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This article examines how Protestant and Catholic elites in early seventeenth-century France memorialized the Wars of Religion in purpose-built picture galleries. Postwar France remained a divided nation, and portrait galleries offered a sectarian memory of the conflict, glorifying party heroes. Historical picture galleries, on the other hand, promoted a shared memory of the wars, focusing on King Henry IV’s successful campaign against the Catholic League to unite the kingdom. This article argues that postwar elites made a sincere effort to manage religious tensions by allowing partisan memories to circulate in private while promoting a consensual memory in public.

INTRODUCTION

ON THE MORNING of 26 February 1622 the Antwerp painter Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) entered the Louvre, the royal palace at the heart of Paris, to sign a most promising deal: he agreed to deliver forty-eight paintings to Maria de’ Medici (1575–1642), queen mother of France, for the dazzling sum of 60,000 livres. The contract clearly laid out the topics Rubens was to paint, starting with a set of twenty-four scenes “in which shall be represented the histories of the very illustrious life and heroic deeds of the said Queen,” followed by another twenty-four pictures depicting “all of the battles of the late King Henry the Great, the encounters he engaged in, his combats, conquests and sieges of cities, with the triumphs of the said
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Both series were destined for two separate galleries in the Luxembourg palace, the queen’s new Parisian residence that was nearing completion in St. Germain-des-Prés.

There was perhaps nothing remarkable about Maria’s decision to have her deeds and those of her late husband, Henry IV (1553–1610), immortalized in paint, as early modern rulers habitually relied on works of art to eulogize their accomplishments. Yet painting the lives of the royal couple was far from straightforward because their past was marked by turbulent events that had to be handled with care—even brushed over in places—to avoid controversy. Thus Rubens had to find a tactful way to depict Maria’s banishment from court in 1617, her subsequent escape from exile in 1619, and the wars she waged in 1619–20 against her own son, King Louis XIII (1601–43). Henry IV’s life presented far greater challenges. Indeed, when in May 1625 the first set of paintings showing the life of Maria de’ Medici was unveiled in the Luxembourg palace, Rubens gloomily predicted that “there will not fail to be difficulties over the subjects of the other gallery, which ought to be easy and free from scruples.”

As anyone in France knew, painting the king’s life meant rekindling painful memories about the French Wars of Religion (1562–98). Born and raised as the Huguenot prince of Navarre, Henry had taken up arms against the French Crown during the civil wars, commanding Protestant troops in an attempt to convert France to the Reformed faith. In the 1590s he had subsequently campaigned against the Catholic League, an alliance of Catholic noblemen, clergy, officeholders, and devout laymen that sought to eradicate Calvinism and disputed Henry’s accession to the French throne in 1589. Other problematic episodes included the king’s conversion to Catholicism in 1593 and the issuing of the Edict of Nantes in 1598; although both decisions helped end the civil wars, uncompromising Protestants and Catholics accused him of betrayal. The king’s turbulent life thus poignantly reminded the French that the Wars of Religion had divided them by faith for almost forty years—a history that was best forgotten, lest it reignite the religious tensions that had just been laid to rest.
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Henry IV was well aware that publicly remembering the war’s massacres, sieges, and profanations of sacred property would only perpetuate religious strife, which explains why in the Edict of Nantes he ordered his subjects to leave the divisive past behind. Its first article stipulated that “the memory of all things that have happened on either side . . . shall remain extinguished and suppressed, as if they have never taken place.” Yet in spite of royal injunctions, the past was not easily forgotten. Recent scholarship, spearheaded by the work of Philip Benedict, has shown that Protestants and Catholics continued to revisit the wars, especially in history books and engravings. Jean Crespin’s famous Protestant martyrology, the Livre des Martyrs (Book of martyrs), enjoyed popularity among Huguenot readers throughout the seventeenth century, just as the etchings of Tortorel and Perrissin, which documented notable wartime events, were sold to French Catholics and Protestants alike, and copied many times by other engravers.

While scholars have fruitfully begun to explore Protestant recollections of the wars, there is much less work on Catholic memories that asks to what extent they differed or resembled those of Protestants. Moreover, most studies have focused on printed memories, in particular the histories written by such towering figures as De La Popelinière, D’Aubigne, Mezeray, and De Thou, whereas material memory vectors like devotional objects, statues, and paintings have received far less attention. This article seeks to address these imbalances by looking at one particular form of material commemoration that proliferated among Protestant and Catholic elites in the first postwar decades: picture galleries about the French Wars of Religion. Such commemorative galleries formed a surprisingly popular genre, which could be found not only in royal residences like Maria de’ Medici’s Luxembourg palace, but also in the homes of prominent officeholders and provincial noblemen.

Although these galleries have been the subject of much art historical research, little has been done to probe them as sites of memory. Yet as Pierre Nora has famously argued, spaces are crucial to the preservation of the past. To ensure that events are not forgotten, societies engage in the creation of what Nora has called “lieux de mémoire” (“sites of memory”), spaces that serve as tangible reminders of the past, such as statues, coins, and monuments. This article will argue that picture galleries in early modern France likewise operated as sites of memory, because in these purpose-built spaces owners consciously displayed a series of
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pictures to tell the story of the French civil wars. It is important to note, however, that remembering also required forgetting. The German scholar Jan Assmann has pointed out that whenever people enshrine the past, they will select only the most memorable stories for safekeeping and discard those deemed unfit for memorialization. This process of filtering eventually produces a set of canonical memories, which Assmann has labeled cultural memory. Aleida Assmann has likewise observed that although societies have access to a vast reservoir of stories about the past—an “archival memory”—they will select just a few of these to create a “functional memory” and forget about the others.9

I will examine how in postwar France elites likewise formulated canonical narratives about the past, selecting some stories for memorialization while blotting out others. Two related questions will guide this exploration. First, what visual choices did the owners of picture galleries make—which wartime figures and events were depicted and which ones forgotten? And second, why did both the monarchy and the elites decide to remember the French Wars of Religion if royal policy encouraged them to forget the past? I will argue that the postwar picture galleries tell an ambiguous story. On the one hand, Protestants and Catholics remained divided by faith, as portrait galleries commemorated the conflict along the same religious fault lines that had set them apart during the wars. Galleries depicting historical events, on the other hand, contained some common ground: both the monarchy and the elites left out the most upsetting episodes of religious turmoil, focusing instead on King Henry’s triumphs over the league to underscore the role of the monarchy in reuniting the kingdom behind a common cause. This coexistence of contested and shared memories suggests that in the first decades after 1598 the story of what had happened during the Wars of Religion was not yet set in stone, allowing Protestants and Catholics to overcome the troublesome past.

For purposes of clarity and analysis this article has been divided into four parts. The first section traces the genesis of the picture gallery in early modern France, as well as its development during the Wars of Religion. The second part explores contested memories about the conflict through the prism of two competing portrait galleries (one Protestant, the other Catholic), followed by a section that examines shared memories in five historical galleries, each of which showcased key events from the wars, in particular from the reign of Henry IV. The article concludes with a section on the reception and impact of these galleries on wider public understandings of the past.

THE RISE OF THE PICTURE GALLERY

The story of the picture gallery starts well before the outbreak of the Wars of Religion, in the medieval chateaux of French noblemen and monarchs.

Beginning in the fourteenth century, they began adorning their residences with purpose-built galleries, which markedly differed from the passageways common in Italian Renaissance architecture, known as loggias; in contrast to these open-air corridors, the French gallery was consciously designed as an interior space, usually on the first floor. The gallery functioned as a private passage between the lord’s apartments and other parts of the castle, such as the chapel or the library, extending the private space of the lord and his family and allowing them to move around their residence without encountering other household members. Although random fires and the French Revolution have done away with many of them, by 1600 galleries had become a regular feature of castles and elite residences throughout France.¹⁰

During the sixteenth century the gallery underwent a profound change, evolving from a functional passageway into an autonomous room, while retaining its private nature: galleries became spaces where the lord of the manor could retreat to walk at leisure, contemplate affairs, and meet with people far from prying eyes. The Italian ambassador Giulio Alvarotti, who in 1553 visited the splendid gallery in the chateau of Anet, built by King Henry II (1519–59) for his mistress Diane de Poitiers, observed that “this gallery is like a hall with windows on all sides, but much narrower than a hall. These are places made especially for taking a stroll.”¹¹ The French architect Jacques Gentillâtre (b. 1578) defined the gallery in very similar terms in his guidebook written for aspiring designers: “It is a place devoted to no other purpose than for the lord to take a walk with his friends, who come to see him and visit him to do business.”¹²

As the gallery morphed from passageway into an extended private space, owners also began to decorate them, creating what became known as picture galleries: elongated rooms with wooden panelling, windows on at least one side, and framed pictures along the walls. The picture gallery soon spread across Europe, from France and the Low Countries to England, as well as to Spain, Germany, and Scandinavia.¹³

Picture galleries also became a prime locus for memory politics, as owners consciously designed them as lieux de mémoire where they could display portraits.

¹⁰The genesis of the French gallery is traced in Prinz; Büttner; J. Guillaume; Strunck.
¹¹Giulio Alvarotti to Ercole d’Este, Duke of Ferrara (Paris, 1 April 1553), in Chatenet, 2008, 5: “Questa galeria è come una sala con le finestre da ogni lato, ma più stretta che una sala. Sono lochi che fanno espressi per passeggiare.”
¹²Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS 14727, Jacques Gentillâtre, “Manual for Architects,” fol. 353: “C’est un lieu qui n’est dédié à autre office que pour se prommener le seigneur avec autre de ces amis qui le viendront voir et visiter pour communiquer dafaire.” On Gentillâtre’s life and career, see Châtelet-Lange.
¹³Useful overviews of the early modern gallery are offered in Les grandes galeries européennes; Europäische Galeriebauten; Lagerlöf.
to commemorate their forebears and celebrate their own heroic deeds. One of the earliest and most lavish picture galleries of this kind was installed in the royal palace of Fontainebleau. Built in the eleventh century as a hunting lodge for the French kings, the medieval castle was transformed into a fashionable royal residence by King Francis I (1494–1547). In 1528 construction began on a two-story gallery that would connect the castle with the nearby Trinitarian abbey, but the first floor was eventually sealed off to create an autonomous, sixty-meter-long picture gallery that could only be entered through the king’s private apartments (fig. 1). Between 1533 and 1539, the Italian painter Giovanni Battista Rosso (1494–1540) led a team of artists that filled the gallery with twelve allegorical frescos glorifying Francis’s life and reign.14

More widespread, however, were galleries outfitted with portraits of family members, which served as mementos of deceased ancestors and affirmed one’s lineage and dynastic might. The very purpose of portraits, after all, is to remember sitters long after their lifetime. As Leon Battista Alberti (1404–72) famously explained in his De Pictura (On painting, 1436), a portrait allows “the absent to be present” since it “shows the living, after long centuries, the dead, so that these become recognized with the artist’s great admiration and the viewers’ pleasure.”15 Family portraits were usually scattered throughout the residences of the ruling elites, but in the second half of the sixteenth century they began to create separate galleries to showcase their collections.16 The gallery that Ambassador Alvarotti visited in the chateau of Anet, for example, contained pictures of successive French monarchs since Louis IX, an equestrian portrait of Henry II, several portraits of the king’s mistress Diane de Poitiers, and members of her family.17 Queen Mother Catherine de’ Medici (1519–89) created a similar gallery in her private Parisian residence, known as the Hôtel de la Reine. The fifty-five pictures on display glorified the Valois dynasty, in particular the marriage strategy of Catherine, who had successfully married off her children to rulers across Europe. Besides portraits of herself and her late husband King Henry II, all Catherine’s children and their partners were present, including her eldest son Francis II, married to Mary Stuart; Catherine’s daughter Elisabeth, consort to Philip II of Spain; King Charles IX and his wife Elisabeth of Austria; King Henry III; the Duke of Anjou; and Catherine’s third daughter Marguerite, who had married the future King Henry IV. They were facing the portraits of foreign rulers with direct ties to the Valois dynasty, such as Mary Tudor; Mary, Queen of Scots; and Emperor Charles V.18 Catherine may well have modeled her gallery after Philip II’s, installed in the palace of El Pardo outside of Madrid. As consort to the Spanish king, Catherine’s
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14Béguin, Binenbaum, Chastel, et al.; Boudon, Blécon, and Grodecki, 28–33; Lagerløf, 21–81. Color reproductions of the frescos can be found in Crépin-Leblond and Drogue.
15Alberti, 44 (De Pictura 2.25).
16Dimier, 1:130–43; Mac Gowan; Polleross.
17Roussel, 84–89, 127; Leloup, 59–60.
daughter Elisabeth had been actively involved in the creation of Philip’s gallery and had even learned to paint portraits herself, some of which she sent home to her mother. Philip II’s gallery was very similar in scope to Catherine’s in Paris: it contained forty-five portraits celebrating the Habsburg dynasty, including pictures of the king, his parents and sisters, members of the Austrian branch of the Habsburg family, and grandees like the Duke of Alba.19

Woodall.
The outbreak of the French civil wars in 1562 infused portrait galleries with historical meaning that went beyond the celebration of one’s own roots. Although galleries continued to function as sites of family heritage where owners remembered their lineage and kin, the pictures on display could also form a visual narrative about the wars, especially when portraits of the main wartime protagonists were included. Picture galleries thus became staged sites of memory, museums *avant la lettre* that allowed visitors to relive the Wars of Religion through an overwhelming display of figures. Moreover, the choices people made in who was depicted and who was not, as well as the spatial arrangement of the pictures, meant that galleries could convey a partisan story of the past. By remembering specific figures—in particular, party heroes or victims of persecution—and consciously forgetting others, picture galleries became indicative of one’s religious and political allegiances. Analyzing these visual canons of great men and women can thus be a useful tool to understand how Protestants and Catholics defined themselves.\(^{20}\)

Admittedly, it is not always easy to determine to what extent owners intended their portrait collections to form a coherent narrative. Although early modern collections were consciously constructed through the efforts of an individual, they were also the vestiges of random inheritances, gifts, exchanges, and later-regretted commissions. Moreover, it was difficult to sell unwanted family portraits on an art market that would have little interest in such unknown sitters. Yet despite the somewhat haphazard genesis of many early modern portrait collections, there nonetheless is compelling evidence that some owners in France did create a coherent series of pictures to remember the past, carefully selecting portraits to be hung in a separate room. The collection of Pierre de L’Estoile (1546–1611), an *audienier* (hearer) in the Royal Chancery attached to the Parlement of Paris, is a case in point. During his life he amassed sixty paintings that were displayed throughout his home, including a large landscape in the reception hall, a picture representing the history of Lot in the main bedchamber, and a small panel with the Tree of Life in the adjoining room. The portraits of key figures from the Wars of Religion, however, were set aside in a private cabinet. It contained several pictures of Henry III and Henry IV, as well as portraits of high-ranking magistrates, including Chancellor Michel de l’Hôpital and Barnabé Brisson, a former president of the Parlement of Paris executed by the Catholic League in 1591. L’Estoile also owned portraits of Catholic hardliners, such as the Duke of Guise, the cardinal of Lorraine, and Guy Du Faur de Pibrac, notorious for having published a justification of the Saint Bartholomews’s Day Massacre.\(^{21}\) L’Estoile thus made a deliberate choice to
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21 The paintings owned by L’Estoile are described in his postmortem inventory, published in Greffe and Lothe, 19–20, 33, 36–38. For an analysis, see Hamilton, 2014, 59–82.
separate the portraits of wartime figures from his other paintings. His cabinet effectively constituted a visual record of the troubles, containing both heroes and villains, as he sought to keep alive even the most painful memories about the wars.

DIVIDED MEMORIES

Whereas L’Estoile clearly collected as many portraits as possible, regardless of the sitter’s religious and political allegiances, other owners were decidedly more selective in which wartime figures they included in their portrait galleries. This section will compare the galleries of two men who both participated in the conflict, but remembered the wars in very different ways. One was created in the chateau of Saumur by Philippe Duplessis-Mornay (1549–1623), a Protestant nobleman and close adviser to Henry IV, the other in the Parisian townhouse of Sébastien Zamet (1549–1614), a Catholic financier who had first raised money for the Catholic League, but switched allegiances in 1593 to support Henry IV. Although both galleries no longer exist and their paintings now remain lost or scattered, surviving inventories reveal the topics and spatial arrangement of the pictures that once adorned their walls. They reveal that the galleries of these high-ranking officeholders offered contrasting narratives about the civil wars, precisely along the religious and political fault lines that had divided them during the conflict. The creation of these partisan memories was also very much a conscious decision: as will become clear, both men collected a large number of paintings during their lifetimes, but selected only a sampling for inclusion in their purpose-built galleries, which suggests these series were less the result of accidental accumulation than of careful planning and a wish to commemorate the past.

Duplessis-Mornay’s Gallery

Philippe Duplessis-Mornay’s gallery offered a resolutely Protestant reading of the Wars of Religion, reflecting a lifetime spent promoting the Huguenot cause. Born in 1549 as the second son of the Berry nobleman Jacques de Mornay, Duplessis-Mornay had converted to the Reformed faith during his student years in Paris. Between 1568 and 1572 he subsequently went on an academic tour that took him to Geneva, Heidelberg, Frankfurt, Italy, Bohemia, Cologne, and the Low Countries, before seeking refuge in London after the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre. In 1576 he entered into the service of Henry of Navarre (the future King Henry IV) to become his chief propagandist and secretary, authoring several treatises that justified Henry’s intervention in the French Wars of Religion. Duplessis-Mornay’s most notable—and certainly most infamous—tract was the anonymous *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* (Defense of liberty against tyrants, 1579), which legitimized the use of force to subvert royal authority whenever monarchs disregarded the fundamental rights of their
subjects, particularly the freedom of religion. He also carried out diplomatic missions to England and the Low Countries to secure the support of Queen Elizabeth and the Dutch rebels, but his most lasting contribution came in 1598, when he co-drafted the final peace treaty between Protestants and Catholics, the Edict of Nantes.22

After the wars Duplessis-Mornay retired to Saumur, a town on the Loire River of which he had been made a royal governor in 1589. Because Saumur was of strategic importance to Henry’s campaign against the Catholic League, Duplessis-Mornay had been tasked with strengthening its defenses: the medieval chateau, once home to the Dukes of Anjou, was fortified and transformed into a citadel and the suburbs protected by new walls. Duplessis-Mornay also overhauled the old interior: the walls dividing two reception rooms and the medieval chapel were knocked down, thus creating a gallery that occupied the entire north wing. The gallery was outfitted with wooden panelling, a large fireplace at the center, and four windows overlooking the Loire River, and decorated in 1609 with tapestries and a series of portraits.23

Evidence suggests that the portraits on display in the gallery had been carefully chosen by Duplessis-Mornay. An inventory drawn up in September 1619 listed more than a hundred portraits hung in various rooms of the chateau, fifty-four of which were clustered in his gallery.24 Like many noblemen, Duplessis-Mornay had acquired portraits throughout his life. Some of these he had commissioned from the most renowned painters working at the court of Henry IV: in October 1578 Marc Duval delivered “a small picture of His Majesty,” and in 1602 Jacob Bunel was paid 124 livres for a portrait of Duplessis-Mornay’s wife Charlotte.25 A second portrait of Henry IV, which ended up in the private apartments of Duplessis-Mornay, was probably gifted by the king himself, who had his court painter François Bunel mass-produce royal portraits that were offered to nobles and foreign rulers to reward them for their loyalty and to secure future support.26 Yet inventories prior to 1609—the year the gallery was finished—list just twenty portraits in Duplessis-Mornay’s possession, which means that the majority of the fifty-four pictures displayed in the gallery must have been acquired in the following decade, after he had decided to outfit this space with a series of portraits. In 1609, for example, Duplessis-Mornay ordered four portraits from court painter Antoine de Recouvrance, including one of himself.27 The Saumur gallery, then, was not
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26Perot; Lafond, 7–27.
an accidental accumulation of portraits, but a carefully planned series, as Duplessis-Mornay pinched some pictures from his own collection, but also ordered new ones to create a coherent story about his past.

The 1619 inventory reveals Duplessis-Mornay’s underlying vision for his gallery (fig. 2). Upon entering the gallery through a door, visitors would see dotted on the opposite wall the portraits of eminent Protestant nobles and rulers who had played a key role during the wars, such as the Huguenot commanders Condé, Lesdiguières, and Téligny, as well as Gaspard de Coligny, whose murder in 1572 had sparked the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre—tellingly, Duplessis-Mornay also owned a tableau showing “the murder of Monsieur the Admiral.” Foreign rulers, some of whom were already deceased, included Queen Jeanne d’Albret of Navarre, Prince William of Orange, William’s son Maurice, the Elector Palatine, Landgrave Maurice of Hesse, Queen Elizabeth I, and Elizabeth’s successor James I. The gallery also contained pictures of the major Protestant Reformers: Martin Luther, John Calvin, Guillaume Farel, Pierre Viret, and John Knox. The centerpiece, however, was an equestrian portrait of King Henry IV hung above the fireplace, together with a small portrait of Henry as king of Navarre, and his bronze statue placed on top of the mantelpiece. The king was flanked by pictures of his second wife, Maria de’ Medici, and their son Louis XIII. The other side of the gallery contained mostly members of the extended Duplessis-Mornay family, including a portrait of himself and his parents, his older brother Pierre, his wife Charlotte, their deceased son Philippe, their daughters Marthe, Élisabeth, and Anne, and their respective husbands. The remaining spots were taken up by Protestant nobles and friends close to Duplessis-Mornay, such as Theodore Beza, Louise de Coligny, the historian and president of the Parlement of Paris Jacques-Auguste de Thou, the English poet and courtier Philip Sidney, the Huguenot commander François de la Noue, and Coligny’s younger brother François and the Baron de Piles, who had both fallen victim to the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre.

Duplessis-Mornay’s picture gallery, in other words, was both a who’s who of the Wars of Religion as well as a deeply personal interpretation of the past, since he consciously paired portraits of his own family with those of prominent figures from the conflict. The lives of the Duplessis-Mornay family reflected the story of the struggle between Protestants and Catholics, tying family history to the commemoration of the national past. The layout of the gallery supported this message: the sequence of pictures radiated outward from the pictures of Philippe and his wife Charlotte, who, surrounded by their children, were facing portraits

28 Ibid., 163–65, identifies the sitters in the gallery.
29 Ibid., 168.
of Henry IV and the royal family. A painting at the end of the gallery underlined the importance of family history, depicting—as the inventory explained—“in the fashion of a tree, the offspring and alliances of the House of Mornay.” Such a pedigree was not only a helpful aide-mémoire to visitors trying to identify the relationships between the various sitters, it also emphasized the dynastic pride of the Duplessis-Mornay family.

At the same time, the gallery constituted a visual record of the Wars of Religion, which had profoundly marked Duplessis-Mornay’s life. The importance he attached to history was clearly apparent from his manuscript treatise “Advis à qui écrit l’histoire de son temps” (Advice to he who writes the history of his times), in which he argued that although historians should write dispassionately about the past, by presenting the naked evidence they would surely convince readers of God’s providential plan to let Protestantism triumph over Catholic ignorance. History, then, served as an instrument of religious and
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30 Ibid., 165. Philips II’s gallery in El Pardo contained a similar pedigree: Woodall, 65.
political propaganda.31 The memory of the French civil wars was particularly important to Duplessis-Mornay. Already in 1578 he had begun writing a Latin history of the recent troubles, which sadly perished when he sailed from England to the Low Countries.32 At the outer end of the Saumur gallery also stood a cupboard known as the petite bibliothèque, which contained his manuscripts, published work, and the carefully annotated books of other authors, including De Thou’s overview of the French civil wars, the Historia Sui Temporis (History of his times, 1604–08).33 In addition, Duplessis-Mornay owned a copy of Theodore Beza’s Histoire ecclésiastique (Ecclesiastical history, 1580), which offered a history of the Huguenot communities from the Reformation until the end of the first civil war in 1563, and which he deemed the best possible guide to the early decades of the Protestant movement.34 His admiration for De Thou and Beza was clearly evident from the gallery, which included both their portraits.

Yet the many pictures of rulers, nobles, and theologians were not merely illustrations of events that Duplessis-Mornay had experienced during his lifetime. Just like the family pantheon, these paintings constituted a deeply personal record of the past, as he had known most of the sitters personally—in a sense, they were his extended family. The prominent place taken up by Henry IV was a logical choice, since Duplessis-Mornay had served him throughout his life; for the many foreign rulers present in his gallery, he had often entertained personal relationships with them in order to further the Huguenot cause. In 1572, for example, having just returned from his ramblings through Europe, Duplessis-Mornay managed to escape the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre and flee to London, where he had several audiences with Queen Elizabeth trying to convince her to support the Huguenots. His entry at court was facilitated by letters of recommendation from the English ambassador to France, Sir Francis Walsingham (1532–90), whom he had befriended in Paris, and whose portrait hung in Duplessis-Mornay’s private apartments.35 During his grand tour he had also met Calvinist refugees from the Low Countries in Cologne. Their stories of religious persecution, followed by a visit to the war-torn provinces in the spring of 1572, marked the beginning of Duplessis-Mornay’s lifelong commitment to the Dutch Revolt and its leader, Prince William of Orange. Upon his return to Paris he advocated an armed French intervention in Flanders to support the Protestant rebels, and between 1578 and 1582 he even served as counselor to the prince of Orange in Antwerp. In 1605 Duplessis-Mornay also secured a position

31La Fontenelle de Vaudoré and Auguis, 7:196–206. See also Daussy, 2005.
32Daussy, 2005, 471.
33Lièvre, 360; Daussy and Gourdin; Daussy, 2002, 36.
34Philippe Duplessis-Mornay to Benoit Turretini (Saumur, 2 August 1617), in Memoires de Messire Phillipes de Mornay, seigneur du Plessis Marly, 1:1167.
35Daussy, 2002, 87–93; Poton, 37–44. For Walsingham’s portrait, see Fillon, 166.
for his son Philippe in the army of William’s successor, Prince Maurice, although this would prove a fateful decision: Philippe the Younger perished in battle the same year.\(^{36}\) The picture gallery thus stood as a clear testimony to the transnational alliance of rulers and nobles who had labored alongside Duplessis-Mornay to further the Protestant cause, both in France and abroad.

Indeed, when surveying the gallery, visitors would have noticed that Duplessis-Mornay’s record of the past was decidedly one-sided, focusing on Protestant heroes, friends, and family, while omitting virtually all the Catholic players in the conflict. In contrast to Pierre de L’Estoile’s gallery, there was no trace of the Guise family, nor of the Catholic monarchs who preceded Henry IV. The only Catholic figures present in the gallery were Duplessis-Mornay’s own brother Pierre, who had remained loyal to the Church of Rome; his friend Jacques-Auguste de Thou; King Louis XIII; Maria de’ Medici; and Henry IV, who had converted to Catholicism in 1593. In fact, the prominent place allotted the king and his family—right at the center of his gallery—obscured deeper religious tensions. The king’s abjuration had left Duplessis-Mornay with the bitter taste of betrayal, and attempts to woo the monarch back into the Protestant fold failed spectacularly. In 1598, for instance, Duplessis-Mornay firmly denounced the Mass as unbiblical and the pope as the Antichrist in *De l’Institution, Usage et Doctrine du Saint Sacrement de l’Eucharistie en l’Eglise Ancienne* (On the institution, use, and doctrine of the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist in the ancient Church), but the polemical treatise only strained his relationship with Henry IV, who no longer sought his political advice.\(^{37}\) Yet despite his religious misgivings Duplessis-Mornay continued to serve the monarchy, and probably included the portraits of Henry IV, his wife Maria de’ Medici, and their son as proof of his undiminished loyalty. By placing Henry’s portrait in his gallery of Huguenot heroes Duplessis-Mornay was in fact hinting that the deceased monarch should still be ranked among the Protestants.

**Zamet’s Gallery**

The Parisian gallery of Sébastien Zamet was a perfect counterpoint to that of Duplessis-Mornay, as it comprised only portraits of Catholic figures and excluded the major Protestant players in the conflict. Looking back on Zamet’s life, this was hardly surprising, because he had provided substantial loans to both the monarchy and the Catholic League to support the anti-Huguenot campaign. Born around 1549 in the Tuscan town of Lucca, Zamet moved to

\(^{36}\) Daussy, 2002, 56–80, 152–82; Poton, 185–89.

Paris in 1572 where he became one of the most prominent bankers extending loans to the debt-ridden French monarchy. When the league gained control of Paris in 1588, Zamet remained in the capital to provide financial support to its nominal leader, the Duke of Mayenne (1554–1611); he also extended loans to Philip II of Spain and secured additional funds from the papacy. Yet the death of Zamet’s brother Horace in 1591, who was murdered by rioting Leaguer soldiers in the abbey of Juilly outside Paris, seriously shook his belief in the league, as did the military campaign of King Henry IV, who recaptured many Leaguer cities in the 1590s. The king’s conversion to Catholicism in 1593 and the surrender of Paris the next year eventually convinced Zamet that the tide was turning, so from 1594 onward he instead began extending generous loans to support Henry’s campaign against the Catholic League and Spain.38

But although Zamet switched allegiances, supporting a king whom many Catholics still believed to be a Protestant at heart, he never forgot his Leaguer past. On the contrary, Zamet commemorated this troublesome period in a purpose-built picture gallery in his Parisian townhouse on the Rue de la Cerisaie, close to the Arsenal and the Bastille. The spacious home, which he first rented in 1583, comprised two inner courtyards, gardens, a wine cellar, and stables. Zamet purchased the house in 1587, launching a vast reconstruction campaign that would last until 1600. A series of contracts reveals that the latest addition to his residence was a two-story gallery overlooking the garden, constructed in 1598 by the Parisian master-mason François Petit (fig. 3).39 The downstairs gallery, which could be accessed directly through the main hall, was lavishly decorated with tapestries showing mythological scenes, along with a portrait of Henry IV on horseback and a hunting scene of the king and his entourage.40

According to the postmortem inventory of Zamet’s galleries drawn up in 1614, the upstairs gallery contained over sixty paintings.41 In contrast to Duplessis-Mornay’s gallery, Zamet exhibited not just portraits, but also landscapes and religious scenes, including pictures of Christ and the Virgin Mary, the Adoration of the Magi, and an assortment of saints. He clearly intended his newly constructed gallery as a space to showcase his taste in fine art—the inventory even identifies some biblical scenes by the renowned Renaissance artist Jacopo Bassano (1510–92). Although the nineteen portraits were thus part of a larger visual assemblage, they could still be identified as

38 There is no biography on Zamet, but useful information can be found in Prunel, 1–11; Knecht, 321–22.
39 Coope, 675–76; Grodecki, 191–95.
40 Grodecki, 197–98.
41 The postmortem inventory is transcribed in ibid., 243–49.
a separate corpus, chosen to tell the story of Zamet’s past. Nearly all the portraits were identical in size (80 cm in height and 64 cm in width) and decorated with similar gold-leafed frames, suggesting that Zamet either commissioned them as a series, or had existing pictures cut down and uniformly framed to create a sense of unity. Moreover, the inventory explicitly referred to the gallery as *la galerie des rois* (the gallery of kings) because of the many royal portraits.

The artist who appraised the paintings, the Parisian master-painter Jacques Quesnel (d. 1629), also identified the various sitters. The gallery included the equestrian portraits of Francis I, Henry II, and Francis II, though remarkably enough not of Henry III and Henry IV, both of whom Zamet had served for many years. Instead, his collection comprised a series of portraits that stressed the links between France and the Spanish Habsburgs, in particular their intervention in the French civil wars to support the Catholic League and depose Henry IV. Zamet thus owned pictures of Philip II and his French wife, Elisabeth of Valois, as well as of Philip III and his consort, Margaret of Austria. The gallery also contained a portrait of Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma, who had invaded France in 1590 to relieve the Leaguer stronghold of Paris from the besieging troops of Henry IV, and portraits of the archdukes Albrecht and Isabella, who had captured Calais and Amiens in 1596–97. Even more striking were two pictures of Cardinal René de Birague, who had persecuted the Huguenots of Lyon and had vocally supported the decision to assassinate the Protestant nobility on Saint Bartholomew’s eve. The only family portraits to hang in the gallery were those of Zamet and his wife, Madeleine Le Clerc, in addition to a life-size picture of Zamet. Just like Duplessis-Mornay, then, Zamet tied his own past to that of the monarchy, foreign rulers, nobles, and clergymen, but in their visual choices the two men occupied opposite ends of the spectrum: whereas Duplessis-Mornay picked Protestants to adorn his
gallery, Zamet created an international pantheon of figures who had supported
the Catholic cause in France.

The Zamet gallery raises interesting questions about the possibility of
remembering the Wars of Religion in postwar France, in particular the period
of the league. Because the movement had sought to overthrow Henry IV but was
ultimately defeated, it had ended up on the wrong side of history, disgraced and
formally condemned to oblivion by a string of royal edicts: whenever Henry IV
captured a Leaguer stronghold he ordered the inhabitants to forget their
rebellious past, in exchange for a formal pardon.42 Philip Benedict has
therefore argued that for Catholics who returned to the obedience of Henry
IV, the less said about this troublesome period the better.43 Perhaps Zamet felt
the same: it is entirely possible that he had acquired the portraits during his
Leaguer years, but had found it impossible to dispose of them once he had joined
the royalist cause. After the defeat of the league it would have been difficult to
offload such unwanted pictures on the art market, while Zamet may also have
resisted the idea of throwing away cherished works of art. It remains difficult to
say whether the portraits of prominent Leaguers found in other Parisian
inventories, sometimes decades after the wars had ended, are evidence of
continued Leaguer sympathy or simply embarrassing pictures that never got
thrown away.44 Yet, that Zamet had his entire collection of Leaguer portraits put
in ornate gold-leafed frames and proudly displayed them in his purpose-built
picture gallery suggests that he hardly viewed them as an uncomfortable
inheritance, but rather as a proud reminder of his Leaguer past. It seems that
Henry IV’s wish to gain the trust and cooperation of his former opponents in
fact left ex-Leaguers with some leeway to commemorate their tainted history, as
long as these countermemories did not threaten the still-fragile peace. Zamet was
thus able to pair his allegiance to the new regime with an ongoing attachment to
the league: the portraits of Henry IV he displayed downstairs were clearly
intended as a show of loyalty to the Bourbon dynasty, whereas the upstairs
gallery celebrated a past that was perhaps disgraced, yet never entirely forgotten.

SHARED HISTORIES

The portrait galleries of Duplessis-Mornay and Zamet offered competing,
partisan narratives about the French Wars of Religion, but others carefully

42Finley-Croswhite; De Waele, 149–68.
44Examples of Leaguer portraits owned in postwar France are listed in Wildenstein, 1951,
45, 228 (inventory of Nicolas Nourry, 4 November 1608); Wildenstein 1950, 206, 238
(inventory of Anne Hotman, 28 May 1631); ibid., 205, 239 (inventory of Pierre Sotty, 6 June
1633).
avoided mention of the religious tensions, focusing instead on Henry IV’s role in uniting the nation. This royalist narrative found its expression in a different type of picture gallery, one filled not with portraits but with paintings contemporaries commonly referred to as “histories,” depicting key historical events such as battles and sieges. Historical picture galleries were part of a long multimedia tradition of art cycles that eulogized the great deeds of princes. The fresco series King Francis I had installed in his Fontainbleau gallery dated back to the 1530s, but similar sequences existed in the rich manuscript and tapestry traditions of Renaissance France. Catherine de’ Medici in particular stimulated the creation of cycles that heaped praise on the Valois dynasty because she sought to strengthen her position as queen mother and regent after the premature deaths of her husband Henry II in 1559 and her son Francis II in 1560.\footnote{Gaehtgens, 2007.} The most notable example of Catherine’s art patronage are the so-called Valois tapestries, woven in Brussels around 1575, which portray the queen mother and her family in a series of dazzling court festivals.\footnote{The classic study is Yates; but for a more recent interpretation, see Bertrand.} Other noteworthy series include the drawings made by the artist Antoine Caron (1521–99) for the allegorical tapestry series \textit{L’Histoire d’Artemise} (The history of Artemisia), which praises Catherine’s wise rule through the history of the ancient Queen Artemisia, and his designs for another series celebrating the heroic deeds of the Valois monarchy, known as \textit{L’Histoire françoysé de nostre temps} (The French history of our times).\footnote{Ehrmann, 1986, 52–104; Auclair; Gaehtgens, 2007 and 2008.}

The historical picture gallery that developed in France around 1600 thus extended the well-recognized tradition of royal cycles to panel painting. It also borrowed from older cycles the need to carefully select the episodes that augmented the ruler’s prestige while avoiding those that pointed to weakness or dissent. This process of selection gained additional meaning in postwar France, however, as Henry IV sought not just to extol his reign like any self-conscious prince would, but above all to prove that he was France’s legitimate ruler who had ended the fratricidal wars. To achieve this goal, the historical galleries created in Henry’s palaces thus left out events from the king’s early life, when he had taken up arms against the French monarchy as the Protestant king of Navarre, while they celebrated his successful military campaign against the Catholic League as king of France. At first sight, creating picture galleries that helped to relive the conflict—depicting precisely those episodes that were likely to embarrass or even antagonize ex-Leaguers—seemed painfully at odds with Henry’s repeated injunctions to forget and forgive, as well as with his policy of co-opting the support of his former opponents. Yet the memory of the league could also serve to bridge past divisions. The postwar galleries were an attempt to
rewrite the story of the wars, presenting the conflict not as a religious struggle between Protestants and Catholics, but between Frenchmen who had been loyal to the monarchy, irrespective of their faith, and those who had erroneously rebelled against it. The memory of the league thus deflected attention from the religious tensions that could plunge the kingdom back into civil war, uniting the nation around the monarch as the restorer of order.

The theoretical impetus for the surge in historical picture galleries was laid by Antoine de Laval (1550–1631), a humanist man of letters, architect, and painter at the court of Henry IV. In 1600 he authored a short treatise, published five years later as Des peintures convenables aux basiliques et palais du Roy (On the appropriate paintings for the king’s basilicas and palaces), in which he criticized French monarchs like Francis I for relying on ancient mythology and allegory to decorate their galleries. Surely, the history of their own reign and their predecessors’ offered plenty of glorious events that could be depicted. Laval was thinking in particular of the recently finished gallery in the Louvre, known as the Petite Galerie, which, he argued, should be adorned “with a masterpiece that is not common: not with fables, landscapes, or vain figures, which possess nothing commendable besides their color & stroke, but with the most beautiful & glorious history of the habitable world”—the history of the French monarchy.

Laval’s call for historical scenes inspired the decoration of at least two postwar royal galleries. During his reign Henry IV spent prodigious sums of money on the completion and decoration of the palaces he had inherited from his Valois predecessors, most of which had been left unfinished or were in dire need of modernization. The king’s vast campaign of architectural renewal, supervised by his superintendent, the Duke of Sully (1560–1641), included the creation of galleries decorated with scenes from the Wars of Religion. The first such gallery appeared in the Louvre, the Parisian residence of the French monarchy. King Charles IX had already begun the construction of a single-story gallery to extend the castle to the Seine, but the project was abandoned during the wars. It was Henry IV who completed the gallery after his capture of Paris in 1594, adding a second floor that would be lavishly decorated with paintings. In 1595 he ordered the construction of another, 500-meter-long gallery along the Seine to connect the Louvre to the nearby Tuileries palace, built by Catherine de’ Medici in the 1560s.
The decoration of the smaller of these two galleries, the so-called Petite Galerie, straddled the divide between a portrait gallery and a historical gallery. It was closely modeled on Laval’s treatise, who had suggested a traditional sequence of life-size portraits of French kings accompanied by historical vignettes showing “the battles, pompes of coronations, weddings, games, jousts or other famous acts of their times, portrayed in grey & white grisailles.”52 Henry’s court artist Toussaint Dubreuil (1561–1602) designed the gallery decorations accordingly in 1601, but when he died the next year the project was entrusted to Jacob Bunel, who executed fourteen portraits of French kings, from Louis IX to Henry IV, and another fourteen pictures of noteworthy queens. The paintings were installed in the Petite Galerie around 1608, where they remained until a fire destroyed them in 1661.53 Taken together, the portraits suggested an unbroken royal lineage since medieval times, neatly brushing over the fact that Henry IV belonged to a competing royal dynasty. The surrounding historical scenes proposed by Laval were omitted from the design, but the Wars of Religion still found their way into the Petite Galerie: the gallery’s immense vault was decorated with scenes from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* that subtly evoked Henry’s victory over the league. Designed by Dubreuil before his death, the ceiling frescos ostensibly showed Hercules slaying the Hydra, the rescue of Prometheus, Perseus beheading Medusa and freeing Andromeda, and the airborne struggle between Jupiter and the Titans, but keen-eyed observers would spot that the heroic figures bore a striking resemblance to Henry IV.54 The scenes were intended as an allegory of Henry’s defeat of the Catholic League, a theme that proliferated in many postwar representations of the king: just like the ancient heroes had slain dangerous beasts, so Henry IV had defeated the monster of Leaguer rebellion (fig. 4).55

The memory of Henry’s triumph over the league was even more palpable in the royal gallery he created at Fontainebleau. Whereas the Petite Galerie offered a coded narrative of the king’s triumphs, the Fontainebleau gallery required little decrypting, as it showed in realistic fashion the battles Henry had fought against his Leaguer opponents. The gallery was begun in 1600, when the king decided to extend the medieval palace with a two-story gallery of around eighty meters in length and ten meters in width. The project was overseen by Sébastien Zamet, who had been nominated superintendent of Fontainebleau in 1599, and whose experience in creating his own gallery in Paris undoubtedly proved useful. In

52Laval, 10–11: “Des batailles, des pompes de sacre, de nopces, de ieux, de ioustes ou autres actes celebres de leur temps representez en camayeuls gris & blanc.”
55Vivanti.
1603 he signed an agreement with court painter Jean de Hoey (1545–1615), born in Leiden but active in France as early as 1564, who was to assemble a team of painters from the Low Countries to decorate the two galleries together with the painter Ambroise Dubois (1543–1614).  

The picture series commemorating the wars was installed in the upstairs gallery, officially known as the Galerie de la Reine, but soon nicknamed Galerie de Diane, after the six pictures near the entrance that told the history of the goddess Diana—an obvious tribute to Henry’s second wife Maria de’ Medici. The gallery’s vast middle section, however, was taken up by ten canvases depicting key events from the wars, five on each side, each measuring 5.20 meters in width and 2.30 meters in height. The paintings unfortunately

\[56\] Boudon, Blécon, and Grodecki, 74–77, 254–55; Droguet, 2010b; Samoyault-Verlet. For an overview of De Hoey’s career, see M. Guillaume; Béisme-Droguet.

\[57\] Wirth.
disappeared when the gallery was redesigned in the Napoleonic era, but the testimony of Pierre Guilbert (1697–1759), a Jansenist abbé who published a guidebook to the palace in 1731, informs us that they depicted “the capture of cities, the battles & the victories of Henry the Great,” including the battles at Coutras, Arques, Ivry, Fontaine-Françoise, and Honfleur, and the surrender of Mantes and Vernon-sur-Seine, the inhabitants kneeling down to hand Henry the city keys.58 Besides the incongruous Battle of Coutras (1587), where Henry had led the Huguenots to victory against King Henry III, all the other paintings thus focused exclusively on Henry’s victorious campaign against the Catholic League.

Keeping alive the memory of the league served a clear purpose: the battle scenes not only added to the king’s fame, they also presented him as a leader who had crushed rebellion and reunited the kingdom. That the historical galleries in the Louvre and Fontainebleau should indeed be understood as political statements is also suggested by a contemporary marble mantelpiece, known as La Belle Chéminée, which Henry IV ordered in 1597 for the grand reception hall at Fontainebleau. Carved by the sculptor Matthieu Jacquet (ca. 1545–ca. 1611) from Grenoble, it was decorated with a large bas-relief of the king on horseback and a smaller relief underneath that paralleled two key scenes from the royal gallery: the king in the Battle of Ivry, vanquishing his Leaguer enemies, while in the background the Leaguer stronghold of Mantes surrenders to the king (fig. 5).59 According to the Trinitarian chaplain of Fontainebleau who authored the chateau’s first guidebook in 1642, Pierre Dan (d. 1649), Henry IV had the mantelpiece constructed as an “immortal trophy of his victories,” a powerful reminder that “with the strength of his arm & his courage, he had called his enemies & his rebellious subjects to duty & to reason, and had finally brought Peace to his Kingdom.”60

Historical picture galleries commemorating Henry IV’s reign proved remarkably enduring, extending far beyond the king’s death in 1610 and spreading to aristocratic galleries across France. The decades following Henry’s assassination witnessed the construction of new picture galleries that were closely modeled on those of the late king, all celebrating his military victories and ultimate triumph over the Catholic League. By far the most ambitious project was initiated by Henry’s widow, Maria de’ Medici, who in 1622 commissioned a set of twenty-four pictures from Peter Paul Rubens to commemorate Henry’s

58Guilbert, 1:170–01: “Des prises de Villes, des Batailles & Victoires d’Henry le Grand.” Guilbert did not specify the remaining three scenes. See the appendix below for a chronological list of events depicted in the gallery.
59Ciprut; Ehrmann, 1975; Drogue; 2010a.
60Dan, 140: “Par la force de son bras & de son courage, il a eu mis ses ennemis & ses sujets rebelles au devoir & à la raison, il a enfin donné la Paix à son Royaume.”
military victories, alongside another series to eulogize her own life. Both cycles were to decorate two separate galleries in the queen’s Parisian residence, the Luxembourg palace (fig. 6), which was modeled on the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, the Medici family home where she had grown up. The two galleries, each measuring almost sixty meters in length and over seven meters in width, were created on the first floor of the two wings surrounding the central courtyard. The Medici cycle hung in the western wing, here depicted on the right; the Henry IV cycle was destined for the parallel eastern gallery on the left.61

Yet the Luxembourg palace was more than just a childhood re-creation. Maria de’ Medici consciously designed her residence as a monument to honor the memory of her husband, and in the process raise her own profile. Following Henry’s assassination in 1610 she had assumed the regency in the name of her eight-year-old son Louis, but her position at court had become increasingly precarious. In 1617 the young king banned Maria from his council and exiled her to Blois, from where she escaped two years later to wage war against her own son; she only returned to Paris following her reconciliation with Louis in 1622.62

61Galletti, 2012; Thuillier and Foucart.

62For a detailed account of Maria de’ Medici’s life, see Dubost.
Commissioning the paintings from Rubens that same year was an attempt to demonstrate her regained stature at court: by commemorating her own life in conjunction with that of Henry IV, who had bequeathed the kingdom to her, the queen mother sought to legitimize her position at the heart of the Bourbon monarchy.

After completing the Medici cycle, which was installed in May 1625, Rubens set to work on the life of Henry IV. By January 1628 the painter was producing sketches for the pictures, based on a list of topics drawn up by Maria de’ Medici. Yet Rubens did not begin the actual canvases until the spring of 1630, because he was interrupted by diplomatic missions on behalf of the Habsburg archdukes, first to Madrid in 1628, then to London in 1629. Upon his return to Antwerp, Rubens was unable to complete the paintings, however, because in December 1630 Maria de’ Medici once again clashed with her son and was forced into exile—this time definitively—to the Southern Netherlands.63 As a result, the Henry cycle remained unfinished, but Rubens’s correspondence and the sketches and pictures he produced before the project was abandoned nonetheless give a sense of what the completed series would have looked like.64

Figure 6. Israël Sylvestre. View of the Palais du Luxembourg, ca. 1650. Versailles, Chateaux de Versailles et de Trianon. © RMN-Grand Palais / Gérard Blot.

63Merle du Bourg, 43–45.
64For good overviews of the Henry IV cycle and the artwork Rubens produced before the project was abandoned, see Jost; Van Hout; Galletti, 2008. See the appendix for a list of events for which Rubens produced sketches or paintings.
The overall theme chosen for the cycle was clearly inspired by Henry’s galleries commemorating his struggle and ultimate triumph over the league, in particular the gallery at Fontainebleau. The 1622 contract signed between Maria de’ Medici and Rubens stipulated that the painter was to depict “all of the battles of the late King Henry the Great, the encounters he engaged in, his combats, conquests and sieges of cities, with the triumphs of the said victories in the fashion of the triumphs of the Romans.” The contract also indicates that the queen wished to exclude a good deal of her husband’s early life. Although the series commenced with *The Birth of Henry IV*, his past as a Protestant prince was entirely omitted, in particular his marriage to Marguerite of Valois in 1572, the subsequent Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, and Henry’s early military career against the French Crown. Probably the only episode from the king’s Protestant past that would have graced the walls of the gallery was *The Battle of Coutras*, a painting auctioned in Antwerp in 1642 but lost ever since.

Whereas Maria deemed the memory of the king’s early years unfit for remembrance, his triumph over the league figured prominently in the gallery. The right wall was to be adorned with a series of battles against Leaguer forces from which Henry IV had emerged victorious, most famously the *Battle of Arques* and the *Battle of Ivry* (fig. 7). Although it is uncertain if Rubens included Henry’s controversial conversion to Catholicism in 1593, he did paint another key event, the 1589 *Reconciliation of King Henry III and Henry of Navarre* (fig. 8), when the childless king formally acknowledged the Protestant prince of Navarre as his successor. In Rubens’s representation, Navarre kneels to receive the scepter from the French king, while the female figure of Peace bearing a staff of concord sanctions the event and wards off Discord, represented by a crone disguised behind a mask—an allusion to Henry’s efforts to bring the civil wars to an end.

The series continued with pictures that commemorated the defeat of the league through a mixture of historical and allegorical figures. The eye-catching *Triumph of Henry IV* (fig. 9), which would have stretched across the full width of the gallery, shows the king as a Roman emperor at the center of a triumphal procession making its way toward an arch. Standing in his chariot, Henry holds

---

65Thuillier and Foucart, 97. For the original French contract, see Rooses, 217.
66Duverger, 7:173; Van Hout, 24.
67This photo is the only remaining evidence of the complete painting, which was cut in half by its owner, the German art collector August Neuerburg, to fit in his reception room. The lower half is now in the Rubenshuis in Antwerp; the upper half was given on loan to the city of Cologne, but went missing during the Second World War: Frieda Haüsler to Ludwig Burkhard, Hamburg, 12 March 1957, in Rubenianum Antwerp, Burkhard documentation, LB 1025/2.
68For a detailed description, see Held, 1:126–27.
an olive branch as a token of peace and forgiveness, while a winged putto crowns the king with laurels, and figures in the cortège celebrate his victories over the league. A more disturbing detail, however, are the prisoners being dragged along: like a Roman emperor parading vanquished nations through the streets of Rome, Henry IV is depicted as a ruler humiliating the Leaguer rebels. Rubens’s earlier sketches for this scene even had the king crushing them underneath his chariot.
A similar narrative of Leaguer submission and royal magnificence is presented in the next scene, *The Surrender of Paris* (fig. 11). The city of Paris is personified as a woman, kneeling before the king to hand him the city keys, while the inhabitants beg for mercy. On the left, royalist soldiers trample a male figure representing the league, who is holding a snake and torch, the symbols of discord and rebellion. A triumphal procession crosses the Seine in the background, while bound prisoners are being pushed into the river, a reference to the Spanish soldiers who had been drowned because they refused to surrender to Henry IV. Although Rubens partially relied on allegory to narrate the life of Henry IV, the pictures were still remarkably

---

69 The sequence of sketches is outlined in ibid., 1:128–32.
70 Ibid., 1:132–33. See also the discussion of this sketch by Jost, 193–94; Van Hout, 30.
frank in their depiction of the league as a force of evil and in recalling the retribution against those who had rebelled against the king.

Historical picture galleries depicting Henry’s life and triumphs were by no means a prerogative of the monarchy. In the aftermath of the civil wars several noblemen created galleries in their local chateaux, showcasing the same royalist victories against the league that Henry IV had chosen at Fontainebleau and the Louvre, alongside wartime events that had marked their own lives. These local
galleries may well have been a matter of taste, as nobles sought to imitate the latest fashion from Paris, but clientelism seems to have played an equally important role: galleries that blended episodes from the civil wars with services rendered to the Bourbon king helped emphasize one’s loyalty. As Sharon Kettering has shown, patron-client relationships in early modern France were defined by reciprocal bonds of loyalty and self-interest. Clients were subservient to their patron, but received favors in exchange for their service, including material benefits, advancement, and protection. Because the power of the French state was fairly limited, clients played a key role in ensuring that the monarch’s wishes were carried out on a local level. This was especially imperative for Henry IV, whose authority had been contested not only by Leaguer noblemen and officeholders, but also by Protestant elites questioning his conversion to the Church of Rome. The king therefore invested much time and effort in building up a network of clients to strengthen his regional power base and reunite the country, appointing royalist officials to control recaptured Leaguer towns and nominating loyal governors across France. Among these men was Duplessis-Mornay, who was named governor of Saumur in 1589 to control the Loire Valley. The provincial galleries he and other royal clients created thus epitomized their patron-client relationship: besides imitating royal tastes, they also used picture galleries to demonstrate their loyalty to the monarchy, even when their relationship had suffered in the past.

This was particularly true for one royal client, Chancellor Nicolas Brulart de Sillery (1544–1624). A former Leaguer like Zamet, his relationship with Henry IV

---

71 Kettering; Finley-Croswhite.
became strained when his brother Jean, a Capuchin friar, publicly preached against the Edict of Nantes, for which the king publicly lambasted Nicolas during a session of the Parlement de Paris.72 The chancellor redeemed himself, however, by negotiating the Franco-Spanish Treaty of Vervins (1598), and by persuading the pope to annul Henry’s first marriage. He eventually created an extensive picture gallery in his chateau at Berny, a few miles south of Paris. The castle was destroyed during the French Revolution, but the testimony of the royal historiographer Denis Godefroy (1615–81), who visited the gallery twice, reveals that the series narrated Henry IV’s life in twenty-nine scenes, supplemented by two pictures showing the coronation of Louis XIII in 1610 and two portraits of the royal family. The vast majority of the paintings focused on Henry’s military successes against the league, most notably the battles of Arques, Ivry, and Fontaine-Française, his conquest of Brittany, and the capture of Leaguer cities like Paris, Chartres, Dreux, Laon, La Fère, and Amiens. Yet, tellingly, Brulart himself also made an appearance in a picture celebrating the Peace of Vervins, emphasizing once again his own service and loyalty to the Bourbon monarchy.73

An equivalent gallery was created by François de Bonne, Duke of Lesdiguières (1543–1626), a Protestant army commander from the Dauphiné who had made his reputation during the wars. Employing guerrilla tactics, his troops had raided villages, destroyed harvests and livestock, and captured a series of Catholic towns. After Henry’s accession to the throne in 1589, Lesdiguières became the royalist commander of Dauphiné, responsible for capturing Leaguer strongholds such as Grenoble, which he took in December 1590. As a reward he was appointed lieutenant-general of the Dauphiné in 1597.74 Lesdiguières was not just a warrior nobleman, however; he also had a passion for history. Educated at the universities of Avignon and Paris, he owned a large library of over 700 volumes, including more than 280 histories, such as D’Aubigné’s Histoire universelle (Universal history, 1624).75 Lesdiguières’s interest in recent history also manifested itself in a picture gallery created around 1614 in his chateau at Vizille, just north of Grenoble. The visual narrative of the gallery was very similar to that of Brulart’s: it featured an equestrian portrait of King Henry IV, juxtaposed with portraits of the king and Maria de’ Medici, and seventeen tableaux depicting events from the wars. Nine of these paintings narrated the familiar sequence of Henry’s triumphs: the battles of Coutras, Arques, Ivry, and Fontaine-Française, the capture of Rouen, Amiens, La Fère, and Montmérian, as well as the king’s entry into Paris in 1594. The eight paintings on the opposite side, however, traced Lesdiguières’s personal military triumphs in the Dauphiné,

72Nelson, 116.
73Wilhelm. See the appendix for a list of all events depicted in Brulart’s gallery.
74For a biography of Lesdiguières, see Gal.
75Ibid., 39–41.
beginning with the capture of Grenoble in 1590. This second set was commissioned in 1611 from Antoine Schanaert, a Protestant painter from Brussels who had settled in Grenoble.\footnote{Ibid., 256–58; Pilot; Maignien, 330–33. For the history of the castle, see Gaillard. Schanaert was contracted for eight paintings, but by 1677 the gallery comprised ten Lesdiguières scenes: Pilot, 429. For a list of all the scenes depicted, see the appendix.}

The Lesdiguières and Brulart galleries clearly echoed the sequence of royal triumphs shown at the Louvre and Fontainebleau, just as they bore some striking resemblances to the galleries of Duplessis-Mornay and Zamet, in particular the display of royal portraits and the blending of personal and royal history to demonstrate their loyalty to the Bourbon regime. Yet whereas Duplessis-Mornay and Zamet created a resolutely confessional pantheon of Protestant and Catholic heroes, at Vizille and Berny the religious allegiances of their owners were not immediately apparent. Contemporaries undoubtedly remembered that Lesdiguières had spent his life campaigning against the Catholics of Dauphine, while they knew that Brulart had supported the league, but their galleries did not offer a sectarian narrative of the wars. Both actually avoided the contentious past, focusing instead on the royalist memory of Leaguer defeat and Henry’s supremacy. Brulart thus chose to depict the downfall of the league, even though personally this must have been a troubling memory, whereas Lesdiguières entirely omitted his Huguenot past to
focus on the victories he had scored as a royalist commander. Even *The Capture of Grenoble* (fig. 12), one of the few paintings to escape the fire that destroyed the gallery at Vizille in 1825, should not be read as a Protestant victory over the Catholics of Dauphiné, but rather as the defeat of rebels who had prolonged the fratricidal wars. The other pictures featuring the duke’s military successes in fact told the story of another war, that against the Duke of Savoy, who had invaded the Dauphiné in 1588 but was defeated in a series of battles and sieges. Lesdiguières thus consciously cast himself as a royalist client serving his king, not as a Huguenot soldier in the clasp of party interests. In other words, the memory of the league, expressed in the recurring sequence of battles and sieges that saw Henry IV emerge as triumphant, helped Catholics and Protestants to remember the wars without descending into partisan conflict again; the defeat of Leaguer rebels by the Bourbon monarchy became a shared memory that transcended the memory of religious opposition.

**PICTURE GALLERIES AND THEIR VIEWERS**

The surviving inventories, accounts, drawings, and paintings offer precious evidence of the layout of French picture galleries and their intended meanings, but they tell us very little about their actual functioning. Who viewed the paintings on display? And how did visitors respond to what they saw? The latter question is particularly germane, because the galleries conveyed a history of the French civil wars that may not have been apparent to every visitor. The sequence of paintings and portraits required an intimate understanding of the events that had taken place, the specific role their owners had played in the unfolding story of the civil wars, and those episodes they may have wanted to sweep under the rug. Sara Galletti has correctly pointed out that Rubens’s Medici cycle, though provocative in its depiction of Maria’s life, was not necessarily offensive to contemporaries, because its true meaning was skillfully hidden in allegory: “What decides whether a visual message transmitted through an image or group of images will lead to a scandal or will generate consensus is the composition of its audience and the audience’s ability to extract the underlying meaning.”

To understand how picture galleries about the Wars of Religion functioned as sites of memory, then, it does not suffice to analyze the visual canon and owners’ intentions—one must also explore audience responses.

Before visitors were able to decode the underlying narrative of a picture gallery, they first had to gain physical access. Doing so was not self-evident, because galleries were consciously designed as an extension of the lord’s private space, out of bounds to courtiers and other visitors, and sometimes even kept under lock and key by their owners. Francis I’s gallery at Fontainebleau, for instance, could only be entered with the permission of the king himself, who carried the key on his body and took great pride in personally showing visitors

---
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around. In 1541 Cardinal Farnese’s secretary, Niccolò Ardinghelli, reported that “His Majesty, his face cheerful, led us first into the chamber and then into the adjacent gallery, . . . opening the doors with his own hand, and declaring to us the history of the paintings.” The king held the key to his gallery in more than just a literal sense, as visitors could only penetrate the frescos’ deeper meaning when he explained the scenes to them. Francis’s sister Marguerite (1492–1549) once frankly admitted that she was most grateful for the king’s elucidations, “for to see your buildings without hearing your intention is like reading Hebrew.” Similar private viewings took place in Catherine de’ Medici’s Parisian residence, the Hôtel de la Reine. When in 1580 King Henry III organized a soirée in his mother’s house, he invited only a happy few into the gallery, including Lady Anne Cobham (d. 1612), the wife of the English ambassador. She later reported that the king “led the way up into a goodly gallery, himself keeping the door till all those were entered whom he liked to have present. Then, showing the pictures to the ladies, he called me to him and brought me to those of the King and Queen of Scots.”

Scholars who have studied the layout and placement of galleries in royal residences have demonstrated that entering a personal gallery became somewhat easier around 1600, when French monarchs began to transform this once private domain into a space used for public entertainment and dynastic magnificence. The opening up of galleries was partly the accidental result of larger architectural changes that transformed the topography of French royal palaces from 1550 onward, in particular during the reigns of Charles IX and Henry III. Both monarchs introduced a series of antechambers in their residences that physically separated their private apartments (in particular the chambre du roi) from the public audience hall (the salle), accentuating the different social status of those courtiers who were allowed to visit the king and those who had to remain in the hall. As antechambers became the primary instrument for regulating access to the monarch, royal galleries conversely lost their importance as extensions of the king’s private space and were increasingly being used for public events, such as the reception of ambassadors, banquets, and wedding celebrations.

In addition to these architectural transformations there was the more mundane need for royal propaganda. Henry IV in particular realized that staging public ceremonies in his galleries—where visitors were surrounded by magnificent art series that celebrated his reign—could be used to assert his

---
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authority vis-à-vis the leading nobles of the realm, many of whom had contested his legitimacy as king of France during the wars.\textsuperscript{82} It was precisely for this reason that Antoine de Laval advocated a historical rather than a mythological gallery in the Louvre, asserting that “the Nobility, together with the rest of the intelligent minds in this world, will upon viewing this gallery set aside their doubts that were born long ago regarding the history of our Kings, and acknowledge their origins, descendants, deeds, and alliances, the times and length of their Reigns, their successors to the Crown, [and] their lineage.”\textsuperscript{83}

Of course, the transformation of French picture galleries was more of an evolution than a radical change. Even as royal galleries were opened up to larger audiences, they retained their private nature because access was still controlled by the monarch, who allowed only a privileged public to enter. In practice, galleries blended private and public spheres.\textsuperscript{84} Just like his predecessors, for example, Henry IV continued to entertain foreign dignitaries by offering them private tours of his otherwise public galleries. In 1608 he guided the Florentine ambassador Guidi through the rooms and galleries at Fontainebleau, proudly pointing out the paintings on display.\textsuperscript{85} The Petite Galerie in the Louvre also operated on a dual level. On the one hand the gallery conformed to old patterns of privacy, since it could only be accessed through the king’s inner sanctum, the \textit{chambre du roi} in the southwestern corner of the Louvre. On the other hand, the royal portraits and painted vault were clearly meant to impress visitors, and on several occasions the gallery was indeed used as the magnificent backdrop to state ceremonies: in 1606 Henry IV held a reception to celebrate the baptism of his son in the Petite Galerie, and in 1612 the Spanish ambassador was solemnly received by Louis XIII, seated on a throne at the outer end of the gallery.\textsuperscript{86}

The same was true for aristocratic galleries. Duplessis-Mornay’s gallery at Saumur, for instance, functioned both as public and private sphere. The cupboard containing his manuscripts, published works, and annotated books suggests that he used the gallery as a private place for study in addition to his library, yet the gallery was not situated behind his own apartments: visitors who climbed the chateau’s main staircase to the first floor could directly enter the room by turning left.\textsuperscript{87} Moreover, as governor of Saumur, Duplessis-Mornay held regular audiences in the gallery, seated underneath a canopy of tapestries depicting
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\textsuperscript{84}Galletti, 2014, 895–903.
\textsuperscript{85}Müntz, 259.
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the history of the Maccabean Revolt.\textsuperscript{88} The topography of the Luxembourg palace, in contrast, allowed Maria de' Medici to separate public and private spheres. Whereas Rubens’s pictures narrating the queen’s life were hidden away in a gallery directly behind her private rooms, remaining out of sight even to courtiers, the Henry IV cycle was clearly meant to be seen. The king’s gallery could be entered directly from the main staircase, and was to be connected via two passageways to an adjacent ballroom. Although this latter extension to the palace never materialized because of Maria’s disgrace from court in 1630, it does reveal that the queen intended the Henry gallery as an impressive public space: each time courtiers would be making their way to a party they would have been face to face with the memory of Leaguer rebellion and royal triumph.\textsuperscript{89}

Yet gaining access to a picture gallery did not necessarily mean that visitors understood the pictures on display. That their owners often acted as tour guides and intellectual gatekeepers, obfuscating or decoding the intended meaning of the paintings, suggests that picture galleries were open to multiple, if not competing interpretations. Arguably the most famous example is the visit Louis XIII paid to his mother’s new gallery in the Luxembourg palace in May 1625: Rubens later reported that to avoid controversy Maria’s court chaplain Claude Maugis had guided the king around, “changing and concealing the true meaning with great skill.”\textsuperscript{90} Some of the picture galleries about the Wars of Religion required similar expertise to decode rather than conceal their underlying narrative—especially those that relied on allegory. The vault of the Petite Galerie, which used scenes from Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses} to tell the story of Henry’s triumph over the Catholic League, was difficult to understand if visitors were unaware that each of the mythological heroes resembled Henry IV. The English nobleman Thomas Coryate (ca. 1577–1617), who visited the gallery in 1608, thus missed the allusion to Leaguer defeat, as he claimed that the vault depicted “God and the Angels, the Sunne, the Moone, the Starres, the Planets, and other Celestiall figures.”\textsuperscript{91} The royalist exile Richard Symonds (1617–60) also failed to see the historical narrative, simply observing that “the Roofe has many storyes of men & women,” whereas he did identify “the pictures of the Kings of France” along the walls.\textsuperscript{92} Allegory, in other words, allowed artists to represent the conflicted past without causing outright provocation; only those in the know understood what they saw.

Most postwar picture galleries, however, were designed to convey a clearer message. Following Antoine de Laval’s suggestion to eschew allegory, Henry IV

\textsuperscript{88}Fillon, 225.
\textsuperscript{89}Galletti, 2008, 48–49; Galletti, 2014, 900–01.
\textsuperscript{90}Peter Paul Rubens to Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (Paris, 13 May 1625), in Magurn, 109.
\textsuperscript{91}Coryate, 25.
\textsuperscript{92}In Millar, 158.
chose to decorate the Galerie de la Reine at Fontainebleau with historical scenes that were far easier to deduce. The Henry IV cycle in the Luxembourg palace, as well as the galleries of Brulart de Sillery and the Duke of Lesdiguières, likewise presented a more straightforward story about the civil wars. The various descriptions of these galleries—penned by travelers, diplomats, clergymen, and antiquaries—demonstrate not only that visitors regularly gained access, but also that they understood the paintings as a coherent series celebrating Henry’s military triumphs. Brulart’s gallery at Berny, for instance, was visited in 1645 by the Strasbourg tourist Élie Brackenhoffer (1618–82), who correctly identified the paintings as “the magnificent exploits of King Henry the Great.” The royal historiographer Denis Godefroy, who had preceded him in 1641, likewise observed that “in a large and long gallery is depicted the life of King Henry IV, in thirty-three well-executed paintings, which represent au naturel his principal deeds in peace and war.”

93 Godefroy also added historical background notes on the events he saw in Brulart’s gallery, stressing Henry IV’s magnanimous role in bringing the wars to an end. Two scenes depicting the surrender of Paris prompted his observation that, after the king’s entry into the city, “heralds went into the various neighborhoods, loudly proclaiming to the People the General Pardon—a result of the King’s goodness—and the forgetting of all that had happened.”

Extracting the underlying narrative of Duplessis-Mornay’s and Zamet’s portrait galleries may have been more difficult, as visitors not only had to be familiar with the people on display and their relationship to the owner, but also had to understand the tacit partisan narrative about the Wars of Religion that united the portraits. Although no visitor testimonies have survived, other sources do suggest that the memories conveyed by these portrait galleries were obvious enough to contemporaries. The Protestant gallery of Duplessis-Mornay raised the ire of Catholic soldiers who entered the castle in May 1621, when Louis XIII halted in Saumur on his way to subdue a Huguenot rebellion in the south of France. To Duplessis-Mornay’s dismay, the king deposed him as governor and stationed troops in the chateau, who proceeded to destroy the Protestant books and manuscripts in his gallery—and presumably also the portraits of Protestant grandees, as none of them have survived.95 From the location of Zamet’s portrait gallery one can infer that the martyred memory of the Catholic League was also apparent to contemporaries. Whereas Zamet’s downstairs gallery, outfitted with two large paintings of Henry IV, was easily accessed from the main hall, the portrait series of
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Leaguer supporters was discreetly placed upstairs. The physical separation between royalist and Leaguer portraits is all the more acute given that Zamet regularly entertained Henry IV and royal officeholders in his own house and organized dinners in the hall adjacent to the downstairs gallery.⁹⁶

CONCLUSION

The Edict of Nantes ended the Wars of Religion in 1598, but inside the chateaux and palaces of postwar France the conflict lived on for decades. Both King Henry IV and the elites commemorated the wars in purpose-built picture galleries that showcased a coherent series of historical portraits and events. These galleries are a remarkable source, as they reveal canonical memories about the civil wars that have long remained hidden. They first of all widen the scope of material available to study the memory of the French civil wars. Most scholarship has focused on written sources, such as histories, newsheets, and diaries, but visual imagery was an equally powerful tool to communicate memories of the past. Remembering in visual form bore a striking similarity to textual memories about the wars: just like printed histories, engravings and paintings contained a narrative that had to be read by those who viewed them, offering what was often a clearly partisan Protestant or Catholic view of the past. Yet the visual memorialization of the wars also presented powerful storytelling opportunities that textual histories lacked, such as the encoding of troublesome episodes in allegory, or the condensing of multiple events into one scene.

A close reading of the historical narratives embedded in French picture galleries also offers remarkable new evidence about the ways in which Catholics and Protestants remembered the civil wars. As was to be expected, both sides told radically different stories about the past, making their own community victims while assigning blame to the other. The portrait galleries of Philippe Duplessis-Mornay and Sébastien Zamet are prime examples of such vocal sectarian memories: they commemorated the wars from a resolutely confessional perspective, focusing exclusively on heroes, such as the Protestant victims of the Saint Bartholomew’s Massacre featured in Duplessis-Mornay’s gallery, or the Leaguers commemorated as martyrs in Zamet’s gallery. At the same time, however, French elites crafted a royalist narrative that united Frenchmen into the nation, irrespective of their past and religious convictions. Whereas printed memories—such as the etchings by Tortorel and Perrissin or the histories by Beza and De Thou—dwell at length on the earlier civil wars, the picture galleries sidestep these contentious events almost entirely. They instead commemorated the reign of Henry IV, who had triumphed over the league as king of France, and whose equestrian portrait formed the centerpiece of most collections. Including the king’s portrait was partly a personal choice, as royal clients wished to demonstrate their loyalty to the Bourbon monarchy. But the series
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of sieges and battles present in royal and elite galleries demonstrate that Henry was also remembered as the monarch who had delivered France from civil strife, uniting the country behind a common cause—the defeat of rebels—that transcended religious fault lines. Protestants and Catholics may have remained divided by faith in the aftermath of the civil wars, but they also relied on the past to bridge these very divisions. The memory of the league served as a neutral zone of contact that allowed them to tell a story about the wars that effectively avoided confessional conflict.

The coexistence between sectarian and consensual memories about the French Wars of Religion may be explained by the different types of picture gallery this article has examined, and their different degrees of openness. Portrait galleries were first and foremost intended as personal memories, not unlike diaries or family memoirs, with a limited audience and access carefully regulated by their owners. The privacy of portrait galleries consequently allowed for greater flexibility in remembering the wars from a partisan perspective, even if those memories risked upsetting the precarious religious balance struck by the Edict of Nantes. The portrait galleries of Zamet and Duplessis-Mornay thus functioned as personal records of their past, visualizing the individual—and hence partisan—memory of their involvement in the civil wars. The historical picture galleries created in France’s royal palaces and the chateaux of noblemen, on the other hand, were clearly meant to be seen. They were gradually opened up to a larger audience of courtiers, nobles, and elite tourists, who were supposed to marvel at Henry’s exploits in defeating the league and restoring order to France. As a result, historical picture galleries promoted a more consensual, royalist memory of the wars.

It thus appears that Frenchmen made a tacit division between remembering in private and in public. The Edict of Nantes prohibited the public memory of the wars, in particular the revival of past injustices, but because the monarchy relied on the support of both Protestants and Catholics to uphold religious diversity in France, there existed at least some leeway to remember the wars in private. Writing about the practice of toleration in early modern Europe, Benjamin Kaplan has termed this double standard the “fiction of privacy”: to keep the peace, communities often turned a blind eye to the clandestine churches of Protestant or Catholic dissenters, provided their services did not spill out into the public sphere. The picture galleries of Duplessis-Mornay and Zamet likewise functioned as supposedly private spaces: contemporaries must have known about their galleries and the flagrant partisan memories they contained, but condoned them as long as these memories did not enter the public realm, where they would disturb the fiction of a forgotten past. Ultimately, the dual strategy of crafting consensual public memories while tolerating partisan private narratives points to the considerable willingness of the first postwar generation to uphold the Edict of Nantes. People
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realized that France’s experiment with religious toleration, however grudging or pragmatic it may have been, was the only way forward to leave the past behind.

APPENDIX
Episodes from King Henry IV’s Life in Four French Picture Galleries

The titles listed below are descriptions of the depicted events, not official titles, because these varied from one gallery inventory to another. Similarly, dates indicate when an event took place, not when the painting was created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galerie de la Reine, Palais de Fontainebleau</th>
<th>Henry IV cycle, Palais du Luxembourg</th>
<th>Brulart de Sillery, Berny</th>
<th>Duke of Lesdiguières, Vizille</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Henry of Navarre (1553)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the Protestant Party (1569)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Coutras (1587)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation with King Henry III (1589)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Arques (1589)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of the Fauxbourgs of Paris (1589)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victories in the Vendôme, Maine, and Normandy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Honfleur (1590)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Ivry (1590)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Galerie de la Reine, Palais de Fontainebleau</th>
<th>Henry IV cycle, Palais du Luxembourg</th>
<th>Brulart de Sillery, Berny</th>
<th>Duke of Lesdiguières, Vizille</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrender of Mantes (1590)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrender of Vernon-sur-Seine (1590)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrender of Chartres (1591)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Ivetot (1592)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Dreux (1593)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion to Catholicism (1593)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of His People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacre of Henry IV (1594)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry into Paris (1594)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemency toward the People of Paris</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrender of Rouen (1594)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Laon (1594)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Fontaine-Française (1595)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of La Fère (1596)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Galerie de la Reine, Palais de Fontainebleau</th>
<th>Henry IV cycle, Palais du Luxembourg</th>
<th>Brulart de Sillery, Berny</th>
<th>Duke of Lesdiguières, Vizille</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Amiens (1597)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacification of Brittany (1598)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace of Vervins (1598)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Bourg-en-Bresse (1600)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Montmélan (1600)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage to Maria de’ Medici (1600)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fruits of Peace</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saves the Holy Sepulcher from the Turks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbiters between the Pope and Venice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Accomplishments in Peacetime</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Henry IV (1610)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronation of Louis XIII (1610)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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