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 Dürers 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*

Laura Calvert. *Francisco de Osuna and the Spirit of the Letter*. North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures 133. Chapel Hill, N.C.: U.N.C. Department of Romance Languages; Portland, Ore.: International Scholarly Book Services Inc., 1973. Pp. 175. \$6.50.

Francisco de Osuna, a Spanish Franciscan of the early sixteenth century who wrote a series of popular spiritual guides in the form of "alphabets," has been more admired than studied by posterity. His name appears in all histories of Spanish mysticism as a primary influence on St. Teresa, and his importance for Spanish secular literature is also admitted. The only two modern editions of his work are not readily available, however, and the only full-length study prior to this one was published in French by Fidèle de Ros in 1936. The appearance of the Calvert study is therefore timely.

Osuna's obscurity is due, one suspects, not to fortuitous neglect but to inherent difficulties of access for modern readers. The problem is not so much the unfamiliarity of the genre or any opacity of style as the lack of any obvious consistency either in organization or in the use of images. Calvert attributes this apparent aimlessness, behind which she claims to detect an orderly sequence, to Osuna's intention of providing not elements of a linear argument but rather figures for contemplation. Whatever the difficulties of approach, one soon becomes aware that Osuna was a man both of uncommon perception and of independent judgment. One is not surprised that he criticizes the ecclesiastical hierarchy, for such criticism was neither unusual nor particularly risky. His boldness becomes impressive, however, when one finds him defending converts when they were automatically suspect to the Inquisition, urging persuasion as the best means of dealing with heretics, and openly espousing democracy as preferable to monarchy. Osuna took a lively interest in scientific matters, sprinkling observations about natural phenomena throughout his writings. By his speculations about the heart and the blood he may have contributed to the discovery of the circulation of the blood, as he certainly helped to foster devotion to the Sacred Heart.

The author's primary interest—in this book at least, for she apparently has another on the way—is in Osuna's use of myth, symbolism, and allegory. His general approach, based on the medieval search for levels of meaning within texts, was not particularly original. In his use of traditional methods, however, he was capable of considerable innovation. Calvert calls attention particularly to his extensive drawing on nature as a book capable of providing letters for his alphabets, a book inferior indeed to Scripture but not radically different in kind. In numerous "meditations on the creatures" he used the natural order as a fertile source of analogies. These analogies were more often directed to the intellect than to the imagination, moving by abstraction from the functions of things rather than by description from their appearances, for the path to contemplation was through knowledge formed by love rather than through images appealing to the senses. What Osuna sought was thus "the spirit of the letter"; and he did so with considerable freedom, convinced that fidelity to one faith was consistent with many interpretations either of the book of nature or of Holy Scripture. One wonders how different relations between scientists and the church might have been in succeeding centuries if Osuna's approach had prevailed.

Students of the Renaissance will naturally be interested in possible connections between leading humanists and one who shared their spirit in such measure. A number of parallels are pointed out, notably with Erasmus and Ficino, but they are all fairly general and the trails soon peter out. More promising is the author's suggestion that medieval traditions of rhetoric and homiletics, still very much alive in Osuna and transmitted through him and others to modern secular writers, would repay more study than they have yet re-

ceived. Among influences of Osuna on later writers, that on the metaphysical poets seems most important.

The author has performed a welcome service and done so with skill and subtlety. Specialists in Spanish literature or in mysticism will derive the most benefits, but the few non-specialists who are likely to pick up a book with such a title will find unexpected rewards. The book does not make easy reading, to be sure, as in the case of Osuna himself not through the obscurity of the subject or through deficiencies in style but through complexities in the sequence of thought. Is this evidence of some lack of clarity, or is it a necessary reflection of Osuna's own complexities? It is difficult to know without a mastery of Osuna's thought, and the author seems to be practically the only expert. By restricting herself to certain aspects of Osuna's use of figures she could undoubtedly have written a neater and more approachable book. But then we should have learned less about Osuna, and this in the present state of research we could ill afford.

JOHN WEBSTER GRANT, *Victoria University*

Gareth A. Davies, *A Poet at Court: Antonio Hurtado de Mendoza (1586-1644)*. Oxford: The Dolphin Book Co. Ltd., 1971. Pp. 367. £4.50.

In this work Dr. Davies offers the first comprehensive study of a writer who, although now virtually ignored, in his day figured prominently among the *littérateurs* of the court of Philip III. Davies's interest in Mendoza was awakened by the contradiction between Gracián's admiration, expressed in his *Agudeza y arte de ingenio*, and the subsequent demise of the poet's fame.

A Poet at Court is a splendid work. The approach is that of a literary historian and critic, with well-appointed judgments succinctly expounded. Following Mendoza's biography—his relationship with Olivares and his participation in court life make fascinating reading—Dr. Davies discusses Mendoza's reputation among his literary contemporaries. Although Mendoza's position at court may have elicited some exaggerated eulogies, there is little doubt that he was highly regarded not only as an outstanding poet but also as an accomplished *entremesista* and dramatist. Among his acquaintances he could count such luminaries as Quevedo, Lope de Vega, Luis Vélez de Guevara, even collaborating with Quevedo in the composition of dramas.

The discussion of Mendoza's verse and drama is detailed (Chapters V-VI, IX-XII). As poet Mendoza excelled in the use of traditional forms: the *romances*, *coplas*, *redondillas*, *endechas*, and above all the *décima* (in the use of which Lope acclaimed him as unequalled). Davies attributes Mendoza's predilection for the *décima* to his love of the conceit, the intellectual exercise so favoured by seventeenth-century Spanish writers, and the basis of Gracián's admiration. As dramatist Mendoza composed some twelve works, a small number considering the enormous output of some of his contemporaries. His greatest success appears to have been in his social comedies and his spectacle play, *Querer por sólo querer*. Nevertheless, Davies concludes that Mendoza's plays, although interesting, are of secondary order in the Spanish theatre of the seventeenth century.

Dr. Davies's major contribution for those whose interest in Mendoza is marginal is to