that many of the tales are concerned with artistic competition. In a revealing analysis of the Arachne-Minerva weaving contest, he discusses Minerva's tapestry as dominated by images of stasis and divine justice, whereas Arachne weaves a mirror of Ovid's own text, imaging tales of transformation that flow seamlessly from one to the other in a narrative structure that continually transgresses and subverts hierarchical order. Barkan then turns to an artistic depiction of the weaving contest as it is figured in Diego Velasquez's *Las Hilanderas*, and in an illuminating discussion, he demonstrates how the three planes of the painting interact with one another. He identifies the tapestry in the background as Velasquez's rendering of Titian's *Rape of Europa*, then in the Spanish royal collection. Barkan's reads this "visual quotation" as homage to Titian, the great master of metamorphic subjects. But surely given the reference to the contest, in which artistic identity itself depends upon the outcome of the competition, we must see the allusion to Titian, especially given the Bloomian critical legacy of the anxiety of influence, as more complicated than a painterly tribute.

Barkan seems to be on the verge of recognizing here and elsewhere the genuinely metamorphic relationship between artists (or poets) and their predecessors, but his tentativeness about the politics of intertextuality means that his interpretations often stop precisely when they are becoming most interesting. This is especially apparent in the sections on Petrarch and Spenser, which are disappointingly schematic, but the final chapter on Shakespeare brings the book to a powerful conclusion. It opens with a provocative reading of *Titus Andronicus*, *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Cymbeline* that integrates the earlier analyses of Philomela and tapestries in a discussion of the thematics of reading. Although similar in some respects to Jonathan Goldberg's treatment of these texts in *Voice Terminal Echo: Postmodernism and Renaissance English Texts* (1986), Barkan's analysis culminates in an acute meditation on reading as voyeurism, a fitting theoretical transformation in this history of erotic and textual metamorphosis.

ELIZABETH D. HARVEY, *University of Western Ontario*

Luciano Cheles. *The Studiolo of Urbino: An Iconographic Investigation*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1986. Pp. 194. Pls. 8; Figs. 109. \$42.50.

Luciano Cheles has devoted a monographic study of two of the most fascinating private rooms of the Italian Renaissance, the *studiolo* in the Palazzo Ducale in Urbino, and its no less elegant counterpart in Gubbio. The book was published simultaneously in the United States and in Germany. It is based on the author's postgraduate thesis and some articles listed in the bibliography, and had in part

been lavishly published in *FMR* (Franco Maria Ricci). It is well printed and illustrated, and includes a bibliography and an index.

Both *studiolo* were designed for Federigo da Montefeltre, both share the fate of having been dismantled in later years. In Urbino, the intarsia decoration and some of the painted portraits remain, the others being in the collection of the Louvre; the intarsia panels of the Gubbio *studiolo* are now in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, while paintings, believed to come from this room, are in London; those in Berlin perished during the war.

In contrast to other *studiolo* of the Renaissance, like that of Isabella d'Este in Mantua or that of her brother Alfonso I in Ferrara, the physical set-up of the Urbino and Gubbio rooms can be more easily reconstructed and have been so in the past. P. Rotondi's reconstruction of the original installation of the paintings has been accepted by Cheles. The reconstructions of the Gubbio *studiolo* as proposed by Clough, however, have been rejected without providing an alternative suggestion. As far as the author is concerned, the *Oration* might be the only known painting connected with the Gubbio *studiolo* while the allegories of the liberal arts (London and formerly Berlin) might be unrelated to this room. The double portrait of Federigo and Guidobaldo, once considered to have been part of the Urbino *studiolo*, is now believed not to have been part of the decoration of this room.

Discussing first the physical setting of the Urbino and Gubbio *studioli*, the investigation shifts to the portraits of famous men and then to the intarsia panels that cover the lower part of the walls of each of these rooms. A brief discussion of the ceiling in Urbino is followed by the conclusion and two appendices listing the inscriptions underneath the portraits (unfortunately given in lower case instead of in upper case letters) and the text on the books of these famous men.

Professor Cheles' focus of inquiry is the question of whether the arrangement of the portraits of the famous men and the various displays in the perspective setting of the intarsia panels is arbitrary or was dictated by a carefully designed scheme. He believes that there exist several layers of references: liberal arts, theological and cardinal virtues, muses, etc. He stresses the often-personal allusions, be they manifested in the selection of individual famous men or puns on the Duke's name. The author is unquestionably right in assuming that the decoration of a *studiolo* is not something arbitrary. The difficulty in deciphering the meaning of the decoration rests partially in the fact that the modern researcher is looking for clear-cut categories, while Renaissance patrons had – at times – no scruples about keeping the lines of distinction as fluid as possible. The various re-arrangements of the paintings in the *studiolo* of Isabella d'Este, which each time implied a new reading of the old painting, may serve as a warning example.

Parts of Mr. Cheles arguments are convincing, other remain speculative, as he himself states very clearly. But this ambiguity does not invalidate the main arguments that there does indeed exist meaning where previously none was seen,

or at least none in a comprehensive way. But then, as William Heckscher in his admirable interpretation of the Erasmus portrait by Holbein has pointed out, "in historical research any watertight argument is *eo ipso* suspect."

The *Studiolo of Urbino* will be the basis from which further research will proceed. It is hoped that at such a moment also the Gubbio *studiolo* will receive the discussion it deserves.

EGON VERHEYEN, *George Mason University*

Elizabeth Wirth Marvick. *Louis XIII: The Making of a King*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986. Pp. xx, 278, illus. \$31.50.

"I wish and command you to whip him every time he is stubborn or does something bad ... there is nothing in the world that will do him more good," wrote King Henry IV to the Dauphin's governess in November 1607. Henry had recommended and practised such stern discipline since the Dauphin was 18-months old (p. 30). At times, however, Henry displayed a different sentiment towards his first son by Marie de Medici. On 26 June 1606, Henry and Louis went into the governess' "little bedroom, where the king went to bed and had his son put in a night shirt to play there with him 'in a very familiar way' " (p. 42). The love-hate relationship between Louis and his father, Elizabeth Marvick argues, created conflicts within the Dauphin's psyche. During his youth these conflicts made Louis feel alternately important and inferior. It was only when he ordered, in April 1617, the assassination of his mother's favoured counselor, Concino Concini, the *maréchal d'Ancre*, that he found a means of striking out at both his late father and, after Henry's own murder, the paternal authority represented by the *maréchal*. With this act, Marvick suggests, Louis realized his autonomy and overcame the shadow of his great and *gallant* father. Rid of this encumbrance, Louis assumed an active, often ruthless role in the management of his kingdom, tempered only by his occasional need to depend upon his prime minister or a handful of favourites for support.

Delving into a monarch's mind, especially during his or her formative years, is a fascinating and instructive enterprise, often beyond historical reconstruction. Marvick, however, has been able to exploit a valuable source - the diary kept by Louis's physician, Jean Héroard, recording the events and developments of Louis's first 26 years. The rather egocentric Héroard came to be the Dauphin's physician via a circuitous route. Having studied medicine at Montpellier in the 1570s, Héroard took up the equine anatomy and wrote a text entitled the "Hippostéologie" (1579), commissioned by Charles IX, which was to be part of a treatise on "the veterinary art." Later, Héroard developed political ambitions, successfully cultivated the Queen's favour and became a court physician. His meticulously kept diary seems to have been the "laboratory notebook" for his