HISTORICAL PATHOLOGY: THE CASE OF KING LOUIS XI OF FRANCE.

By CHALFANT ROBINSON,

Assistant Professor of History in Princeton University.

The idea that disease has played an influential part in shaping the general course of history contains no novelty. Epidemics of all times have been the object of scientific investigation, and their political, social, and economic influence has been definitely weighed. The black death in England, malaria and the decline of Greek civilization, small-pox, cholera, and yellow fever, occur at once to the mind as examples of diseases which have been undeniable factors in history. Many of these have been studied with painstaking thoroughness. Yet, however true this may be of epidemics affecting masses of people, it is not true of individual cases. There is scant reason why it should be. The diseases of individuals, of rulers, let us say, certainly have little historical significance excepting in so far as they bear upon the mental integrity of the sufferer. As a matter of fact, only recently has very much attention been given to the historical value of mental pathology, and to the abnormal conduct of historical persons which has been so frequently the result of their bodily afflictions.¹ This factor is, nevertheless, of definite historical importance.

It is the purpose of this paper, therefore, to raise the question, first, whether the historian should not devote to the study of historical pathology his serious attention; and, second, to attempt to show from examples, especially the example of Louis XI, the desirability of its employment in the study of medieval biography.

At the outset Bernheim's indorsement inspires confidence in the soundness of this method of investigation. He says:

A theoretical knowledge of mental troubles is quite indispensable to an understanding of the numerous phenomena of character and of numerous actions; I do not speak of the Cæsarean madness, now become a commonplace, but of the phenomena which recur so frequently in the biographies of

¹ Ueber den Einfluss acuter Krankheiten auf die Entstehung von Geisteskrankheiten, von Dr. Emil Kraepelin, Archiv für Psychiatrie, Vol. XI, XII.

historical persons, such as religious exaltation which passes over into hallucination and fixed ideas. . . . Here the realms of psychology and psychiatry touch, and the historian cannot but profit by a study of the fundamental aspects of the latter. In what a different light, for example, would the actions and motives of the unfortunate Louis II of Bavaria be understood if they could be explained rather from the psychopathic conditions of his mental affliction than from the analogy of normal mentality. How readily the layman mistakes for genial caprice, or for fantastic extravagance, what the alienist recognizes as precursors, or symptoms, of mental disease.²

Viewed from this angle, the writer of biography will seek in personal eccentricities a new source of evidence, and in the manifestations of mental disease an additional field for historical investigation; since in many cases he will have to determine whether certain actions call for a pathological or a political explanation.

That the whole interpretation of a reign may turn upon just such a choice is clearly shown in the case of King Edward the Second of England. While he was upon the throne the barons took away his power; his wife left him; and England was in a condition of confusion hard to explain. When, however, it was made clear from the chroniclers that King Edward was a hereditary degenerate³ the unexplained incidents of his reign found a ready and satisfactory solution.

²“Eine theoretische Kenntnis der Seelenstörungen [ist] für das Verständnis zahlreicher Charaktererscheinungen und Handlungen geradezu unentbehrlich: Ich will hier nicht von dem zum Schlagwort gewordenen. Cäsarenwahnsinn reden, sondern von den so häufig in Biographien historischer Persönlichkeiten wiederkehrenden Erscheinungen, wie die religiöse Exaltation, die sich bis zu Hallucinationen und fixen Ideen steigert, . . . Hier berührt sich die Psychologie mit der Psychiatrie, und es kann dem Historiker nur zum Vorteil gereichen, wenn er sich mit den Grundzügen der letzteren vertraut macht. Wie anders versteht man z. b. manche Handlungen und Motive des unglücklichen Königs Ludwig II von Bayern, wenn man sie im Zusammenhange mit seiner psychischen Erkrankung aus psychopathischen Bedingungen herzuleiten vermag, als wenn man sie aus den Analogieen eines normalen Seelenlebens erklären wollte! Wie leicht hält der Unkundige für geniale Laune oder phantastische Ueberschwenglichkeit, was der Kenner der Psychiatrie als Vorboten oder Symptome von Geistesstörung interpretiert!”—Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie*. (Leipzig, 1903, p. 604.)

³ Was King Edward the Second a Degenerate? A consideration of his reign from that point of view. Chalfant Robinson, *American Journal of Insanity*, Vol. LXVI, No. 3.

Without any doubt the subject is difficult for the historian to approach, but too much attention cannot be directed to heredity; for the biographer must have scientific information as to the physical inheritance of his subject if his conclusions are to have any value whatever.

This statement does not overlook the obvious fact that of the two recognized dominant factors in determining character, heredity and environment, historical biography has been, in the main, concerned with the latter. Historical setting, or the political and social environment of the monarch, has generally occupied the field to the exclusion of the equally important factor of heredity. Yet in most cases of medieval royal biography, where the personality of the ruler counts for so much, the factor of heredity is of such importance that properly it may not be disregarded.

The close intermarriages in royal families will have special weight, moreover, if we bear in mind the fact that they give such force to the law of heredity as to make the ruler far more often mentally aberrant than the subject. The insanity of King Charles the Sixth of France, for example, may be traced to the fact that he was the descendant of two sons of Louis VIII, married to two sisters, and that not a single marriage for 235 years took place outside this family save one, and that the tainted inheritance converged upon Charles the Sixth.⁴

The medieval monarch was under little necessity for restraint in his personal conduct and was encouraged by his surroundings to give rein to his impulses. Due to this very lack of inhibition, indeed, his mental symptoms were often revealed to his contemporaries with perfect frankness, because their significance was not understood, and to posterity, frequently with scientific definiteness, by the chroniclers.⁵

⁴ Brachet, CXXXVII.

⁵ Higden's Polychronicon, VIII, p. 298. This writer shows a surprising degree of scientific accuracy in cataloging several of the essential traits of the degeneracy of King Edward the Second. He says in his description of the King: "Not caring to associate with the nobles, he clave to buffoons, singers, actors, grooms, laborers, rowers, sailors, and other mechanics; indulging in drink, readily betraying secrets, striking bystanders on light occasions, following rather the advice of some one else than his own; lavish in giving, magnificent in entertaining, voluble in speech, varied in employments, unfortunate against his enemies, harsh toward his own men . . ."

Though imagining that he was answerable for his actions to no law but his own will and responsible to God alone, the medieval prince really was governed by the rigid biological law of his being, determined for him by his ancestors.

Another science will thus claim the right to share in the results of the investigations of the historian. For, while the historian insists that it is his province to collect, analyze, and verify the recorded facts according to strict historical methods, the biologist observes that certain of these facts collected by the historian have for mental science a very special scientific significance. This he sets forth, and the historian cannot escape the duty of reinterpreting his history in the light of biology. Plainly, many of the problems in history lie between these two fields, or in both of them. For their proper solution the historian must avail himself of the biological sciences, such as the study of mental pathology, and the biologist, such as the alienist, must acquaint himself with the historical facts.

It is this double interpretation of history in the light of the historical records and of the laws of mental pathology which asks recognition for itself as a new science under the name of historical pathology.

Brachet, the eminent pupil of Littré, editor of the works of Hippocrates and founder of the science, gives the following definition: "Historical pathology is, properly speaking, the explanation by means of biological science of the data which historical texts furnish, data organized and checked according to the rules of scientific criticism, with the double aim of serving both the medical and historical sciences."^{*}

In view of this definition and what has gone before, the difficulty of handling the material is further apparent. The historian who attempts it may be compared to a lawyer who, in an intricate case, calls in his scientific experts to aid him in constructing a reasonable hypothesis for his client's past actions which shall take everything into account, and which shall contradict none of the known facts.

^{*}La pathologie historique est proprement l'explication, par la science biologique, des données que nous fournissent les textes historique, données réunies et contrôlées suivant les règles de la critique scientifique, dans le double but de servir, tantôt à la science médicale, tantôt à la science historique. Auguste Brachet, *Pathologie Mentale des Rois de France* (Paris, 1903), Introduction, XII.

The difficulties multiply as we proceed, but they are not insuperable, although it will be plain that historical pathology must demand that the investigator shall have not only a thorough knowledge of the historical facts and of the principles of historical criticism, but a knowledge, as well, of the theory and practice of medieval medicine, and that he shall be in a position to make a clinical examination of his facts before he can interpret them.

So much for its general application. What kind of problems give to it specific illustration? A few may be stated as historical examples, thus: What account have his biographers taken of the fact that when the body of Philip the Fair, of France, was examined after his death his heart was found to be "not larger," according to a contemporary, "than that of a newborn child, or a bird,"⁷ raising the question whether a man with a physiological defect of this kind could have developed the energy to accomplish the tremendous tasks with which he is credited, and perhaps confirming the estimate of his contemporary, the Bishop of Palmiers, "the King is of no account whatever; he is not a man nor a beast, but an image, and all that he can do is to stare at people."⁸

If Pope Boniface VIII suffered from senile dementia, as it seems probable he did, were not his extravagant claims for the Papacy in 1300 rather psychopathic than canonical?

If the separation of Ingeborge of Denmark from Philip Augustus, so long an unsolved mystery, resolves itself into a question of nervous disequilibrium on the King's part, consequent upon a severe illness in Palestine, should not his aversion for Ingeborge be treated as purely pathological, and the incident be interpreted in the light of that assumption?⁹

Has the fact any historical significance that Don Carlos of Spain, always neurotic, died quite insane as a result of an access of

⁷ *Cor autem dicti regis, ut dicitur, adeo erat parvum sicut est cor alicujus pueri qui hodie prodiit ex utero matris sue; ymo intellexi quod illi qui viderunt comparant illud cordi alicujus avis.* La mort et les funérailles de Philippe le Bel d'après un compte rendu à la cour marjorque. P. P. Ch. Baudon le mony (Bibl. de l'école des Chartes, LVIII, 1897, p. 12). Brachet, *Pathologie Mentale*, p. 454.

⁸ *Item quod dictus Episcopus dixit quod dominus noster Rex nihil omnino valebat—quod non erat homo, nec bestia, sed imago—quod nihil omnino sciebat nisi respicere homines.* Dupuy, *Hist. du différend d'entre le pape Boniface VIII et Philipe le Bel* (Paris, 1665), p. 653. Brachet, p. 444.

⁹ Brachet, *Pathologie Mentale*, pp. 307-335.

malarial fever and not at all of poison?³⁰ This last question must be answered in the affirmative, for the case of Don Carlos became historic in modern medical research, since it illustrates the now generally accepted hypothesis that in neurotic cases there almost invariably follows in the train of malarial or other severe fevers, frequent abnormal nervous or mental manifestations, and that these are governed not by the laws of the disease but by the neurotic inheritance of the patient; by the terrain, in other words, upon which the fever operates. Or, stated in medical terms, "The law of neurosis, in the case of post-infections of those predisposed by heredity to psychopathic conditions, is that the form of post-infection is a function, not of the nature of the infection, but of the heredity of the subject."³¹ This law is far-reaching for historical pathology, since it means that a neurotic subject, of determined psychopathic ancestry, under normal conditions irritable, eccentric, lacking in self-control, impulsive, and precipitate in his actions, if attacked by a severe illness, like typhoid, malarial fever, grippe or pneumonia, would be quite likely to develop some of the characteristic stigmata of degeneracy: Fixed ideas, obsessions, maniacal delusions, or some one of the various phobias. These might produce changes in his character apparently quite new, and otherwise quite inexplicable.³²

It is desirable to keep this law or hypothesis clearly in mind in considering the personality of King Louis XI of France, the next example.

In interpreting his actions, biographers of Louis XI have taken little account of these statements, cited by Brachet, made by the King's contemporaries concerning his health. "He was often sick." (N. Gilles, Fol. CXX, V.) "His maladies were indeed great and grievous to him." (Commines, Éd. Dupont, II, 270.) "He was tormented almost to death by several different and pitiable maladies." (Oliver de la Marche, *Memoires*, Éd. Beaune et d'Arbaumont, 1883-88, I, p. 180.) "Before his death he was

³⁰ Brachet, *Path. Ment.*, *Introd.*, XIII.

³¹ Brachet calls it one of the most precious conquests of the modern clinic in the realm of prognostic. *Path. Ment.*, pp. 291-292, where he cites the conclusive demonstration of this law by Tessier, in his *Leçons cliniques sur la grippe*.

³² Ueber den Einfluss acuter Krankheiten auf die Entstehung von Geisteskrankheiten, von Dr. Emil Kraepelin, *Archiv für Psychiatrie*, XI, XII.

troubled with several maladies, for the purpose of healing which the physicians who had charge of the King's health had recourse to terrible and marvellous medicines." (Jean de Roye, *Chron. Scand.*, Éd. B. de Mandrot, II, p. 138.) So far from being negligible, however, the state of the King's health must form the basis of scientific inquiry. Indeed, incidents in the life of Louis XI, irritable,¹⁵ impulsive, and in many ways eccentric,¹⁶ furnish concrete illustrations of a class of questions which the political historian is at a loss to answer, but which are more or less readily and satisfactorily solved in the light of historical pathology. For example: (1) Does it have any historical significance that Louis, always concerned about his health, should send gifts, as he did, to a certain shrine in order that prayers might be offered there that it might please God to send him the quartain fever?¹⁷ (2) How account for the fact that the same Louis, whose reign was replete with cruelty,¹⁸ who kept Cardinal Balue in a small wooden cage for 11 years, thus removing him, as he remarked, from the temptations of the world, could be so tender-hearted as to have a sick dog or a

¹⁵ ". . . . When he came home at night he was often weary and generally in a violent passion with some of his courtiers or huntsmen." Commynes, ed. Scobel, II, p. 81.

¹⁶ "He did many odd things, which made some believe his senses were impaired." Commynes, II, p. 43. "In short, he behaved after so strange a manner that he was more formidable than he had ever been before." II, p. 58.

¹⁷ Raynal, *Hist. du Berry*, III, 132. Brachet, *Introd.*, LXXX.

¹⁸ "The king had ordered several cruel prisons to be made; some were cages of iron and some of wood, but all were covered with iron plates, both within and without, with terrible locks, about 8 feet wide and 7 feet high. . . . He also ordered heavy and terrible fetters to be made in Germany, and particularly, a certain ring for the feet which was extremely hard to be opened, and fitted like an iron collar, with a thick weighty chain and a great globe of iron at the end, most unreasonably heavy." Commynes, ed. Scobel, II, p. 75. Thomas Basin says that the days are not long enough to cite individual instances of where, without show of justice, many persons were drowned and otherwise made away with, or wasted away in the filth of the King's dungeons. "Dies me deficiet, si casus singulos referre velim eorum quos vel in aquarum gurgitibus, vel aliis poenarum generibus, quamvis insontes, variis modis perire fecit, vel squalore carcerum macerari et constringi nullo juris et justitiae ordine observato." Basin, *Historiarum a Ludovico XI*, Lib. VII, p. 173. Elsewhere he compares the King's cruelty to that of the Emperor Domitian. *Hist. Lud.*, VII, 168.

rabbit carefully transported for miles in a royal two-horse chariot? (3) Or, what changed the avaricious close-fisted ruler, who always wore old clothes by preference and looked like a scarecrow,¹⁷ into a lavish spendthrift, who dressed in velvets and furs,¹⁸ paid many times the value of the things he bought, and gave away money and fine clothes without even being asked? (4) Or, what led the king, who struck down his enemies with a ruthless hand and who terrorized friend and foe alike by his masterful dealings,¹⁹ to become so apprehensive that he dismissed even the servants of his household for fear some of them might diminish or take from him his royal power?²⁰ (5) Or, how account for the fact that the affable, approachable Louis, who went everywhere and saw everyone, changed into a recluse, defended in his castle from the approach of anyone from the outside by engines of war, archers, and caltrops

¹⁷ He dressed so abominably that once he was cursed as an impostor, and was hooted and followed by a mob through the streets of a village where he was not known and had claimed to be the King. ". . . . Accidit ut, eo transeunte per suburbanum oppidi, quidam eum interrogaret quando rex venire deberet; nulla enim, neque facie, neque apparatu, neque vestium ornatu vel splendore, plus quam famulus aliquis et vilis conditionis dignitatis indicia ostentabat. Cui cum rex ipse responderet quod ipsemet rex esset, statim idem qui interrogabat, movens cachinnum, in eum maledictum jecit, respondens sermone vulgari: '*Vous estes voz fièvres quartaines*' et cum sociis suis, qui una ad videndum regem confluerant, eum ostenderet, dicens eis: 'Videte istum garcionem, qui regem se esse dixit,' quotquot illud audientes erant, similis probri maledictum in eum cumulabant, sibi, tanquam ridiculo alicui ganeoni, per totius suburbani spatium illudentes et post cum acclamantes." Basin, Hist. Ludovici XI, Lib. VII, pp. 167-168 (Soc. de l'histoire de France).

¹⁸ ". . . . His clothes were richer now and more magnificent than they had ever been before; his gowns were all of crimson satin, lined with rich marten's furs, of which he gave away several without being requested, for no person durst ask a favor of him, or scarce speak to him of anything." Commynes, ed. Scobel, II, p. 56.

¹⁹ "His subjects trembled before him; whatever he commanded was instantly executed without the slightest difficulty or hesitation." Commynes, ed. Scobel, II, p. 66.

²⁰ "He was afraid of nothing so much as the loss of his regal authority." Commynes, ed. Scobel, II, p. 38. ". . . . For he was grown marvellously jealous of all his courtiers, and afraid they would either depose him or deprive him of some part of his authority." Ibid., II, p. 42. He was "Afraid of his own children and relatives, and changed every day those very servants whom he had brought up and advanced, . . . yet he durst not trust any of them." Ibid., II, p. 78.

scattered along the roads," and who would not be seen even through a window? (6) Louis, personally brave, who went into the very lair of his enemy at Péronne to beard him, what changed him into a cringing coward who fawned at the feet of an illiterate hermit and begged him to save his life," and who was so obsessed by the fear of dying that he forbade his courtiers to mention even the name of death?"

Incidents like these are to be found in the life history of more than one of the medieval monarchs. Not generally regarded as possessing any definite historical value, they have been set down, as a rule, as interesting peculiarities only. Viewed from the standpoint of historical pathology, however, every evidence of eccentricity, it must be repeated, as well as every malady of the King has a definite scientific value.

The reign of Louis XI serves so well to illustrate further these general principles that an interpretation of his pathological history will be profitable. In the discussion which follows the writer keeps very close to the argument and citations found in Brachet's *Pathologie Mentale des Rois de France*.²¹

The King's health throughout is the theme. Let us take for examination first the statements of two contemporary writers, Robert Gaguin and Jean Le Roye, about a seemingly trifling incident:

(i) Returned to Tours, he thought to lighten the burden of sickness by music. Wherefore he commanded that players of musical instruments of

²¹ Commynes, ed. Scobel, II, p. 76.

²² Commynes, II, p. 56.

²³ Ibid., II, p. 72.

²⁴ Dr. Brachet began in 1880 the labor of collecting material for his monumental work on the mental pathology of the Kings of France. By 1896 he had so much material, principally from manuscript sources, that he decided to publish privately what he had collected, with some brief explanations. This he did in four volumes, one being notes and comments, the other three made up of extracts from the sources. Unfortunately these were never made available to the public, and are not yet. His regrettable death prevented the completion in ordered form of his life work; but that the labor of so many years might not be lost to the world of scholarship, his widow, Mme. Anna Brachet, née Korff, arranged the notes and manuscripts as she found them, and in 1903 published the remarkable treasure-house of data for the study of historical pathology, which is known under the title of *Pathologie Mentale des Rois de France*—a scientific examination of the mental pathology of all the ascendants of Louis XI as far back as Hugh Capet.

all kinds should be summoned, of whom 120 were got together. Among these were certain shepherds, who for many days, not far from the bed-chamber of the king, played softly for the sake of comforting him, and in order that he might not fall asleep, which would make him worse. He commanded to come to Tours, besides this class of people, another quite different kind—anchorites and hermits, holy men and women, to whom he commanded that they pray God continually that, health restored to the King, he might continue to live. So eager was Louis to live longer.²⁵

(ii) At this time the King summoned a great number of players upon low and sweet instruments, whom he lodged at Saint Cosime near Tours, where they assembled to the number of 120; among them were several shepherds from Poitou, who often played before the King, but they did not see him, in order that he might enjoy there these instruments and while away the time and to prevent him from falling asleep. And, on the other hand, he assembled a great number of devout men and women and holy persons such as hermits and saints to pray God without ceasing that He would grant that the King should not die and that He would permit him still to live.²⁶

These two accounts, except for the statements that the instruments were low and sweet, and that the King kept out of sight, are alike. They are all that we have from the chroniclers about the incident. Commynes, the King's official biographer, for reasons of his own, does not speak of the shepherds, and mentions only one hermit.

²⁵ "Turorum reversus, excogitavit a musica valitudinis levamen quaerere. Quamobrem accersiri mandat omnis generi musici instrumenti lusores quos centum et viginti convenisse constat. Inter quos assuerunt ovium pastores: qui multos dies non procul a regis cubiculo continenter modulabantur, ejus consolandi causa, et ne somno, quo gravabatur, succumberet. Jussit, præter hoc hominum genus, alterum longe diversum ad se convenire. Solitarii et qui eremum incolebant homines—fœminæ quoque spectatæ religionis Turorum convenerunt, quibus negotium mandatum est: Deum indesinenter orare: ut regi salute restituta maneret ipse diu superstes. Jam appetens diutissime vivendi fuit Ludovicus." Robert Gaguin, *Ann.* 1482, f. 281, ed. 1560. Brachet, p. xviii.

²⁶ "Dudit temps, le roy fist venir grant nombre et grant quantité de joueurs de bas et doulx instruments qu'il fist loger à Saint Cosme près Tours, où illec ilz se assemblerent jusques au nombre de six vingtz; entre lesquelz y vint plusieurs bergiers du pays de Poictou, qui souvent jouerent devant le logis du roy, mais ilz ne le veoyent pas, affin que ausdiz instrumens le roy y prensist plaisir et passe temps et pour le garder de dormir. Et d'ung autre costé, y fist aussy venir grant nombre de bigotz, bigottes et gens de devocion comme hermites et saintes creatures pour sans cesser prier à Dieu qu'il permist qu'il ne mourust point et qu'il le laissant encores vivre." *Journal de Jean de Roye, ou Chron. Scandaleuse*, Éd. de B. de Mandrot, II, 122, *Ann.* 1482. Brachet, XVIII.

If they are examined as material for historical pathology, the details are very suggestive. In the first place, does the intercession of the holy men and women have any particular significance? Apparently not. It was the common practice of the time, and their part may be dismissed without comment. It is quite another matter with the shepherds and their melodies, however, for here there arise, as to the therapeutic value of music and as to the class of afflictions for which it was employed, the following questions: (a) In the treatment of what disease would recourse be had to music as a tonic stimulant? (b) In what class of maladies would sleep in the daytime be prohibited as harmful? (c) In what would the tonic action of the stimulant have to be moderate and sedative? The textbooks of medieval medicine recommend musicotherapy as a familiar treatment for cases of extreme nervous disorder. Healing by means of music, indeed, is much older than the Middle Ages, as old as the Old Testament at least, for David played before Saul to soothe the monarch when the "evil spirit of the Lord was upon him," and he sought to smite David to the wall with his javelin.

Together, under one head, in the system of medieval medicine, insanity, melancholia, and epilepsy are grouped. Exhibiting the traits characteristic of psychoneuroses, they differ in species but are alike in genera.

The shepherds might certainly have been employed for a therapeutic purpose. This inference, however, to be of any value will have to be confirmed by examples from the medical practice of the time. For this purpose the following citations are interesting and more or less specific:

Bernard de Gordon, in his *Lilium Medicinæ*, Part II, Cap. XIX, *De Mania et Melancholia*, says: "The first thing to be sought in curing it is light-heartedness and rejoicing—jesting ought to be indulged in, and musical instruments; in short, everything that will cheer the mind."

"*Primum quod competit in curatione est gaudium et lætitia . . . et multa jocalia præsentare debent et ibi esse instrumenta musica et breviter omnia quæ lætificant animam.*" Bernard de Gordon, *Lilium Medicinæ*, Part II, Cap. XIX, *De Mania et Melancholia* (1363). Brachet, XXVIII. Textbooks of this kind are very hard to get hold of by the student. The writer takes this occasion to express his grateful thanks to the Surgeon General's library at Washington for the use of a copy of the *Lilium Medicinæ*.

Barthelemy L'Anglois, in his *Grant Proprietaire des Choses*, says: "This is a kind of madness which physicians call *amentia*, others call it *mania*, The treatment is to have singing and the sound of instruments of music, but in moderation."²⁸

Avicenne, in his *Canon*, calls attention to the fact that while some persons are benefited by music, others are made worse,²⁹ and the *Lilium Medicinæ* says that loud sounds often bring on attacks of epilepsy.³⁰ Both imply the moderation which modern medicine insists upon. "The tonic effect of the music should never be so great as to provoke convulsions."³¹ Hence the low and sweet instruments in Louis' case, as a clue as to why the shepherds played before the King's chamber.

In this class of afflictions, medieval medicine recommended that the sense of smell be stimulated (odorotherapy) also and for the same purpose. It is quite significant to find from manuscript sources in the Archives Nationale and from the Egerton Mss. in the British Museum records showing that from 1480 to 1482 the King's servants were scouring the country for roses and rosebuds, coquemint, sweet marjoram, and violets to keep continually fresh in the King's room.³²

²⁸ "Il est une espece de folie que les physiciens appellent amence: et les autres l'appellent manie. . . . La medecine est faire chanter et sonner des instrumens de musique . . . et si les doit on faire travailler moyennement. Barthelemy L'Anglois, *Le grant proprietaire des Choses*, Trad. P. Corbichon, Lib. VI, Cap. V., Brachet, XXVIII.

²⁹ "Et quidam homines sunt, quos sanat lætitia et auditus cantilenæ, et quidam sunt quos illud augmentat." Avicenne, *Canon*, Lib. III, Tr. 4, Cap. XXIX, de cura Melancholiæ. Brachet, XXIX.

³⁰ [Epilepsia.] "Provenit etiam ex aspectu terribili, sicut est aspectus fulgaris, aut sono maximo, sicut est tonitrum, aut tympani magni et similia." *Lilium Med.*, p. 273.

³¹ Ch. Féré, *La Pathologie des Emotions*, p. 95.

³² "28 Juillet 1480. A Nicholas Mesnagier, varlet de Fourrière, 27 l. 12 s. 8 d. t.,—pour avoir envoyé deux hommes à cheval of La Mothe d'Esgruy à Paris et Prouvins quérir des rozes et boutens. Où il y ont vacqué, tant à aller que retourner dix jours entiers. (Arch. Nat. kk-64, fol. 62), Brachet, XXXII. A Guillaume du Jardin, tapissier dudit siegneur, pour avoir fourny durant ledit mois de juillet et août, dudit an, de cormente et autres herbes, pour mettre ès chambres et retraict dudit sieur, 2 s. 60. T. Par. Jour. Vallent 7 l. 15 s. t. (27 Septembre, 1480.) (Id., *ibid.*, fol. 65.) Brach., XXXII. A Jehau le Nonnant, varlet de fourrière dudit seigneur, 23 l. 2 s. 4 d.—Pour avoir fourny par chasoun jour depuis le douzième jour

The following extracts lead to the conclusion that these flowers were for something else than for ornamenting the King's room simply: Avicenne, Canon, De cura melancholiæ, says: "Let him sit in places where the temperature is good and let the air of the room be moist and fragrant. It is universally desirable that in breathing odors he should smell pleasant odors and fragrant flowers."²² That actual flowers in nervous troubles were not indispensable the following prescription shows: "Let the epileptic smell day and night this confection [of calamint and rosewater]. It can be made into an apple, and when he wakes in the morning he can hold it in his hand."²³ But the next shows that they seem to have been frequently preferred: . . . "The room of the epileptic should be suffused with hyssop, rhue, stryax, and calamint,"²⁴ and "the house should be well lighted, without pictures, and there should be a great deal of fragrance."²⁵

de juing jusque au 15 jour d'aoust ensuivant de roses fresches pour mettre es chambres et retraict dudit seigneur, pour en avoir envoyé chercher a Montbazon, Montoire, Montdoubleau et autres lieux. (11 mars, 1481.) (British Museum, Mss. Egerton, 833, fol. 43.) Brach., XXXII. A Robert Gautier, tapissier dudit seigneur, pour avoir fourny de coqmente et autres herbes pour mettre es chambres dudit seigneur par tous les lieux où il a esté durant le moys de septembre dudit an. (16 dec. 1481.) (Id., *ibid.*, fol. 34.) Brach., XXXIII. A Jean Gebert 64 s.—Pour avoir fourny du rouy marin et marjolaine pour mettre es chambres dudit seigneur depuis le jour de noël jusques au vingt sixiesme jour de janvier ensuivant." (6 mars, 1482.) (Id., *ibid.*, fol. 26.) Brach., XXXIII. A Patrix Gebert 8 l. 17 s. 8 d.—Pour ses paynes et salaires d'avoir fourny et porté en la chambre dudit seigneur des violectes, fleurs d'espines, adglentiers, groseliers et autres nouveaulxtez depuis le 20 jour de mars jusques au derrenier jour d'avril, 1482." (Id., fol. 72.) Brachet, XXXIII.

²² "Et sedeat in locis temperatis et humectetur aer hospitii ejus et odorificetur, sternendo odorifera in ipso, et universaliter oportet, ut semper olfaciat odores bonos, et flores boni odoris." Avicenne, Canon, Lib. III, Tr. 4, XX, Brachet, XXX.

²³ "De cura epilepsiæ. "Utatur epilepticus ista confectione in qua inveni magnum juvamentum: ambrae grisæ calamintæ ana i conficiantur cum aqua ros. optima. Odoret epilepticus die ac nocte totam confectionem, vel fiat pomum de ista confectione, quod teneat in manu. Cum mane surrexerit et teneat pomum dictum in manu." Lilius Medicinæ, II, p. 25. Brachet, XXX.

²⁴ "De cura epilepsiæ. "Camera epileptici suffumigetur cum hyssopo ruta et strace et calaminta." (Id., *ibid.*, II, p. 25.)

²⁵ "Domus debet esse clara luminosa, sine picturis et debent ibi esse multa odorifera." (Id., *ibid.*, II, Cap. XIX.)

This stimulation of the olfactory nerve bears the same testimony as musicotherapy that the King was being treated for some form of nervous disorder. There is as yet no specific indication as to the disease, but the suspicion as to what it may be is confirmed by an examination of the things especially to be avoided in epilepsy: (a) Sleep in the daytime; the *Lilium Medicinæ* says: "Sleep in the daytime should be especially avoided."³⁷ "He should not sleep in the daytime, for a long heavy slumber is very harmful."³⁸ "Sleep in the afternoon is very bad, and in general much sleep does harm."³⁹ It will be recalled that the shepherds played to keep the King from falling asleep. (b) Allowing the head to be cold. This induces sleep,⁴⁰ and since, according to Hippocrates (*Coaques*, Section 342, Ed. Littré, V. 657) excessive sleep is provocative of epilepsy, the epileptic should have his head well covered. (c) Insulation. The *Lilium Medicinæ* says of things to be avoided in epilepsy: "Too great cold, and everything that suddenly makes the head warm, such as long exposure to the sun."⁴¹ The Canon of Avicenne says: "All excessive heat of the sun, and cold, is conducive to epilepsy,"⁴² and, ". . . it is especially desirable that the head be protected against excessive heat and cold."⁴³ The traditional likeness of Louis XI, wearing the old felt hat, from which he was inseparable, at once occurs to the mind, and this hat becomes very significant when the reason he wore it so constantly is made plain. Apparently he had adopted a very definite means for pro-

³⁷ "Potissimè vitet somnum diurnum." *Lilium Medicinæ*, Particula II; *De passionibus capitis*, Cap. XXV. *Quæ vitanda in epilepsia*. Brachet, XXXVIII.

³⁸ "Non dormiat de die, somnus enim profundus multum nocet et longus." (*Id.*, *ibid.*, XXVI.)

³⁹ Avicenne, Canon, Lib. III, Tr. 5, Cap. XI, de cura epilepsiæ. "Et multum dormire post meridiem nocet; et universaliter somnus multus nocet." Brachet, XXXVIII.

⁴⁰ Galen, *De locis affectis*, L. III, Cap. V, edit. Venise, 1576, folio T. IV, p. 16, v. f.

⁴¹ *Lilium Medicinæ*, II, 25, "Quæ vitanda in epilepsia. Frigiditas nimia et omne illud quod subito calefacit caput sicut est longa mora in sole." Brachet, XL.

⁴² Avicenne, Canon, Lib. III, Tr. 5, Cap. X. "De causis moventibus epilepsiam. Et epilepsiam quidem commovet omnis calor superfluous solaris, et omne frigus." Brachet, XL.

⁴³ "De cura epilepsiæ. Immo oportet, ut caput muniatur ab omni calore superfluo aut a frigore superfluo." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Cap. XL. Brachet, XL.

tecting his head from heat and cold, for the MSS. sources, cited in Brachet, from 1468 on, show that for this purpose the King was regularly being supplied with caps or bonnets, which he never went without, day or night.

They were uniformly double; a scarlet one when he rode horseback and a double white or black nightcap over which he drew at night a scarlet bonnet tied with six strings. Sometimes, apparently for greater insulation, they were lined with felt or with beaver.⁴ (d) The head should be kept elevated. This is enjoined in Avicenne's Canon, *De cura epilepsiæ*; "He should take care to keep his head elevated, and as far as possible not to bend over."⁴ And the same thing is repeated in the *Lilium Medicinæ*: [The epileptic] "should particularly avoid lying upon his back, and with his head hanging down. He should not sleep in the daytime, as has been said, and he should sleep with his head raised."⁴ Louis apparently

"Pour deux tocques d'escarlade doubles pour servir au Roy à porter de jour quant il chevauche par pays." (Arch. Nat. Comptes de L'Argenterie, kk. 61, fol. 29, Nov., 1468.) "Pour deux bonnetz noirs doubles pour servir audit seigneur à porter de jour." (Id., *ibid.*, fol. 20, Nov., 1468.) "Pour deux tocques blanches doubles pour servir au Roy à mettre de nuyt, 60 s. Pour ung bonnet d'escarlade fait à six fils pour servir audit seigneur à metre par dessus lesdites tocques, 35 s." (Id., *ibid.*, fol. 39, Avril, 1469.) "Pour deux tocques blanches doubles à mettre de nuyt pour ledit seigneur, 60 s. Et pour ung fin bonnet d'escarlade fais à six fils pour audit seigneur à mettre de nuyt pardessus les dictes tocques, 35 s." (Id., *ibid.*, fol. 47, Septembre, 1469.) "Audit Glaude Lambert, la somme de 60 l. 5 s. tant pour un voyage d'estre allé et venu de la ville de Montpellier à Romme echapter et payier treize chapeaux de bièvre, et iceulx avoir apportez en ladite ville de Montpellier pour la personne du Roy comme pour l'achapt d'iceulx.

"Audit Thomas Cardonne dit l'Enfant de Rouhan, chappelier, la somme de 212 l. 4 s. 9 d. tant pour le façon de neuf autres chapeaux pour la personne dudit seigneur en ladite ville de Montpellier que pour l'echapt de layne et autres fraiz nécessaires qu'il a convenu faire." (Comptes originaux de règne de Louis XI, Oct., 1478-Oct., 1479, Bibl. Nat. f. fr. 23265, fol. 6.) Brachet, XLI-XLII.

⁴"De cura epilepsiæ, et studeat ut caput suum sit elevatum et caveat ne ipsum pendere faciat in quantum possibile est . . ." Avicenne, Canon, l. III, tr. 50, Cap. XI. Brachet, XLL.

⁴Quæ vitanda in epilepsia. "Vitentur omnes causæ quæ dictæ sunt; potissime vitet jacere supra dorsum et capite inclinato. Non dormiat de die ut dictum est, et jaceat capite elevato." *Lilium medicinæ*, particula II: de passionibus capitis, Cap. XXV. Brachet, XL.

thought these precautions were worth following, for the manuscripts discovered by Brachet in the Archives Nationales and in the British Museum show that in 1481-1482 he carried about with him, everywhere he went, a special headboard, apparently for the purpose."

Nothing would seem to be more evident from these remedies than that the King was following the advice of his physicians in being treated for some very severe nervous affliction which looks like epilepsy, a disease which might prepare the way for later mental disturbances but which would not necessarily impair the King's political acumen. This hypothesis offers a reasonable explanation, at least from the standpoint of pathology, of the mysterious passage about the shepherds in Gaguin and in the Scandalous Chronicle.

On the other hand, the political historians in the past, lacking this biological basis, have been forced to draw many times upon their imaginations for a plausible explanation of the very serious incidents related by the chroniclers. In pointing out the obvious fact that these accounts are unreliable as history, it need not be remarked that they illustrate, nevertheless, a very important principle. The extracts which follow, most of them found in Brachet, are taken from standard histories of France and deal with the passage about the shepherds. Chateaubriand says: "The honesty and rustic simplicity of the country lads and lassies who came to figure in the donjons of Plessis served to smooth the brow of the

"A Guillaume Genou 40 l. 2 s. 1 d. pour cheval de poil bay pour servir à porter après lui le dossier de la chambre dudit seigneur." 30 juin, 1481. (Arch. nat. kk. 64, fol. 140.) "A Guillaume Genou dit Rondelet 25 l. 2 s. 6 d., pour avoir mené et conduit sur ung cheval le dossier pour servir au lit dudit seigneur depuis le vingt cinquiesme jour de juing jusques au derrenier jour d'aoust ensuivant." 9 sept., 1481. (Arch. nat. kk. 64, fol. 167.) "Claude Foulon 27 l., pour avoir mené sur ung cheval sommier dedans ung bahu de cuir un gros loudier pour servir es logiez dudit seigneur à mettre derrière le chevet de son lit par tous les lieux où il esté depuis le 18 jour de novembre jusque au premier jour de fevrier ensuivant." 5 fevrier, 1482. (British Museum Mss. Egerton 883, fol. 29.) "A Gilles Genest 47 l., pour avoir mené sur ung cheval sommier ung dossier de boys pour servir es logiez dudit seigneur à mettre derrière son lit où il a vacqué depuis le premier jour de septembre jusques au premier jour de janvier ensuivant." (Id., *ibid.*, fol. 29, 10 mai, 1482.) Brachet, XL-XLI.)

tyrant.”⁴⁸ If the reader will recall just what Gaguin and Jean Le Roye say about the shepherds, the following historical embroideries will be interesting. Zevort, a modern writer, makes this contribution: “The greatest distraction of Louis was on Sunday to watch the joyous gambols of the young men and women who danced before the château.”⁴⁹ Even so reliable a historian as Henri Martin follows the errors of the others. He says: “He [Louis] abandoned himself to a thousand fantasies to secure a moment from the ennui which consumed him. He summoned from all sides players on ‘low and sweet instruments,’ and had shepherds come who played airs before him and danced the dances of their native country. But nothing succeeded in distracting him; the object of his caprice once attained caused him only impatience and disgust.”⁵⁰ An older history adds considerably to what the chroniclers recount. “Shepherds and shepherdesses,” it says, “gathered together from Poitou; they were divided into several bands. Some played on their rustic instruments; others sang and danced in the meadows. Louis sometimes at the window and sometimes walking in the gallery saw and tried to participate in these harmless and innocent pleasures, but if he saw that he was observed, or that anyone was watching him he withdrew and did not dare to appear again.”⁵¹ The two accounts next following

⁴⁸ Des danses de jeunes paysans et al jeunes paysannes qui venient figurer dans les donjons du Plessis le bonheur et l’innocense champêtre servaient à déridier le front du tyran. Chateaubriand, *Analyse raisonnée de l’histoire de France*, I, 185.

⁴⁹ “La plus grande distraction de Louis XI était le dimanche, de regarder les joyeux ebats des jeunes gens et des jeunes filles qui dansaient sur la place du château.” Edgar Zevort, *Hist. nationale*, 1890, 31^e edit., p. 31.

⁵⁰ “Il s’abandonnait à mille fantaisies pour secourir un moment l’ennui qui le rongait . . . Il mandait de tout parts des joueurs de ‘bas et doux instruments’; il faisait venir des bergers qui jouaient devant lui les airs et dansaient les danses de leur pays. Mais rien ne réussissait à le distraire; l’objet de son caprice, à peine atteint, ne lui causait plus qu’impatience et dégoût.” Henri Martin, *Hist. de France*, VII, 140.

⁵¹ “On rassembla les bergers et les bergères du Poitou; on les partagea en plusieurs bandes, les uns jouolent de leurs instruments champêtres; les autres chantoient et dansoient dans la prairie; Louis, tantôt aux tenêtres de son appartement et tantôt promenant dans une galerie voyoit et tâchoit de partager ces plaisirs vrais et innocents; mais s’il venoit à s’apercevoir que quelqu’un le regardait, il se retiroit, promptement, et il n’osoit plus paraître.” Velly, Villaret, Garnier, *Hist. de France*, 1768 XIX, 117.

state either frankly or covertly what their authors suspect that the chroniclers have been led to conceal. "There is a pleasure in reading in the histories all that the fear of actual death and the loss of authority made King Louis do in the closing years of his reign; the dance of young girls before his lodgings and the bands of flute players collected from all sides to divert him,"²⁸ and "without believing at all the strange and ferocious tales of the last acts of this Tiberius, sick and voluntary prisoner, and without pretending that he bathed in the blood of children, that young girls came to dance lascivious dances in his chamber, it is certain that his cruelty and defiance redoubled at the approach of death."²⁹ Even so recent a biographer as Christopher Hare (1907) offers the traditional explanation that the shepherds played for the King to beguile the long hours.³⁰

All these accounts are wrong as history. This does not mean, however, that they have not been carefully written. Most of them have been. It does mean that no explanation of incidents in royal biography is safe until the possibility of a pathological interpretation has been eliminated.

To continue with the remedies: The Scandalous Chronicle says: "To heal these maladies there were made for him terrible and marvelous remedies by the physicians and doctors who had care of the King's person."³¹ Gaguin says in 1482: "Every day Louis was

²⁸ "Il y a plaisir de lire dans les histoires tout ce que la crainte de la mort réellé et ceile de perdre son autorité, faisoient faire au Roi Louis durant les dernières années de son règne. Les danses de jeunes filles à l'entour de son logis, et les bandes de joueurs de fiûtes qu'on amassait de toutes parts pour le divertir, etc." Mezèray, *Abrégé Chronolog. de France*, II, 618.

²⁹ "Sans croire tout ce qu'on a raconté d'étrange et de féroce sur les derniers actes de ce Tibère malade et volontairement prisonnier, sans prétendre qu'il prenait des bains de sang d'enfants, que de jeunes filles venaient danser sa chambre des danses lascives, il est certain que sa cruauté et défiance redoublèrent aux approches de la mort." Charles Lacreteille, *Louis XI*, p. 68. The extracts quoted above are from Brachet, LI-LII.

³⁰ "While he was watching death approach step by step we do not wonder that he sent for musicians, 'joueurs de doux et bas instruments,' to beguile the long hours of suffering and isolation." *The Life of Louis XI*, Christopher Hare, New York, 1907, p. 258.

³¹ "... l'our le guérir desquelles maladies furent faictes pour lui, par les médecins qui avoient la cure de sa personne, de terrible et merveilleuses médecines." *Chron. Scandaleuse*, éd. mandrot, II, 138. Brachet, XLVI.

more and more sick, and his physicians offered remedies to him of a marvelous kind, for he vehemently hoped to acquire health by means of human blood drawn from certain youths, which he drank and bathed in."⁶⁶ The shock that comes with this reference to the use of human blood is natural, and the historians, in their ignorance of medieval medical practice, are justified in their incredulity or horror of it.⁶⁷ But the use of human blood takes on quite a different aspect when it becomes plain that it was a remedy pure and simple for a specific disease. Galen prescribes human blood for epileptics—a sovereign remedy for this disease from the time of antiquity⁶⁸ until the eighteenth century at least⁶⁹—and modern medicine, of course, recognizes in the transfusion of blood a valu-

⁶⁶ "Tous les jours de plus estoit Loys mallade et ne lui prouffitoient les médecines quises en merveilleuses manières. . . . Car vénementement esperoit acquerir santé par le sang humain qu'il but et huma de quelques enfans." Robert Gaguin, 1482, éd. 1508, f. CCII, V°. Brachet, XLV.

⁶⁷ "On avait si mauvaise opinion de lui, que les rumeurs les plus bizarres et les plus atroces s'accréditèrent au sujet des remèdes qu'il employait pour retarder a fin. On prétendit que Louis, par l'ordonnance de Coictier, 'buvoit et humoit' le sang des enfans afin de réchauffer son sang appauvri." Henri Martin, *Hist. de France*, p. 153.

"Une chronique dit qu'on lui faisait boire du sang d'enfans nouvellement égorgés, remède plus convenable au caractère d'un tyran qu'à la santé d'un malade. Crime horrible, péché mortel." Liskenne, *Hist. de Louis XI*, p. 301.

"Puis il buvait du sang de petits enfans pour se redonner de la jeunesse; remède qui semblait tout à fait approprié au tempérament du malade." Chateaubriand, *Analyse Raisonnée de l'Histoire de France*, I, 185.

"La profonde réclusion dans laquelle il vivait faisait croire qu'il se passait des choses bien extraordinaires dans ce château impénétrable. On alla jusqu'à répandre le bruit que l'on y rassemblait des enfans que l'on saignait, et dont on lui faisait boire le sang pour corriger l'acreté du sien." Anquetil, *Hist. de France*, II, 207. Brachet, XLVI-VII.

⁶⁸ "Epileptics (comitiales morbi) drank the blood of gladiators, also, as from living cups." Sanguinem quoque gladiatorum bibunt, ut viventibus poculis. (Pliny, XXVIII, 2. Brachet, XLIV.)

⁶⁹ "Human blood.—Virtues: Human blood, fresh and drunk warm, is said to benefit epilepsy." Sanguis humanus.—Vires: Sanguis humanus (recens adhuc et calde potus) conferre dicitur ad epilepsiam. (Magnet, *Rerum ad Pharmaciā Galenico Chymicā Spectantium Thesaurus*, 1703, l. 1, p. 987. Brachet, XLIV.)

"All the writers recommend human blood for healing epilepsy." Tous les auteurs recommandent le sang human pour la guérison de l'épilepsie." (Pharmacopée Royale Galénique et Chimique. Moses Charas, edit. de 1773, t. II, p. 418. Brachet, XLV.)

able restorative. Louis probably did take human blood for his malady, although we have only a hint as to how he got it.⁶⁰ He also probably submitted to the heroic treatment of having his head cauterized with a hot iron,⁶¹ a recognized therapeutic agent in epilepsy in the Middle Ages.⁶²

Medieval medicine further suggests a solution of gold to be drunk as medicine in psychoneurotic cases. Avicenne, Canon, says: "The limatura of gold is good for tremor of the heart [Louis complained of this] and for depression of the mind and for him who talks alone."⁶³ Indeed, the salts of gold is a recognized modern remedy in cases of spasms and convulsions. The records show that in 1483 a certain man received the sum of 192 livres of gold for a beverage called "potable gold" ordered for the King by his physicians (Legeay, Louis XI, II, pp. 506), and Louis probably took this, too.

Furthermore, it is interesting to notice another means of obtaining relief from sickness in the Middle Ages, which furnishes an indirect means of diagnosing a disease. This is hagiotherapy, or the invocation of the saints which protect against certain afflictions. Taken alone, this agency should not serve as a basis for any conclusion as to the disease itself, but it is a very useful check upon other data as indicating from his prayers and gifts to certain saints what the patient himself thought was the matter with him. The documents in the various archives show conclusively that Louis XI had frequent recourse to the intercession of the saints who were to be specifically invoked in epilepsy, spasms, and convulsions—St. John the Evangelist, St. Giles, St. Claude, and St. Paul, for example.⁶⁴ Moreover, the gifts of Louis to the saints invoked for

⁶⁰ In the royal accounts for this date there is a receipt which reads as follows: "To John Pellart, the sum of £9 12 s. 6 d. ordered paid to him by the said lord (Louis) the aforesaid day for having been bled by the order and command of the said lord on two occasions for demonstration (espreuve). A Jehan Pellart la somme de £9 12 s. 6 d. a luy ordonnée par ledit seigneur ledit jour pour avoir este seigné par l'ordonnance et commandement dudit seigneur par deux fois pour espreuve." 29 juin, 1482. (British Museum. Mss. Egerton, 883, fol. 62. Brachet, XLVI.)

⁶¹ Brachet, XXXI-XXXII, 13.

⁶² Avicenne, Canon, l. III, Tr. 4, Cap. X, de cura melancholiæ. "Et quandoque oportet ut caput ejus secundum crucem cauterization, si nihil aliud confert."

⁶³ Avicenne, Canon, Bk. II, Tract. 2, Cap. LXXVIII. Brachet, XXXV.

⁶⁴ Du Broc de Segagne, Les Saints Patrons (cited in Brachet, XLVIII.)

epilepsy became finally so great that Parlement again and again opposed the alienation of parts of the royal domain for this purpose.⁶⁶

Now, it seems fair, from the symptoms and from the remedies employed by Louis, to conclude that the King was very sick with some nervous malady, and that the particular malady could not be anything else than epilepsy.

But if Louis had epilepsy, why did not the physician announce the fact? The reason in the Middle Ages, even more than to-day, was that epilepsy was a reflection on the patient and upon his parents, and its existence was always concealed when it was possible. Hence, for example, the silence of Commynes upon the remedies taken by the King.

This fact explains why Louis had recourse to a strange procedure: He made gifts and asked the intercession of the saint protecting against the quartain fever, not that he might be spared, but that it might please God to send him that disease. "Because," he explains, "the doctors say that I have a sickness of which I may never be cured unless I have the quartain fever."⁶⁷

History as such cannot explain this strange request, but medieval medicine does so without trouble and in this way. Hippocrates 2000 years ago laid down the principle of the substitution of one disease for another. "Persons taken with the quartain fever," he says, "are never taken with the great sickness [epilepsy], and, if taken first with that affection they get the quartain fever, the first is healed by the second."⁶⁸

Louis had epilepsy, and any lingering doubt as to the fact is dispelled by the direct statement of Gaguin that he had it: "At that time [1480] Louis began to be very sick. For the comitial sickness [epilepsy], which for a long time had oppressed him, demanded the most diligent efforts of his physicians."⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Brachet, L., British Museum, Egerton Mss. No. 1668, fol. 299.

⁶⁷ Arch. du Cher, Fonds du Chapitre, d. Raynal, Hist. du Berry, III, 132. Brachet, LXXX.

⁶⁸ "Les individus pris de fièvre quarte ne sont jamais atteints de la grande maladie (l'épilepsie); et, si, pris d'abord de cette affection, la fièvre quarte leur survient, celle-ci les guérit de celle-là." Hippocrates, Epidémies, VI, 6, 5 (tr. Littré, V, 325). Brachet, LXXXII.

⁶⁹ "... Sed per id tempus aegrotare maxime Ludovicus coepit. Nam comitali morbo cum inter dum premeretur, . . . Quamobrem medicorum diligenti opera usus est." Robert Gaguin, f. 279, Brachet, LXXIX.

It is perfectly clear, therefore, that Louis was not a Tiberius, exhausting every means to please his jaded senses, but a miserable nervous wreck, trying to recover his health by the most advanced scientific treatment of his age, and if he is not an object of compassion, his actions, at least, demand sympathetic interpretation.

The fact that Louis suffered many years from attacks of epilepsy is in itself sufficient indication of a very serious nervous condition, whatever produced it. He had a bad inheritance of gout, insanity mania, and obsessions of one kind or another from his various ancestors. Space does not permit of a discussion of this statement, but Brachet's researches⁹⁹ furnish ample warrant for the assertion that the terrain in the King's case was very bad indeed.

Before going further, it is desirable to recall the medical hypothesis mentioned earlier, that in cases of hereditary neurasthenics, after a severe or exhausting illness, some form of mental disturbance is a more or less certain sequence.

The pathological history of Louis XI forms no exception to the general formula, and, following his bitter experience at Péronne, in 1468, and his very serious illness in 1479, there are recorded the following acts which can be interpreted only as psychopathic outbursts, latent or repressed before, but common in one form or other to all hereditary degenerates: (a) Louis develops a mania for lavish expenditures (a form of megalomania) so foreign to his general character; (b) a morbid fear of death, an obsession with Louis (thanatophobia); (c) a mania for collecting things, simply for the sake of collection (collectomania); (d) an irresponsible mania for seizing things which he wanted (kleptomania); and finally, (e) a morbid love for animals (zoophilia).

His illness in 1479 was so severe as to lead to the report that the King was not only helpless, but was actually dead.¹⁰⁰ The pivotal

⁹⁹ His *Pathologie Mentale* devotes something like 700 pages to the subject.

¹⁰⁰ "... Wherefore the report was widely spread throughout all the lands of the Duke that the King himself had declined into such weakness of body that he could neither ride horseback nor be conveyed in a chariot, nor could he get any better either by the aid or diligence of his physicians. This popular rumor filled not only the lands of the Duke, but very many of the provinces of the realm as well, so that many reviled him and secretly cursed him as not sick but dead." "... Ex eo re rumor increbuit per omnes terras ducis quod ipse rex in talem corporis sui invaletudinem incurrerat, quod nunquam nec equo, nec carru vectari posset, nec inde ulla

point of his reign is here, and by reason of that very sickness. For it is from this illness that a series of acts may be dated which should be classed as explosions of megalomania.

He purchased 22 caps at once, during the winter of 1478-79, for example, paying 700 francs apiece for them—a very significant change from the avaricious Louis. After this year he changed his habits completely, dressed extravagantly, and gave away lavishly. Commynes, of the earlier part of his reign, says: "The King dresses very shabbily, so badly that it could not be worse. The material is bad enough at any time, and he wears an old hat, different from the rest, with a lead image on it."¹¹ But after 1479 Commynes is obliged to record the fact, already cited, that he "dressed richly, a thing which he had never been accustomed to do before, and wore only satin robes lined with good marten fur, and he gave some of these to persons without their asking." Further evidence of this lavish giving is found in the sums which he gave his physician,¹² and in his excessive gifts to the saints.¹³

He had a morbid fear of death. For a long time during his reign the fact that the King was terribly afraid of death was known and played upon. He released Cardinal Balue and Bishop Berdun from their cages because of the fear that God would send judgment upon him for keeping a cardinal and a bishop in chains. Furthermore, his fear that he would die was so great that he became an absolute slave to his physician,¹⁴ Coictier, to whom,

medicorum ope aut industria convalescere. Qui rumor nedum terras ducis, sed plurimas etiam regni provincias vulgo adimplevit; ita ut etiam eum, nedum ægrotum, sed mortuum esse plures susurrarent et clanculo jactitarent." Basin, *Hist. Ludow. XI*, vol. 3, Lib. VI, Cap. XIII, pp. 40-50.

¹¹ "Nostre roy se habilloit fort court, et si mal que pis ne pouvoit, et essez mauvais drap aucunes fois, et portoit ung mauvais chapeau, different des autres, et ung image de plom dessus." (Commynes, ed Dupont, I, 166. Brachet, CI.)

¹² In less than eight months he gave to Coictier, his physician, 98,000 crowns.

¹³ "... A great part of the domains were in this way disposed of, and had he lived a few years longer the revenues of the kingdom would have passed into the hands of the churchmen." Duclos, *Louis XI*, II, 319.

¹⁴ "... The doctor used him very roughly indeed; one would not have given such outrageous language to one's servants as he gave to the King, who stood in such awe of him that he durst not forbid him his presence." Commynes, Scobel, edit. II, 74.

according to Commynes,⁷⁵ he paid 10,000 crowns a month in the hope that he would lengthen the King's life and all that Coictier had to do to get anything that he wanted was to threaten to leave.⁷⁶ Everyone apparently knew about this fear, for Sixtus IV, to win his favor, let Louis know that he had granted indulgence to all such as should visit churches to pray for his recovery. Even Charles the Bold seems to have known the abject terror to which the King gave way; and Commynes was, of course, thoroughly familiar with it. His account leaves no doubt at all about the fact, for he says: "Never was a man more fearful of death nor used more means to prevent it. He had, all his life long, commanded and requested his servants . . . that whenever we saw him in any danger of death we should not tell him of it, but merely admonish him to confess himself, without ever mentioning that cruel and shocking word 'death,'"⁷⁷ and Commynes, otherwise so careful of the reputation of the King, nevertheless confesses that when St. Francis de Paul came to him from Rome, Louis fell upon his knees before the hermit and besought him to prolong his life.⁷⁸

His voluntary isolation, which historians have found so hard to explain, may have been a sign of his morbid mental condition after 1479, but it seems plausible to assume that Louis was again following the advice of his physicians. The records show that in the winter of 1478-79 Louis was very sick, and that it was difficult to see him. It was in 1479 that, to avoid being seen and to render access to his person even more difficult, the King had the contrivance of sharp stakes, called "caltrops," placed along the roads approaching his castle, and he continued to shun meeting anyone.

It is profitable to compare the statement of the medical authorities upon this question of seclusion with that of the historians. From a medical standpoint, above all things else prescribed for epileptics was isolation. The *Grant Proprietaire des Choses* says: "Above all things should the epileptic avoid harmful foods and association with people, because his malady takes him thus more often than when he is alone."⁷⁹ Barante, as an example

⁷⁵ Ibid., II, 71.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 74-75.

⁷⁷ Commynes, ed. Scobel, II, 72.

⁷⁸ Ibid., II, 56.

⁷⁹ ". . . . Devant toutes choses ilz se doivent garder de viands nuisibles . . . et de trop habiter en la compagnie des gens, car leur mal les prent plus tost que quand ilz sont tous seulz." Liv., VII, Chap. IX; Brachet, XCV.

of the historians, accounts for the facts thus: "His mistrust," he says, "became horrible, and almost insane; every year he had his castle of Plessis surrounded with more walls, ditches, and rails. On the towers were iron shields and shelter from arrows, and even artillery. More than 1800 of those planks bristling with nails, called 'caltrops,' were distributed on yonder side of the ditch."⁸⁰ There is no question as to his suspicion and distrust of everyone who approached him at this time; and the advice of his physicians probably simply intensified his desire to keep by himself.

Let us now examine the manifestations of combined megalomania and collectionomania, of which Commynes furnishes the evidence, unconsciously, to be sure, but unmistakably:

. . . . He caused fine horses or mules to be bought at any price whatsoever, but this was not done in France. He had a great passion for dogs, and sent into foreign countries for them; . . . and bought them at a dearer price than the people asked. He sent into Sicily to buy a mule of an officer of that country, and paid him double the value. . . . He bought strange creatures wherever they could be found. . . . He sent into Sweden and Denmark for two sorts of beasts which those countries afforded; . . . for six of each of these beasts he gave the merchant 4500 Dutch florins. Yet when all these rarities were brought to him he valued them not at all, and many times would not so much as speak to the persons who brought them to him. In short, he behaved after so strange a manner that he was more formidable both to his neighbors and subjects than he had ever been before.⁸¹

The significant circumstance in this case is that Louis paid the extravagant sum of 125,000 francs, in modern money, apiece, for certain animals, which he would not look at when they were brought to him. This indifference taken together with the fact that he gave more for what he bought than anyone asked for the animal, is plainly pathological. Commynes makes it appear that all this took place in the last years of the King's life, but the records show that similar purchases were made as early as 1479.

Suspicion points to Louis as an hereditary degenerate. His actions seem to furnish a most clear-cut manifestation of the conventional stigmata of degenerate zoophilia—that is to say, a morbid love for animals and a hypersensitiveness as to their comfort. These stigmata are (1) extravagance of purchase; (2) indifference of the purchaser; and (3) hypersensitiveness to the suffering of sick animals. The first two traits are common to morbid collectionomania, the third, always associated with indifference to the

⁸⁰ Guizot, III, 256.

⁸¹ Commynes, ed. Scobel, II, 57-58.

suffering of human creatures, and often with extreme cruelty, is decisive for zoophilia.⁸²

The illustrations of zoophilia, which follow, are interesting, because they are so precise; the King's great cruelty has already been mentioned. Commynes further says: "The King inflicted very severe punishments to inspire dread, and for fear of losing his authority, as he himself told me, . . . so that he passed his time in making and ruining men." As to his morbid interest in animal suffering, the illustrations could not be more explicit. "March 30, 1479 [paid], to John de Reffou . . . 53s. for having brought in a litter and by water from Fourges to Tours, a hunting dog which was sick."⁸³ "Oct., 1480, to Jacques de Saint Benoist, for the purchase and carting of a boat which he took by order of the King and for using it to bring a stag to the pool of Gastine, that it might die there."⁸⁴ "July 4, 1481, to Vincent l'Aumosnier, 50s. for having brought, in a three-horse chariot, from Garrannes to Dreux, . . . one of the King's greyhounds which was sick."⁸⁵ "To Louis Lucas, £6 19s. from the King . . . for having brought, in a two-horse chariot, a rabbit of the King's from Forges . . . to Bonne Aventure."⁸⁶

⁸² Ballet, *Intermittent Morbid States of the Emotions*, in his chapter on "Zoophilia and Zoophobia," says: "That which demonstrates the morbid character of this state, aside from *abulia* and emotionalism, is the indifference, often complete, of the Zoophiles for their own relations and friends, and for human suffering generally, to which indifference there is sometimes added a veritable cruelty." See also *The Zoophil-Psychosis*, by Charles L. Dana, M. D., *Medical Record*, March 6, 1909, and *Zoophile et Zoophobie*, *Extrait de la Belgique Médicale*, 1897, par Ch. Féré.

⁸³ "30 mars., 1479. A Jehan du Reffou, maistre d'ostel dudit seigneur, 53 s. 4 d. t. . . . pour avoir fait mener en une lictière et par eaue, depuis les Forges Jusques à Tours, ung chien courant qui estoit malade." (Arch. nat. kk. 64, fol. 17. Brachet, CXV.)

⁸⁴ "Octobre, 1480. A Jacques de Saint-Benoist, . . . pour l'achapt et charroy d'un bastea qu'il a prins par l'ordonnance dudit seigneur, et le fait mener a l'estang de Gastine, pour y faire mourir un cerf." (Arch. nat. kk. 64, fol. 158v, Arcq. p. 393. Brachet, CXVI.)

⁸⁵ "4 juillet, 1481. A Vincent L'Aumosnier, 50 s. . . . pour avoir fait mener en une charette à trois chevaulx ung des lévriers dudit seigneur qui estoit malade, de Garannes à Dreux . . ." (Arch. nat. kk. 64, fol. 150. Brachet, CXVI.)

⁸⁶ "A Loys Lucas, . . . 6 l. 10 s. . . . pour avoir faict mener et conduire à une charecte à deux chevaulx ung des lièvres dudit seigneur des forges . . . à Bonne Aventure." (Arch. nat. kk. 64, fol. 116. Brachet, CXVII.)

Now, having stated the hypothesis of zoophilia, still following Brachet, the deductive method may be used thus: In the case of the degenerate zoophile there are usually found pronounced symptoms of kleptomania. We are sure to find that Louis was a kleptomaniac. For, by an inconsistency which is the mark of this morbid condition, the sick man steals that which he covets, not because he cannot buy it, but because stealing is more agreeable to him as a kind of conquest.

Thus the records furnish what may be fanciful evidence that Louis did not scruple to rob his subjects' henroosts on occasions: "January, 1483, . . . In this month the King commanded that his servants should travel all night along all the roads and on the River Loire ahead of certain birds of Turkey, which were being taken to Brittany, to take them and bring them to him." "Item, two days afterwards the birds were found at 8 o'clock at night and were brought at that time to Montilz."⁸⁷

Possibly the next illustration is simply a piece of high-handed tyranny on the King's part, but it took place at a time when he was spending enormous sums for other animals and he could easily have paid his subjects for theirs. Viewed in connection with his other actions at this time, seizure has a suspiciously pathological complexion, if it is not definitely a case of kleptomania:

By the King's grace he commanded a most base thing to be done. . . . For he sent commissioners to the town of Rouen and many other places of the realm, who ordered, on the King's authority, under penalty of confiscation of goods and body, that all dogs, large and small, should be brought together to one place. Being thus collected, they carried away the best of these, tied in carts and wagons, to the King.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ "Janvier, 1483. Item. audit moys le roy manda que on allast toute nuyt par tous les chemins et sur la rivièrre de loire audavant de plusieurs oyseaulx de Iurkie, qu'on portoit en Bretagne, pour les prendre et les lui apporter. Item, Deux jours apres les oyseaulx dessusditz fuerent trouvez a huyt heures de nuyt et les convint porter a ladite heure aux Montilz." (*Comptes de Tours*, t. XLIV, fol. 82 V°. Brachet, CXVII.)

⁸⁸ "Cujus etiam rei gratia, rem stultissimam . . . fieri jussit. Misit enim commissarios ad urbem Rothomagensensem et alia plurima regni loca, qui ex ipsius auctoritate juberent sub pœna confiscationis corporis et bonorum ut omnes canes, parvi et magni, ad unam plateam ducerentur. Quibus sic in unum collectis, quos ducerent eligendos, ad regem in carrucis et vehiculis ligatos veherent. . . ." (*Thos. Basin, Hist. Lud. III*, 168, Brachet, CXVII.)

There remains to consider an incident which took place in 1468, after Louis had ventured to intrust himself to the power of his arch-enemy, Charles the Bold, at Péronne. Relying upon his subtlety and cunning words to secure his ends, Louis had boldly gone in person to Charles at his castle in Péronne. The discussion had gone on smoothly enough for several days when Charles learned that Louis was arousing the people of Liège—Charles' subjects—against him. In a terrible passion Charles imprisoned Louis, threatened to depose him, and even to take his life. Louis in his terror agreed to the most humiliating conditions of peace with Charles. Among others, he was compelled to march in person along with Charles against the people of Liège, and actually hurled back the cry, "Vive la Bourgogne!" against the people of that city when they shouted "Vive la France!" The incident took place upon his return to Paris after this chagrin of Péronne. It is as follows:

And on the same day [Saturday, November 19, 1468] there were taken for the King, in the city of Paris, all the magpies, jays, and owls, either in cages or not, belonging to private individuals, and brought before him. And the places from which these birds were taken were written down and registered, as well as all that could speak words such as "Thief," "Wanton," "Hey, get out," "Pérette, give me a drink," and several other fine phrases which those birds had been taught and knew how to say. Then, again, by another commission of the King there were sought out and taken all the stags, hinds, and deer that could be found in Paris and were brought to Amboise.⁹⁹

The account which Gaguin gives of this affair is substantially the same. He says: "I doubt whether I should write down at all what actually took place, a deed in its novelty unworthy of a king. Magpies and grackles which had been taught to whistle or to imitate the human voice, which were kept in cages by the Parisians for

⁹⁹ "Et, ce mesmes jour, fuerent prinses pour le roy. . . . En ladictie ville de Paris tous les pyes, jays, chouetes estans en cage ou autrement et estans privée, pour toutes les porter devers le roy. Et estoit escript et enregistré le lieu ou avoient este prins lesdiz oiseaulz et aussi tout ce qu'ilz savoient dire, comme: 'Larron! Paillart! Filz de Putain! Va hors. Va! Pérette, donne moy à boire!' et plusieurs autres beaux motz que iceulx oiseaux savoient bien dire et qu'on leur aavoit aprins. Et depuis encores, par autre commission du roy . . . fut venu querir et prendre audit lieu de Paris tous les cerfs, biches, et grues, qu'on y peust trouver et tout fait mener a Amboise. Journal de Jean de Roye, I, 220, Brachet, CVI.

amusement in the house, and soon afterwards stags and deer, all were commanded by Louis to be seized and brought to Amboise.*

These two texts report two important facts: First, on November 19, 1468, after seizing all the talking birds (magpies and jays), as well as those that were mute, the King had them all transported to his park at Amboise, and a little later all the stags, hinds, and deer which the Parisians were keeping in their gardens were carried off to the same place. Second, this double zoological seizure by the King, twice by armed force, of the rare and curious animals of the Parisians for his own use appeared inexplicable and revolted public opinion.

Any attempt to justify this bizarre act psychologically, immediately raises the following questions: (a) Why did the King seize the birds at all? (b) Why a second time the animals? (c) Why seizure instead of purchase—an act which must have seemed both tyrannical and incomprehensible? (d) Why the double seizure immediately after Péronne, when he needed the support of public opinion? And (e) how is this strange action explained by contemporaries? How by modern historians?

Taking the questions up in inverse order: His contemporaries have no explanation to make. Gaguin, who wrote in 1501, and who would let pass no opportunity to discredit the King if he could, is very much amazed at the King's action, but he does not know what to make of it. Commynes, who must have had some ideas about it, for his own purpose conceals the affair, and we are led to suspect that he conceals it in order to protect the King's reputation.

Modern historians, unable to offer anything better, have fallen upon the very remote similarity of the words "Péronne" and "Pérette" as an explanation. Pérette de Châlons had been a mistress to the King some time before this, and although the chroniclers record that the birds said "Pérette," the historians have substituted the word "Péronne" as better explaining the puzzling circumstance. One after the other, Duclos, Sismondi, Barante, Hare, and Michelet, have explained the seizure of the birds on the

* "Quod vero sequitur an scriberem aliquando dubitavi facinus profecto sua novitate indignum rege. Picas et graculos qui in caveis humanas voces vel sibilare vel imitari edocti apud Parisios ad voluptatem domesticæ alebantur: Moxque cervos et grues capi omnes et Ambasiam duci Ludovicus imperat." Robert Gaguin, *Compendium de Francorum Gestis*, Liv. X, f° CXLVII, V°—CXLVIII, Brachet, CVII.

ground that the word "Péronne" reminded the King of his humiliation. Duclos says: "The chronicler further tells us that the same day the King ordered the magpies, jays, and other tame birds to be brought to him, with the names of those to whom they belonged. And it is the common opinion that he did this because the birds had been taught to say 'Péronne.'"¹¹

Sismondi goes a little further in his explanation when he says:

Nevertheless the King was ashamed of the trap into which he had plunged of his own accord, and did not wish to enter Paris for fear of exposing himself to the ridicule of the people; he even feared so much the raillery to which he ought to be the butt that he seized all the magpies, jays, and crows which had been taught to speak and registered the words which their masters had taught them to pronounce, meaning to punish all those who had made them repeat the name Péronne, or Pérette de Châlons, . . . then the King's mistress.¹²

Barante thinks that it was in the cause of public order that the birds were taken:

The precautions were indeed so great that there were seized by the King's order all the magpies, jays, and crows, and other privately owned birds to whom the inhabitants of Paris had taught the words "Thief," "Wanton," and "Pérette, give me a drink." The commission responsible for this seizure wrote in its register what each bird knew how to say and with whom it had been found. Such was the fear of what might excite disorder or give offense either to the King or to the Princes.¹³

¹¹ "La Chronique dit que le même jour le roi se fit apporter les pies, les geais et autres oiseaux privés, avec les noms de ceux auxquels ils appartenoient, et la tradition est que c'étoit parce qu'on leur avoit appris à dire Péronne." Duclos, *Hist. de Louis XI*, ed. de La Haye, 1750, I, 398. Brachet, CIX.

¹² "Cependant le roi étoit honteux du piège où il étoit allé se jeter de lui-même; il ne voulut point entrer dans Paris, pour ne pas s'exposer aux propos du peuple; il craignoit même si fort les railleries auxquelles il sentoit qu'il devoit être en butte qu'il fit saisir toutes les pies, les geais, les corbeaux auxquels on avoit appris à parler, et enregistrer les mots que leurs maîtres leur avoient enseigné à prononcer pour punir tous ceux qui leur auroient fait répéter le nom ou de Péronne ou de Pérette de Châlons, bourgeoise de Paris, alors sa maitresse." Sismondi, *Hist. d. Français*, XIV, 283; Brachet, CIX.

¹³ ". . . Les précautions furent même si grandes, que l'on saisit par ordre du roi toutes les pies, geais, corbeaux et autres oiseaux apprivoisés, à qui des habitants de Paris avoient appris des paroles, comme: 'Larron, paillard, va, dehors: Pérette, donne moi à boire.' Le commissaire chargé de cette saisie inscrivit exactement sur son registre ce que chaque oiseau savoit dire, et chez qui on l'avait trouvé; tant on craignoit ce qui pouvoit exciter quelque désordre et offenser soit le roi, soit les princes." Barante, *Hist. des ducs de Bourgogne*, éd. Gachard, II, 332, col. 2; Brachet, CIX.

Christopher Hare does not vary from the traditional explanation:

The whole story of Péronne could not fail to excite the satirical wit of the keen Parisians. The King, after his three weeks anxiety, was unwise enough to show it. He ordered that all who spoke ill of the Duke of Burgundy should be severely punished, while the names were to be taken of all owners of magpies, jackdaws, and other talking birds who had been maliciously taught to cry "*Péronne*."¹⁴

Michelet tries to reconcile the text of the Chroniclers with what to him is the obvious explanation:

The farce of Péronne . . . the ablest of the able duped. . . . Every one laughed, young and old, the small children, but what am I saying, the very talking birds, jays, magpies, and starlings spoke of nothing else, they knew but one word, "*Pérette*."¹⁵

So much for the explanations of the political historians, the best that can be offered, without recourse to mental pathology, and all of them, without exception, absolutely wrong. But if they all have the wrong explanation, what is the right one? Brachet offers but one: kleptomania. This, he properly says, explains quite naturally the two seizures of 1468, which roused the people of Paris. But the relation of that act of kleptomania to the date of its outbreak is still to be accounted for, and why the bizarre act took place precisely upon the return from the interview at Péronne in which Louis was within a hair's breadth of being first deposed, and afterwards put to death by Charles the Bold.

Of the three hypotheses—(1) a chance coincidence, (2) exaggerated assertion of the King's authority, and (3) the psychopathic interpretation—the last only is tenable. For in the date of the King's act is to be recognized the law of impulse in degenerates. The depleted mental and nervous condition in which the King found himself upon his return after the detention at Péronne and after the terrible emotional strain which he had undergone led to inevitable nervous exhaustion, 18 months after a severe attack of typho-malaria. It is natural to think that he should find himself unable at this particular time to withstand an irresistible impulse

¹⁴ Hare, *Life of Louis XI*, p. 159.

¹⁵ La farce de Péronne . . . l'habile des habiles, dupé . . . Tous en riaient, jeunes et vieux, les petits enfants, que dis-je? les oiseaux causeurs, geais, pies et sansonnets, ne causaient d'autre chose; ils ne savaient qu'un mot, "*Pérette*." Michelet, *Hist. de France*, éd. Flammarion, VI, 242-243; Brachet, CIX.

to zoophilistic kleptomania, which must have tempted him more than once, but which his care for his reputation had held in check. He yielded to that impulse, knowing very well that it was the worst possible moment to do it, and that he had best not yield to it, or at least wait until he had less need for public opinion.*

It is Brachet's conclusion, and it seems unassailable, that the psychological interpretation of the King's act in seizing the birds and beasts was an attack of kleptomania in the case of a degenerate zoophile, breaking out consecutively upon a condition of depleted nervous tone, produced in this case by his captivity.

This conclusion is the more acceptable in that it conforms to the three conditions of hypothesis: (a) It is contradicted by none of the observed facts; (b) it explains them all; (c) it discloses the formula of zoophile for the King.

In view of what one king's reign has to contribute to the study of historical pathology, and upon the reasonable assumption that such conditions are not confined to one reign, the question naturally arises: Is it possible to write a faithful biography which fails to consider what bearing the biological factor may have upon the life history of any individual? Assuredly the study of historical pathology has a very definite place in solving the problems of history.

*Féré, *Pathologie des Emotions*, p. 277. "The emotions have pathological effects, the more marked when they are produced at the end of a sickness, in convalescence; in a word, where they act upon an organism already enfeebled."