bution, Professor Cullen has summarized earlier criticism and has given full credit to others who have dealt with similar themes, at the same time showing carefully where his opinions differ.

K. HARPER, Bishop's University


The year 1971, the 500th anniversary of Albrecht Dürer's birth (1471-1528), witnessed an overwhelming number of exhibitions and publications devoted to Dürer's artistic oeuvre, theoretical writings, contemporaries, and his later cult in Germany. The slim volume of seven essays presently under review comprises the public lectures originally presented in conjunction with the Dürer Festival held in the fall of 1971 at the Whitworth Art Gallery of the University of Manchester in collaboration with the Goethe Institute.

As published, the order of these papers moves smoothly from the general context of the times to more circumscribed issues and finally to aspects of Dürer's afterlife. In the first essay entitled, "Dürer and the Renaissance," Michael Levey challenges not only the parochial understanding of the Renaissance, peculiar to many engaged in the history of art, as essentially an artistic style or even a movement like Impressionism but also the superficial equation of "Renaissance" with "Italian Renaissance." He maintains in brief that the word "Renaissance" stands "for an historical attitude during a particular period of European history." Within the expanded perimeters set forth, Dürer's attitudes and achievements take on indeed an eminently commanding position. Readers familiar with the author's other writings will find these deceptively simple perceptions a complement to his Early Renaissance in the Pelican series Style and Civilization.

Drawing on similar assumptions, Peter Skrine outlines Dürer's relationship to the vital religious and humanist questions of the day in "Dürer and the Temper of his Age," of which the most interesting section centers on Dürer's 1508 altarpiece Martyrdom of 10,000 Christians commissioned by the Elector of Saxony to embellish the Schlosskirche in Wittenberg which housed his zealously assembled collection of over 5,000 sacred relics. Dürer has painted himself moving calmly through this scene of mass torture and execution accompanied by a figure identified by Skrine as Conrad Celtis. If this is so, this rather neglected painting documents one of the significant junctures in Dürer's work. Here as elsewhere in this volume, some notes and bibliographical references are already out of date or rather incomplete—due not to negligence but rather to the swift, widespread acceptance of such 1971 publications as F. Anzelewsky's Albrecht Dürer, Das malerische Werk, hardly available in time for consultation.

Perhaps in consequence of the public nature of the original series, the resulting papers are addressed to divergent audiences. James Byam Shaw's general exposition on "Dürer the Engraver" remains isolated among essays intended for the more knowledgeable student, while considerations on "Dürer and Thomas Mann" presented as the final essay by Ulrich
Finke can only be fully appreciated by those enjoying a thorough familiarity with Mann’s work.

The two intervening essays are focused as well on Dürer’s afterlife. In “Dürer and the 17th Century” Henry Ley offers a productive commentary on Joachim von Sandrart’s extensive biography of “Germany’s glory” in his Teutsche Academie (Nuremberg, 1675, 1679), followed by a sketch of Dürer collecting, active enthusiasm for which had subsided by 1625. Keith Andrews surveys the various manifestations of “Dürer’s Posthumous Fame” from the petulant criticisms of sixteenth-century Italian writers to the sober scholarship and dime-store reproductions of our own time. Marring this remarkably orchestrated overview is a confusing passage on the preservation of Dürer’s physical image; the author stresses that the self-portraits, both drawn and painted, “all date from the early years of his life.” Then he asks, “Does this mean that the older Dürer found it impossible, or no longer necessary, to present himself to the outside world?” Unless Andrews has in mind a personal, unstated definition of self-portraiture, this is a very odd question. It is precisely this quality of probing self-exposure which characterizes the famous Self-Portrait as the Man of Sorrows (formerly in Bremen), a drawing signed and dated 1522, when the artist was 51. While the included instruments of Christ’s Passion are variously interpreted in reference to Dürer’s mental and physical health (it is thought that he may have contracted malaria in the Netherlands), these do not obscure the penetrating analysis of his own face and sagging body. This passage is especially puzzling since this drawing is specifically discussed and illustrated in the preceding essay by Alistair Smith on “Dürer as a Portraitist” in which the author turns, among other points, to Dürer’s development of a persona as a technique of self-expression. This rather disconcerting discrepancy might well have been clarified, if not eliminated, by the editor, along with other minor irritants such as two mutually exclusive datings for an engraving within the same essay (Holy Family, p. 53 and caption to fig. 12).

The disparate intentions of these essays distinguish this collection from the thematic concentration of the important symposium held in Nuremberg in 1971 on Dürer’s achievements in the years 1490-1500 (see Kunstchronik, XXV, July, 1972, entire issue) and the papers on the artist’s relationship to his times gathered in Albrecht Dürrers Umwelt (Nürnberg Forschungen XV, 1971), Albrecht Dürer: Kunst einer Zeitenwende, ed. H. Schade (Regensburg, 1971), Albrecht Dürer: Kunst im Aufbruch, ed. E. Ullmann (Leipzig, 1972). For broad commentary on these and other publications including the major exhibition catalogues (Nuremberg, Dresden, Washington, etc.) issued in connection with the anniversary year, see the comprehensive reviews in Art Bulletin, June, 1974 (W. Stechow), Revue de l’Art 19, 1973 (P. Vaisse), and Burlington Magazine, February, 1972 (M. Levey).

JOANEATH SPICER DURHAM, University of Toronto