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

work on the rearing and education of princes, *L'institution du prince* (1609). While this diary is invaluable for a psychoanalytic study of Louis, it has significant limitations. First, the sections of the diary accounting for Louis's first 40 months have been lost. Héroard's nephew, however, produced an abridgement of the diary, eliminating many of the "details on Louis's bodily treatment and processes" (p. xvii), which partially fills this lacuna. The evidentiary difficulty, though certainly not fatal, forces the reader to wonder what might be absent from the abridgement, especially in light of Marvick's painstaking interpretation of Louis's growth through the oral, anal and genital stages of childhood between 1601 and 1604.

Second, Marvick's dependence on Héroard's diary obliges her to question her observer's reliability, credentials and biases to a greater degree than she has. For instance, the reader learns early in the book that "during the first two years of Louis's life, Héroard was omnipresent" (p. 15). Clearly, the knowledge that Héroard constantly observed Louis in the months following his birth is significant to the psycho-biographer, who requires a detailed account of these formative stages. Yet, it is evident that Héroard was not all that vigilant in his observation of the infant: after a second wet-nurse arrived to care for three-month old Louis in late December 1601, Héroard promptly departed for a six-week holiday (p. 13). There is no account of how the child received the new wet-nurse, except for the report that Louis was found to be "very cheerful" upon Héroard's return. Furthermore, one wonders what motivated Héroard to produce this collection of highly detailed observations of the Dauphin. Was it sheer curiosity derived from his own veterinary and medical training? Was it a desire of this favour-seeker to make himself invaluable at court by becoming an expert on the raising of royal offspring? Or was it that Héroard was primarily interested in writing a book about the training of princes? This last motive might help to explain why, after the publication of *L'institution du prince*, Héroard's account is plagued with "incompleteness" (p. 144) and is "fragmentary" (p. 159). Finally, although Marvick notes that Héroard recopied, edited and skipped pages in his diary, she does not fully explore either the reasons for, or significance of, any *ex post facto* emendations. In sum, Marvick trusts Héroard to have been an "objective" reporter, but she needs to state more explicitly – by means of a thorough assessment of motivations and character – what might (or might not) have shaped the doctor's perceptions.

Marvick's approach has also succumbed to other pitfalls that have entrapped psycho-biographers. In a recently published collection of articles (*Psycho/History*, edited by Geoffrey Cocks and Travis L. Crosby, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), several authors discuss the benefits and difficulties of this kind of historical analysis. To Marvick's credit, she has not fashioned a study replete with technical jargon, a prevalent flaw. Marvick shares, however, the common weakness of interpreting an historical psychological condition by comparison to a single modern case history. While such analogies are suggestive, too strict

parallelism tries the reader's methodological patience. Without the careful correlation of factors in both the historical and modern cases, as well as the corroboration of additional modern cases, relying on single studies is not convincing. Furthermore, Marvick has failed to merge her detailed analysis of Louis's first eight years (Chapters 1-6) with her summary studies of either the period between Henry's death and d'Ancre's assassination (Chapters 7-14) or the bulk of Louis's adult life (Chapter 15). Marvick suggests that Louis's infant sexual exhibitionism, his early sexual experiences, his regard for *les siens*, and the development of various love-hate relationships with his father, his sister Elizabeth and others reveal aspects of Louis's character that help to explain his later behaviour. Yet she rarely refers to her psychological analysis of Louis's childhood in her brief account of the mature monarch's actions and decisions.

One of the most significant contributions that psycho-biography can make to historical studies is to uncover an actor's character and hidden motives. In every case, however, the results of such psychoanalysis must be firmly situated within the historical context and not regarded as the sole, or necessarily chief, reason for any given act or event. Faced with Marvick's argument that Louis ruthlessly chose to assassinate d'Ancre to free himself from paternal dominance, the reader wonders what other personal and political motives and circumstances (the recent rebellion of the aristocracy, perhaps) contributed to the King's decision. Louis's rulership concerns may have complemented or transcended his psychological motives. In any case, Marvick needs to place her psychological insights more fully within the broader political, social, intellectual and economic context in order to discover the important interaction between the individual and events.

Despite these drawbacks, this intriguing look at the early years of Louis XIII is worth reading. In addition to presenting Héroard's detailed observations and correlating these with recent psychoanalytic findings, the book encourages scholars to consider how to construct psycho-biographies, to overcome the difficulties inherent in the task and to adopt methodological measures to ensure that an historical character's psychological motivations and the development of his or her behaviour find their deserved place in history.

DAVID M. BESSEN, *Ohio Northern University*

Dino Compagni's Chronicle of Florence, translated, annotated and with an introduction by Daniel Bornstein. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986. Pp. xxviii, 110.

This English edition of Dino Compagni's *Chronicle of Florence* provides the English-speaking world with one of the most important primary sources for the political and cultural history of late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Florence. Completed in 1312 by an observer and participant in many of the