

The essays provide helpful intellectual structure to the entries that follow them and, in the spirit of the dictionary in its entirety, respond to each other dialogically and as a network. The only disappointment here is that the system of keywords and networking (asterisks) does not extend to the essays as well. This would have strengthened the integration of the “parts” within the “whole.” Again, keywords at the close of each entry also help to bind individual entries into unity, as do cross-referencing of entries marked by asterisks. The historical index is a great help as quick reference guide that contains a useful summary of biographies and principal concepts explored in the two tomes.

The review copy of this important reference work was marred by one regrettable error: all entries under the letter “C” prior to “Chasteigner de La Rochepezay” were ... omitted. This means that seven new entries and more than 20 old are simply missing from the volumes, although they are briefly recuperated in the historical index. The many enrichments of this augmented new edition are improvements that are made possible by digital technology, and they would work especially well on a digital platform: networking through hyperlinks; keyword searches, etc. We can only hope that the dictionary can be offered on a digital platform as well, like, for example, the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Nevertheless, this dictionary will prove to be an important resource not only to start research on individual thinkers, but also to extend that research to other thinkers through networks and to broader problematics in philosophical, cultural, and intellectual history of seventeenth-century France.

Emmanuelle Hénin and Valérie Wampfler, eds. *Memento Marie: Regards sur la galerie Médicis*. Reims: ÉPURE, 2019. 512 pp. + 60 illustrations. 25€. Review by ARIANNE MARGOLIN, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY.

Emmanuelle Hénin and Valérie Wampfler’s volume is both a useful and contributory study of power, allegory, and representation employed by Henry IV’s second queen, Maria de’ Medici, who ruled in the stead of Louis XIII between 1610 and 1617. An anthology of texts, images, and critical analyses related to Peter Paul Rubens’s Marie de’ Medici Cycle (1621–1625), a grandiose project portray-

ing the deposed queen's struggles and triumphs as regent, *Memento Marie* offers us a multifaceted analysis of the motivations behind the commission, both from the self-aggrandizing viewpoint of Maria de' Medici as well as the artistic community which served as the viewing public. While the subject has been most recently discussed by Cynthia Lawrence, Carol Strickland, John Boswell, and Sara Galletti, this volume contributes to our understanding of the emblematic nature of the Maria de' Medici Cycle as a biographical advertisement of female power in France and artistic experimentation and innovation. On one hand, the series of twenty-one paintings made use of allegory to justify the queen's rise to an unprecedented status of proxy and authority in Salic France. On the other hand, these paintings would inevitably serve as the cornerstone of the 1671 quarrel between the pro-drawing Poussinists and the colorist Rubenists, as well as of the debate over allegory, mimesis, and *ut pictura poesis* in the eighteenth century. *Memento Marie* examines the use, intent, and reception of *ekphrasis* and allegory by several critics including Richelieu, Peiresc, Morgues, Bellori, Félibien, Pierre de Duput, Diderot, Winckelmann, and Quatremère de Quincy.

As stated, this volume is bold in that it combines three different books under one large investigation: the editor's preface, selected analyses of the Cycle written by philosophes and art critics, and contemporary criticism of the Cycle's reception as allegory and illustration of power. Since Hénin's preface serves as the introduction to the primary source material included in the second section, it suffices here to treat them as conjunctive. To appreciate the innovative character of the Maria de' Medici Cycle, we must consider that these paintings were meant to serve as testimony and propaganda to the queen's place in history. The Cycle was originally located in the queen's reception, where courtiers and diplomats alike could view them, and became royal property following her second and final exile by Louis XIII in 1631. She never returned to France and, as Hénin remarks, was rendered invisible for years afterward (41). It was thanks to Bellori's critique of Rubens's work in his *Vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti moderni* (1672) that shifted the Cycle from a ceremonial affair to the subject of art criticism (42–43). Yet the re-introduction of the Medici Cycle to a French audience drew controversy for its use of color and its

subject matter. Although Roger de Piles praised Rubens for his use of color to accentuate tension and sentiment, André Félibien criticized him for it, accusing the latter of having sacrificed accuracy and true beauty of form (195–96).

Intertwined with Rubens's colorism is the problematic nature of Maria de' Medici herself as a worthy figure of portraiture. While it was expected for kings and princes to commission praiseworthy commemorations of victories in battle and their spheres of influence, queens and ladies were largely viewed in the context of the less laudatory role of wife and mother of male heirs (63). In Hénin's view, the Cycle represents allegory in its etymological sense, which Rubens confirmed as a self-defined "interpreter" of her life; hidden within chiaroscuro and mythological references lies the attestation of a queen regnant in practice, if not in title (65–66). The preface concludes by addressing the argument over appropriate use of allegory in the Cycle, which many critics maintained was an historical document and thus had to be depicted faithfully. The editors draw our attention to Roger de Piles, Jean-Baptiste du Bos, Diderot, and Wincklemann regarding this question of *vraisemblance* and of realism versus idealism in the Cycle. For the more traditionalist Du Bos, the use of allegory is inherently incompatible with historical narration and therefore, allegory featured in the Cycle constitutes an active disrespect of nature and mimesis on Rubens's part (75–76). Diderot, however, supports allegory in painting and portraiture within the context of the human passion and expression more characteristic of the bourgeoisie, as opposed to the opulence of classicism and Horatian rhetoric (76–77). Wincklemann and Quatremère de Quincy take the Cycle's idealism and realism even further by pointing out the "double contradiction" within the *Traité d'Angoulême* of juxtaposing pagan and Christian symbols (79), which they asserted was idealistic painting *ipso facto*.

The third and final part consists of five critical essays by Fanny Cosandey, Marianne Cojannot-Le Blanc, Valérie Wampfler, Laëtitia Pierre, and Stéphane Lojkin on the political, allegorical, and semi-otic nature of the Medici Cycle. Collectively, they pose the following critical question: since allegory cannot be understood as a faithful representation of history, what precisely then *is* the language of both the individual portrait and the series of portraits in the Medici Cycle?

Cosandey and Wampfler consider Rubens's choices of mythological and iconographical storytelling—for example, the use of the Virgin Mary in *La Naissance de la reine* (Cosandey, 375) and of the gentle, yet victorious Pallas in the *Marie de Médicis en reine triomphante* (Wampfler, 405)—as the reappropriation of power and monarchy from its traditionally masculine attributes. Wampfler furthermore scrutinizes Rubens's statement that he was a translator of Maria de' Medici's life; rather than presenting her power as a product of war, by use of pacific symbology such as the laurel, olive, and palm, her regency is depicted as one of exceptional stability (404–405), a theme that Morisot repeats in his *Porticus Medicaea* (126; Wampfler, 458). Laëtitia Pierre's article on Dandré-Bardon and Gougenot's criticism of colorism and allegory serves as the tie between the previous three essays and Stéphane Lojkin's discussion on semiotics and allegory within the Cycle, though she also insightfully gives a voice to the amateurs who contributed to the body of art criticism. Colorism and the suitability of allegory caused debate among less well-known French amateurs and theoreticians, with Gougenot siding with Du Bos with respect to allegory as dependent upon reason and virtue, and Dandré-Bardon extolling Rubens for employing chiaroscuro and occasional embellishments to highlight action and expression (464–468). The anthology concludes with Stéphane Lojkin's semiotic reading of the Cycle; Rubens's allegory (and allegory generally) cannot be read as a simple narration but as a disconnected system of narratives that a spectator interprets theatrically (480–481). In the case of the Cycle, the use of allegory and color not only highlight the fragmented symbolism of Maria de' Medici's greatness but moreover of her resentful interdependence with Louis XIII (486–487)—insofar as her achievements and status were historically real, she still functions within and is relegated to obscurity.

Hénin's and Wampfler's anthology is a fascinating reference, albeit overambitious in its presentation and inclusion of primary and secondary sources. No treatise can do everything, and it may have been more effective to separate the preface and texts into one volume, adding original exchanges between Peiresc and Rubens that are curiously absent, and the critical essays to a subsequent tome. Despite this inconsistency, *Memento Marie* proposes a unique, versatile study that intersects with numerous disciplines such as feminist critique and aesthetics.