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It is notable that when historians write about the day-to-day lives of people, they normally ignore monarchies. As eminent as this dynasty was, there are few studies that deal to a considerable extent with its quotidian lives. There are a few extraordinary examples. In *El aprendizaje cortesano de Felipe II* (1999), José Luis Gonzalo Sánchez-Molero frames Philip as a Renaissance prince within European literary culture, but organic narratives about the Habsburgs and their practice of the everyday are as rare as emeralds.

What makes Hoffman’s book especially important is that, through her assessment of the raison d’être of monarchy, we gain an appreciation (and a vivid narrative) of what it was like to grow up being a ruler. Analyzing household and domestic mechanisms and the monarchy’s ideological framework, Hoffman divides her book into two parts. She organizes the first part according to three household subdivisions: 1) the servants and nobles who were the children’s caretakers and playmates; 2) teachers and tutors, humanists and noblewomen, and mendicants and Jesuits, who taught the children to read and write, some of whom emphasized the Latin classics and history, others who taught them the languages of Spain, and *damas* who spoke French or Italian to them; and 3) the “defenders of the faith” who ensured that the court was a “house of religion.”

Hoffman begins with an exposition of the *servidores* and their duties. We experience the routines and lesson plans, while getting to know the educators and servants who groomed the children. The *servidores* who nurtured the children of Philip III and Margarita of Austria taught them to be prudent, just, and merciful rulers. To use modern parlance, the teaching goal was to instill in children (who spent many hours goofing off and having fun) the competency to focus and make decisions, while acquiring the capacity to synthesize criticism and advice from counselors. Daily routines included masses, the discipline of penance (which the children began to practice at seven), and reading books. The boys, for instance, interrupted their play with the study of Roman history; they normally read and discussed the writings of Livy and Tacitus, who constituted “the true school in which the Prince and King will find examples to follow, cases to note, and ways to guide the business of his Monarchy for good results” (77-78).
In part two, Hoffman explores of the lives of the girls (Ana, Maria and Margarita) and the boys (Carlos, Philip, Fernando, and Alfonso), while organizing these chapters as illustrations of the children’s development and how they grew up into responsible adults who internalized moral and dynastic obligations. There appears to have been a harsh reality of parents forcing their children to marry other children they did not know and love, but that was because royal children inherited duties. Royal women had to merit love, in addition to extend the family network, strengthen or rebuild alliances, and potentially enlarge the royal patrimony. Philip III, for instance, told his daughter Ana that she must assume her “new obligations of state” and that she must “win her husband’s love and support the true religion” (119). The comportment of Ana’s household was a demonstration of her own integrity and a reflection of her own reputation. She set the example by avoiding luxuries, showing her prudence by self-restraint, and working all the time. And in the case of Prince Carlos and Fernando who become like sons to their brother, King Philip IV, when their father died in 1621, the brothers dutifully recognized their dynastic priorities and departed from their homeland, never seeing each other again.

In sum, Hoffman shows that the Habsburgs were principled workhorses, but at the same time were allowed to enjoy their youth hunting and playing. It is no wonder, then, that juntas and long hours marked Spanish Habsburg governance. As Philip II (the “decider” in Parker’s words) once whined: “it is ten at night, I am wasted and dying of hunger . . . and still there are so many papers on my desk.” Hoffman concludes that monarchy was a key stabilizing force in Spain, noting that “the same elements of idealized personality, precedent, and family promised a stability that have made governments and people turn again and again to royal solutions to questions of power” (226). She has published a work, extensively researched, that makes a strong case for the integrity of monarchy, and her analysis of the mundane structures that sustained the rectitude of royal power makes one wonder whether people acquired more, if any, influence and power when they replaced monarchs with presidents.
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