France’s misfortunes on this foreigner: “[The Italian foreigner [Catherine de Médicis] has cruelly plundered all France. It is this foreigner who has thrown the apple of discord among the French...and who impedes peace.”\textsuperscript{451} It did not help that Catherine surrounded herself with Italians at the French court.\textsuperscript{452} As a consequence, Catherine’s loyalty to her adopted country of France, was often called into question. This was an unfair accusation though, as De Lamar Jensen confirms that her “loyalty to family and friends never compromised her political dedication to the service of France.”\textsuperscript{453} Catherine’s reputation as an untrustworthy foreigner greeted Marie upon her arrival in France in 1600. Unfortunately, Marie did not heed the example of Catherine and also surrounded herself with Italians at her court in France, which ultimately contributed to her first exile. It would seem that the queens could not be both French and Italian. Cynthia Lawrence suggests that it was only after their widowhood that a foreign born queen could again redefine herself with her country of origin in shaping her personal identity.\textsuperscript{454} It significant then that all of the previous examples of Catherine and Marie celebrating their Medici ancestors were commissioned following the deaths of their husbands.

Only after both Catherine and Marie de Médicis were both widowed did they embark upon what were to be the most prominent projects of their patronage: architecture. Catherine spent a great deal of money and time on the construction and renovation of palaces and funerary monuments. As evidenced by her letters and other documentation, Catherine was very

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{449} Innocenti (2008), 64.
\footnote{450} As quoted by Innocenti (2008), 43.
\footnote{452} For more on Catherine’s Italian compatriots and their presence at court, see Robert J. Knecht, \textit{The French Renaissance Court: 1438-1589} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 321. The Italian presence especially peaked during the reign of Henri III: “The number of Italians receiving pensions from the crown rose dramatically from seventy-seven under Henri II to 243 in 1577”, 321.
\footnote{453} De Lamar Jensen, "Catherine de Medici and her Florentine Friends", \textit{The Sixteenth Century Journal} 9 (1978), 73.
\footnote{454} Lawrence (1997), 107, and Wilson-Chevalier (2007), 462-464: "Only, once a widow, she no longer represented the vessel carrying the future of France, and she became free to live her life and to provide a more personal identity.”
\end{footnotes}
involved in over seventeen ambitious building projects completed during her lifetime. Catherine had a good eye for architecture and art and was not afraid to tell her architects and artists how she wanted things done. Her image as a serene widow and mother in portraiture seems to be the complete antithesis of the power and might that was displayed through her architectural patronage. In a way, Catherine’s architectural patronage helped to affirm her public image. Instead of following the feminine tradition of solely commissioning portraits related to her family, she was imitating what previous kings had done before her, and by doing so was showing her strength and status as regent and Queen Mother. As Sophie Marinez discusses in her dissertation on gender and architectural patronage, “The building of châteaux was a highly regimented undertaking that served, among other purposes, to affirm a lord’s social status in medieval and early modern France.” These spaces affirmed Catherine’s status and allowed her a sense of control. By building her own palaces, she could exert her influence on their interior spaces where court life played out, and remain an important figure within the French court. As Sheila ffolliott notes, “Instead of retiring to a convent that she had founded, ... Catherine remained at the centre of court life, devoting all her energy and resources to the planning and support of a new arena where she can control the choreography, literally as well as figuratively.” Catherine’s architectural patronage was so prolific in the sixteenth century that Jacques Androuet du Cerceau’s second volume of Les plus excellent bastiments de France, published in Paris in 1579, was not only dedicated to Catherine but also featured many of her building projects. Unfortunately, however, her most famous architectural projects that will be discussed here, the Tuileries Palace (Figure 2.34) and the Hôtel de la Reine (Figure 2.35), do not survive. In fact, most of her architectural patronage does not survive. The information that can be garnered about these projects comes from the contemporary sources such as inventories, royal treasury minutes, architectural drawings, and du Cerceau’s book. This chapter will focus on the Tuileries and the Hôtel de la Reine, as these were two projects that Catherine built from the ground up.

455 Sophie Marinez, Gender, Architecture, and Self-Construction in the Works of Madamemoiselle de Montpensier (1627-1693), Ph.D. Dissertation (City University of New York, 2010), 58: “They include reparations of the abbey of Corbie and of two towers on the Mont Saint-Michel, the commission of the Valois Mausoleum at Saint-Denis, new fortifications at the chateau of Amboise, maintenance works at the chateau of Saint-Germain-en-Laye, additional structures and parks at the chateau of Vincennes, renovations at Blois, constructions of a house, park garden and canal at Hières, near Toulon, a country house or ‘cassine’ near her chateau at Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, construction of the castles of Charleval and Saint-Maur, renovations on the chateau of Montceaux-en-Brie, the enlargement of Chenonceau, renovations and enlargements of the Louvre and Fontainebleau, and, of course, the magnificent Tuileries, its gardens, and her Hôtel de la Reine in Paris.”

456 As Marinez (2010) explains, 59: “She paid meticulous attention to the works she commissioned, from ordering the planting of two or three thousand elm trees at Vincennes and detailing what kind of renovations in which rooms at Blois should be completed, to instructing Phillibert de l’Orme exactly how the statue of Henri II in the Valois mausoleum ought to display the traditional attributes of victorious kings. For the Tuileries Palace, Catherine even sketched the design and provided the dimensions.”

457 Marinez (2010), 16.

458 Marinez (2010), 16.


460 Gosman (2003), 113.

Begun in 1564, Catherine was extremely involved in the construction and interior layout of the Tuileries Palace. As the architect of the Tuileries Philibert de l'Orme (1514-1570) observed in his 1567 publication of *Architecture*, "[Catherine], with an admirable understanding combined with great prudence and wisdom, [ordered] the organisation of her said palace as to the apartments and location of the halls, antechambers, closets, galleries, and measurements of width and length." Just as Marie de Médicis built the Luxembourg Palace as a retreat from the Louvre, so too did Catherine build the Tuileries to the west beyond Paris's fourteenth century city walls. The peacefulness of its location was enhanced by her addition of gardens, and the views of the Seine and countryside to the southwest.

The initial concept for the Tuileries Palace was immense, and would have stood as one of the largest palaces in Europe in the sixteenth century, manifesting a huge symbol of Valois power. De l'Orme followed closely the requests that Catherine made for the Tuileries, especially concerning materials and decorations. Although de l'Orme provided all of the designs for the palace, it was not finished before his death in 1570. Jean Bullant (1515-1578), already working with de l'Orme, became the lead architect. Although it kept some antique Italian details, the Tuileries was ultimately French in design, perhaps a response to the growing anti-Italian sentiment in Catherine's court. In fact, de l'Orme created a new style for the Tuileries. This was truly Catherine de Médicis's palace. Unfortunately, however, two years later, Catherine stopped the work at the Tuileries. The best-known explanation for the ceasing of building is that the superstitious Catherine was told by an astrologer that she would die in the parish of Saint-Germain, where the Tuileries was located. It is unfortunate that it was never completed, as the Tuileries was due to became a bastion of not only Valois Power, but Catherine de Médicis's power. It is interesting to consider that the Luxembourg Palace was never completed either. Two powerful queens build two statements of their power, yet the palaces were never completed and abandoned. However they still represented these women and their powerful roles. Catherine even used the Tuileries Palace as the backdrop for some of her famous fêtes. She hosted the English ambassador in the Tuileries gardens in June 1572, and also celebrated the marriage of Marguerite de Valois and...

---

462 As quoted in Knecht (2008), 228. Marinez (2010) goes so far to say that Catherine de Medici even provided a sketch of the design and dimensions for the Tuileries, 59.
465 Marinez (2010), 58.
466 Blunt (1999), 55.
468 As Laurent Odde explains how de l'Orme's style reflected his patron, "At the Tuileries...the architect invents a more complex style where the bossages, introduced by Serlio at the chateau de Vallery, are no longer limited to the facades but surround the fluted columns with rings decorated with rich symbolism dear to Catherine. This new French order evokes the feminine grace of the Ionic capitals, the gender of Catherine, and recalls also, by the rustic rings, the virile Tuscan order associated with the origins of the queen: the perfect harmony created between the architecture of the palace and its sponsor seems intentional. De l'Orme...conceived for Catherine a palace where the galleries, the rich polychrome, the bossages, the carved decorations, mixed the influences to create a new style, singularly a 'Catherine de Medici style,'" Wilson-Chevalier (2007), 496-497.
469 Thomson (1984), 174-175. However, Odde suggests that the Tuileries was never completed due to lack of funds, Wilson-Chevalier (2007), 498-499. However, this is the only reference I have come across to this.
Henri of Navarre with celebrations held in the gardens.\(^{470}\) Just as the Luxembourg Palace served as the host for the festivities for the wedding of Henrietta Maria and Charles I in 1625, the Tuileries Palace also provided a powerful facade for Catherine and the Valois dynasty.

Shortly after Catherine abandoned the Tuileries, she began work on the Hôtel de la Reine, in the northwest parish of Les Halles. She continued her employment of Jean Bullant as the Hôtel’s architect.\(^{471}\) Catherine initially looked to her Florence for inspiration for this building project. According to David Thomson, “Up to 1576, a design incorporating many features copied from the Uffizi was the approved project, before being discarded in favour of a less ambitious and costly scheme.”\(^{472}\) As previously noted, Marie’s Luxembourg Palace also looked to Florentine examples.\(^{473}\) The palatial Hôtel de la Reine was made up of three large central pavilions which joined two corps de logis.\(^{474}\) It became less known for its exterior architecture and more known for its incredibly rich decorations and impressive art and book collection that Catherine kept there.\(^{475}\) Unfortunately, the Hôtel de la Reine was destroyed in 1748 and replaced with the Halle au Blé. All that remains of the Hôtel de la Reine is the mysterious tall fluted column.\(^{476}\)

Catherine de Médicis occupied the west wing of the Hôtel de la Reine. Although Catherine’s private residence, it was often used as a formal reception space for visiting dignitaries and royals. Thus, Catherine’s art collections were on display and assisted in her formal demonstration of power.\(^{477}\) Information regarding Catherine’s immense collection at the Hôtel de la Reine can be found in its inventory, taken six months after Catherine’s death on the 5\(^{th}\) of January 1589.\(^{478}\) The inventory was taken by two councillors of the Administration of Finances, Jacques Depleurre and Barnabé de Ceriziers, on the 15\(^{th}\) of July 1589.\(^{479}\) It should be noted, however, that items had already been removed from Catherine’s residence, possibly at the request of her granddaughter, Christine de Lorraine, who was the chief benefactor of her

\(^{471}\) Catherine commissioned Jean Bullant for this project in August 1572, Kerrie-rue Michahelles, “Catherine de Medici’s 1589 Inventory at the Hôtel de la Reine in Paris,” Furniture History 38 (2002), 2.
\(^{472}\) Thomson (1984), 175.
\(^{475}\) Michahelles (2002), 4.
\(^{476}\) According to Thomson (1984), “The tall fluted Doric column, which now has the Halle au Blé for its neighbour, stood in the middle of this courtyard...; the purpose or symbolism of this strange monument has never been satisfactorily explained. It has been suggested that it might have had some memorial purpose, that it was an observatory or served as a watch tower over the city and surrounding the countryside”, 175-176. For more on possible explanations for this column, see Odde, in Wilson-Chevalier (2007), 501-502. Michahelles (2002), 3.
\(^{477}\) Wilson-Chevalier (2007), 525.
\(^{478}\) The inventory was published by Edmond Bonnaffée in 1874, Inventaire des Meubles de Catherine de Médicis en 1589 (Paris: Auguste Aubry).
\(^{479}\) Michahelles (2002), 4.
It is therefore not possible to know all of the items in Catherine’s collection there, but the inventory does give a good idea of what was there. The inventory includes more than 450 paintings with various themes, including classical themes, mythologies, Biblical, genre scenes, landscapes, and of course, portraits.

It becomes very clear in the inventory of the Hôtel de la Reine that Catherine’s art collection consisted largely of portraits, especially portraits of her own family members. The inventory included over 250 portraits. Much like Marie de Médicis’s portraits in the Luxembourg Palace, especially the Cabinet Doré, the inclusion of portraits of her own family was used to enhance her power through her lineage. Aside from the Cabinet Doré’s devotion to the Medici, Marie had also planned, but never executed, a Medici portrait gallery in the Luxembourg Palace. As mentioned previously, the inclusion of family portraits in interior decoration of palaces was a dynastic tool that was often used by the Medici that Catherine brought from Florence to France. In the room referred to in the inventory as the “great cabinet” was a collection of portraits of Catherine’s family, mostly portraits of her children. In the cabinet that adjoined this one were portraits of recently deceased family members. Family members included those from the Medici branch and those from her mother, Madeleine de la Tour d’Auvergne’s family. The grand gallery of the Hôtel de la Reine was also filled with 139 portraits, again consisting mainly of Catherine’s family and other important members of the nobility. These images of Catherine’s relations furthered her own image of power, for through them she established her legitimacy. The members of other royal families were dear political interests of Catherine, for example the multiple portraits of Elizabeth I of England. Catherine tried, unsuccessfully, to arrange the marriage between Elizabeth and her son, François, the duc d’Anjou. During these negotiations, she collected portraits of Elizabeth. Similarly, the Cabinet of Enamels was also filled with 32 portraits of French nobility, with François II holding court above the fireplace. The cabinet of mirrors, named for the 119 Venetian mirrors on display there, also included eighty-three portraits, including Henri II, husband of Catherine, in pride of place above the fireplace. Interestingly, Marie de Médicis placed herself above the fireplace in the gallery that housed the Médicis Cycle. The Queen Triumphant oversees all of the paintings of
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480 Michahelles (2002), 4. The inventory of the items that Christine de Lorraine inherited and took to Florence in 1589 is kept in the Archivio di Stato, Florence, with the original in the Archivio Notarile Moderno.
482 Michahelles (2002), 519-520. Unfortunately, the inventory does not list the artist of any of the paintings and sculptures in Catherine’s collection. As Bonnaffé (1874) wrote of the inventory, “Il est bien regrettable que l’on ne puisse savoir à quels artistes attribuer les portraits de la grande galerie et des autres cabinets. J’ai dit que Benjamin Fallon, Pierre et Cosme du Monstier, “peintres de la reine mère”, devaient avoir une grande part dans cette collection. Mais nous savons aussi qu’Estienne du Monstier, François Clouet, Corneille de Lyon et d’autres encore ont travaillé pour Catherine de Médicis”, 137.
483 Marrow (1978), 81.
485 Innocenti (2008), 25.
486 Wilson-Chevalier (2007), 520.
488 Bonnaffé (1874), 155-156. The cabinet of enamels also included thirty-nine small Limoges oval enamels encased in the panelling.
the Médicis Cycle, firmly placing Marie as the most important figure included in the portraits, whereas Catherine placed her husband and son in pride of place.

Ultimately, that is the difference between Catherine’s and Marie’s patronage and the creation of their images. For Marie, the promotion of her image was about herself, rather than her family, whereas Catherine promoted herself through images of her family. Originally following the example of Catherine’s gentle motherly imagery, Marie eventually begins to take a more aggressive stance in her imagery as a response to attacks from the French court and her exile in 1617 at the hands of her own son. Marie’s imagery becomes more complex, portraiture becomes less important, and allegory comes to the fore. Marie becomes the most important figure. No longer does she only rely on portraiture of her familial and political relations to enhance her power, as Catherine did, but she relies on powerful images of herself. Rubens created twenty-four images of Marie de Médicis that enhanced her power in The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. Each image illustrates an event from her life that served to promote her legitimacy. Marie is only absent in four of the paintings: the portraits of her mother and father, The Fates spin the Destiny of Marie de Médicis (Figure 2.36), in which her incredible life is foretold by the Fates, and The Exchange of the Princesses at the Spanish Border (Figure 2.37), commemorating her hard political work in arranging the double marriage of her daughter, Elisabeth, to the king of Spain, and her son, Louis XIII, to Anne of Austria. Rather than conforming to the expected gender norms of wife, widow and mother in her imagery, Marie defies those rules and becomes the femme forte, the warrior widow. She goes far beyond the demure wife, widow and mother of Catherine de Médicis, and in turn garners much negative attention for her threatening masculine displays of power. Ultimately, Marie’s image backfired, however, so too did Catherine’s. Despite adhering to gender expectations, Catherine’s posthumous reputation consisted largely of the image of a wicked Italian queen, or the Black Widow, responsible for the massacre on St Bartholomew Day. It would seem that the ambition of a powerful female regent in sixteenth and seventeenth century France was too much of a threat to be remembered with praise, and the image that these women created for themselves did little to combat the negative connotations of a powerful foreign female and the modern notions of a useless female in power.
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489 Crawford (2004), 74-77.
490 For more on this, see N.M. Sutherland, “Catherine de Medici: the Legend of the Wicked Italian Queen,” The Sixteenth Century Journal 9 (1978): 45-56.
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Chapter 3
The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle as a Triumphal Entry

The 'Joyous Entry' was a central expression of empowerment in early modern Europe; a representation of propaganda which developed from theatrical displays first witnessed as the Middle Ages gave way to the Renaissance. Ceremonies and spectacles, provoked by different events, always promoted a ruling house and often included petitions from subjects. What had been ephemeral events became more powerful and permanent forms of propaganda with the spread of printing. Thus, as Daniel has argued, the targets for this propaganda were in fact other linked European courts. With the dissemination of the 'book' of the 'Festival', a pan-European iconography developed. The Valois and the Medici were the pioneers in festival culture. Florentine and Parisian celebrations were the most extravagant and ambitious in Europe; though the motives for each court for investing in public festival display were crucially different. Nevertheless through access to printed accounts and the migrations of princesses in the European marriage market, what was created in Florence and Paris became the European standard to which other courts aspired.

491 Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly, in J.R. Mulryne and Elizabeth Goldring, eds., Court Festivals of the European Renaissance: Art, Politics and Performance (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), differentiates between two types of festivals: ceremony and spectacle. As Watanabe-O’Kelly explains, "The first is concerned with bringing power structures into being, and includes events and displays accompanying coronation and anointing, solemn entries, baptisms, marriages and funerals. The second takes in theatrical performances, opera, ballet de cour, caroussel, and firework dramas", 8.

492 Political propaganda of royal entries: R.J. Knecht, in J.R. Mulryne, Helen Watanabe-O’Kelly and Margaret Shewring, eds., Europa Triumphans (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp.19-32: "[Before the courts became less mobilized in the late sixteenth century, however, a French king would visit many towns, and whenever he did so for the first time he was given a ‘joyous entry’ (entrée joyeuse). This was a most effective form of royal propaganda. Neither royal proclamations nor official tracts could move the hearts of the people as much as ceremonies in which the king appeared in person amidst a décor carefully designed to project his idealized personality and the nature of his rule." More on the political propaganda of entries: Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly discusses the festival and its book as part of the panoply of power, in Mulryne, Watanabe-O’Kelly and Shewring (2004), 3-18. Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly discusses at whom festival books were aimed, in Mulryne, Watanabe-O’Kelly and Shewring (2004), 14-15: “But in general it is clear that they are meant to impress other courts, whether they be allies or rivals. Princes saw to it that their ambassadors disseminated copies of the festival books at the courts to which they were accredited, and it is clear from the inventories of princely libraries that princes collected accounts from other courts.”

493 Ute Daniel explains the significance of the entry’s ability to reach a wider audience as “it's public consisted of those people whose opinion and behaviour could have consequences for the home court, that is, the European dynasties or parts of them to whom the home court was linked.,” in Mulryne, Watanabe-O’Kelly and Shewring (2004), 34.

494 Roy Strong emphasizes this point of difference in Art and Power (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 127.

495 Existence of printed programmes in libraries throughout Europe: for example, Watanabe-O’Kelly, in Mulryne, Watanabe-O’Kelly and Shewring (2004), 17, cites an inventory of printed programmes in a library in Europe, the manuscript inventory of the library of Elector August of Saxony compiled in 1575: "Registratur der bücher in des Churfürsten zu Saxen Liberey zu Annaburg." Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Dresden, Bibl.Arch.1 B, vol. 20.
The Medici’s use of the festival arts became so prolific in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that Florence became synonymous in early modern Europe with festival tradition. As only recently ennobled bankers, the Medici’s *nouveaux* status informed much of their artistic propaganda. Medici festival activities often celebrated profitable alliances, specifically marriage alliances, as Medici power grew through these advantageous unions. This was where a female was the most useful in seventeenth century politics: a pawn to be traded for wealth and political gain. This policy served the Medici well, and to commemorate these achievements, they produced the aforementioned festivals in praise of the new bride and her husband and the hoped for fruit of their union. These events became a rare occasion when females were allowed to be glorified publicly, albeit with a strong emphasis on the female’s worth measured by her supposed fecundity. One of the most successful marriage pawns for the Grand Dukes of Tuscany was Marie de Médicis. The consideration of potential husbands vying for Marie’s hand in marriage was a significant political deliberation that was negotiated for nearly a year. Deemed as a somewhat miraculous match, Marie, at the age of twenty-seven, was betrothed to Henri IV of France in April 1600.496

When Marie de Médicis finally married Henri IV of France in October 1600, the celebrations staged in Florence followed Medici festival art tradition. Eleven years earlier, Marie had witnessed Florence’s transformation during the extravagant festivities that welcomed the French princess, Christine de Lorraine, as the new Grand Duchess of Tuscany. Florence in 1589 had never before seen such a spectacle, and Christine’s entry and festival became the epitome of Florentine nuptial celebrations. Marie must have expected the same extravagance when her marriage to Henri IV was negotiated. Befitting the fact that Marie’s newly acquired title of the Queen of France now outranked all of her Medici relatives, an immense series of celebratory events were staged following her wedding-by-proxy in Florence Cathedral. Marie was praised as the vessel of future progeny and bearer of glorious peace and prosperity for France. These celebrations were so extravagant and awe-inspiring that over twenty years later Peter Paul Rubens and Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc would discuss these events in reference to their involvement in the commission of the Médicis Cycle.497 However, the pomp of the Florentine

496 As the legend goes, Marie had been told by a fortune-telling nun, *Passitea*, that she was destined to marry the King of France. For this reason, it has been said that Marie turned down marriage offers from other ruling houses of Europe. Ronald Forsyth Millen and Robert Erich Wolf, *Historic Deeds and Mystic Figures: a New Reading of Rubens’s Life of Marie de Medici* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 41.

497 Rubens was in the service of the Duke of Mantua, who was in attendance at the wedding-by-proxy in Florence, as was Peiresc. Rubens and Peiresc discussed these events in a letter from 17 October 1622. Max
celebrations did not follow Marie all the way to her arrival in Paris. Although entries and arches were erected to greet Marie in Marseilles, Avignon and Lyons, no elaborate reception greeted her in Paris. The French monarchy’s welcome of Marie and her Florentine entourage in Paris was indifferent, a fact that did not go unnoticed by the Medici. This was even more insulting considering the fact that Henri IV made the deliberate decision not to celebrate Marie’s arrival into Paris with a formal entry. It was not uncommon for foreign brides to receive smaller entries organized by the provincial councils of the towns that marked the journey from the port city of arrival. However, the entry organized by the monarchy and hosted by the capital city should always have held the most prestige. Paris had been the host many times before for the entry of foreign queens. The commissioning, producing and hosting of an entry in the capital city for the new queen was more than an acknowledgement of respect, it was protocol. These events were important for not only the hosting monarchy, but also for the legitimacy of the new bride as it was an honorary recognition of her role as the new queen. The specifically Parisian royal entry tradition implies a reverence for the droit joyeux avènement à la couronne, which was according to Lawrence M. Bryant, “a stylized phrase of the seventeenth century used to describe the bundle of rights owed the king by his subjects as an expression of gratitude for his ensuring political order and filling royal offices.” The absence of the display of the gratitude in honour of Marie’s droit joyeux avènement à la couronne was a symbolic statement by Henri IV, an action which would influence later events.

Henri’s attitude towards his Medici bride would fluctuate throughout their ten years of marriage. During one such fluctuation in 1610, Marie had grown in Henri’s esteem. Henri decided to leave the regency of their young son in her hands as he intervened in the Jülich-Cleves succession issue and prepared to leave France on a military campaign. This episode

---

498 For more on Marie and her entourage’s awareness of the indifference of Henri, see Julia Pardoe, The Life of Marie de Médicis Queen of France (London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1890), 103.
499 For example, a few of the foreign queens who received entries into Paris: Isabeau of Bavaria, 1389; Elisabeth of Austria in 1571; Catherine de Medici multiple times throughout the seventeenth century.
500 Mulryne and Goldring, eds. (2002), 16, writes of the significance of this acknowledgement: “At the entry of a royal bride into her capital city, the presence of her new subjects lining the streets constitutes her official recognition as consort.”
502 This was not, however, the first time Henri IV had entrusted Marie with the regency of the kingdom should he die. In 1603, whilst suffering through a dangerous illness, Henri IV made the preparations for conferring the regency upon Marie. As noted by Mézeray, “1603. Before this treaty the king had been greatly afflicted with a retention of urine, caused, as was said, by an excrescence stopping up that channel. The danger was so eminent that believing he should die he had begun to dispose of the government during the minority of his son.” François Eudes de Mézeray, Histoire de France (Paris: Denys Thierry, Jean Guignard and Claude Barbin, 1685), 904.
would be Marie’s second opportunity to be honoured with a triumphal entry. Marie’s legitimacy as Henri IV’s lawful bride was perpetually challenged by enemies of the crown in an attempt to undermine Henri’s and Marie’s power, and this became a major concern as Henri prepared to leave the regency in her hands. Thus to strengthen Marie’s power as regent, it was decided that she would be formally crowned in the abbey of Saint-Denis in May 1610. In Marie’s opinion, this was not enough to silence her critics. Encouraged by her close confidant, Concino Concini, the Marèchal d’Ancre, Marie requested a formal entry to enhance her authority. Henri IV’s immediate reaction was a firm refusal; preparations for war did not go well with extravagant entries. François Eudes de Mezéray explained Henri’s initial hesitation:

April and May 1610. Already the forces were marching towards the frontiers of Champagne, the train of artillery was gone, and they had sent to demand passage of the Archduke through his territories; this demand was to be followed close, the least demur would have been prejudicial and besides that ceremony of a coronation did not agree well with the great embarrass of present affairs, no more than the expense which she required could be compatible with the vast charges necessary for so great a war. Moreover could the thing in its own nature be agreeable to him, the obstinate eagerness she pressed him withal must have given him some aversion.503

Eventually, Henri gave in to Marie’s requests. In a letter of 9th February 1610, Henri announced his intention of Marie’s formal entry “to return to our said spouse the honour and duty that is accustomed on such occasions.”504 Henri convened a council that included architects, engineers, poets and intellectuals to plan and construct Marie’s entry, which was to take place two days after her coronation. The council chosen by Henri assembled to plan the entry on the 12 February 1610, and it was

approved by all the company that the city will make for the said entry all of the service, honour, splendour, magnificence, and triumph that will be possible both by demonstration of joy, allegory, poetry, sculpture, paintings, sumptuous accoutrements, presents, among others; and ensure that this is the most excellent entry that has ever been made.505

503 Mèzeray (1685), 941.
505 Régnier (1883-1921), 426-504.
Marie was crowned in a sumptuous ceremony on 13 May 1610 in Saint-Denis. On the 14th, Paris was basking in the glory from the previous day’s celebrations and the preparations for Marie’s entry. Seizing the opportunity to continue preparing for war during the two day respite, Henri IV departed the Louvre to meet with one of his ministers, the Duc de Sully. The streets of Paris were crowded, as the arches and stages constructed for Marie’s entry were already in place. As Pierre l’Estoile observed of bustling Paris in May 1610:

> Today, Saturday the eight of May, I have been walking through the city, to see, like the others, the preparations for the entry of our Queen: in all the streets where she must pass to go to the palace, you can see triumphant arches, the artificial landscapes, the portals, the theatres, the devices and inscriptions of honour, the figures and fictions, taken from the Holy Bible and fables: briefly, a million inventions and riches, worthy of only the capacity of the inhabitants of Paris.

However, Henri IV was assassinated on his way to see the Duc de Sully. The Royal Council quickly converged on the Louvre and Marie was declared the regent for the dauphin, Louis XIII. Her entry into Paris was cancelled, and the decorations were reconstructed and tailored for Henri IV’s funeral. It was a relatively uncomplicated transition from entry to funeral, as Sara Mamone notes, “since the monumental character and the somewhat stereotypical triumphant project was based on the same themes that celebrate the glory of the late king, in the journey which will lead to the last monument of his funeral, at Saint-Denis.” Again, Henri IV halts Marie’s formal entry into Paris. After her first exile in 1617, Marie returned to Paris on 3 November 1621. Again, Marie was not welcomed by a formal entry, but by an informal gathering of throngs of admirers. Matteo Bartolini, a Florentine resident in Paris at the time, recounts her informal triumphant return:

> When it was heard that the Queen Mother had left Fontainebleau there began an exodus of those who wished to go out to meet Her Majesty, who had arrived at a half-quarter league from the Porte de Saint-Antoine with an escort of sixty six-horse carriages and with a thousand horses. She was received there by the Queen Regnant and by Madame, sister to the King, by the Princesses of the Blood, and by the princesses and ladies of the Court, who were followed by a great number of carriages and infinite cavalry commanded by the

---

506 The Duc de Sully had fallen ill and decided to remain at home that day. For more on this and the events of this day, see Robert J. Knecht, “The Murder of le roi Henri”, History Today 60 (2010): 41-47.
507 Sara Mamone, Firenze e Parigi: Due Capitali dello Maria de’ Medici (Milan: Silvana, 1987), 183.
Duc de Montbazon, Governor of Paris. The Queen Mother did not get down from her litter out of concern over her feet, which were still bothering her somewhat, nor the Queen from her carriage; but coming alongside they made their compliments and the princesses and dames theirs; and if night had not fallen they would still be there, so great and mutual was the jubilation of everyone at being together again. With this reception and escort the Queen Mother entered Paris preceding the Queen Regnant, followed right up to the Louvre by the entire populace rejoicing at having back again the Queen Mother of their King; and the satisfaction of Her Majesty is something that everyone can imagine.509

It would be safe to assume that Louis XIII, still under the influence of his favourite Luynes, had hoped his mother would return to Paris as unceremoniously as she left in 1617. Thus, from Marie’s initial arrival in Paris in 1601 to the cancellation of her triumphal entry in 1610, to her return to Paris after exile in 1621, Marie had never been formally welcomed into Paris with all of the pomp, ceremony, and great expense customary for such figures.

Shortly after Marie returned to Paris following exile, she summoned Peter Paul Rubens to Paris. Her reason would become apparent in February 1622 when Rubens signed the contract for the commission that would become the Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle and the Life of Henri IV Cycle. The contract specifically calls for Rubens to paint forty eight paintings dedicated to the life of Marie de Médicis and the life of Henri IV. Rubens was requested

...to represent in the said pictures all the events which were written out in detail at length according to the wishes of Her Majesty, who has given a copy of this to said Sieur Rubens...[and] to draw and paint with his own hand twenty-four pictures in which shall be represented the histories of the very illustrious life and heroic deeds of the said Queen according to the specifications [in subjects up to the number of nineteen] which, as has been said, have been given to the said Sieur Rubens by the said Majesty [who will transmit to him the other five subjects while he is working on the first ones].510

One set of twenty four paintings was to be devoted to “the very illustrious life and heroic deeds...of the Queen [Marie de Médicis].”511 The other half of the commission was to illustrate

509 Letter from M. Bartolini to Florence, April 8, 1620, ASF Medicea 46354, unnumbered, translated by Millen and Wolf (189), 212.
511 Rooses (1910), 217.
the life of Henri IV with “all the battles of the deceased King Henry the Great, the encounters he was engaged in, his combats, conquests, and sieges of towns with the Triumphs of said victories in the manner of the triumphs of the Romans.” Together these cycles would form the east and west galleries of the Luxembourg Palace. However, the cycles, as a pair, were never finished. The half devoted to Marie de Médicis was completed in 1625, but the Henri IV Cycle, although prepared in sketch form by a keen Rubens, was never completed. To this day, the Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle is viewed as a finished work, however, as Shaw Smith argues, it should be thought of as only half of an agenda to legitimize Marie as the heiress to Henri IV and his policies. Marie de Médicis had a very clear idea from the cycle’s inception of how she wanted her story to be told. From the start, the contract states that the subject matter of nineteen of the twenty-four canvases had already been decided, and Rubens had been instructed that more of the subjects would be decided soon. By April 1622, Rubens had returned to Antwerp to begin work on the canvases, and he and his contact at the French court, Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc, were already in correspondence concerning the subject matter of the other five canvases. The cycle would begin with The Birth of Marie de Médicis, The Education of Marie, The Presentation of her Portrait to Henri IV, The Marriage-by-Proxy in Florence, The Landing at Marseilles, The Arrival in Lyons and The Birth of the Dauphin. Four canvases had been set aside to illustrate the marriages of Louis XIII to the Spanish Infanta and Elisabeth de France to the future king of Spain. This number was eventually decreased, and more space was made for subjects depicting “topics directly concerning the Queen Mother.” After Rubens suggested the safely

---

512 Rooses (1910), 217.
513 Despite the contract from 1622 and Rubens’s attempts to keep the Henri IV Cycle project going, Cardinal Richelieu looked for other artists to complete the project, including Guido Reni and the Cavalier d’Arpino. For more information about this and the demise of the Henri IV Cycle, see Jacques Thuillier and Jacques Foucart, translated Robert Erich Wolf, Rubens’ Life of Marie de Medici (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1970), 45-46, 59, 64, 129-130, 158; Marrow, 45-46; Kristen Lohse Belkin, Rubens (London: Phaidon, 1998), 192. Rubens, however, was excited about the Henri IV Cycle, as he wrote to Peiresc in 1622, “for the future I believe there will not fail to be difficulties over the subjects of the other gallery, which ought to be easy and free from scruples. The theme is so vast and so magnificent that it would suffice for ten galleries,” and wrote to Dupuy in 1628, “I have now begun the designs for the other gallery which I believe, according to the quality of the subject, will succeed better than the first, so that I hope to rise higher than to decline.” Letters in Ruth Saunders Magurn, editor and translator, The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 109-110, 234. Eventually, however, Rubens becomes very frustrated with the French court and their lack of contact following the unveiling of the Medici Cycle in 1625, and the plans are abandoned.
515 Letter from 22 April 1622, Rooses and Reulens (1887-1909), tome 2, 388-390. The list of subjects in this letter included those already agreed upon and those still in negotiation. The subjects that were already approved for inclusion are listed in this letter: three portraits as yet undefined; The Birth of Marie; The Education of Marie; The Presentation of the Portrait; The Wedding in Florence; The Landing at Marseilles; The Arrival in Lyons; and The Birth of the Dauphin. The subjects still in negotiation are also listed in this letter: The Coronation; Il Flamineo; The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency; The Regency; The Taking of Jülich; The Peace of the Regency; The Council of the Gods; The
vague Roman subject *Il Flamineo*, Peiresc suggests “another subject prior to the coronation, which could fill one of the eight panels before the ninth, you could take for example, the arrival in Paris, or when the late king began to involve the Queen in the most important government affairs, even when he was preparing to leave the kingdom...” The latter subject was chosen to be depicted and became *The Consignment of the Regency*. The arrival in Paris is never mentioned again, perhaps to avoid embarrassment. Henri IV’s triumphant arrival into Paris in 1589 is depicted by Rubens for the *Henri IV Cycle*, but there is no such corresponding canvas in the Médicis Cycle. Nonetheless, the concept of an entry was discussed in the Médicis Cycle negotiations and makes an appearance in the *Life of Henri IV Cycle*. In fact, these two cycles share many similarities with entries, specifically Florentine entries, which would fit into Marie’s Florentine agenda for the Luxembourg Palace. The emphasis of certain themes, subjects and iconography, the use of abstract mythologies and allegory to illustrate glorious deeds and legitimacy, the prevalent architecture, the accompanying text verbalizing the glorification and explaining the images; a similar purpose, similar desired audience, similar events surrounding their debut; even the way the viewer was intended to move around the gallery or entry arches; all of these are features that are shared by both the festival arts in celebration of marriage and the Médicis Cycle.

Marie’s entry into Paris in 1610 is also important to be considered in reference to the Médicis Cycle. It represents an image for Marie that was commissioned by Henri IV at Marie’s request. This entry symbolized so much more for Marie’s current status as newly crowned queen and soon to be regent. It is extremely significant when one considers that this was the event that actually marked Marie’s turning point from Queen to Regent and widow. However, the entry never took place, which, without a doubt, impacted Marie. Mamone also believes that “the non-existence of the entry of Marie creates a much deeper mark than if it had actually occurred. This failed spectacle actually marks the passage of the Queen to the autonomy of her widowhood.” Despite the fact that the entry never took place, a large document was published by the Paris Town Council to commemorate this event. Even in 1610, the event and its decorations were deemed momentous enough to be venerated in such a way. Marie knew the symbolical power that entries could effectively portray, and perhaps she took this one step further by making an ephemeral tradition permanent for all of her subjects and foreign visitors to see on the walls of the Luxembourg Palace. Provoked by the multiple occasions when her

---

*MARRIAGE OF THE KING; THE MARRIAGE OF THE QUEEN OF SPAIN; THE MARRIAGES;* four reserved paintings for subjects not clearly defined; *The Coming of Age of Louis XIII;* and an unidentified final subject.

ambitions to be commemorated had been frustrated, it is therefore possible to imagine that the *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle* and the *Life of Henri IV Cycle* are the culmination of the long-awaited for entry that Marie de Médicis never received.

Considering the fragility of Marie's position in Paris in 1622, having just recently returned into her son's favour, it was specified in the contract that Marie reserved the right to instruct changes to the sensitive canvases if what Rubens produced was not suitable. This was perhaps due to their potentially politically sensitive subject matter. Marie's censorship of the canvases meant that the canvases went through multiple stages of approval, further demonstrating Marie's desire to control her own image. It is therefore highly probable that Marie had artistic precedents in mind when commissioning the Cycle. This is suggested by the statement in the contract that refers to the document to be given to Rubens that included detailed descriptions of the suggested subjects: "...all the stories which are written down and enumerated at length in writing in accord with the Queen's intention...in order that Rubens should entirely satisfy the Queen's intention." Undoubtedly, these descriptions also suggested precedents. It is also very likely that Rubens had at his disposal existing material such as iconographical and mythological manuals, numismatical objects and books, classical writings and artefacts, emblem books, entry books, manuscript or published accounts and descriptions, first-hand or second-hand reports, polemical writings, sermons, panegyrics, contemporary prints, paintings, etcetera, that he either consulted on his own or were provided by Marie and her counsellors. It is likely that those documents consulted by Rubens also included festival books. The festival book, first introduced in 1475, quickly became its own literary genre by 1520. By the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, they were prevalent throughout libraries and printing houses of Europe, spreading local festivals to an international audience. Surely we can be certain that Rubens and Marie consulted a whole corpus of material bearing upon the joyous entry as a European and specifically Medicean event that could influence the Médicis

---

518 From the contract: "...que lad. dame Royne s'est reservée le pouvoir d'augmenter ou diminuer les subjects desd. tableaux avant quils seront commancés et de faire retoucher et changer les figures qui ne luy seront agréables...." New York, Pierpont Morgan Library. Department of Literary and Historical Manuscripts. MA 386.1.
519 Rubens created several drawings, bazzetti and modelli for each subject, which were then either approved or amendments were recommended by Marie de Medici and her advisers before Rubens could embark upon the final canvases. The evolution of the project from the drawings first produced by Rubens to the final canvases reveals much about the artistic and political concerns of Marie and the delicate nature of her position at court upon her return from exile.
520 Rooses (1910), 218.
522The first festival book records a banquet arranged for a marriage in Pesaro in 1475: "a banquet which lasted seven and a half hours during which gods sent the goods to the table...." Margaret McGowan, "Festival Books: their Status, Purpose, and Value" (lecture, British Library, 2008), 3. Watanabe-O'Kelly, 6.
Cycle’s creation, including one of the most widely-disseminated festival books - that celebrating the nuptials of Marie de Médicis’s aunt and uncle, Christine de Lorraine and the Grand Duke Ferdinando of Tuscany in 1589.\footnote{According to Zerner, in Mulryne, Watanabe-O’Kelly and Shewring (2004), “These were the most elaborate and splendid festivals of their time, and have left the fullest documentation. The archival material and the published descriptions are more abundant than for any other Renaissance festival. The event also engendered the most extensive publication of visual records. For half a century Florence would be a most productive centre of illustrated festival publications”...so much so that “this elaborate visual documentation of the 1589 wedding festivities served as a model for many others all over Europe.”\footnote{James M. Saslow, The Medici Wedding of 1589: Florentine Festival as Theatrum Mundi (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 147.}}

As previously mentioned, one of the problems Rubens faced when he embarked upon the Médicis Cycle was that there was no known artistic precedent for the glorification of a still-living secular female in a permanent setting. There were, however, the records of ephemeral glorifications of still-living secular females in the festival arts, namely elaborate entries and their accompanying spectacles celebrating nuptials. James Saslow discusses the rarity of such female glorification and its prevalence in festivals arts in reference to Christine de Lorraine’s entry celebrations in Florence in 1589: \footnote{Strong (1984), 6.}

As she passed under this image, did she reflect on the disjunction between the ideal allegorical realm, where women reigned supreme, and the actual world she was entering, in which brides merely mediated relations between men and a wife’s powers extended only as far as the limits of her own body and dowry? Probably not: she had been schooled in this system since birth, and besides she must have been exhausted from her all-day ceremonial performances and glad to escape from public scrutiny.\footnote{Rubens must have known that this “ideal allegorical realm” created during entries was an ideal form of glorification for a female, as, again, it was one of the only forms of glorification for a secular female. This is one of the few occasions where extreme amounts of praise were directed at the most important roles of a female, those of wife, mother and queen: three of the roles emphasized in The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. It just so happened that Marie’s closest familial precedents were also glorified in this way.}

Entries and festivals brought together some of the greatest cultural minds of the time to create what Strong calls the only art form that “demonstrates so fully the passionate belief in the union of the arts held during the Renaissance.”\footnote{There was a credence in the Renaissance that...}
images held power and the truth.\textsuperscript{526} A similar association between power and images can be observed in entries, as Mulryne observes, “The princes did become stronger as a result of these associations, in their own self-esteem, or by derivation in the eyes of their political constituencies. In the era which saw Renaissance, Reformation and new styles of government, festival proved its attraction as a vehicle for media manipulation.”\textsuperscript{527} This power of images and entry imagery must have been a driving force behind Marie’s commission of the Médicis Cycle. The Abbé de Saint-Ambroise, while advising the subjects of the Médicis Cycle, wrote in a letter to Peiresc to instruct Rubens to “follow the truth of history as is known to you.”\textsuperscript{528} It is known that Rubens created an ideal world of Marie’s life, which was often quite far from the “truth of history.” Yet Marie must have believed that vindication could come out through the means of paint. Entries and festivals equally created an ideal world to which the monarch and his people could aspire. Through the abstract glorification of her rule, the depiction of the ideal version of her history and reign as regent, and the display of the values and wise rulership to which her son, Louis XIII, should aspire, Rubens created a series of canvases whose imagery closely resembles the basic formula of entries and festivals that prevailed throughout Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These are defined by Roy Strong in \textit{Art and Power} as “variants of a remarkably consistent visual and iconographical vocabulary.”\textsuperscript{529} It was recognized even in the seventeenth century that entries were repetitive in nature, as Théodore Godefroy writes in his \textit{Le Cérémonial François} of 1649, “for between them there is great resemblance in so many points and ways.”\textsuperscript{530} There are three recurring themes identified by Strong that repeat throughout entries: an emphasis on the legitimacy of the monarch; the presentation of virtues to which the monarch should aspire; and the demonstration of the benefits that would come from the fruitful and wise rule of this monarch.\textsuperscript{531} Strong writes that

\textsuperscript{526} Strong (1984), 22. Strong wrote, “The renaissance court festival, unlike its medieval forebears, stemmed from a philosophy which believed that truth could be apprehended in images.” Also discussed in Claire Innocenti, \textit{Women in Power: Caterina and Maria de’ Medici: the Return to Florence of Two Queens of France} (Florence: Mandragora, 2008).

\textsuperscript{527} Mulryne and Goldring (2002), 5.

\textsuperscript{528} Letter from Peiresc to Rubens, 27 October 1622, Thuillier and Foucart (1970), 62.

\textsuperscript{529} Strong (1984), 7.

\textsuperscript{530} Denys and Théodore Godefroy, \textit{Le cérémonial François} (Paris: 1649): “pour la ressemblance qu’il y a des unes avec les autres en beaucoup de points et circonstances.”

\textsuperscript{531} Strong (1984), 8. “They always somehow emphasized the legitimacy of the monarch, both in terms of his own sanctity, due to the act of coronation and anointing with sacred oil, and in those of his descent of the blood royal as the rightful heir of his dynasty. Without exception, they presented to the ruler himself images of those virtues to which he should aspire, and for this, the whole tradition of the \textit{speculum principis} or ‘mirror of princes’ from St Augustine to John of Salisbury and to the \textit{De Remimine Principum} was drawn upon. The street pageants demonstrated to the prince the benefits that would flow to his subjects from his possession and practice of these virtues, fruits expressed in the form of trees bursting into leaf, flowery bowers and gardens or flowing fountains. Any examination of its underlying ideas shows that its focus is continually on the eternal myths that were essential to the concept of \textit{les rois thaumaturges}, the mystical sacred rulers who were venerated and regarded as a race set apart in the Europe that preceded the age of enlightenment.”

180
more often than not, "...a ruler saw represented in abstract the nature of his government, his role as the imposer of Peace and Justice by Strength leavened by Temperance and Prudence." The preceding sentence could just as easily be applied to *The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*. Before analysing how the Médicis Cycle compares to specific Florentine and French entries and festivals, the Médicis Cycle will be placed within Strong’s entry criteria.

A major concern of the Médicis Cycle is legitimacy, also a theme of entries noted by Strong: “They always somehow emphasized the legitimacy of the monarch, both in terms of his own sanctity, due to the act of coronation and anointing with sacred oil, and in those of his descent of the blood royal as the rightful heir of his dynasty.” The legitimacy of Marie and Henri’s marriage and the regency were questioned within the French court. Marie sought to address these issues in the Médicis Cycle. *The Birth of the Princess* (Figure 3.1), the second canvas in the *Cycle*, and the portraits of the Queen’s parents, set the precedent for Marie’s worthy birth and pedigree that make her a suitable candidate for the bride for Henri IV. In *The Birth*, Marie is borne into the hands of Florence, crowned with turrets, surrounded by Horae scattering blossoms around the scene. A torch-bearing Lucina, the goddess of childbirth, lights the way for the Genius who bears the cornucopia of riches that hint at Marie’s future life as queen: a crown, sceptre, and main de justice. This scene is all cast under the astrological sign of Sagittarius, not Marie’s astrological sign, but Henri IV’s. As this canvas would like to establish, from her mythical birth Marie was destined to be Henri IV’s queen. It was, however, Marie’s wedding to Henri IV that was the cause of much of the doubts of her legitimacy as Queen.

Following the death of his favourite mistress Gabrielle d’Estrées (1573-1599) and the annulment from his first wife, Marguerite de Valois, in 1599, Henri became attached to his new favourite, Henriette d’Entragues (1579-1633). Henri knew that he must take a new bride simply for the future royal progeny of France. Enamoured with Entragues’s sexual prowess, Henri, much to the horror of his councillors, wrote a written promise of marriage to Henriette. However, Henriette was not a suitable bride, and Henri was forced to renege on his promise of marriage and proceed with the negotiations for the Grand Duke of Tuscany’s niece. This was not forgotten by Henriette who would perpetually lead campaigns to overthrow Marie under the

---

533 Strong (1984), 8.
534 Marie’s power was perpetually challenged by the bastard children of Henri IV and his mistresses, Gabrielle d’Estrées and Henriette d’Entragues, particularly the César de Bourbon, the duc de Vendôme, Alexandre, Chevalier de Vendôme, and Gaston Henri, the duc de Verneuil, who believed they were the legitimate heirs of Henri IV. They challenged Marie’s birth, her marriage to Henri IV, her coronation and finally the handing of the regency to Marie after Henri’s death. Millen and Wolf (1989) divulge into the details of the Vendôme plots, 117-119.
535 Pardoe (1890), 52.
accusation that she was not legitimately married to Henri. Therefore, it was imperative that *The Wedding-by-Proxy in Florence* (Figure 3.2) be included in a set of paintings hoping to establish Marie’s legitimacy. When legitimacy comes into question in the Médicis Cycle, Rubens approached the problem by presenting accurate portraits of the witnesses involved. This is true for both *The Coronation of Marie de Médicis* (Figure 3.3) and *The Wedding-by-Proxy*. The coronation is overseen by Henri IV who sits in the loggia just above the bishops’ mitres. Henri IV is literally watching over the ceremony representing the fact that her legitimacy stems directly from him. Henri IV’s former wife, Marguerite de Valois is also recognisable in the middle of the left section of the canvas. Her presence in this scene is crucial. Without her consent to annul her marriage to Henri IV, Marie and Henri’s marriage would not be valid. Those who challenged Marie’s role as Queen of France are also included in the crowd watching the coronation. Duc César de Vendôme (1594-1665) and his brother the Chevalier Alexandre de Vendôme (1598-1629), Henri’s illegitimate sons from Gabrielle d’Estrées and among Marie’s staunchest enemies, are clearly identifiable as the two men in the centre of the canvas. Duc César de Vendôme looks directly out of the canvas at the viewer, while his brother glances at César with his back to the viewer. Their presence served as a reminder that through the act of coronation, Marie is the legitimate Queen of France, and that by their presence at this ceremony, they swore an oath of fealty to Marie.

In addition to an emphasis on legitimacy, Strong states that “without exception, [entry decorations] presented to the ruler himself images of those virtues to which he should aspire....” In the *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*, Marie seems to have led by example. It is thought that the message of the *Cycle* was directed at her son, Louis XIII, to prove to him that she was a worthy regent deserving of his respect and that she had not forgotten her exile and

---

536 Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Baluze, 323, fols. 54-57. The Baluze memorandum specifically called for the Cardinal de Joyeuse, “in his pontifical ornaments,” and he is identifiable from the beginning. Surrounding him are other prelates who can also be identified: four mitred bishops and two red cardinals in the first sketch. Jean Davy du Perron, Grand Almoner de France, is one of the bearded cardinals behind Cardinal de Joyeuse in the first sketch, and he is accompanied by Cardinal François de Sourdis, who is shifted to the right and viewed from behind in the second sketch and final canvas. An additional cardinal is included in the second sketch and the final canvas, Cardinal Pierre de Gondi, placed next to Cardinal de Sourdis. The importance of Sourdis and Gondi is discussed by Millen and Wolf (1989), 113. Gondi was one of the first to mention the idea of marriage between Henri IV and Marie de Medici as far back as 1592. Millen and Wolf (1989) explain the significance of Joyeuse’s inclusion, pg. 112. Joyeuse was one of the members of the council that had officiated over the annulment of Henri’s marriage to Marguerite de Valois, thus his presence further confirms the legitimacy of that annulment.

537 In fact, their presence was so important that Rubens altered their ages to make them even more identifiable in 1622. Some figures are depicted at their age in 1610, some at their age in 1622, as with the Vendômes, who in 1610 would have been much younger than their appearance in the canvas of 1622. Rubens used this method to transcend time and bring attention to the meaning behind their inclusion. Millen and Wolf (1989), 117-119.

the execution of her close confidants. By recording all of her “heroic deeds”, Marie is carefully highlighting those virtues that she possesses to which future rulers, namely her son, should aspire. It is her education and life as a child in *The Education of the Princess* (Figure 3.4) that explains her qualifications and virtues, albeit allegorical, that have prepared her for her future role as Queen. Here, Marie receives her education at the hands of helmeted Minerva who transfers her virtue of wisdom to the young princess while the three Graces offer their approval. Above, Mercury descends, thrusting forth his caduceus, symbol of peace and eloquence to Marie and endowing her with those virtues, while Orpheus plays the *viola da gamba*. These gods and goddesses are endowing Marie with their virtues of wisdom, eloquence, peace and harmony. These were essential elements for a wise and just ruler. Marie believed that her upbringing at the Tuscan court, a court that was known for its great interest in culture and science, hosting many of the prominent scientists, academics, artists and musicians of the time, and where she also witnessed her father, and subsequently her uncle, rule as the Grand Dukes of Tuscany, provided her with enough of an education to later be considered qualified to fulfil the role of regent. There is no such evidence that Marie was ever schooled in the way to run a country, but this scene attempts to convince the viewer that Marie was inherently endowed with the education that made her a successful Queen and Regent. The virtues to which Louis XIII should aspire are the subject of *Louis XIII Comes of Age* (Figure 3.5). To depict the end of her regency on 2 October 1614, Rubens shows Marie guiding the ship of state with Louis by her side. Under the approval of France, the ship is rowed safely by four virtues: Fortitude, Piety, Justice and Concord. This image leads the viewer to believe as regent Marie has been guiding her son and endowing him not only with the wisdom to command the ship of state, but also the virtues of Fortitude, Piety, Justice and Concord. Here one can believe Marie was not acting as regent to enhance her own power, but simply preserving the kingdom for her son. Ironically, Henri IV once noted that the similarities between mother and son would eventually lead to their estrangement. As Moote explains, “Henri sensed a central component of this: the striking resemblance of Louis’ stubbornness and displays of temper to the emotional makeup of Marie. He even predicted that they would clash someday.” Until that moment, however, Marie believed she had endowed her son with all of the virtues to which he should aspire.

Another prevalent theme in entries noted by Strong are “the benefits that would flow to [the Prince’s] subjects from his possession and practice of these virtues, fruits expressed in the form of trees bursting into leaf, flowery bowers and gardens or flowing fountains.”

---

539 Millen and Wolf’s (1989) opinion in their introduction, pages 1-18.
541 Strong (1984), 8.
one canvas in the Médicis Cycle that demonstrates this flow of benefits: *The Felicity of the Regency* (Figure 3.6). In a rare occasion, Rubens describes the subject in his own words, which offers insight into not only the delicacy of the subject matter of the Médicis Cycle, but also his opinions on Marie de Médicis:

*[The Felicity of the Regency] shows the felicity of her regency and the flourishing of the Kingdom of France, with the resuscitation of the sciences and arts thanks to the liberality and splendour of Her Majesty who, seated on a resplendent throne, holds a pair of scales in her hand and with prudence and equity, holds the world in equilibrium. This subject, which does not touch on the particular reasons of state of this kingdom nor apply to any individual, was found very pleasing.*

Marie is depicted enthroned under a canopy of green vines topped with a garland of fruit to enhance the image of the fruitful nature of her rule. She holds the scales of justice and is accompanied by Minerva, whose wisdom allowed Marie to rule wisely. Saturn and France stand to the left of the canvas, while Abundance with a cornucopia and Liberality or Splendour shower gold chains and coins on the putti at the bottom of the canvas, referring to Marie's liberality. Symbols of the arts and sciences, which flourished under Marie's rule, are visible at the bottom of the canvas. The evil which she conquered during her regency is allegorized by the figures who struggle at the bottom right: Envy, Ignorance and Vice. Two fames blast their trumpets at the top of the canvas announcing the benefits of Marie's rule. Although Marie's time as regent was decidedly challenging, ultimately, it was a relatively peaceful and prosperous era for France. This canvas perfectly encapsulates what Marie took to be her glorious deeds and the "benefits that would flow to [her] subjects from [her] possession and practice of these virtues" that would make this image not out of place in a royal entry.

It is not only the allegory and iconography of the Médicis Cycle that bears a striking similarity to triumphal entries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Quite simply, the architecture featuring in the background of a number of canvases of the Médicis Cycle takes on an entry form – the ancient Roman triumphal arch that was a prerequisite for triumphal entries.

It must be noted here, however, that this was not the initial choice of subject matter for this moment in the Médicis Cycle. This was painted upon Rubens’ arrival in Paris in 1625, after the rejection of the original canvas, *The Flight from Paris*, which was deemed as too sensitive to be hung on the walls of the Luxembourg. As Rubens wrote of this change in a letter of 13 May 1625: "I believe I wrote you that a picture was removed which depicted the Queen's departure from Paris and that, in its place, I did an entirely new one...." Millen and Wolf (1989), 165.

*Millen and Wolf (1989), 165.*
researched past, as these scenes appear to take place in unidentifiable arched settings. The triumphal arch was originally erected for a processional entry in the Roman period to denote a military or civic triumph, but it eventually became a general symbol of power in later periods. Symbolically the triumphal arch is an appropriate backdrop in the Médicis Cycle. It features prominently in seven canvases. For example, *The Consignment of the Regency* (Figure 3.7) and *The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency* (Figure 3.8) both have arches that not only denote the form of a triumphal entry arch but also symbolize Marie’s triumph in the moments preceding and following Henri IV’s assassination and her accepting of the regency. The arch returns in *The Negotiations at Angoulême* (Figure 3.9), the canvas depicting the negotiations for peace between Marie and her son in 1621. Again, the arch’s presence is conspicuous. It is possible that the arch has appeared in another moment of triumph for the Queen, for this is when her son was beginning to acknowledge somewhat the error of his ways. Perhaps the figures were to move through this triumphal arch in a procession towards peace. Peace would eventually be reached, but it would be completely abstracted in Rubens’s artistic interpretation, *The Reconciliation of the Mother and Son* (Figure 3.10). Interestingly, an arch was originally featured in the sketches for *The Queen Triumphant* (Figure 3.11). However, it is absent from the final canvas. Yet, the arches are an overriding feature, and as one moves throughout the Médicis Cycle, one moves from one arch to another, just as one would move throughout an entry in Florence or Paris.

The unprecedented cultural event commemorated throughout Europe that set the guidelines for future Medici celebrations was in fact the formal entry of Marie’s mother Joanna of Austria into Florence in 1569. Grand Duke Cosimo I de’ Medici spared no expense for the marriage festivities of his son Francesco. Joanna was the daughter of the late Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I (1503-1564) and sister of the current Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian II (1527-1576) and these events would be the fruition of Cosimo’s hard-earned political alliances with some of the ruling houses of Europe. Cosimo I was one of the most significant Medici proponents of cultural propaganda, and it was under his patronage that Medici propaganda was thoroughly developed into a category with recurring patterns and themes that reflected the *nouveaux* insecurities of this banking dynasty. The repetitive themes of Medici patronage

---

include dynasty, legitimacy, the return of a Golden Age, and destiny. It was with the assistance of Cosimo's artistic advisers Vincenzo Borghini and Giorgio Vasari that these themes merged into a formalized image of Cosimo and the Medici. When it came time to devise the plan for the entry of Joanna of Austria into Florence in 1565, Cosimo again turned to Borghini and Vasari. Vasari acted as the intermediary between Cosimo and Borghini, and Borghini was the artistic interpreter.\(^{546}\) Benedictine monk, historian and member of the *Accademmia delle Arti del disegno*, Borghini was often employed by the Medici as principal designer for the festival arts celebrating Medici achievements.\(^{547}\) Eve Borsook describes Borghini's role in the development of the Medici image: "More than anyone else, it was to Borghini that the first Medici Grand Dukes owed the imperial character of the political and religious allegories on which the art of the court was based."\(^{548}\) Before developing Joanna's entry, Borghini extensively researched previous festivals and entries, distinguishing between the different types of spectacles and developing his own guidelines for entries.\(^{549}\) Borghini followed the advice of sixteenth and seventeenth century theorists who believed that a successful iconographic programme actually depended upon a known myth or allegory, not a new one, and the original interpretation the author could provide for this familiar myth and his ability to relate the myth to the topic at hand.\(^{550}\) Borghini's knowledge of classical sources, iconography, allegory, mythology, numismatics, and *imprese* informed his conclusions for the development of Medici entries. This information all combined to create the fundamentals that Borghini thought were vital for an effective entry, which he submitted with the programme for Joanna of Austria's entry on 5 April 1565.\(^{551}\) Strong summarizes Borghini's entry formula and notes that there were three types of entry: an entry of a ruler into his own city; an entry or a ruler into a foreign city; and an entry celebrating a marriage. Strong also notes that Borghini's entries typically started with an arch dedicated to the city of Florence, followed by one dedicated to Hymen, followed by the celebration of the bride's family, a celebration of the groom's family and an arch lauding the magnificence and wisdom of Duke Cosimo.\(^{552}\) This format was to be used repeatedly in Medici festivals, including that of Christine of Lorraine's entry into Florence in 1589 and Marie de Médicis's wedding festivities in 1600.


\(^{549}\) McGowan(2008), 10.


\(^{551}\) Scorza (1981), 58.

\(^{552}\) Strong (1973), 172-174.
If the *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle* is to be compared to the Medici festival arts in Florence, it is important to consider how the *Medici Cycle* fits into Borghini's formula. The imagery chosen by Borghini was used specifically to enhance nuptial celebrations: to glorify the bride and her family, display her legitimacy as the new bride, praise the city of her arrival and birth, and praise the groom and his wisdom and success. All of these were also considerations for the subjects in the Médicis Cycle, especially when the *Life of Henri IV Cycle* is included in the overall project. The beginning of Borghini's programme celebrated the city of Florence, the birthplace of the Medici. The figure of Florence dominates the second canvas of the Médicis Cycle in *The Birth of the Princess*, in which the story of Marie's birth is made into myth. The infant Marie is welcomed into the arms of Florence by the goddess of childbirth Lucina under whom a *putti* holds the shield of Florence with its red fleur-de-lis. The scene takes place on the banks of the river Arno overlooked by the river god of Tuscany resting upon a lion, the symbol of Florence and Tuscany. Not only establishing the historical fact of Marie’s birthplace, the regally dressed and crowned Florence’s presence at Marie’s birth signals the value that Marie and Rubens placed on Florence as Marie’s birthplace and the possible role that her Florentine heritage played in her life. The point I wish to stress, and it is one ignored by previous scholars, is that Marie de Médicis, even after arriving in Paris, never forgot her Florentine birthright.

Borghini's programme then moves to the subject of marriage through the celebration of the figure of Hymen, the adolescent god of marriage. Hymen's presence in nuptial décor was not uncommon, as it was believed that Hymen signalled the future happiness of the marriage. Hymen appears multiple times in the Médicis Cycle. He is overseeing the nuptial negotiations in *The Presentation of the Portrait* (Figure 3.12), assisted by Cupid, Jupiter and Juno. His presence at the right of the altar in *The Wedding-by-Proxy in Florence* signals Marie and Henri’s happy future. Hymen appears in *The Meeting of Marie de Médicis and Henri IV at Lyons* (Figure 3.13), the canvas that symbolizes the consummation of their marriage. Hymen's presence in three of the marriage-related canvases and in Borghini’s programme denotes the importance of Hymen’s symbolism in conveying the future happiness and prosperity that will be brought forth by the union of this couple, a theme that was also present in the Médicis Cycle.

Following the “decoration to Hymen”, Borghini’s programme also includes an arch to commemorate the bride’s family. The bride's parents would have been significant in proving the bride's worth and legitimacy. This would establish the bride's line and foretell of the noble

---

lineage of the couple’s future dynasty. Establishing a noble lineage was an important ambition of Medici cultural propaganda as newly established Grand Dukes; something of which Marie was also aware when she arrived in Paris. Many taunts were aimed at Marie concerning her family’s background. The Portrait of the Queen’s Father, Francesco I de’ Medici (Figure 3.14), dressed in his Grand Ducal attire, and its companion Portrait of the Queen’s Mother, Joanna of Austria (Figure 3.15), presented with all the regal bearing of the daughter of a Holy Roman Emperor, highlight the noble lineage of Marie’s birth. Portraits of Marie de Médicis’s parents were subsequently placed on both sides of the fireplace, below The Queen Triumphant (Figure 3.16). Simson compares the arrangement of these portraits to an altarpiece, with the portrait of the Queen forming the dominant central canvas. However, it is interesting to observe that they were placed almost as if in an arch form: the two portraits of her parents forming the sides of the arch, with the portrait of The Queen Triumphant forming the peak of the arch. Perhaps this is why the arch was removed from the final canvas. This is interesting especially when one considers the strange appearance of Marie de Médicis in The Queen Triumphant as Minerva Victrix, a figure often placed at the top of entry arches. The MS Baluze, the manuscript from August 1622 that outlines the content of each canvas declares that:

The Queen will be painted as a queen triumphant, helmet on head, the sceptre in her hand; beneath her feet, armour, helmets, cuirasses, piles of arms, drums; overhead, two cherubs with butterfly wings, the mark of immortality, holding a laurel wreath over the Queen's head to show that her glory is immortal; and in the sky, two Fames holding triumphs [trumpets?] publishing her virtues and the glory of the good conduct of the government of the state; beneath her feet will be written HIC EST ILLA, meaning that here is the greatest queen on earth, the rarest virtue of the world which has never had any like her in all the centuries of posterity.

This passage would not be out of place in the descriptions of Minerva placed atop entry arches with portraits of the bride’s family flanking the arch, as described in festival books.

Following the emphasis on the bride’s family, Borghini then turns to “an amphitheatre lauding the groom’s family.” As the 1622 contract for the Médicis Cycle requests, “all the
battles of the deceased King Henry the Great, the encounters he was engaged in, his combats, and sieges of towns with the triumphs of the said victories in the manner of the triumphs of the Romans” were to be painted by Rubens for the east gallery of the Luxembourg Palace. The wording of the contract in itself suggests an entry, in addition to that fact that in fitting with Borghini’s programme it is a clear celebration of the groom and his family. As the Life of Henri IV Cycle formed only one half of the entire commission, it is safe to assume that the Médicis Cycle and the Henri IV Cycle had strong correlations. Not only did the galleries mirror each other, one forming the east gallery, the other the west, but there is also a strong parallel between many of the paintings in the two cycles that encourage the hypothesis that these two cycles formed two halves of a whole agenda. Shaw Smith explores this theory: “As an heroic pairing, and they were considered a pair since the earliest contract, the combined galleries, I argue, were structured on a parallel system of triads which unified the entire forty-eight monumental scenes.”

Although only ten of the twenty four canvases commissioned for the Henri IV Cycle are known, it is very possible that two of those canvases would have been portraits of the king’s parents, to correlate with the portraits of the queen’s parents and their location. The known canvases, nonetheless, are equivalent to “an amphitheatre lauding the groom’s family.” Starting with The Birth of Henri IV (Figure 3.17), Henri is born into the arms of the figure of the city of Pau and welcomed by Mars who hands him a flaming sword. He is accompanied by three putti who carry a lance and a shield, while the river god of Gave de Pau looks on, all overlooked by the zodiacal sign of Sagittarius. The Henri IV Cycle then goes on to celebrate his triumphs as the king of Navarre and king of France.

Borghini finishes with “three arches expressing the wisdom and magnanimity of Duke Cosimo’s rule.” The second half of Médicis Cycle that follows after the Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency is fundamentally devoted to the wisdom and magnanimity of Marie’s rule. It begins with Marie’s military achievements in The Victory at Jülich (Figure 3.18). Her political achievements are praised in The Exchange of the Princesses (Figure 3.19). The following canvas in the cycle, The Felicity of the Regency, glorifies Marie’s wise, magnanimous and peaceful rule as Queen Regent. There is no better display of Marie’s wisdom and magnanimity than this succession of canvases that fit into Borghini’s specifications.

558 Smith (1992), 127.
More specifically, though, the Médicis Cycle closely resembles the entry decorations created for the marriage between Christine de Lorraine, and the Grand Duke Ferdinando de’ Medici that followed Borghini’s directions. On the 20th of February 1589, Ferdinando married Christine, the niece of Henri III and granddaughter of Catherine de Médicis, by proxy at the Château de Blois. One week later, Christine departed Blois for Florence. One of the spectators for the events in Florence was in fact Marie herself. As the niece of the Grand Duke Ferdinando, Marie was in attendance and participated in Christine’s procession as it passed each of the entry arches through the streets of Florence. This elaborate display must have had an impact on Marie, for there had never before been a celebration as elaborate, and it was to profoundly influence not just future Florentine entries but also entries in other European courts. The overarching effects of this entry through the wide dissemination of its commemorative festival books (of which there were at least fifteen different publications) are described by James Saslow: “It is in large part thanks to these detailed and widely disseminated texts and images that the 1589 production exercised so much influence over succeeding generations and is recoverable today.”

Although this 1589 spectacle was created in the light of Borghini’s programme, the 1589 wedding celebrations’ large scale and sophistication had no comparison. The wedding celebrations would last for three weeks, beginning with Christine de Lorraine’s arrival in Tuscany and to her entry into Florence on 30 April. The creative team included Niccolò Gaddi, who oversaw the entire programme, designer Bernardo Buontalenti, sculptor Giovanni Bologna, painters Alessandro Allori, Ludovico Cigoli, and Andrea Boscoli, and writer of all the Latin

---

561 Saslow (1996) notes of the 1589 wedding’s reliance on Borghini’s programme: “It seems probably that Gaddi relied largely on Borghini’s canonical report, since nearly the same route through the city was planned, and the iconography was fundamentally similar, varying only in emphasis, or where necessary to adapt to changes in international politics; themes were again civic, dynastic, marital, historical, and allegorical,” 23.

562 Saslow (1996), 99-100. “On February 20, four days after the meeting in Ferdinando’s presence to plan for her arrival, he and Christine were officially married. The proxy wedding took place in the royal chapel at Blois, in the presence of King Henri III, Queen Louise, and the entire court. On the 27th, Christine left Blois to begin her three-week journey south to Marseilles, where she would be met by Don Pitero de’ Medici and the Tuscan fleet.”

563 “In addition to musicians and singers, different groups of which performed at each successive arch, the ‘cast’ included the royal family, other rulers, clerics, ambassadors, nobles and household officials,” Saslow (1996), 139. “Marie, 16 years old when she rode through the streets accompanying Christine in 1589, must have realized then that she was next in line for such an apotheosis, and would seem to have paid close attention to potentially useful precedents,” Saslow (1996), 186.

564 Saslow (1996), 178. Saslow (1996), 4: “At least fifteen souvenir accounts of the major events were published – more than for any other such event – either as programme books for use at the events themselves, or as memorials issued afterward.”

565 “More events were planned, more lavish theatrical entertainments initiated, more money spent, and more visual and written records were executed than for any Medici wedding before or after.”

566 Saslow (1996), 1.
inscriptions, Pietro Angeli da Barga. Fifty six plates from Raffaello Gualterotti’s *Descrizione* provide an invaluable visual record of this entry. The two-story entry arches were constructed in wood and plaster, covered with painted canvases and stucco decorations, and adorned with sculptures. It is from Gualterotti’s plates that one can discern the remarkable resemblances between the 1589 entry decorations and the Médicis Cycle. There were seven arches in total, each with their own theme: first arch, military history of Florence from its founding in the fourteenth century; second arch, previous marriages of the Medici and Lorraine dynasties, and preceding episodes in the wedding of Ferdinando and Christine; third arch, military history since the First Crusade of the house of Lorraine-Guise, whose arms top the central pediment; fourth arch, history of the Church in Florence; fifth arch, the House of Hapsburg, with allegories of America, Europe, and Asia, in reference to the Hapsburg world empire; sixth arch, history of the Medici since the grandfather of Duke Cosimo I; seventh arch, the apotheosis of Florence and of the three grand dukes, centred on the allegorical crowning of modern Tuscany by Cosimo I as successor to the ancient Etruscans. It is the subjects of the second and seventh entry arches that will be reviewed here in comparison to the Médicis Cycle.

The second entry arch, located at the Ponte alla Carraia, was a commemoration of previous marriages of the Medici and Lorraine dynasties, and episodes from the events in Christine’s life leading up to her arrival in Florence. The first canvas, *Catherine de Médicis enthroned with her Family* (Figure 3.20), by Cosimo Gamberucci, depicts Catherine de Médicis enthroned as the matriarchal “grandmother” of Europe, on a raised platform, in a setting of double arches, surrounded by members of her family. It seems only fitting that Catherine should be depicted in this way, as not only did she provide a large part of Christine’s dowry, but also, in his 1589 *Descrizione*, Gualterotti calls Christine “her [Catherine’s] granddaughter, whom she raised like her own daughter,” and writes of Catherine’s wish to “send back to her homeland…someone of her own blood.” When compared to the Médicis Cycle canvases, this scene possesses similarities to *The Consignment of the Regency*. Marie receives the globe of state from Henri IV, who passes it to her with the aid of the future heir, Louis XIII. *Catherine enthroned* is also a dynastic celebration, as Catherine is surrounded by her progeny. Both scenes consist of groups of people surrounding the protagonists in the centre, on a raised platform. It is

---

568 Catherine as the “grandmother” of Europe, Saslow (1996), 142. Of Christine’s dowry: “...she was to bring with her the enormous sum of 600,000 scudi (half contributed by Catherine herself), as well as jewelry and other items”, Saslow (1996), 18. An inventory of the goods brought by Christine is in ASF, Guardroba mediceo, filza no 152, 1589.
interesting to note that both settings, that of Catherine enthroned and The Consignment, are of two arches, one viewed through the other. Again, this is a motif that prevails in the Médicis Cycle and would have been utilised in the 1589 entry as an architectural echo of the triumphal arches. At the left of the Catherine canvas are figures, presumably soldiers, holding pikes as if preparing for battle, just as in the left of the Consignment, where soldiers wielding pikes are preparing to follow Henri IV into battle. What is most interesting, however, is the group of figures at the left of the Catherine scene: an adolescent boy is seen handing over a round object, possibly a helmet, to an older man dressed in armour. This figural group has much in common with the middle group of figures in The Consignment. Henri IV is handing over the orb of state to Marie, assisted by his adolescent son, Louis XIII. Their positioning, stance and round object is similar to that of the young boy and man in the Catherine scene. Both groups of men are positioned on a step, moving towards the right, exchanging a round object. A dog at the right of the Catherine scene jumps on the boy's leg, just as the dog jumps onto Marie's dress at the right of the Consignment scene. Keeping within the right side of both pictures, each has a figure staring out of the scene towards the viewer: a seated figure in the Catherine scene and the mysterious diadem-wearing figure, possibly Vigilance, on the right of the Consignment scene. The general position of Catherine's enthronement resembles that of Marie in The Felicity of the Regency. Marie is surrounded by figures, enthroned with her left hand on an orb and her right hand raised holding the scales of justice, just as Catherine's rests her left hand on the chair and raises her right hand. Both women are surrounded by representations of their dynastic gifts, Catherine with realistic figures, Marie with abstract personifications of her children as putto reaping the rewards of her rule.

As one of the major themes of the second arch, and indeed the entire entry as a whole, there are three scenes devoted to important marriages in the Medici and Lorraine dynasties. Two of these wedding scenes resemble closely the Wedding-by-Proxy in Florence, the fifth canvas in the Médicis Cycle: The Wedding of Catherine de Médicis and Henri II by Cosimo Dati (Figure 3.21) and The Wedding of Duke Lorenzo de' Medici by Battista Naldini and Giovanni Cosci (Figure 3.22). The setting of these scenes follows the generic depiction of marriages that pervades throughout Renaissance and Early Modern European art history that Rubens also utilises in the Médicis Cycle. Just as in Marie's proxy wedding, both sets of couples are joined in

570 It has been discovered that the setting of The Consignment of the Regency is in fact the portico of Rubens's home in Antwerp, Millen and Wolf (1989), 97.
571 The MS Baluze calls for the figures of Prudence and Generosity. BNP, MS Baluze, 323, fol. 55v. However, it is a struggle to identify them as such. Prudence does not have any identifying attributes, and the figure of Generosity is also missing attributes that link her to such a definition. The diadem positioned on her head instead suggests an ever-watchful justice, or Vigilance. Millen and Wolf (1989), 99.
the middle of the scene, on a raised platform with steps leading up to them, within an arched and domineering architectural setting. In the middle of all three couples (Marie and the Grand Duke, Catherine and Henri, and Lorenzo and Clarice Orsini), the officiating priest can clearly be seen joining the couples’ hands for the exchanging of the rings. The surrounding witnesses in Marie’s wedding scene and those in Catherine’s wedding scene have been reversed: one side of both consists of a group of men whose swaggering stance at the foot of the stairs greets the viewer and brings them into the scene, while on the other side of both scenes there is a group of less dramatic figures, predominantly female in both scenes, highlighted by the presence of an adolescent boy, Hymen in the case of the Marie scene. The Wedding of Duke Lorenzo de’ Medici is somewhat different, however, it also includes a small boy at the foot of the stairs with a dog, just as in Marie’s proxy wedding in Florence, and a man in the centre above the dog, whose jutting elbow is reminiscent of the elbow of Roger de Bellegarde at the far right of the proxy wedding.

The third marriage scene in the second 1589 entry arch, The Wedding of Charles II of Lorraine and Claude de France by Valerio Marucelli (Figure 3.23), has much more in common with The Coronation of the Médicis Cycle. This scene depicting the marriage of Christine de Lorraine’s parents sees Claude de France kneeling on the steps of the altar of the church. She is facing the officiating prelates, surrounded by a standing and kneeling audience overlooked by a balcony full of figures. The similarities with Marie’s coronation scene (Figure 3.3) are striking, especially if compared to the sketches for The Coronation, one of which is in the Hermitage in St Petersburg (Figure 3.24), the other in the Alte Pinakothek in Munich (Figure 3.25). All three canvases by Rubens portray Marie kneeling on the steps of the altar, facing the officiating prelates, surrounded by a large audience, all overlooked by a balcony of musicians and another balcony holding Henri IV. Both Claude and Marie are placed under the altar canopy, although the canopy is much more prominent in the preparatory sketches. Claude and Marie both kneel at the altar, their trains trailing behind them held by an assisting female, with the gap between the hem of the dress and the train bearer filled with the spectators. The stance of the man at the far right in the Claude scene with his foot placed on one step is similar to the swagger of Alexandre de Vendôme in Marie’s coronation scene. There is even a figure to the left of Claude, presumably Charles II, who has been replaced with the figures of Marie’s children, Gaston and then Elisabeth, in the final canvas in The Coronation of Marie de Médicis.572 One of the differences

572 The original sketch in St Petersburg shows two male adolescent figures at the altar with Marie de Medici, assumed to be Louis XIII and his younger brother Gaston d’Orléans. However, Gaston is no longer present by the time of the creation of the Munich sketch, as he has been replaced by his sister Elisabeth, who remains in the final canvas. There are some theories that have attempted to explain this switch. See Millen and Wolf (1989), 107-120.
in the two images is that the allegorical figures of Glory and Honour who top Marie’s coronation are missing in The Wedding image, but presumably similar figures would have been present in sculptural form at the top of the arch that held the canvas of The Wedding of Charles II of Lorraine and Claude de France. Moving away from The Coronation, the kneeling figures who surround the main action of Claude’s wedding remind one of the kneeling figures who surround the enthroned Marie, again under a canopy, and direct all of their attention to the main figures at the right of the canvas in The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency. It is almost as if the kneeling Claude who faces the group of prelates, under a canopy, has been replaced by the kneeling figure of France who offers the orb of state to Marie.

The second entry arch’s decorations then move from the depiction of felicitous marriages to scenes from the events leading up to Christine de Lorraine’s arrival in Florence. Christine taking leave of her Family by Giovanni Cosci (Figure 3.26) and Don Pietro de’ Medici welcomes Christine aboard the Capitana in Marseilles, also by Cosci (Figure 3.27), depict Christine’s leaving of France and her family and her welcome into the arms of the Medici. Whilst these are realistic scenes depicting actual events, they are also symbolic of Christine’s transitional journey from being a French princess to becoming the Grand Duchess of Tuscany. In Christine taking leave of her Family, the young bride is visible bowing to her grandmother, Catherine de Médicis, recognisable by her widows’ peak. This event took place at the end of February 1589 at the Château de Blois, from where Christine was to begin her long journey south to Marseilles and then on to Florence. Don Pietro de’ Medici welcomes Christine aboard the Capitana in Marseilles depicts the event on the 11th of April 1589, when Don Pietro, who was sent by his brother Ferdinando, retrieves Christine in Marseilles to begin her departure to her new home. Saslow remarks of the symbolism of this actual departure: “She was no longer moving away from the centre of her old existence, but centripetally, into ever-tightening circles of Medici organization and symbolic destiny.” This is where Christine’s journey actually began, much like Marie’s journey as she stepped off the boat in Marseilles to enter her new home in The Disembarkation at Marseilles (Figure 3.28). The Disembarkation at Marseilles is almost a combination of Christine taking leave of her Family and Don Pietro de’ Medici welcomes Christine aboard the Capitana in Marseilles. Marie moves away from her family who are represented by her sister, Eleanora of Mantua, her aunt Christine de Lorraine, a Florentine cavalier, and her dear friend Leonora Galigai, who stand behind her in The Disembarkation. Marie moves towards her new life in France, represented by the figures of Provence and

---

573 Saslow (1996), 121.
574 It is interesting to note that the last time Christine de Lorraine was in Marseilles was for the event that is depicting in Don Pietro de Medici welcomes Christine aboard the Capitana in Marseilles.
Marseilles, in much the same way as Christine said goodbye to her family in one canvas and greeted her new life in Marseilles in the next. The comparison of the Marseilles scenes is the most intriguing. In one, Christine is *embarking* on the Capitana, guided onto the gangplank by Don Pietro de’ Medici, surrounded by a man with his back to the viewer and her ladies in waiting, with a group of men at the left who look on from behind a balustrade. At the top, the details of the setting are visible: the masts of the ship and rooftops of Marseilles. The bottom of the scene holds the most movement, with a boat of three men rowing through the rough sea. *The Disembarkation at Marseilles* is effectively the opposite: here Marie is *disembarking* the ship that has come into port at Marseilles. Instead of being welcomed onto the boat by a Medici, accompanied by her ladies in waiting, she moves away from the mystery Medici man aboard the boat and disembarks onto the gangplank occupied by the figures of Provence and Marseilles.

Just as Christine was led away from her accompanying ladies in waiting, so too is Marie led away from the ship and her ladies in waiting who hover behind her. Don Pietro with his arms outstretched welcoming Christine has been replaced by the figure of France welcoming Marie with open arms. The upper portions of both canvases are similar: the flying flags, masts and columns are present in both, and each is topped off with the balls of the Medici arms. The lower portion of Marie’s disembarkation scene is also where there is the most movement and drama: here Nereids, Neptune and Proteus thrash in the sea, resembling the movement and drama of the rowing men at the bottom of Christine’s embarkation. If in fact *The Disembarkation at Marseilles* is a combination of *Christine taking leave of her Family* and *Don Pietro de’ Medici welcomes Christine aboard the Capitana at Marseilles*, it is also curious to note the presence of two women who were dead at the time the canvases were completed. In *Christine taking leave of her Family*, Catherine de Médicis is the centre of attention, even though she had already died by the time this would have taken place in 1589. In *The Disembarkation at Marseilles*, Marie is accompanied by her friend, Leonora Galigai. Galigai did accompany Marie to Marseilles in 1600, but her ghostly appearance in this canvas from the 1620s serves as a reminder of her execution in 1617 at the orders of Louis XIII. Millen and Wolf consider the presence of Marie’s deceased friend and note the Netherlandish portrait tradition that included deceased relatives at joyous family gatherings, but were conspicuous by their clothing or lack of engagement with the rest of

---

575 The identity of this man, whom Millen and Wolf (1989) call “the most exasperating enigma of the cycle”, a Knight of Malta, has always been a mystery, but there is no doubt that he is significant, as he was altered the most throughout the sketches and remained precariously positioned on his own to the left. His identity has been debated by scholars for centuries, yet no secure identification has been made. He has been called the Grand Duke Ferdinando, Monsieur de Sillery, Don Pedro Gonzáles de Mendoza, all of whom could not have been a Knight of Malta, as pointed out by Millen and Wolf (1989), 67. Millen and Wolf believe that he is a reminder of the problems that the fleet commanded by the Knights of Malta caused upon Marie’s arrival in Marseilles. See Millen and Wolf, 67-68 for more information on this event and a summary of previous literature’s opinions on the identity of this man.

576 Held (1980) and Millen and Wolf (1989) both believe this figure to be Leonora Galigai.
the figures included. By including the deceased women, their presence becomes more significant. Catherine is featured as the important link that Christine already had to the Medici in Florence, while Leonora represents Marie’s childhood link to her life in Florence, and the great loss that was Leonora’s death at the hands of Louis XIII.

Scenes from the seventh entry arch may also have influenced Rubens. The theme of the seventh was modern Tuscany as successor to the ancient Etruscans. As the description reads, the first canvas is, by Jacopo Ligozzi, the *Apotheosis and crowning of Tuscany* (Figure 3.29). The Medici, surrounding the figure of Tuscany, take away her Etruscan crown and replace it with the Medici Grand Ducal crown. Tuscany hands a sceptre to the figure of Florence at the left of the canvas, while the bottom and top of the canvas are scattered with allegorical figures of river gods and other deities. Aesthetically speaking, this scene shares much with *The Birth of the Dauphin* in the Médicis Cycle. It is the grouping of the figural groups in both canvases that is interesting. Just as enthroned Tuscany is surrounded by figures on her left and her right, so too is Marie enthroned and surrounded by allegorical figures in *The Birth of the Dauphin*. When comparing the two canvases, it would seem that Cosimo de’ Medici, who crowns Tuscany, has been replaced by the figure of Cybele in *The Birth of the Dauphin*. The figure standing behind Cosimo has been replaced by the winged youth in *The Birth of the Dauphin*, just as the figure of Florence in the *Apotheosis* has been replaced by Conjugal Fecundity. The Medici figures to the right of the *Apotheosis* have been replaced in the *Birth of the Dauphin* by the two figures of Justice and Good Health. In the *Apotheosis* scene, at the bottom right is a figural group of a small child with his arms around a lamb or perhaps a goat, which has been replaced by the figure of the dog in *The Birth of the Dauphin*, while the infant child has been taken into the arms of Good Health. The backdrop of the tree and the deities in the sky above in the *Apotheosis and crowning of Tuscany* is similar to the oak tree behind Marie and Apollo and a rider on Pegasus in the sky in *The Birth of the Dauphin*.

It is, however, the second canvas of the seventh arch that is still closer formally and thematically to the Médicis Cycle. *Pope Pius V crowns Cosimo I* by Bernardino Poccetti depicts a large crowd of witnesses watching Cosimo being crowned by Pius V at the top left, set in the Sala Reggia of the Vatican, whose decorative walls fill the background of this scene. If compared to *The Coronation of Marie de Médicis* in the Médicis Cycle, including its two preparatory sketches, one has to take into consideration that the scenes are the reverse of the other: Cosimo is crowned at the left, while Marie is crowned at the right. This reverse, however, was only

---

577 Millen and Wolf (1989), 64.
578 Saslow (1996), 146.
introduced by Rubens in the second preparatory sketch and the final canvas of Marie’s coronation. In the first preparatory sketch, Marie is crowned at the left, similar to the setting of *Pope Pius V crowns Cosimo I*. However, both lead the viewer to the main event through the large crowd that begins at the far corners of the canvases. Each crowd is marked by a man whose back is to the viewer, and whose jutting arm does more to lead the viewer’s gaze into the canvas. Above the crowds in both scenes is a balcony overlooking the event: in Cosimo’s coronation this balcony at the above right is underneath a canopy and filled with unidentifiable figures, while in Marie’s coronation the balcony holds the figure of Henri IV. Both coronation scenes were important events to be included in the depiction of an entry arch dedicated to Florence and the Grand Dukes and a cycle of paintings legitimating and glorifying the rule of a Medici queen of France. For Cosimo’s crowning as Grand Duke by Pius V in 1569 was the climax of a long and arduous journey during which Cosimo sought to have his status elevated from mere duke to Grand Duke.\(^{579}\) This was finally the recognition by the pope of Cosimo’s sovereign status.

The grand success and notoriety of the 1589 wedding entry and festival guaranteed that the same team would be utilized for the planning and design of Marie de Médicis’s wedding in Florence in 1600.\(^{580}\) The 1600 celebrations following the proxy marriage of Marie de Médicis to Henri IV in Florence Cathedral on the 5th of October were again overseen by designer Bernardo Buontalenti. Based on Borghini’s 1565 formula and repeating much of the themes of the 1589 celebrations, the 1600 celebrations were a grand Medici event that was again known throughout Europe. Rubens and Peiresc would later allude to their presence in Florence in 1600 when discussing the Médicis Cycle twenty-two years later.\(^{581}\) In this letter, Peiresc goes on to describe the decorations of the wedding and following banquet celebrating Marie’s marriage to Henri. At this time in 1622, the Peiresc and Rubens correspondence was in direct reference to the selection of subjects that were to be included in the Médicis Cycle, specifically the depiction of the wedding-by-proxy. Even though the final canvas of *The Wedding-by-Proxy* in Florence reflects little of the celebrations in Florence in 1600, from this letter one can ascertain that during this discussion and deliberation, Rubens and Peiresc were looking back to the Florentine

\(^{579}\) Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor, conferred the title of duke onto Alessandro de’ Medici in 1531. Strong (1973), 170.

\(^{580}\) *“For subsequent Medici occasions, notably further dynastic weddings in 1600 and 1608, members of the same team also created a series of court entertainments that were heavily dependent on the themes, forms, and physical machinery that they had laid down in 1589. Buontalenti was again the chief designer in 1600 for the wedding of Marie de Médicis, Ferdinando’s niece, to Henri IV, a continuation of the French alliance. The themes and locales were so similar to 1589 that Roy Strong could understandably misidentify one scene design for the earlier event as belonging to 1600,”* Saslow (1996), 182.

celebrations as an example. Deborah Marrow’s study of Marie de Médicis’s patronage states that the Florentine celebrations in 1600 had a lasting visual impact on Marie and are “important for an understanding of her future taste and iconography.”\textsuperscript{582} It is therefore possible that this impact affected Rubens’s development of the Médicis Cycle, whether it was guided by the influence it had on Marie or by Rubens’s presence in Florence in 1600. It is therefore even more relevant when one compares the imagery of the festivities in 1600 to the Médicis Cycle.

Again, all of Florence was transformed in 1600 for the wedding festivities, including the facade of the Duomo, which was covered with paintings depicting Florentine and French history.\textsuperscript{583} These glorious decorations set within the theme of universal peace are described in the festival book by Buonarroti, published in Florence in 1600.\textsuperscript{584} The main spectacle was the banquet in the Salone dei Cinquecento in the Palazzo Vecchio. Marie, as the centre of attention, sat beneath a canopy, which was flanked by two paintings by Jacopo da Empoli that linked Marie’s marriage to a French king with the marriage of one of her ancestors to another French king.\textsuperscript{585} One was a depiction of Catherine de Médicis’s wedding to Henri II (Figure 3.30), and the other was a depiction of Marie’s proxy wedding to Henri IV (Figure 3.31). Each course of the banquet came with its own set of magnificent decorations.\textsuperscript{586} The banquet culminated with the musical entertainment, \textit{La contesa fra Giunone e Minerva}. The decorations for this entertainment consisted of the figures of Juno and Minerva posing on clouds, above whom a symbol of peace, manifested in a rainbow, appeared.\textsuperscript{587} Juno, pulled by two peacocks and holding a sceptre, and Minerva, drawn by a unicorn, spoke of the glorious virtues of Henri and Marie, promised future peace and prosperity for the new couple and called the banquet a “superhuman banquet of the demi-gods.”\textsuperscript{588} It was in fact this musical interlude during the banquet that Rubens and Peiresc
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\bibitem{582} Marrow (1978), 7.
\bibitem{583} Marrow (1978), 7.
\bibitem{584} Michelangelo Buonarroti il giovane, \textit{Descrizione delle felicissime nozze della Cristianissmia Maestà di Madama Maria de Medici Regina di Francia e di Navarra} (Florence: Giorgio Marescotti, 1600). Theme of universal peace, Strong (1984), 145.
\bibitem{585} Knecht, in Mulryne (2002), 28.
\bibitem{586} Strong (1984) describes some of the courses: “One course was in the form of a winter landscape with a hunting scene, another dish was the lion of Florence, which opened to shower forth \textit{fleur de lys} and then change into an eagle. There was a course on the themes of the labours of Hercules in compliment to the warrior bridegroom, and the bride had set before her an equestrian statue of her husband. The statue, together with the other edible sculpture, was the work of Pietro Tacca, the most important of Giovanni Bologna’s assistants,” 146.
\bibitem{587} Knecht, in Mulryne (2002), 28.
\bibitem{588} Marrow (1978), 7, and Strong (1984), 146, describes the details of this musical interlude: “Juno began a contention with her sister goddess by complaining of her appearance at such peaceful nuptials. Minerva replied by gesturing to the rainbow and saying that she in fact brought love and peace. Together they celebrated the virtues of this martial king and ended with predictions of huge expansions of his empire even into the Orient.”
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would later specifically discuss in the letter from October 1622. This, it would seem, was the beginning of Minerva’s role in Marie’s patronage. Marie’s identification with Minerva is especially visible in the Médicis Cycle in which Minerva took on a leading role. In the Médicis Cycle, Minerva served as Marie’s aid in times of need and an exemplar of Marie’s wisdom. Minerva appears in the Médicis Cycle in five of the canvases, and Marie appears twice in the guise of Minerva. Juno is equally as prevalent and significant in the Médicis Cycle, appearing in four canvases, with Marie appearing in one canvas in the guise of Juno. It is in fact Jupiter and Juno who begin the Médicis Cycle as they oversee the Fates spinning Marie’s destiny (Figure 3.32). Juno, like Minerva, becomes another guise for Marie. In Rubens’s allegorical portrayal of Marie’s life, Marie takes on the virtues of both Minerva and Juno, making her not only blessed by these deities, but also therefore worthy of the praise befitting the goddesses. Millen and Wolf remark again on the power of Juno’s presence in the Cycle: “She is...her essence as royal consort.” In other words, Marie becomes the Juno to Henri’s Jupiter. Much like Minerva, Juno’s traits were called on in Marie’s times of need in the Médicis Cycle, specifically when she was to be the dutiful wife to Henri’s Jupiter. It is therefore fitting that for The Marriage consummated in Lyons, the imagery is strikingly reminiscent of the descriptions of La contesa fra Giunone e Minerva. Although Minerva is absent, the appearance of Henri IV and Marie de Médicis in the guises of Jupiter and Juno to illustrate the moment that they were finally united in Lyons the 9th of December 1600. Just as Juno and Minerva appeared, Henri and Marie (Juno) hover on clouds above the personification of Lyons in her chariot. Marie is accompanied by Juno’s chariot and peacocks, similar accoutrements to Juno’s in La Contesa, while Henri is accompanied by Jupiter’s signifying eagle. Overhead, just as in La Contesa, a rainbow appears to symbolize the peace and prosperity that this marriage will bring.

590 Millen and Wolf (1989), 43.
593 Millen and Wolf (1989), 27, go into more detail about the Juno-Marie identification: “In the case of Juno, by one of those intellectual shifts that characterize the Flemish painter’s better work, the goddess is assimilated to the queen, becomes her surrogate, her other self, her emblematic identity. Thus no facile comparison of Maria with Juno (that could be left for Malherbe and his kind) but a profounder, more thoughtful, more thought-provoking metamorphosis of queen into Juno-as-wife (as into those other divine essences to which she was emblematically associated, as will appear later). It is an avatar that applies to Maria de’ Medici only as royal consort, and it is not without its tang of vinegar: both wives, Juno and Maria, immortal and mortal, had to put up with an arrogantly philandering husband who may have been an effective ruler but was always a foolish lover, never learning the most elementary caution and manly reserve, no matter how often burnt or burning.”
594 La contesa fra Giunone e Minerva by Giovanni Battista Guarini and Emilio de’ Cavalieri, Buonarroti, Buonarroti (1600).
The Médicis Cycle has thus far been discussed here in relation to Florentine entries and nuptial celebrations, yet what should also be considered are the French entries in Lyons and Avignon that greeted Marie, and above all the entry into Paris that was commissioned and designed in 1610 but never took place. For the purpose of this study, the Avignon and Lyons entries will be only briefly reviewed because these entries had nothing to do with Henri IV; he had no influence on their commission and execution. However, the entry into Paris in 1610 was commissioned by Henri IV, which makes it more relevant to not only Marie herself and her public image, but also to the Médicis Cycle.

As Marie arrived in France and made her way from Marseilles to Lyons, where she would meet Henri IV for the first time, she stopped in Avignon on the 19th of November 1600, and was greeted with a lavish entry. However, this entry was not entirely meant for her. As Henri had relatively recently become a Catholic in 1593, there was still much tension between him and the Jesuits.⁵⁹⁵ A Jesuit had attempted to assassinate Henri in 1595, and from there after relations between Henri and the Jesuits remained strained. When it was announced that Marie and Henri would be travelling through Avignon, a papal enclave, on their way to Paris, the Jesuits of Avignon took this as an opportunity to make amends to Henri.⁵⁹⁶ Thus, the *Labyrinthe Royale de l’Hercule Gaulois triumphant* was devised, an entry almost solely dedicated to Henri IV.⁵⁹⁷ However, Henri was called to war with the Duke of Savoy and could not make it to Avignon, and Marie entered this Henri-themed entry on her own. It was too late for it to be changed for Marie, for, as Alison Saunders notes, it “carried too important a political message for it to be changed simply because he himself was not present.”⁵⁹⁸ The programme was designed by André Valladier, and consisted of seven arches, each outlining the virtues and
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⁵⁹⁵ Henri IV succeeded the throne in 1589, and he was largely opposed for being Protestant. It was only in 1593 after promising to convert to Catholicism, that he was fully recognized as King of France. There was, however, widespread distrust of his conversion. The Jesuits were some of the most vocal and active of his opponents. For more information see Victor Tapié, *France in the Age of Louis XIII and Richelieu* (New York: Praeger, 1974).


victories of the king and paralleling these with the Labours of Hercules. Marie was modestly referenced in a genealogy of the Houses of France and of the Medici and in a few of the arches representing the hoped for peace and prosperity brought by these nuptials.599

Although Marie’s entry into Lyons serves as the subject of one of the canvases in the Médicis Cycle, the entry was not as elaborate as that in Avignon. Henri IV was again absent for the triumphal entry staged by Lyons. This was the city, however, in which Marie did finally meet her new spouse. Known from the programme devised by Pierre Matthieu, the entry consisted of six arches and numerous sculptural features, each inscribed with verses taken from well-known writers.600 The arches featured painted canvases, with scenes inspired by Blaise de Vigenère’s translation of Philostratus, Les Images.601 The entry’s themes were again classical and allegorical, however, not much is known of the meanings of the allegories and symbolism. Pierre Matthieu’s text is often interrupted by tangents detailing Henri’s military history, possibly a consequence of the hastiness in which the entry was devised and Pierre Matthieu’s main role as an historian rather than designer.602 Each arch was decorated with large canvases depicting French battles and statues of great ancient and modern men: Alexander, Caesar and Hercules, St. Louis, Henri III and Henri IV; statues also appeared of ancient gods and their virtues: Saturn, Orpheus, Apollo, Mercury and Minerva; Courage, Generosity, Magnanimity and Renown.603 Again, Marie was largely neglected in favour of honouring Henri IV and his military prowess. One of Marie’s few acknowledgements in the decorations of the Lyons entry was a history of Florence honouring her dynasty and highlighting her legitimacy as Henri’s new queen.

The entry into Avignon by Valladier was such a success that when it came time to devise the plan for Marie’s entry into Paris in 1610, it was his work that was consulted.604 Henri sent a letter on the 9th of February 1610 requesting an entry to be designed and constructed in honour of “the very high and very illustrious princess Marie de Médicis” to coincide with her coronation.605 Three days later, the Provost des Marchands et Eschevins responded to Henri’s letter agreeing to devise “the most excellent entry that has ever been made.”606 Mathurin

599 "Underlying the symbolism lay a complex of ideas linking the king’s forthcoming nuptials to the current political situation,” Mulryne (2004), 29.
600 Pierre Matthieu, L’Entrée de très-grand princesse Marie de Médicis en la ville de Lyons..., (Lyon: Thibaud Aucellin, 1600). “The monuments of the entry itself were inscribed with verses and maxims taken from Lipsius, Gabriel Symeoni, Du Bartas, Jean Bertant, and Justus Caesar Scaliger…” Mulryne (2004), 31.
603 Mulryne and Goldring (2002), 38.
604 Goldring and Mulryne (2002), 34.
605 Tueley (1883-1921), 426-504.
606 Tueley (1883-1921), 426-504.
Régnier, a court poet, was to develop the symbolism and allegory of the entry and provide the accompanying text, while Louis Métezeau, the architect of the king, and Tommaso Francini, his engineer, were to be in charge of the physical details, along with Guillaume, the master mason. All gathered to construct an entry to celebrate the “happy fecundity of this sacred marriage.” While this entry never actually took place, it is well documented. The Paris Town Councillors had every detail recorded and Régnier’s text saved so as to preserve the magnificence that had been created and to allow the entry to still be shared with its subjects despite its cancellation. It is from this work that the details of the nine arches, three temples and fifteen fixtures can be discerned and compared to the Médicis Cycle. Possibly this was given to Rubens to guide him. In the interval between 1610 and 1622, Marie had been made regent, ruled alongside her son Louis XIII, been exiled, “forgiven”, and returned to Paris, yet she still had not been formally welcomed into Paris. The themes of the 1610 entry include majesty, motherhood, legitimacy and marriage, many of the themes that were still relevant to Marie in 1622 that appear in the Médicis Cycle. As the introduction to the 1610 entry reads,

...though His Majesty having all the satisfied contentment of his subjects if he made some more assurances of peace by any continuous line from a legitimate marriage, and allied to this effect is the very high and very illustrious princess Marie de Médicis, fit for the rare and incomparable virtues of a king so great and magnanimous.

The symbolism of the 1610 entry thus revolves around Henri’s and Marie's virtues and the peace and prosperity their union brought to France, not unlike the previously discussed symbolism of the first ten canvases of the Médicis Cycle. The dates of the subjects depicted in the first ten canvases of the Médicis Cycle end in 1610 with Marie’s coronation, which took place two days before the entry was to take place. It is therefore interesting to note how similar the symbolism of the 1610 entry and the first ten canvases are, as the canvases in the Médicis Cycle depict major events in Marie's life up to 1610 and the entry reflects Marie's time as queen up to 1610 when it was devised.

607 Also listed as involved are Monsieur Christon, the king’s professor of Latin and Greek, and Monsieur Nicolas Sanguyn, the Lord of Treon.
608 Tueley (1883-1921), 426-504.
609 The details of the entry are preserved in Alexandre Tueley, ed., Registres et Deliberations de la ville de Paris, no. 11 (Paris: 1883-1921), 426-504. Mulryne and Goldring maintain that the Paris Town Council did not want to see its money go to waste: “The Town Council had expended so much money on the preparations that it wished to leave a comprehensive record of its generosity”, pg. 34.
610 Tueley (1883-1921), 426-504.
The 1610 entry begins at the Porte Saint-Denis with an arch "Dedicated to the king, restorer of the State, Founder of Peace, and Conservator of the Public Good." Henri is praised here as "the father of the country and the joy of his people, the saviour of France after civil wars."611 This is the beginning of Henri praised by his alter ego Jupiter. He appears here as Jupiter Stator and Jupiter Conservator. This is unusual, for as, Millen and Wolf state, "In devices and imprese, Henri was most often represented as the Gallic Hercules from whom his House of Navarre claimed descent, but on occasion he consented to assume the guise of the king of the gods."612 This identification of Henri as Jupiter in the 1610 entry is intriguing as one of the other rare occasions in which Henri was identified as Jupiter was in the Médicis Cycle. In The Marriage Consummated in Lyons, Henri appears as Jupiter on his eagle, accompanied by Marie as Juno with her peacocks. On this arch, Henri was to appear as Jupiter Stator (the Steadfast) with a pike in his hand, a thunderbolt in his left hand and an eagle at his feet, as he is found according to the ancient Latin medals, just as in The Marriage consummated in Lyons.613 As the stanza by Régnier describing Henri as Jupiter in the second arch reads, "What he [Jupiter] does in the sky, you [Henri IV] do on Earth."614 Alongside these Jupiters is Eunomia, the goddess of good government. According to Bardon, a portrait by Isaac Fournier of Marie de Médicis as Justice, now known only from the Thomas de Leu engraving from 1609 (Figure 3.33), served as the inspiration for Eunomia in the 1610 entry.615 In the engraving, Marie, dressed in a garment decorated with fleur-de-lis, is enthroned holding a pair of scales in her left hand and a sword in her right hand. According to the 1610 description, Eunomia will hold in her right hand a pair of scales to represent the sincerity of French laws, and in her left hand a golden sword; the sword according to the hieroglyphic letters of the Egyptians signifies...abundance..., and gold is the virtue of a noble and generous heart.... The golden sword is also a mark of peace.... The Queen will be represented in the guise of this goddess.616

Millen and Wolf, who make note of this aesthetic relationship, go on to compare this image of Marie from 1609 and the depiction of Eunomia in 1610 to Marie in The Felicity of the Regency of the Médicis Cycle: "Though it can be objected that in Rubens's painting Maria holds not a sword but a golden main de justice, yet by assonance with the portrait, the engraving, and the
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triumphal entry text, one senses some sort of association...”\textsuperscript{617} Although there are detailed differences, the association of Marie with Eunomia would be fitting, as Eunomia represents good government and that would be also the message of \textit{The Felicity of the Regency}, and of the Médicis Cycle as a whole.

Henri IV and Marie de Médicis are transformed into the figures of the Sun and Cybele in the fourth arch, “Dedicated to Their Majesties. On the Abundance and Fertility of this Kingdom.” According to the accompanying text, they are represented as such because “by their marriage [we] were therein filled with perpetual felicity.”\textsuperscript{618} Turret-crowned Cybele is holding a sceptre in her hand to signify her power over the earth, with a lion at her feet to represent the power she wields over even princes and kings. The Sun glances at Cybele, symbolically offering his warmth, “and she receives his influences, widely producing all types of plants and flowers through his heat.”\textsuperscript{619} Cybele, in fact, features as one of Marie’s alter-egos in the Médicis Cycle. As soon as Marie gives birth to Louis XIII, in \textit{The Birth of the Dauphin}, Marie’s role changes. She is no longer identified with Juno, that mythological symbol of a good wife. Her role now is that of Mother. So too is the symbolism in the 1610 entry when Marie is celebrated as the mother of the future of France. From the marriage of Henri and Marie, peace and prosperity have been born in France, as have six royal children. Henri is the Sun, from which all things grow, while his wife Marie is Mother Earth, fed by the Sun: “That is to say, by their marriage were germinated in this kingdom all kinds of goods and therein filled with perpetual felicity.”\textsuperscript{620} When Cybele appears in \textit{The Birth of the Dauphin}, Marie becomes the \textit{Magna Mater} of France who benefitted from the rays of the Sun [Henri IV], who is perhaps represented by Apollo, the Sun god, who rises in the sky above Marie. Marie’s appearance as Cybele appears again in the 1610 entry in the decorations for the second temple, “Dedicated to the Queen. For the Chastity and Marital Modesty,” modelled on the Temple of Vesta.\textsuperscript{621} Here, the virtue of chastity has been applied to Marie through Cybele and her relationship with the story of Claudia, a Vestal Virgin.\textsuperscript{622} It is also believed that in Rubens’s Médicis Cycle, another Vestal Virgin was to be utilized to symbolize Marie’s faithfulness to her husband: “Il Flamineo.”\textsuperscript{623} “Il Flamineo,” perhaps referring to a Roman priest, was connected by Emil Kieser in 1942 to a drawing of the Roman tale of Tuccia
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(Figure 3.34) who proved her chastity by carrying water in a sieve. This connection has been rejected by Millen and Wolf on the basis that it would be outrageous for Marie, mother of six children, to have been equated with a Vestal Virgin. They claim that "the equation of Maria de’ Medici, whose proudest boast and strongest claim on French gratitude was that she mothered six children, with a vestal virgin is so preposterous as to be unacceptable even as a Baroque conceit." However, this had been done before, in the 1610 entry through the Vestal Virgin Claudia’s story of her fight to prove her chastity, similar to that of Tuccia. It is therefore possible that Rubens was simply using the same trope again in 1622 to fill the subjects concerning Marie’s time as wife and mother, to identify her faithfulness and chastity to only Henri IV, as was the purpose in 1610. As Mulryne explains the 1610 temple’s use of Vestal Virgin imagery, "Ingeniously, the poet works the argument so that Marie de Médicis’s ‘amour celeste and pudique’ (‘celestial and pure love’) is enflamed only by the king’s sun [of the previous arch]." This could also have been Rubens’s strategy in 1622. Kieser believes that the Vestal Tuccia drawing was rejected because of its potential to be connected to an attempt to prove Marie’s innocence in the conspiracy to murder Henri IV, which some doubted 1610. This is possible, and the subject was substituted with The Consignment of the Regency, a much more powerful image aiding in the conviction of Marie as the worthy successor of Henri.

The succession of the future king, the dauphin, Louis XIII, is the subject of the ninth station, “On the Grandeur of Paris.” A ship sailing on calm seas, representing the ship of state, had been constructed and placed on a rock, guided by the Dauphin. The ship’s mast was replaced with the figure of Minerva, to represent that “...the prince the Dauphin who governs our hopes and that we receive certain assurances of peace, that under the wise government of the king, represented by the figure of Minerva, for his admirable prudence and incomparable valour.” Meaning that here the future ship of state that will be guided by the Dauphin receives its wise guidance from Henri IV, represented by Minerva. However, when Louis XIII does come of age in the Médicis Cycle, his ship of state is instead guided by the wisdom of his mother, Marie, whose alter ego in the Cycle is Minerva. It is possible that the figure of Minerva/Henry in the entry has been replaced by Marie/Minerva in the Cycle, as she wisely guides Louis XIII’s ship of state, accompanied by the figures of France, Prudence, Fortitude, Piety, Justice and Concord in The Coming of Age of Louis XIII.

---
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The 1610 entry decorations come to a close with the third temple, “Dedicated to Their Majesties on the Eternity of Their Empire and Immortality of Their Virtues.” The eternity of the empire of Henri and Marie is represented by the figure of Eternity with her symbol, the serpent biting its own tail, handing a sceptre to the King, Queen and their children, with these words written below the tableau: EMPIRE WITHOUT END.\textsuperscript{628} The reverse of this tableau, that is the last image of the 1610 entry, is the figure of Minerva Triumphant, seated on a pile of arms and trophies of peace and war, above which hovers figures with palms, laurels and other similar objects.\textsuperscript{629} That description could accurately also describe \textit{The Queen Triumphant}, the final canvas in the Médicis Cycle, in which Marie, in the guise of Minerva Victrix, stands on a pile of arms and trophies of war, holding a victory, and crowned with a laurel wreath. As Marie’s power in 1610 was in the hands of her still-living husband, Minerva symbolically still remained an ambiguous triumphant figure in 1610. However, in 1622, after the death of Henri IV, her time as regent, her exile and return to France, Marie is now Triumphant Minerva. The last line of the entry reads as if it could also be the addendum to the final scene of the Médicis Cycle, \textit{The Queen Triumphant}, “There are their virtues engraved and imprinted as well as in the hearts of men. Rule...in lengthy peace and continuous fecundity!”\textsuperscript{630} The MS Baluze indicates that \textit{The Queen Triumphant} was to feature the line HIC EST ILLA, “meaning that here is the greatest queen on earth, the rarest virtue of the world which has never had any like her in all the centuries of posterity.”\textsuperscript{631} As previously discussed in reference to the placement of \textit{The Queen Triumphant} and the portraits of the queen’s parents, \textit{The Queen Triumphant} forms the peak of the triumphal entry that is the Médicis Cycle. Millen and Wolf claim this image is at odds with Marie’s current position as Dowager Queen with little power remaining. However, this is fitting when considering the Médicis Cycle as Marie’s long awaited for entry, for this was always how her entry was to end – Minerva Triumphant: Marie Triumphant.

Festivals and entries often inspired permanent art.\textsuperscript{632} The aim of the \textit{Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle} was to legitimate and glorify Marie de Médicis as a worthy wife of Henri IV, the mother of the dauphin, the legitimate regent for Louis XIII, and successful ruler during her regency. Here it has been demonstrated that Rubens was closely aware of a powerful living tradition of a specifically Medicean way of recalling and proclaiming the power and virtue of the prince and his surrogates. Rubens must have considered the entry tradition when devising a suitable pictorial biography for Marie, especially when one considers the fact that he also served
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as the designer of triumphal entries. Rubens arrived in Paris in February 1625 to deliver the final canvases of the Médicis Cycle. Although initially not commissioned for this purpose, it was decided that the Médicis Cycle would be unveiled in conjunction with a banquet celebrating the wedding of Marie’s daughter, Henrietta Maria, to Charles I of England in 1625. Henrietta Maria was married to Charles I by proxy in Paris on the 11th of May 1625. The marriage was later lauded during a banquet held by Cardinal Richelieu in the West Gallery of the Luxembourg Palace, the new home of the Médicis Cycle. The Florentine resident in Paris, Giovanni Battista Gondi, wrote that the banquet took place “at that noble Palace, that for the first time you see adorned with rich hangings and of quantities of royal ornaments of the greatest splendour than ever before a King or Queen has so far seen in this Kingdom....” At the marriage festivities, Marie was praised as “the mother of three of the most powerful sovereigns in Christendom, trium regum mater.” The glorious debut of the Médicis Cycle was thus a nuptial celebration, much like those triumphal entries into Florence that celebrated the arrival of the new bride. The celebration of Henrietta Maria’s marriage would have been two-fold: on the one hand it would celebrate Henrietta Maria’s new role as bride to the king of England, and on the other hand it celebrated Marie’s power in contracting advantageous marriages for her children and thus becoming “the Mother of Europe.” This was an epithet which had once been applied to her ancestor Catherine de Médicis. It is therefore suitable that a cycle of paintings glorifying Marie’s “illustrious life and heroic deeds” should be unveiled for such a political triumph. The Médicis Cycle’s triumphal-entry like imagery perfectly fits into the event that coincided with its unveiling. While entries generally had a much broader audience that included members of the court, the subjects of the sovereign and the wider audience who experienced the entry through printed sources, the Médicis Cycle’s intended audience were those whom Marie felt needed to see its message most. These included her son, the French court, and visiting foreign dignitaries. These are the ones from whom she demanded a certain respect that she felt had been missing as far back as her first uneventful entry into Paris in 1600. Unfortunately, however, as R.J. Knecht observed of festivals and entries, “Magnificence could not always secure political success.”
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Chapter 4

*Le Temps Revient: Marie de Médicis’s Image during her Second Exile*

The image that Marie de Médicis created for herself through the Luxembourg Palace and its interior decoration also defined her from 1630, when she was exiled for a second time. The Médicis Cycle by Rubens was created as a reaction to Marie’s first exile in 1617. It was Marie’s manifesto of power as she returned to the King’s Council in 1620, a pictorial message for her detractors, and the image that she wanted to promote of herself. It thus became Marie’s public identity as she was banished from France a second time by her son, Louis XIII, and fled to the Spanish Netherlands, the Dutch Republic and England. The Médicis Cycle became part of Marie’s apologia. Marie’s polemicists, Jean Puget de la Serre and Mathieu de Morgues, who followed her into exile, used themes and imagery from the Médicis Cycle to praise her throughout her European exile. This chapter will examine how Marie’s patronage at the Luxembourg Palace, specifically the Médicis Cycle, formed the image she promoted of herself during her second and final exile.

After almost ten years of peace between Marie de Médicis and her son, Louis XIII, their relationship eventually became undermined by Cardinal Richelieu’s growing power within French politics in 1630. This all came to a head over the 10th and 11th of November 1630, known as the Day of the Dupes. Marie and Richelieu disagreed over the action to be taken against the Habsburgs. Richelieu wanted to ally France with Protestant forces against the Catholic Hapsburgs, while Marie opted instead for peace and a Franco-Spanish alliance. Marie believed her position as mother of the king made her advice more pertinent than Richelieu’s. However, Louis XIII was swayed by Richelieu’s convincing argument that war against the Habsburgs was the best decision for France. Louis attempted to convince his mother that this was the right decision, but she refused to agree with Richelieu, demanding that Louis banish him. Instead, Louis placed his own mother under house arrest in Compiègne. Amidst rumours that Richelieu wanted to send Marie back to Italy, Marie again escaped from house arrest and absconded to the Spanish Netherlands on the 18th of July 1631. Marie continued to blame Richelieu for driving

---
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a wedge between herself and her son. When attempting to negotiate her return to France, she insisted to Claude de Bullion, Richelieu's superintendent of finance,

that she was the mother of a king who was suffering marvellously and that all his affairs were falling into disorder. I found her extremely angry...because he [Louis XIII] wants to honour and respect his mother, but he will assist and defend the Cardinal in and against all things.641

As Louis's opinion of Richelieu remained unchanged, Marie had no choice but to remain in exile.

Marie arrived in Antwerp, in the Spanish Netherlands, in September 1631. Although an exile, Marie did not stop meddling in French politics. In fact, as an exile, it is possible that she was even more of a threat to Richelieu. She was welcomed into the court of the enemy, the Spanish Habsburgs, and her entourage included the heir to the throne of France, Gaston, duc d'Orléans, her second son.642 Marie and Gaston used exile as a political manoeuvre to gain support against Richelieu.643 In a letter to Louis XIII of 21 July 1631, Marie defended her position in exile and pleaded with him to ally himself with her against Richelieu. She wrote that she went to the Spanish Netherlands “to make union and concord between you and my son d'Orléans, which he [Richelieu] had already destroyed in your soul with his artifices.... I have nothing which is more dear to me than being useful in your service.”644 It should not be forgotten that, Louis XIII aside, she was the mother of the Queen of England, the Queen of Spain and the Duchess of Savoy, and thus still held some political sway. She could still influence an alliance between the Catholic powers of France and Spain, especially as she fled to the Spanish Netherlands. While there, she deployed her agents to various European courts in an attempt to negotiate peace with her son and arrange other possible exile hosts.645 However, her activity was viewed suspiciously by not only her enemies in France, but also her hosts in the Spanish Netherlands. Her status as a political exile afforded her no security as she maintained her right to interfere with French politics.

Politics were not Marie's only concern. She still struggled with issues of her status and public image, just as she had when she returned to Paris in 1620. The question remained in France and in Europe: What is Marie's role now that Louis XIII is of age and no longer in need of

642 Louis XIII had yet to have his first child with Anne of Austria. Louis XIV was not born until 1638, leaving Gaston as the heir to the French throne during his mother's exile.
643 Toby Osborne, “‘Chimeres, Monopolies, and Stratagems’: French Exiles in the Spanish Netherlands during the Thirty Years’ War”, The Seventeenth Century 15 (2000), 165: As Toby Osborne has observed, “Both Marie de Medici and Gaston, after all, viewed temporary exile in the Spanish Netherlands primarily as a tool for securing political advantages in France, with the implication that their loyalties were not with their hosts.”.
a regent? Although Marie seems sure of her status as the Queen Mother and all the power she believes that entails, others do not. It was difficult for her hosts to know how accommodating they should be to this controversial Queen Mother, whose regal titles were uncertain outside of France. Therefore, throughout her exile, it was imperative that Marie publicised her position. She did this by promoting an image of herself that highlighted the roles that made her more worthy of a place at Louis XIII’s side than Richelieu: wife, widow, mother and regent. When Marie returned to Paris in 1620 following her first exile, she commissioned the *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle* as a message to all of her detractors confirming her power as queen mother, widow of the king, former regent for Louis XIII, and current member of the Royal Council. Following her second exile in 1630, the issues remained the same, and thus the desired message remained the same. Rubens had already established a strong image for Marie, and her polemicists who followed her into exile borrowed from Rubens’s creation. Now, however, they had a much larger audience than the one to which her detractors had been exposed to in the *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*. In an attempt to validate her role as the wronged queen mother of France and the legitimate her authority as the widow of Henri IV and the mother of kings, major themes and imagery of the Médicis Cycle were utilised.

Marie de Médicis’s polemicists who followed her into exile and were largely in charge of promoting her image were Jean Puget de la Serre and Matthieu de Morgues. A Jesuit priest, Morgues, the abbé de Saint-Germain, was first employed in the French court as a chaplain for Marguerite de Valois. It could be said that he majored in “wronged women” before he eventually became part of Marie’s entourage around 1617 and becoming her chaplain in 1620. Soon after, Morgues became Marie’s pamphleteer. The early works Morgues produced in support of Marie during her first exile were *La Restauration de l’Estat* (1617), *Le Manifeste de la royn e mère* (1619) and *Consolation aux bons François, vrais et fidélles serviteurs du roy, sur la manutention et restauration de l’Estat* (1618). Morgues’s first success was a pamphlet that included an attack against those who removed the queen mother from her children and an argument against the favourite of Louis XIII, Luynes: *Vérités chrétiennes* (1620), more commonly known as *Manifeste d’Angers*. At this time Marie and Richelieu were still close, and therefore Morgues often wrote in support of Richelieu as well, such as *Advis d’un théologien sans passion sur plusieurs libelles imprimez depuis peu en Allemagne* (1626). This would all change, however, when Richelieu, in a power struggle, turned against Marie.
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Morgues would ultimately take the side of the Queen Mother and join her in exile in the Spanish Netherlands. Morgues was so powerful with his pen that Richelieu found him a threat and often requested in the negotiations following Marie’s exile that Morgues be returned to France. Morgues’s best-known defence of the Queen Mother during her second exile was *Très-humble, très veritable et très-importante remonstrance du Roy* of 1631. In this pamphlet, Morgues again defends the queen and reminds Louis XIII of everything his mother did for him:

> [She] who has the most notable interest in the preservation of your life and our glory; who is the widow of that incomparable Henri the Great who made you a man and a king with her: She who defended you when you were a minor against your enemies...the Mother who loved you more than she loved the womb from which you emerged. ...A queen who is the greatest princess of Europe, by her marriage, her birth, through her children, her alliances, her ventures, and in the conduct of her person. Ah, poor Marie, you who are the widow and mother of great Kings.”

It was important that Morgues emphasized Marie’s role as mother of Louis XIII and how that made her eligible for a certain relationship with the king and his government. As Morgues wrote for Marie in a letter to the Parlement of Paris on the 6th of January 1632, "To be a woman, to be a Queen, to be the Mother of the King, [is] to have the interest that I have in the good of France for me and my children.” In his 1637 *Diverses pieces pour la defense de la royne mere du roy tres-chrestien Louis XIII*, Morgues again pleads with Louis XIII to see the error of his ways in punishing his own mother. Interestingly, Rubens produced the title-page (Figure 4.1) for this publication and borrowed heavily from his work in the Médicis Cycle. In the upper left of the title page is an eagle with lightning bolts, representing Jupiter, who was used by Rubens in the Médicis Cycle to symbolise Henri IV. It is curious that Rubens used Jupiter as an avatar for Henri IV, as Henri was usually compared to Hercules, from whom his family claimed to descend. When he was identified with Jupiter, it was almost always in relation to Marie as Juno, Jupiter’s wife. Therefore, the eagle with lightning bolts here most likely also alludes to Henri IV. A dove with an olive branch sits on the right representing peace. In the middle, sits a woman crowned with turrets, probably Cybele, the Magna Mater, with two lions beside her. Marie had two alter egos in the Médicis Cycle: Juno and Cybele. Juno represented Marie as the wife of Henri IV, whereas Cybele represented Marie as the mother of Louis XIII and his siblings. It has been suggested that the two lions sitting on either side of Marie represent Louis XIII and Marie herself. However, I would suggest, especially considering Rubens’s own identification of Cybele with Marie, that this figure of Cybele in fact represents Marie herself as the Magna Mater, the mother of kings, represented by the two lions. Below Cybele, on the left, Time embraces a young naked woman, an image extremely similar to Time unveils the Truth (Figure 4.2) in the Médicis Cycle. In this image, Time also embraces a young woman underneath an image of the
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reconciliation of Marie and Louis. It suggests that eventually, through time, Louis saw the error of his ways, which is again the message of this title-page. On the right of the title page, Time holds Medusa upside down, getting rid of vanity and destruction. Morgues remained loyal to Marie throughout her exile until her death in 1642 and after. He wrote and published Marie's funeral oration: Les Deux Faces de la Mort de Marie de Médicis of 1643. Marie again was represented as the wounded mother: “Thus Marie de Médicis is dead, Queen of France, mother or mother-in-law of three kings […] Thus ended her bitter life, the mother and grandmother of so many princes and princesses.” This time, however, she was compared to the ultimate mother in Christian terms: the Virgin Mary. Morgues likens Marie’s struggles with the state of France and her regency’s role in saving France with the Virgin Mary’s saving of humanity. Both Marys acted out of love for their sons. As Crawford wrote of Morgues’ comparison of Marie and the Virgin Mary, “She [Marie] thus joined all women who suffered for their children in the company of the Virgin.”

Mathieu de Morgues was accompanied into exile with Marie by Marie’s historiographer, Jean Puget de la Serre. A successful author and playwright, de la Serre continued to work in the service of Marie before returning to France in 1639. Upon his return, he was welcomed back by Louis XIII and Richelieu, eventually becoming Gaston d’Orléans’s librarian. De la Serre’s role during Marie’s exile was largely overtaken by his work in producing the books that commemorated the entries of the Queen Mother into the Spanish Netherlands (1631), the Dutch Republic (1638) and England (1638). These publications were made in conjunction with some of the most prolific engravers of the time, such as Cornelius Galle (1576-1650) and Wenceslaus Hollar (1607-1677). Again, de la Serre was following a clear agenda in portraying Marie, one that was extremely similar to Rubens’s Médicis Cycle. The image that de la Serre created for Marie in the entries copied that of Marie that she herself had promoted.

When Marie escaped from France in 1631, she sought refuge in Brussels at the court of the Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia in the Spanish Netherlands. The Spanish Netherlands was a popular destination for religious and political exiles in the seventeenth century. Marie explained in her own words why she chose the Spanish Netherlands, “I regarded this place as a nearby haven, where I could flee the storm that was unsettling me.” In addition, however, Marie found an ally in Isabella. Mathieu de Morgues explained why Marie would choose to turn to someone like the Archduchess Isabella: “where could the afflicted widow of a king go than to a widowed princess [Isabella] who is amongst the most virtuous ever borne by the world?” Marie and Isabella were both widows and powerful females who ruled alongside and in the

660 Mathieu de Morgues, Les Deux Faces de la Mort de Marie de Médicis (Antwerp: Plantin Press, 1643), 35.
661 Crawford (2004), 95.
663 Osborne (2000), 154, “Given its geo-strategic significance and its semi-separation from the Spanish composite monarchy, the Spanish Netherlands was ideally placed for exiles who wished to remain in contact with their home states while negotiating a settlement or encouraging disorder within those states.”
664 Marie de Médicis, Declaration de la Reyne Mere du Roy tres-Chrestien contenant les raisons de sa sortie des pays-bas (London: George Thomason, 1638), 3.
665 Morgues (1637), 43.
instead of their husbands. After the death of her husband, the Archduke Albert of Austria, in 1621, Isabella was appointed Governor of the Netherlands. She was also one of Rubens’s most important patrons and employed him as one of her political emissaries.\footnote{For more on Isabella’s patronage of Rubens and their political relationship, see Kristin Lohse Belkin, \textit{Rubens} (London: Phaidon, 1998), 96-97, 179, 200-209, 233, 297.} It has been suggested that Isabella was perhaps the influential force in Marie’s choice of Rubens for the Médicis Cycle.\footnote{Belkin (1998), 175.} Despite some initial misgivings, Isabella warmly welcomed Marie and her very large entourage.\footnote{Isabella was worried what the political consequences would be in welcoming Marie de Medici to the Spanish Netherlands and how it would affect their relationship with France, even worrying that Richelieu would use it as an excuse to attack the Spanish Netherlands. For more on this, see Osborne (2000), 149-150 and 156-157.} Although there was some lingering confusion about Marie’s status, Isabella initially welcomed her as a visiting sovereign with all the pomp and ceremony that entailed and significantly housed her in the Coudenberg Palace, the seat of the archdukes.\footnote{Isabella’s nephew, Philip IV of Spain, held clear opinions about Marie’s status, as Toby Osborne (2000) reports, “June 1632. It was at this point, however, that the regime in Madrid responded, diverging from Isabella’s policy of implicit recognition of Marie de Medici’s sovereignty. The Spanish were certainly willing to pay the queen mother a pension while she was in the Catholic Netherlands (as they were for Gaston), but they were less forthcoming on the matter of diplomatic recognition. In a revealing letter to his aunt, Philip IV argued that while Marie de Medici had once been the ruling queen of France, [her agent] could not be commissioned as an accredited ambassador because she had no ‘sovereign status’”, 157. See also, Mansel and Riotte (2011), 24.}

Jean Puget de la Serre gives us an account of her entry into Brussels in \textit{Histoire curieuse de tout ce qui c’est passé a l’entree de la reyne mere du roy treschrestien dans les villes des Pays Bas}, which documents her entries into Antwerp and Mons as well.\footnote{Jean Puget de la Serre, \textit{Histoire curieuse de tout ce qui c’est passé a l’entree de la reyne mere du roy treschrestien dans les villes des Pays Bas} (Antwerp: Plantin Press, 1632).} De la Serre wrote that Marie’s arrival in Brussels was welcomed “with as much astonishment as pleasure [with the ringing of the bell of Saint Nicholas for two hours], which never sounded other than for the entries of sovereign princes.”\footnote{de la Serre (1632), 19.} The title-page (Figure 4.3) of the pamphlet depicts the two widows, Marie and Isabella, embracing, illustrating Morgues’s quotation, “where could the afflicted widow of a king go than to a widowed princess [Isabella] who is amongst the most virtuous ever borne by the world?”\footnote{Morgues (1637), 43.} Marie is the more dominant figure, symbolising her assumed stature in Brussels. She overshadows Isabella, who is the archduchess of this realm and who was offering a safe-haven to Marie, not the other way around, as the image would suggest. It is another example of the ego of Marie, even as she was forced to flee France. Isabella, dressed in her Franciscan habit, rests her left foot on an orb, denoting her regal status in the Spanish Netherlands. To the left of Marie, Justice, Architecture and Minerva each offer Marie a crown. On the right, a winged victory points above to a laurel crown being handed to Marie from the heavens. By including the three closed crowns and the laurel crown being offered to Marie, her royal status is confirmed. This scene is reminiscent of \textit{The Flight from Blois} (Figure 4.4) in the Médicis Cycle, in which Marie is also seeking security and comfort in the arms of her allies. Minerva is present in both images, a figure who was frequently used in Marie’s imagery denoting her wisdom as regent. She appears in the Médicis Cycle whenever Marie needs...
guidance, wisdom or protection, as in *The Flight from Blois*. In *The Flight from Blois*, Minerva embraces Marie and guides her to safety as she escapes from the house arrest that her own son imposed upon her. Minerva appears in Marie’s arrival in Brussels to again aid her in her escape from the dangerous clutches of her son.

While the frontispiece highlights Marie as the fleeing queen seeking shelter from another widow, the second engraving in the *Histoire curieuse* ... emphasizes Marie’s role as a mother, specifically the mother of kings and queens. In this engraving, *The Family Tree* (Figure 4.5), Marie’s portrait is hung on a tree, surrounded by images of her five children: Louis XIII, king of France, surmounts the tree, while on the left sit Elisabeth, queen of Spain, and Henrietta Maria, queen of England; to the right sit Gaston, duc d'Orléans, and Christina, the Duchess of Savoy. Her children emerge from fleur-de-lis, symbol of both France and Florence. This image gave a strong message of how important Marie as mother or mother-in-law of these rulers, who through her role as regent had arranged these important political marriages with Spain, Savoy and England. As the inscription at the foot of the tree reads, “Le couvre de mon ombre toute la terre” (My shadow covers the whole world), it represents the wide stretch of Marie’s influence through her children. *The Médicis Cycle* also emphasizes Marie as mother of not only the dauphin of France, but also the mother of the five other children of France she provided. Nowhere is this more apparent than in *The Birth of the Dauphin* (Figure 4.6). In this image, Marie is seated on a throne in an outdoor setting, having just given birth to Louis XIII, who is held by the genius of Good Health to the right. To the left, Fecundity holds a cornucopia overflowing with a wreath of baby heads, each head representing Marie’s other children. In an image celebrating the birth of Louis XIII, Rubens also included a reference to Marie’s other children.

Despite de la Serre’s insistence on Marie’s importance as the mother of kings and queens, the celebration of Marie was viewed negatively. The same issues that Marie faced in France continued in Brussels: her questionable status and her ongoing battle with her son and Richelieu. It did not help Marie’s case that her large entourage behaved terribly in the Spanish Netherlands, drawing much criticism. Her situation in Brussels also changed with the death of the Archduchess on the 1st of December 1633. Almost immediately, hostility and suspicion were aimed at Marie and her entourage now that she did not have the protection of Isabella. Balthasar Gerbier, an English agent, wrote of Isabella’s death and the effects on Marie,

The truth is this People [are] strong possesst wth an opinion that Queene Mother [Marie de Médicis] and Monsr [Gaston] keppe secret correspondence wth the French king, that

673 Osborne (2000), 167. Toby Osborne describes her entourage: “The one crucial thing they always lacked was any sense of mutual solidarity, and the inescapable image of the French exiles in the Spanish Netherlands is of disunity, factionalism, and feuding, a fact that exasperated the regimes in Brussels and Madrid. As Alessandro Scaglia, former diplomat for the house of Savoy, put it, ‘If I were to write down what happened in one day, it would be a history that would never end.’"
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Marie’s situation worsened when France declared war on Spain on the 19th of May 1635 and attacked two towns in the Spanish Netherlands.\(^\text{675}\) Soon after, Isabella’s successor, the Cardinal Infante Ferdinand (1609-1641), placed Marie under surveillance and demanded that some of her entourage leave as they were suspected of spying.\(^\text{676}\) Marie finally got the hint that she was not welcome in Brussels and left for the Dutch Republic on the 10th of August 1638.

Marie arrived in the Dutch Republic as the guest of Prince Frederick Henry of Nassau (1595-1625) and his wife, Amalia von Solms (1602-1675).\(^\text{677}\) Although Marie’s stay in the Dutch Republic was viewed negatively by the Dutch while she was there and relatively short in comparison to her time in the Spanish Netherlands, she was given a sumptuous state entry upon her arrival.\(^\text{678}\) Marie’s entry was documented in Jean Puget de la Serre’s *Histoire de la Reyne Mere du Roi Treschrestien, dans les provinces unies des Pays-Bas, enrichie de planches*, with engravings by Wenceslas Hollar.\(^\text{679}\) While de la Serre describes the entry, there are also engravings illustrating some of the decorations designed by Claes Moeyaert (1592-1655) and engraved by Pieter Nolpe (1613-1652) that adorned the triumphal arches. The entry again praises Marie as the mother of kings, but also focuses on themes that were addressed by Rubens in the Médicis Cycle: her marriage to Henri IV, her ancestry and her role in France’s peace and prosperity. The entry arch (Figure 4.7) located at Vijgendam in Amsterdam celebrated Marie and Henri IV’s wedding. In this depiction of their marriage vows, Henri and Marie stand on the altar before a cardinal, surrounded by Hercules, Mars and Minerva, characters who have been used to symbolise both Marie and Henri in previous patronage. In reality, Henri was not present at the December 1600 nuptials, but his inclusion in this arch serves to further legitimate Marie’s role as Henri’s spouse. The purpose of the same subject’s placement in the Médicis Cycle was identical.\(^\text{680}\) Marie’s power ultimately stemmed from her status as the wife of Henri IV, therefore the validity of their marriage remained imperative in 1638. Another marriage was included in Marie’s entry that further served to enhance her status: *The Marriage of Francesco de’ Medici and Joanna of Austria* (Figure 4.8), Marie’s parents. It is fitting, then, that this image should be included in her entry establishing her legitimacy, and that Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I, Joanna’s father, should also be included in this image enthroned to the left of the scene. Marie’s concern about her noble status also infiltrated the Médicis Cycle. In fact, the *Cycle* begins with portraits of Marie’s noble status: portraits of her parents, Francesco de’ Medici (Figure 4.9) and
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\(^{674}\) Public Record Office, London, SP 77: State Papers, Foreign, Flanders 1585-1780, fol. 23, 454. Marie was so mistrusted that “a search was ordered of the queen mother’s residence for papers relating to secret negotiations with Richelieu,” Osborne (2000), 166.

\(^{675}\) Van Whye (2007), 50. The French attacked Avain on the 10th of May Tirlemont on the 9th of June.

\(^{676}\) Van Whye (2007), 50.

\(^{677}\) Van Whye (2007), 50.

\(^{678}\) For more on Marie’s time in the Dutch Republic, see van Whye (2007), 50.


\(^{680}\) Rubens hoped to dispel any doubts of the authenticity of the event he depicted by included the likenesses of all the witnesses of the Florentine nuptials, specifically the Cardinal de Joyeuse, who was sent by the pope to officiate the ceremony. Marie was aware of the importance of his identification as he was specifically requested in the MS Baluze. MS Baluze 323, fol. S4r. For more on Henri’s promise to marry his mistress, see Millen and Wolf (1989), 77.
Joanna of Austria (Figure 4.10) surmounted the entrance to the gallery on either side of *The Queen Triumphant*. An image of the marriage of Marie's parents (Figure 4.11) also appears in her Cabinet Doré in the Luxembourg Palace, which was also known as the Cabinet of Medici Marriages, a room devoted to promoting Marie's ancestry. Again, it serves the same purpose: to remind the viewers of her sovereign status.

Another entry arch (Figure 4.12) erected in Amsterdam was surmounted by an image of Marie as Berecynthia or Cybele, the Magna Mater. Again, Marie’s motherhood is celebrated as she is represented as the mother of all mothers. Here she is enthroned as Berecynthia/Cybele in her chariot, at the helm of which is Henri IV. Three nymphs sit in the back of the chariot representing Spain, England and Savoy, the countries to which her daughters were married. The chariot approaches a boat holding the figure of Amsterdam and Mercury with his caduceus, an emblem that has been discussed previously in reference to Marie and the Médicis Cycle. Between the groups of figures are personifications of the four continents. Above the scene is the inscription *Laeta deum partu*, taken from the *Aeneid* VI in reference to Marie’s role as “mother of the gods.”

Cybele appears in the Médicis Cycle in a number of images, becoming her alter ego after her appearance in *The Birth of the Dauphin*, where Cybele stands protectively over the new mother. Marie is no longer identified with Juno, the good wife of Jupiter/Henri, as she was in the previous images, she is now Cybele, the ultimate mother of gods and kings.

The Amsterdam entry also included *tableau vivants* on the Rokin Canal. There are three scenes commemorated by Pieter Nolpe of these theatricals that bear a striking resemblance to *The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*. All three images depict, in allegorical terms, the division and hoped-for reunion of France. The first image, *Marie de Médicis begs the Gods for Help* (Figure 4.13), shows the globe of France being split in two, while Hercules, a stand-in for Henri IV, watches from the left. Marie, dressed as a French maid, is seen at the right, dramatically begging the gods above for help, while Bacchus looks on behind her. Peace, Cupid and Venus observe divided France in horror. Justice with her scales and sword has been knocked to the ground as France was split in two. The scene is watched from above by gods and goddesses sitting on clouds within a zodiac arch: Jupiter with his eagle, Juno with her peacock and chariot, and Mercury with his caduceus. This motif carries on into the next scene: *Hercules meets with Mars and Minerva to unify France* (Figure 4.14). Hercules, again a symbol for Henri IV, Minerva and Mars discuss, at the left, how to unify the globe of France, while Mercury with his caduceus hovers behind them. Justice and Peace are now both thrown to the floor at the right, while Cupid, Venus and Bacchus cower behind them. Marie de Médicis stands behind the globe, watching in hopeful anticipation the discussion between Hercules, Minerva and Mars. The zodiac arch extends into this scene, and the gods and goddesses remain in the clouds above.
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681 From the *Aeneid* VI 786, “High as the Mother of the Gods in place, And proud, like her, of an immortal race. Then, when in pomp she makes the Phrygian round, With golden turrets on her temples crown’d; A hundred gods her sweeping train supply; Her offspring all, and all command the sky”, Virgil, *The Aeneid* (Minneapolis: Lerner Publishing Group, 2015).

682 See Millen and Wolf (1989), 84.
with the addition of Neptune and his trident. Jupiter and Juno are now active participants, having left their relaxed positions, as they watch the scene below unfold. The final scene is Hercules forges the Divided French Empire (Figure 4.15). Here, Hercules, with the help of Mars and Minerva, wields a hammer to unify the French globe. Fortitude, at the right, holds the right hand of Peace, who is now standing. Bacchus and his nymphs celebrate to the left. Again, the zodiac appears above, with gods and goddesses watching the unification, with the addition of Saturn, with his scythe, and Concord with her fasces. Juno is seen releasing a pair of doves. It is the zodiac arch and the presence of the gods above the scene that seems to be drawn from the Médicis Cycle and which will be discussed here.

The zodiac arch and the presence of gods and goddesses overlooking the scene appear in both The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency (Figure 4.16) and The Council of the Gods (Figure 4.17). In The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency, Mercury appears brandishing his caduceus, “the instrument by which concord can be restored in times when the world-order threatens to crack at the seams”, just as he appears in both Marie de Médicis begs the Gods for Help and Hercules meets with Mars and Minerva to unify France. The caduceus is Rubens’s symbol for Discordia concors and Marie’s emblem in the Médicis Cycle as she is the bringer of peace to France. In The Death of Henri IV, Henri is raised to heaven by Jupiter with his eagle, who overlooks all three scenes from the water theatricals. Jupiter’s presence along with Juno and her peacock in the theatre scenes is extremely reminiscent also of The Consummation of the Marriage in Lyons, in the Médicis Cycle, in which Marie and Henri hover above the scene in the guises of Jupiter and Juno, their alter-egos. Saturn joins Jupiter and Juno in the heavens symbolising his role as Time and the coming of a Golden Age as the French empire is being united through the intercession of Marie. Saturn’s presence in the heavens in The Council of the Gods and The Felicity of the Regency of the Médicis Cycle also denotes the coming of a Golden Age with the ascendance of Marie as the regent of France. In the tableaux vivants, Hercules is the stand in for Henri IV, his recurring representative. In the Médicis Cycle, Hercules appears once – awaiting Henri IV, his ancestor, in heaven in The Death of Henri IV and the Consignment of the Regency. Venus and Cupid appear in the three theatre engravings. Their presence here may seem odd, just as their presence in the heavens in The Death of Henri IV and the Consignment of the Regency did. However, Millen and Wolf offer an explanation that they appear here and in the water theatricals “perhaps as token of the reconciliation of nations.” The zodiac above The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency includes the symbols for Leo and Libra, both associated with Henri IV (the lion) and Louis XIII (the Just), two of the same symbols that appear above in the three theatrical scenes. The Council of the Gods follows The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency in the sequence of the Médicis Cycle and thus the zodiac arch continues into its background acting as an extension of the previous scene. Similar to Hercules forges the Divided Empire, this scene also celebrates a union. The Council of the Gods celebrates the union of France and Spain through the royal marriages of Louis XIII to Anne of Austria and Elisabeth de France to Philip IV of Spain. This union was arranged by Marie, just as she begged the gods to unify France in the water theatrics. Above Hercules forging the globe of France, is another council of the gods, extremely reminiscent of the Médicis’s Cycle’s. In both scenes, Juno handles a pair of doves, symbolising the union of France.

---

684 Millen and Wolf (1989), 130.
and Spain, and of the globe of France. In the *tableau vivants*, Bacchus appears symbolising the prosperity that flourishes under peace but which has been threatened under a divided France. He appears in the Médicis Cycle’s *Council of the Gods* symbolising the prosperity under a France unified under Marie. Taking centre stage in *The Council of the Gods* is Marie as Peace wielding her caduceus. She also appears in *Hercules forges the Divided Empire* as Peace personified at the right, holding an olive branch in one hand. Holding court above the unification are Jupiter and Juno, the king and queen of the gods who also oversee Marie’s entry into the council of the gods as the regent of France. The message of these Médicis Cycle images and the *tableaux vivants* in Amsterdam is clear: Marie is the bringer of peace in the face of a troubled and divided France.

Regardless of Marie’s lavish welcome into the Dutch Republic, it served as merely a stopping point for three months before her next journey. Marie wrote her reasons for leaving in a letter published in 1639, *A Declaration of the Queene, mother of the most Christian King, Containing the reasons of her departure out of the Low-Countryes, and disavowing a manifest set out in her name upon the same argument*, blaming her departure on the hostility between France and Spain. She wrote, “I have ever passionately longed for the Union and Concord between the two Crowns, whereof in former times I had laid the foundations by a double Alliance. And that beside I have always endeavoured since the rupture, to contribute all I was able to the reestablishment of Peace.” Marie hoped to depart the Low Countries for her daughter and son-in-law’s protection in England. However, her son-in-law, Charles I, had some severe misgivings in having Marie as a guest. Although there were financial concerns, as she would have to be supported, the political concerns of a staunch French Catholic under the protection of the Protestant king Charles I could potentially damage Charles’s already fragile standing with Parliament. In fact, the French ambassador to Charles I, Pierre de Bellièvre, wrote to Richelieu of Marie’s impending arrival and Charles’s and Henrietta Maria’s hesitations: “[both] feared her arrival, one because of the expense, the other because of the constraint.” However, Charles finally gave in to Marie’s pressure. Marie arrived in England on the 28th of October 1638. Charles I greeted her with a £100 a day allowance and lavish apartments befitting a sovereign in St James’s Palace in London, where she was allowed to maintain a small court of her own followers.

Despite Charles I’s extreme hesitation in inviting Marie de Médicis to England, she was welcomed into London with an elaborate entry. Court poet, Edmund Waller greeted her thus: “Great Queen of Europe! Where thy offspring wears/ All the chief crowns; where princes are thy
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685 Marie de Médicis, *A Declaration of the Queene, mother of the most Christian King, Containing the reasons of her departure out of the Low-Countryes, and disavowing a manifest set out in her name upon the same argument* (London: 1639), 9.
686 For more on Charles’s hesitations, see Obsorne (2000), 166.
687 As quoted in Mansel and Riotte (2011, 30.
688 Marie de Médicis had been lobbying to go to England since first being exiled in 1631. There were rumours in London of her imminent arrival in 1632, see Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Charles I (1629-1631), vol. I, 206, 377. See also Julia Pardoe, *The Life of Marie de Medicis Queen of France* (London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1890), 388.
689 Osborne, in Mansel and Riotte (2011), 31. Pardoe records the size of Marie’s court in London as two hundred people, 390.
heirs; As welcome thou to sea-girt Briton’s shore,/ As erst Latone, who fair Cynthia bore/ To Delos, was.⁶⁹⁰ Again, Jean Puget de la Serre accompanied Marie and presented her entry into England in the best light in his Histoire de l’entree de la reyne mere du roy-tres chrестien, dans la Grand-Bretaigne.⁶⁹¹ De la Serre records the excitement and happiness of the royal couple when receiving Marie, writing of the pregnant Henrietta Maria who had to wait to greet her mother until her arrival at St James’s Palace: “Imagine now her majesty’s impatience on the exception of the honour and contentment of seeing the Queen her mother.”⁶⁹² The first engraving (Figure 4.18) by Wenceslaus Hollar in this entry book is of Henrietta Maria enthroned in a palatial setting, with Minerva at her side. It seems that Marie’s former alter ego in The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle is now guiding Marie’s daughter Henrietta Maria. Through Marie’s wisdom and good government, she is transformed by Rubens into Minerva Victrix in the last image of the Médicis Cycle, The Queen Triumphant (Figure 4.19).⁶⁹³ Perhaps more than a decade later, Minerva now serves as a stand-in for Marie, guiding Henrietta Maria, the current reigning queen of England who should look to her mother for her wisdom that guided her successful regency of France.

The second engraving, Portrait of the King and Queen offering Symbols of their Power to Marie de Médicis (Figure 4.20), shows the king and queen of England offering Marie symbols of royalty. Charles I offers Marie a sceptre, while Henrietta Maria offers her a crown. Three men, one putting forth a sword, kneel before the scene, paying homage to the French dowager queen. The verses below read, “Your excited children offer you their crown and sceptre, they will resign their power, by the sword that they give.”⁶⁹⁴ This scene is reminiscent of the right side of The Death of Henri IV and the Proclamation of the Regency, the half of the painting devoted to Marie taking over the reins of the monarchy. Here too, enthroned under a baldachin, Marie is offered symbols of royalty, a sceptre, a rudder, an orb, while men kneel before her proclaiming their loyalty. In the Proclamation scene, Marie dons the attributes of humilitas. By contrast, here in London she is proud and bold. Hollar, just like Rubens, is emphasizing the respect that should be accorded for a regent of France, even by other members of royalty.

Jean Puget de la Serre records the moment when Marie de Médicis finally reaches London and her daughter, Henrietta Maria, who is waiting for her at St James’s Palace. Reportedly, Henrietta fell to her knees and wept at the sight of her mother, which Wenceslaus Hollar depicted in his engraving of The Arrival of the Royal Party at St James’s Palace (Figure

⁶⁹² De la Serre (1639), 68.
⁶⁹³ Millen and Wolf (1989) explain Minerva’s presence in the Médicis Cycle in depth, explaining that she symbolises Marie’s wisdom and good government, 47-48.
⁶⁹⁴ De la Serre (1639), 10.
Marie wasted no time in setting up her apartments in St James's Palace. Her apartments reportedly included two chambers, a privy chamber, a presence chamber, a bedchamber, a chapel and a cabinet. De la Serre's entry book includes three engravings by Hollar that illustrate Marie's apartments: *The Chamber of Presence with Their Majesties* (Figure 4.22), *Chamber of Marie de Médicis*, and *The Lord Mayor and Others come to greet the Queen Mother* (Figure 4.23). The third engraving is the most revealing of Marie's status while in London. Not only is she having a private meeting with members of the Privy Council, but she is also given a formal bedchamber, with a state bed surrounded by a balustrade, in the French ceremonial tradition. If her apartments were so formal as to include a state bed, this would seemingly confirm her sovereign status at the English court.

It was in the previously mentioned cabinet in Marie's apartments at St James's Palace that de la Serre recorded as holding "nothing of greater value than the relics that her majesty brought there." This cabinet is where she kept her collection of medals that travelled with her throughout her exile as a sort of mobile gallery. It would have obviously been extremely difficult for Marie to travel with her painting collection that she left behind in the Luxembourg Palace. Medals offered the mobility that a painting gallery could not, in a similar vein as miniatures. Commemorative medals played a huge role in the iconography of the French and Medici courts. They were produced for each New Year and any special occasion, such as a royal birth, death or military victory. Emblems had a profound influence on the work of Rubens, who himself was not only an avid collector of them but also a student of Otto van Veen who designed many medals and emblem books in the seventeenth century. In 1639, the surveyor of the king's goods, Abraham van der Doort, took an inventory of Charles I's collections at St James's Palace. This included the "cabinnitt roome when the Queen's mother was to have the reserve of the cupboard there.

This manuscript reveals the collection of medals that Marie kept in her cabinet at St James's Palace while there during her final exile. This collection of medals reveals that Marie had the same intentions for creating an image of herself that proves her legitimacy that pervades the decorative scheme of the Luxembourg Palace and *The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*. All of the medals commemorating historical figures are related to Marie and help to enhance her legitimacy as the Queen of France. Her connection to the Habsburgs, through her mother, is highlighted through multiple medals of Emperor Charles V (1500-1558) and Emperor Ferdinand I. However, she does not forget her Medici relatives. Images of Cosimo I Duke of Florence appear multiple times. Marie's Cabinet Doré in the Luxembourg contained
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695 De la Serre (1639), 60-69.
696 It is believed that the apartments that Marie occupied were those that had been recently redecorated for Henrietta Maria. However, money was also set aside to enhance the apartments upon Marie’s arrival. For more information, see Osborne, in Mansel and Riotte (2011), 31.
697 De la Serre (1639), 60-66.
698 De la Serre (1639), 62.
701 For more on van der Doort and the catalogue of Charles I's collection, see Horace Walpole's edition of *A Catalogue and Description of King Charles I's Capital Collections of Pictures, Limnings, Statues, Bronzes, Medals and Other Curiosities* (London: W. Bathoe, 1758), which interestingly leaves out Marie’s collection at St James’s Palace. See also Margaret Lucille Kekewich, ed., *Princes and Peoples: France and the British Isles, 1620-1714: An Anthology of Primary Sources* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995).
702 Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1513, fol. 92.
many paintings celebrating Medici achievements, including The Coronation of Cosimo I by Zanobi Rossi (now lost). It was important that Marie include an image of Cosimo in both collections, for he was the first Grand Duke of Florence and secured the Medici as a noble family. Just as in the gallery that held the Médicis Cycle that was overseen by her Medici and Habsburg parents, so too in this collection of medals does Marie appear as the heiress of these noble lines.

The medals also relate to Marie as the dowager queen of France. It is a shame that the exact identity and images of these medals are not known, as Rubens was heavily influenced by medals produced for Henri IV, Marie and Louis XIII when producing the Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle. The medals are simply described with a brief identification of the figures or objects in the medal. It is entirely possible that some of these medals that travelled with Marie were the same medals that had inspired Rubens. Millen and Wolf’s study of the Médicis Cycle looks at antique and contemporary medals and Rubens’s reliance on them to create an image vocabulary for Marie. It rightly points out that Rubens must have been provided with iconographical material from Marie’s reign to aid in his construction of Marie’s images. These materials almost certainly included the medals produced under Henri IV’s reign and her regency. Her collection of medals at St James’s Palace includes multiple images of Henri IV and Louis XIII. In two medals from this collection, Louis XIII appears with Juno and Jupiter, two of the guises of his parents in the Médicis Cycle. Rubens painted Marie and Henri IV in the guise of the king and queen of the gods, the ultimate husband and wife, in The Marriage consummated in Lyons. The first medal is “King Louis, now king of France, with Juno sitting on a rainbow.” Many medals were produced during Marie’s regency that depicted her as Juno with her emblematic rainbow. Medals were also produced with just the rainbow, as that became the symbol for Marie and her association with Juno. A similar medal was produced in France 1613 by Nicolas Briot to celebrate Marie’s regency that is now in the British Museum (Figure 4.24). On one side is Louis XIII and on the other is Marie as Juno seated on a rainbow above a landscape with a sceptre and a peacock. It is possible that this was the same medal celebrating Marie’s regency. The second medal featuring Jupiter or Juno in the St James’s collection is “King Louis with Jupiter.” This was not the first time that a medal of Henri IV as Jupiter had appeared. In fact, Henri IV was compared to Jupiter multiple times, including in Marie’s planned triumphal entry into Paris in 1610 and in the Médicis Cycle. A large number of the medals in Marie’s collection at St James’s Palace commemorate Henri IV. Marie needed the image of Henri IV to confirm her status. It was therefore important that his image accompany hers, a reminder that she was his wife and he chose her to be regent in his stead. Two images in the Médicis Cycle were used for just this purpose: The Marriage-by-Proxy in Lyons (Figure 4.25) and The Consignment of the Regency (Figure 4.26). The reminders were equally as important when she was exiled for the second
time, especially as she was no longer simply battling against her son; it was now Marie versus Louis XIII and the ever-powerful propagandist Richelieu. In addition, the battle was no longer just in France, it was throughout Europe.

Marie de Médicis and Henrietta Maria in London

The *Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle* and the decorations of the Luxembourg Palace did not just influence Marie's own image and patronage; it also influenced that of her daughter in England, Henrietta Maria. Although Henrietta Maria spent most of her childhood at the Louvre, she would have been keenly aware of the construction of Marie's image for political purposes through her patronage of the Luxembourg Palace and *The Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle*.\(^\text{710}\) For it was in the Médicis Cycle gallery that a banquet was held celebrating Henrietta Maria and Charles I’s nuptials before Henrietta Maria departed for England in May 1624.\(^\text{711}\) Marie had strong opinions on how her daughter should behave upon arrival in England, as is evidenced from the letter she penned to Henrietta Maria on the 15th of June 1625.\(^\text{712}\) Although the letter had clear religious connotations for the Catholic queen marrying into a Protestant monarchy, it suggests that Marie attempted to exercise her influence over Henrietta Maria in general. It is no surprise, then, that Marie's influence also shows up in Henrietta's cultural patronage in England. There is even a connection between the artists whom Marie employed and those whom Henrietta Maria employed. The most notable link is the artist Orazio Gentileschi. Gentileschi worked for Marie on the decorations of the Luxembourg Palace. His most notable contribution is his painting of *Public Felicity Triumphant over Dangers* (Figure 4.27), which served as the centrepiece of the ceiling of Marie’s antechamber. Gentileschi was one of the most important Florentine painters of the seventeenth century, and Marie invited him to Paris where he worked for her from 1623 to 1625 before he moved to England to work in the court of Charles I and Henrietta Maria. While in England, Gentileschi painted a large number of the decorations for Henrietta Maria’s house at Greenwich (Figure 4.28).\(^\text{713}\) It is believed that Gentileschi was assisted at the Queen’s House by the French artist Jean Monier (1600-1656), who painted the ceiling of Marie’s Cabinet Doré in the Luxembourg Palace. Sykes even suggests that perhaps Monier was part of Marie’s entourage that followed her to London.\(^\text{714}\) It is even probable that Henrietta Maria, Charles I, Marie de Médicis and Henrietta Maria’s advisers discussed possibly employing Rubens to paint the ceiling and walls of Henrietta Maria's cabinet at Greenwich.\(^\text{715}\) This commission eventually was given to Jacob Jordaens (1593-1678) instead, but it is another
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\(^{710}\) Alexander Sykes, "Henrietta Maria's 'House of Delight': French Influence and Iconography in the Queen's House, Greenwich", *Apollo* 133 (1991), 334.

\(^{711}\) Britland (2006), 20.

\(^{712}\) "Instruction de la Reine Marie de Medicis – a la Reine d’angleterre sa fille Marie-Anriette de France 15 juin 1625", Archives nationales, Paris, K 1303. L A longer version: "Instructions données par Marie de Médicis à sa fille Henriette de France, Reyne d'Angleterre", Bibliothèque Nationale, MS 22, 884, f°l. 104ff. For more on this letter, see Britland (2006), 6-8.


\(^{714}\) Sykes (1991), 335.

\(^{715}\) Bell, in Erin Griffey, ed., *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 103. Work was underway at the Queen’s House while Rubens was in London in 1629, Sykes, 332. It has been suggested that he possibly had an influence on Inigo Jones’s use of classical architecture, as Rubens was a huge proponent of classical architecture at the time, Sykes (1991), 332.
indication of the overlapping of artists between mother and daughter in their respective palaces.

In 1628, Henrietta Maria received the “House and Park of Greenwich, with other lands” as part of her marriage agreement. Soon after, she began an extensive refurbishment of the Queen’s House. The House was originally commissioned by Anne of Denmark (1574-1619), wife of James I (1566-1625), in 1616. Anne hired Inigo Jones (1573-1652) to build an Italianate villa modelled on Poggio a Caiano, the Medici villa designed by Giuliano da Sangallo (1443-1516). However, work stopped on the building in April 1618 when Anne became ill. Anne died in 1619, and work was not picked up again until the House was given to Henrietta Maria. Much like the Luxembourg Palace for Marie de Médicis, the Queen’s House came to be closely associated with Henrietta Maria’s image. This was Henrietta Maria’s project, an architectural canvas upon which she could paint her own agenda. The decorative scheme thus had clear French influences. From the “French fashion” bed to the parquet flooring that the Luxembourg Palace made popular to the iconography, most details could find their origins in France. The theme of the “Rose and Lily Queen”, which represented Henrietta Maria (the lily) and Charles I’s (rose) union, pervades throughout the House in details such as the lilies and rosettes carved in the ceiling of the Great Hall and the ceiling timbers of Henrietta Maria’s cabinet. French fleur-de-lis adorned the banister and the capitals of the loggia columns. Henrietta Maria’s artists and craftsmen were instructed to look to France. Some were even encouraged to travel to France and visit the Luxembourg Palace, the Louvre Palace and Fontainebleau Palace. Marie’s Luxembourg Palace was similarly adorned with detailed iconography that represented her image through symbols that came to be used in her repertoire, such as the caduceus, overflowing cornucopias, swags of fruit, gold and laurel crowns, steering oar, olive branch and globe, all symbols that pervaded throughout the Médicis Cycle as well. The architect for the Queen’s House, Inigo Jones, looked to French drawings of architectural details, such as ceiling and fireplace designs, when configuring the interior decoration. The painted decoration, however, has the clear mark of her mother’s influence. In fact, when Marie arrived in London in 1638, the decorations for Henrietta Maria’s withdrawing chamber at the Queen’s House were being discussed. Marie suggested commissioning Jordaens to paint the Psyche series. This is the only evidence of Marie directly influencing Henrietta Maria’s choices while she was in London, but an influence of Marie’s patronage in France can clearly be seen.
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The iconographic choices at the Queen's House largely include the glorification of women, like the Luxembourg Palace decorations which also centred on strong female characters, historical and allegorical, and the glorification of women. Take for example, the decorations of the Great Hall at the Queen's House. It was surmounted by Orazio Gentileschi’s ceiling decoration of *An Allegory of Peace and the Arts under the English Crown* (Figure 4.29). At the centre of this painting, Peace sits with her olive branch, surrounded by female personifications of the Liberal Arts, Victory and Fortune. The nine muses fill the border surrounding the main image accompanied by personifications of Painting, Sculpture, Architecture and Music. The message of this painting is the same as the Médicis Cycle’s *Felicity of the Regency*: under the wise government of these monarchs or regents, peace and the arts thrive. *The Felicity of the Regency* includes many details supporting this, just as Gentileschi’s painting does. Similar to the figure of Peace, Marie is enthroned in the centre, surrounded by personifications of gods and goddesses and the arts, victory and fortune who represent the great success of her regency. On the walls below this ceiling painting in the Great Hall at Greenwich were two large Biblical scenes each representing a female protagonist: Orazio Gentileschi’s *The Finding of Moses* and *Lot and his Daughters*. As discussed in previous chapters, Marie’s Luxembourg Palace was covered in female allegorical figures both inside and out which served to enhance her image as queen. Marie wanted to emphasize her own role in the peace and success of France and the profusion of female imagery suggest this, as it does for Henrietta Maria in the Queen’s House.725

Marie de Médicis did not just influence the decorative scheme at the Queen’s House in Greenwich. From the moment of her arrival in 1638, Marie greatly influenced Caroline court masques. These masques seemed to adopt the image that Marie was in fact promoting of herself, that of widow, mother and peacekeeper that pervaded the halls of the Luxembourg Palace. While the masque has been read as a reaction to the Scottish rebellion and Charles’s interactions with Parliament, Karen Britland asserts that Marie’s presence is an often overlooked theme of the last Caroline court masque, *Salmacida Spolia*, in 1640.726 Written by William Davenant (1606-1668) and performed by Henrietta Maria and Charles I, it celebrated a unified nation and monarchy.727 Marie was the performance’s guest of honour. *Salmacida Spolia* praised Marie as the negotiator and bringer of peace.728 This was a theme in the Médicis Cycle as well, as Marie and Rubens highlighted in *The Exchange of the Princesses* (Figure 4.30) and *The Council of the Gods*.

The iconography and subject matter that Rubens employed in the Médicis Cycle are similar to that seen in *Salmacida Spolia*. The arch that surmounted the play was decorated with symbols that pervaded the Médicis Cycle and had strong associations with Marie’s good
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726 Britland (2006), 176. “*Salmacida Spolia* was so named because its principal motif was the Salamis spring at Halicarnassus whose pure taste had the ability to civilise barbarian natures”, Britland (2006), 182.
728 Osborne, in Mansel and Riotte (2011), 29.
government iconography: the caduceus, the cornucopia, and the rudder of a ship.\(^{229}\) While these objects were not solely used in Marie’s iconography, they did play a major role in her iconography throughout the Luxembourg Palace and at least suggest Salmacida Spolia’s acknowledgement of the use of a pan-European iconography.\(^{230}\) Again, the marriage of Henri IV and Marie was celebrated as the model for a successful rule and union in Salmacida Spolia. In praising their marriage, the lines from the masque read, “You, in whose bosom ev’n the chief and best/ Of modern victors laid his weary head/ When he rewarded victories with rest; / Your beauty kept his valour’s flame alive,/ Your Tuscan wisdom taught it how to thrive.”\(^{231}\) These lines could have easily accompanied the Médicis Cycle paintings which celebrated the marriage of Henri and Marie: The Marriage consummated in Lyons, The Consignment of the Regency, and The Coronation of Marie de Médicis (Figure 4.31). Again, it was important that Marie be seen as the widow of Henri IV for securing her station. Another similar feature was the inclusion of the Amazonian female. Henrietta Maria is costumed in one scene as an Amazon, challenging notions of femininity and threatening male power. Marie also presented herself as an Amazon warrior in the last scene of the Médicis Cycle, The Queen Triumphant. Both images were controversial in their subversion of female passive roles, yet placed them within a tradition of heroic women.

The praise of Marie de Médicis in Salmacida Spolia is ironic, for Marie’s presence in England and her close relationship and comparisons with Henrietta Maria were not welcomed by the English court. The English never particularly warmed to Marie, and this eventually culminated in attacks on her apartments at St James’s Palace.\(^{232}\) Bowing to pressure, Charles I and Parliament offered to pay Marie £10,000 to leave England for Cologne. Marie took them up on their offer and left for Cologne in August of 1641.\(^{233}\) Her departure was recorded in dramatic terms by William Lilly:

> I saw the old Queenmother of France departing from London. A sad spectacle it was, and produced tears in my eyes and those of many other beholders, to see an aged, lean, decrepit, poor queen, ready for her grave, necessitated to depart hence, having no other place of residence left her but where the courtesy of her hard fate assigned. She had been the only stately and magnificent woman of Europe, wife to the greatest king that ever lived in France, mother unto one king and two queens.\(^{234}\)

Gone was the pomp of her previous entries, as Marie’s time as celebrated widow and mother of kings was coming to an end. The image of her that was created in the Luxembourg Palace, especially the Médicis Cycle, had only helped her so far. Despite her continued promotion of this image throughout Europe during her second exile, each location of exile ended in complete disaster, and she was sadly never welcomed back to France. Marie died in Cologne on the 3rd of July 1642. Mathieu de Morgues continued promoting the image of Marie in his funeral oration for her: “Thus ended her bitter life, the mother and grandmother of so many princes and
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princesses.”\textsuperscript{735} Both Maria and the Virgin Mary, according to Morgues, “had saved the state and humanity by devotion to their respective sons. She thus joined all women who suffered for their children in the company of the Virgin.”\textsuperscript{736} Morgues again insists, perhaps on Marie’s behalf, that Marie’s status as wife, widow and mother made her role within politics not only acceptable, but imperative. The same message that was first constructed nearly twenty years earlier on the walls of the west gallery of the Luxembourg Palace.

\textsuperscript{735} Morgues (1643), 35.
\textsuperscript{736} Morgues (1643), 3. Crawford (2004), 95.
Figure 4.1. After Peter Paul Rubens. *Title Page, Diverses Pieces pour la Royne Mere du Roy Tres-Chrestien Louis XIII*. The British Museum, London.
Figure 4.2. Peter Paul Rubens. *Time unveils the Truth*. The Louvre Museum, Paris.
Figure 4.3. Cornelis Galle. *Title Page, Histoire curieuse de tout ce qui c’est passé a l’entrée de la reyne mere du roy treschrestien dans les villes des Pays Bas, Brussels.* The British Library, London.
Figure 4.4. Peter Paul Rubens. *The Flight from Blois*. The Louvre Museum, Paris.
Figure 4.5. Cornelis Galle. The Family Tree. Title Page, Histoire curieuse de tout ce qui c’est passé a l’entree de la reyne mere du roy treschrestien dans les villes des Pays Bas, Brussels. The British Library, London.
Figure 4.7. Pieter Nolpe. *Marriage of Henri IV and Marie de Médicis*. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 4.8. Pieter Nolpe. *The Marriage of Francesco de' Medici and Joanna of Austria*. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
Figure 4.10. Peter Paul Rubens. *Joanna of Austria, Grand Duchess of Tuscany*. The Louvre Museum, Paris.
Figure 4.11. Jacopo Ligozzi. *The Marriage of Francesco de’ Medici and Joanna of Austria.* Broomhall, Fife.

Figure 4.12. Pieter Nolpe. *Marie de Médicis as Berecynthia.* Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
Figure 4.13. Pieter Nolpe. *Marie de Médicis begs the Gods for Help*. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 4.15. Pieter Nolpe. *Hercules forges the Divided French Empire*. Rijskmuseum, Amsterdam.


Figure 4.18. Wenceslaus Hollar. *Henrietta Maria*. The British Library, London.
Figure 4.19. Peter Paul Rubens. *The Queen Triumphant*. The Louvre Museum, Paris.
Figure 4.20. Wenceslaus Hollar. *Portrait of the King and Queen offering Symbols of their Power to Marie de Médicis.* The British Library, London.

Figure 4.23. Wenceslaus Hollar. *The Lord Mayor and Others come to greet the Queen Mother.* The British Library, London.

Figure 4.27. Orazio Gentileschi. *Public Felicity Triumphant over Dangers*. Luxembourg Palace, Paris.
Figure 4.28. Inigo Jones. The Queen's House at Greenwich.

Figure 4.29. Orazio Gentileschi. *An Allegory of Peace and the Arts under the English Crown*. Queen’s House, Greenwich.
Figure 4.30. Peter Paul Rubens. *The Exchange of the Princesses*. The Louvre Museum, Paris.
Figure 4.31. Peter Paul Rubens. *The Coronation of Marie de Médicis*. The Louvre Museum, Paris.
Conclusion

After Marie de Médicis’s death in Cologne on the 3rd of July 1642, Louis XIII had her body brought back to Paris for a burial at Saint-Denis in 1643.\textsuperscript{737} Funerals for Marie were held in Paris, Florence, and Cologne. The most elaborate funeral was held in Florence on the 23rd of September 1642, at the instruction of Marie’s cousin, the Grand Duke Ferdinando II (1610-1670), Christine de Lorraine’s grandson.\textsuperscript{738} The artists and designers employed to put together this celebration of Marie’s life were Vincenzo de Bardi, Francesc de Nerli, Michelangelo Buonarroti il Giovane, Giovanni Battista Doni, Tommaso Segni, Francesco Rondanelli, and Simone Berti, some of the artists who had previously been employed for decorations for Marie in 1600.\textsuperscript{739} A description of the ceremony is included in Simone Berti’s book, along with engravings of the decorations in the church, \textit{Esequie di Francia e di Navarra celebrate in Firenze}.\textsuperscript{740} The decorations included illustrations of the virtues of Marie that made her a good queen, along with the portraits of fourteen women from the Old Testament (Figure 5.1). There were also four large effigies of former French queens to whom Marie had been compared previously: Clothilde (475-544), Hildegarde (914-?), Blanche of Castile, and Catherine de Médicis.\textsuperscript{741} The funeral oration was written by Giovanni Battista Doni. In it he emphasized the appropriate female virtues hat Marie exhibited – piety, obedience, grace, liberality and magnificence.\textsuperscript{742} As examples of the way Marie showed her virtues, Doni used the Luxembourg Palace, the Henri IV equestrian statue, her festivals and other public patronage as examples.\textsuperscript{743} He even went so far as to claim that Marie brought “the restoration of antique Roman glory to France.”\textsuperscript{744} Mathieu de Morgues continued his praise for Marie in the funeral oration he penned in her memory, \textit{Les deux faces de la vie et de la mort de Marie de Médicis royne de France...Discours funèbre}.\textsuperscript{745} De Morgues discusses all of Marie’s virtues that made her a worthy queen, including her liberality and magnificence through her patronage of the arts. He uses the Luxembourg Palace and its extensive interior decorations as a prime example of her liberality.

\textsuperscript{737} ASF Mediceo, 18, insert 5d, fol. 3, 17 April 1645, from a Parisian official to a Florentine historian, translated by Deborah Marrow, \textit{The Art Patronage of Marie de Medici} (University of Pennsylvania: 1978), 184.
\textsuperscript{738} ASF Settimani, IX, fol 434 v, 344 v, 363, translated by Marrow (1978), 184.
\textsuperscript{739} Marrow (1978), 184.
\textsuperscript{740} Simone Berti, \textit{Esequie di Francia e di Navarra celebrate in Firenze} (Florence: Amador Massi and Lorenzo Landi, 1642).
\textsuperscript{741} Marrow (1978), 184.
\textsuperscript{742} Marrow (1978), 184.
\textsuperscript{743} Marrow (1978), 184.
\textsuperscript{744} Marrow (1978), 184.
\textsuperscript{745} Mathieu de Morgues, \textit{Les deux faces de la vie et de la mort de Marie de Médicis royne de France...Discours funèbre} (Antwerp: Plantin Press, 1643).
and magnificence. Even in her death, the celebrations of Marie followed the same pattern that set out for her image in the Luxembourg Palace some twenty years previously. Marie also eventually got her wish: to be seen as an exemplar of queenship. The Medici continued to use her image to symbolise triumphs of the Medici family.\footnote{Marrow (1978), 185.} A Medici commissioned biography of Marie written by Bronzini d’Ancona emphasized her Florentine roots so the Medici could claim her as their own.\footnote{Cristoforo Bronzini d’Ancona, Della virtù, e valore delle donne illustre (Florence: 1632).} Marie’s reputation in France did not fare as well as it did in Florence. As regencies came and went, so did praise of Marie. Her example was used in times of regency to support the queen regent, but also to criticise the role of a powerful woman. Texts such as Jacques Olivier’s Alphabet de l’imperfection et malice des femmes was reprinted multiple times to discredit female regency, using Marie de Médicis, her image gracing the title page, as an example (Figure 5.2).\footnote{Jacques Olivier, Alphabet de l’imperfection et malice des femmes (reprinted in 1617, 1630, 1643) (Paris: Jean Petit-Pas, 1617).}

Although the Life of Marie de Médicis Cycle by Rubens did little to help bolster Marie’s position at the French court, it did set the precedent for absolutist propaganda in Europe during the following centuries. A recent exhibition held at the Royal Academy of Arts, London, Rubens and his Legacy singles out the Médicis Cycle in its section on “Power.” The exhibition calls Rubens an “unequalled propagandist” who used “symbols and allegories with great virtuosity to describe power on the move.”\footnote{"Rubens and his Legacy," Royal Academy of Arts, London (2015).} It looks at how the Médicis Cycle and Rubens’s use of mythology and reality for political purposes inspired later propagandist artists. The Médicis Cycle did not just influence Marie’s manifesto of power, later artists would use it as inspiration for the glorifications of their patrons. The exhibition cites the Orange Hall (1648-1652) at Huis Ten Bosch in The Hague that praises Prince Frederick Henry and the Galerie des Glaces in the Palace of Versailles (1678-1684) celebrating the reign of Louis XIV (1638-1615) as two galleries that specifically looked to the Médicis Cycle for inspiration. The Médicis Cycle’s example of a series of propagandist images to promote a queen succeeded in so much as it became a symbol for power that could be copied for different rulers. Almost two hundred years later, Jacques Louis David (1748-1625) looked to the image of Marie’s coronation (Figure 5.3) as a model for his painting of Napoleon’s coronation (1805-1807) (Figure 5.4) to symbolise power for another ruler whose position was also precarious.\footnote{Philippe Bordes, Jacques-Louis David: Empire to Exile (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 50-51.}
What this thesis has shown that has been neglected by previous Médicis Cycle scholars is that the image that Marie created for herself in the Luxembourg Palace was inspired by three main wellsprings: firstly, her Florentine origins; secondly, the example of her predecessor Catherine de Médicis; thirdly, her planned entry into Paris. She used all of these sources to exalt her position as a mother, queen and regent. At the centre of this manifestation of her image was the Médicis Cycle. Rubens created the definitive image of Marie that she used when she first returned from exile in 1620 to establish herself and send a message to her detractors. The first chapter establishes that Marie’s Florentine and Medici heritage had a profound influence on the development of her image in the Luxembourg Palace, specifically the Médicis Cycle. In fact, the Luxembourg Palace as a whole came to symbolise the image that Marie wanted to portray for herself. By reviewing the interior of the Luxembourg Palace decorations and looking at the sequence of rooms, it is possible to establish Marie’s both public and private image and how the function of these rooms supports that. The second chapter confirms Catherine de Médicis’s influence on Marie’s image and, ultimately, how Marie surpassed Catherine’s image in her subversion of established sixteenth and seventeenth century accepted gender roles. It is clear in this chapter that the Médicis Cycle and its egotistical nature and crossing of gender boundaries typifies this difference between the two Médicis queens. This chapter also explores how Rubens may have used previous images of Catherine in his creation of the Médicis Cycle, specifically the Artemisia Cycle and L’histoire des rois de France by Nicoals Houel and Antoine Caron. As Marie’s closest predecessor as Medici and regent, it is more than likely that Rubens considered how Catherine had previously been portrayed in similar cycles. The third chapter is a new interpretation of the Médicis Cycle as the triumphal entry into Paris that Marie never had. It explores the likelihood that Rubens looked to ephemeral praise of females in triumphal entries for this unprecedented cycle of paintings for a still-living secular female. Finally, the fourth chapter confirms that Marie’s image that was created through the Luxembourg Palace, specifically the Médicis Cycle, became Marie’s public image and helped to shape her later image and patronage as she was exiled from France for a final time in 1630 and became an essential component of her political programme that was used to promote her cause. The final chapter also discusses the influence that this image Marie and Rubens created and the Luxembourg Palace as a whole influenced her daughter Henrietta Maria’s decorations of the Queen’s House at Greenwich. This would be the image of Marie that would survive turmoil and time and become one of the most well-known painting cycles of the Louvre Museum and the most identifiable image of Marie de Médicis and her regency. However, there is more work to be explored concerning the Médicis Cycle’s origins and the similarities between the Luxembourg Palace and the Pitti Palace that was not discussed here due to the breadth of some of the topics. Specifically, I believe there is much to be discovered in the possible connection between
Florentine funeral celebrations and their decorations and the Médicis Cycle. These ephemeral events served similar purposes to triumphal entries and used similar imagery. Specifically, the funeral decorations for Henri IV commissioned by the Grand Duke Ferdinando in Florence have many similarities to the Médicis Cycle.751 Marie utilised the imagery that was safe to be included in ephemeral events to create a permanent image for herself. As has been discussed in this thesis, Rubens was provided with what must have been a plethora of sources from which to create this image of Marie. It is highly possible that this list has yet to be totally exhausted. As was Rubens’s intention in the 1620s, the dissimulation of these images and the plethora of multiple meanings holds the potential to discover more about Marie de Médicis’s image as the Queen Triumphant.

Figure 5.1. Francesco Cecchi. Decorations for the funeral of Marie de Médicis, San Lorenzo, Florence. Taken from Simone Berti, *Esequie di Francia e di Navarra celebrate in Firenze* (Florence: Amador Massi and Lorenzo Landi, 1642). Yale University Library, New Haven.

Figure 5.3. Peter Paul Rubens. *The Coronation of Marie de Médicis*. The Louvre Museum, Paris.
Figure 5.4. Jacques Louis David. *The Coronation of Napoleon*. The Louvre Museum, Paris.
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