find the newly published letters a fascinating source of information concerning a wide variety of topics from the publications plans of Aldus in 1501 (some of which have not been previously utilized), to Isabella's acquisition of dolls, furnishings, assorted delicacies, and even cats.

The publication under review is the result of considerable painstaking research in one of the most complete archives to have survived from the Italian Renaissance. I am sure there will be many scholars who, with this reviewer, will hope that it is Professor Brown's first instalment in book form of a detailed and comprehensive study of the art collecting and patronage of Isabella d'Este; for clearly no one else is more familiar with the enormous amount of documentation upon which such a study must be based.

WARREN TRESIDDER, *McMaster University*

Dewey Ganzel. *Fortune and Men's Eyes: The Career of John Payne Collier*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982. Pp. xiv, 454. \$19.95.

While it is unusual for *Renaissance and Reformation* to review a biography of a nineteenth-century literary scholar, Professor Ganzel's book warrants an exception. John Payne Collier was not only the preeminent Shakespearean scholar of his time, he also was the most infamous forger in English literary history. For over a century Collier has been notorious as a clever rascal whose fabrications and alterations of documents from Shakespeare's time have bedevilled researchers in a dozen fields. Now comes the first full-length life of the scholar-forger, and its author comes to the astonishing conclusion that Collier was innocent of the main charge against him. While Professor Ganzel's carefully-built case is not conclusive, it raises questions enough to undermine the commonly-held tradition about the great forger. If Ganzel's argument holds up, it will necessitate a full reassessment of Collier's supposed contamination of the great quantity of basic research documents that passed through his hands.

If his name were not tainted with scandal, John Payne Collier would rank probably as the single greatest Elizabethan scholar not only of his generation but even to the present. Enormously learned, prodigiously energetic, he published over his long career an incredible quantity of basic research materials. A journalist by trade, largely unschooled, Collier in his spare time immersed himself in Renaissance English literature until he knew more about the field than anyone before him. His first important scholarly book, *The History of English Dramatic Poetry*, may be said without exaggeration to have created that field as an object of literary study. He was the first to print *in extenso* the basic resources: the Stationers' Register, Henslowe's *Diary* and the Alieyn papers; he discovered and first printed John Manningham's diary account of an early performance of *Twelfth Night* and Simon Forman's descriptions of several Shakespeare performances in his *Bocke of Plaies*; he discovered important documents relating to Elizabethan theater in the Public Record Office, the Bodleian Library, and the Ellesmere and Devonshire manuscript collections; he was a prime mover in the founding and/or

publishing programs of the (first) Shakespeare Society, the Percy and Camden Societies, and the Society of Antiquaries; his edition of Shakespeare (1842-1844) was the first to lay out, however imperfectly, the lines of modern bibliographic method; he edited dozens of other Elizabethan plays, ephemeral pieces, and historical documents as well as the works of Spenser; and on and on, through over seventy years of continuous scholarly productivity.

Yet for over a century Collier's name has been a byword for the worst in crimes against literature—forgery of old documents—despite his lifelong protestations of innocence. “No extenuation can be offered for Collier,” wrote Samuel Schoenbaum in *Shakespeare's Lives*; “He forged in deadly earnest, for glory, and staked his reputation on his ‘discoveries.’” Schoenbaum merely echoed the judgment of generations of scholars who have execrated Collier. At one time or another Collier had in his hands all the major materials relating to Elizabethan dramatic literature. In dozens of them later scholars have discovered his fabrications.

Taking for granted the received opinion, Professor Ganzel set out, he tells us on the jacket, to “understand and explain why a man of Collier's obvious ability and achievements would have committed forgery.” Gradually and unwillingly Ganzel came to the conclusion that Collier was the innocent victim of a “conspiracy” to defame him. In making a case for Collier, Ganzel concentrates on the single book that was the focus of the attack on Collier, the Perkins Folio. This crucial document in the forger's unmasking was Collier's personal copy of the Second Folio (1632) of Shakespeare with extensive marginal emendations—upwards of 25,000 of them—in a seventeenth-century hand. Having bought the folio in about 1847 from a bookseller friend, Collier claimed in a series of publications that the Perkins marginalia preserved unique and valuable corrections to the text of all Shakespeare's plays; he manipulated his find skillfully to enhance the value of his forthcoming edition of the *Works*. Gradually, other scholars began to doubt his story and to accuse Collier of writing the emendations himself. The controversy continued until in 1860 a lawyer and literary dilettante named Clement Mansfield Ingleby published a book that, as Ganzel notes, “was to become the ‘final’ word on the subject”: *A Complete View of the Shakespeare Controversy*. Ingleby not only condemned the Perkins marginalia as Collier's own fabrications but traced other Collier forgeries in the Bridgewater manuscripts, in Inigo Jones's sketchbook, and elsewhere. Other researchers following Ingleby's lead down to the present have found Collier fabrications and forged insertions scattered everywhere in the documents Collier had used. Ganzel, however, argues that Collier couldn't have written the marginalia in the Folio, for there is strong evidence that they were already there when he bought the book. Further, argues Ganzel, Ingleby himself had uncovered this evidence and deliberately concealed it so that he could crush Collier.

Ingleby's case was built up, Ganzel shows, by a cabal of anti-Collierites. The centre of the group, and the unlikely villain of the story, was no less a personage than Sir Frederick Madden, Keeper of Manuscripts at the British Museum. From extensive reading in Madden's own papers and other documents, Ganzel discovered that Madden had a strong motive for attacking Collier: some years previously Collier had been instrumental in revealing that Madden had bought for the Museum over a hundred stolen manuscripts; though the affair was hushed up at

the time, it ruined Madden's career. When his chance came, Madden retaliated viciously, but always keeping his name in the background. Largely through his effort, the Perkins Folio was thoroughly discredited and with it its discoverer, Collier. The clinching argument in Ingleby's case against the Folio was Madden's discovery of pencil notes underlying some of the inked emendations—unmistakable evidence of modern tampering. Ganzel argues, however, that the likeliest culprit to have made these pencillings is not Collier but Madden himself.

Ironically, the Perkins Folio now is the least important of Collier's supposed forgeries; no matter what the origin of the volume's marginalia, they have no authority for Shakespeare's text apart from the intrinsic plausibility some of them may have as clever guesses about Shakespeare's intent. Yet Ganzel was right to concentrate on this one book, for even to the present the universal assumption of Collier's guilt rests on the marks in the Perkins Folio.

Many other presumed Collier forgeries, however, are much more important to modern scholarship. At various times Collier has been accused of fabricating the theatrical entries in the diaries of Manningham and Forman and the entries in the Revels Accounts of play performances at court in 1604-05 and 1611-12; all of these include important Shakespeare information, especially the Revels accounts which list seven Shakespeare plays and credit some of them to the oddly-spelled author "Shaxberd." Yet today all these items are considered genuine; Professor Schoenbaum printed facsimiles of each in his *William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life* (1975). Now Ganzel proposes to add to the list of rehabilitated Collier items not only the Perkins emendations but also, in an Appendix to his biography, two other reputed forgeries: six additions to the unpublished diary of Edward Alleyn, and eighty-three Elizabethan ballads copied into the "Hall Commonplace Book" sometime after 1648 (some seventy of these are not elsewhere preserved). To be sure, other important Collier forgeries remain unchallenged. There are, for instance, the fifteen insertions in Henslowe's *Diary*, most of them trivial but including the only documentary evidence that Marlowe wrote *Tamburlaine*. Other unchallenged forgeries lie among the Ellesmere papers, in the Public Record Office, and elsewhere. But perhaps the tide has begun to turn in Collier's favor.

What Ganzel's book has achieved is to bring the whole inherited tradition about Collier into question. The book may fail to convince many readers of Collier's innocence, even as to the Perkins Folio. The argument is painstaking, even at times to the point of tedium, but in the end it is based on circumstantial evidence (as was the case against Collier) and unverifiable report. No reader can fail to be impressed by the author's thorough research and exhaustive documentation; Ganzel has ploughed through voluminous correspondence, lengthy diaries of Collier and Madden, and other manuscripts in widely-separated libraries, as well as the plethora of books and pamphlets from the original controversy. Yet the matter has not been settled, only reopened. As full as it is, Ganzel's book deals only with a few of the reputed forgeries and does not provide even a complete list of them. In many cases, the author takes for granted Collier's innocent use of suspect materials without any disclaimer; in discussing Collier's transcription of Henslowe's *Diary*, for example, Ganzel comments that some of its entries "would become, as we shall see, notorious" (p. 47), but the promise is not kept, for there is

no later analysis of those entries. Ganzel's handling of the paleographic evidence against Collier sometimes seems hasty, even cavalier; he has not utilized many of the newer methods of document analysis. But the book is already lengthy, and if much remains to be done, still Ganzel deserves full credit for clearing away much misinformation.

What is needed now is a complete reexamination of the whole 'canon' of Collier forgeries. The first desideratum is a full list of suspect documents. Then the major items need to be restudied in a collaborative effort. Modern scientific techniques, including sophisticated dating of ink, can supplement traditional analyses to distinguish modern additions in genuine documents and to identify outright fabrications. There is room, too, for further consideration of Collier's character as it bears on the forgeries. A few months before his death Collier wrote in his journal, "I am ashamed of almost every act of my life"; Ganzel treats this and similar admissions as part of Collier's late-life turn to religion, but perhaps Collier had specific scholarly sins to repent of.

There is something deeply unsettling about the Collier "forgeries" taken in the aggregate. On the one hand, we find a man with vast learning able to concoct insertions so seemingly genuine that he is not readily found out, and who without effort writes a variety of convincing Elizabethan hands. On the other hand, we're asked to believe that such a learned and industrious scholar would stoop to insert inconsequential additions on a few scattered pages of the huge and cluttered diary of Henslowe, or would write almost 25,000 trivial marginalia in the Perkins Folio to lend a specious authority to a few of his own emendations. Or, as Professor Ganzel writes in concluding his book, "like so many of the arguments which have been put forward to convict Collier, [the case against the Hall ballads] works only if one accepts an unlikely inconsistency: a brilliant paleographer of almost superhuman skill and cunning who is a clumsy and stupid crook" (p. 416). In any view of him, Collier is an enigma; we may never be satisfied that we have uncovered the real man, but at least we can verify or refute the principal forgeries charged to him. Professor Ganzel has made that task both possible and essential.

WILLIAM M. BAILLIE, *Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania*

John R. Roberts. *John Donne: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern criticism, 1968-1978*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1982. Pp. 434. \$32.00.

This is a masterful companion-volume to Professor Roberts' earlier bibliography that covered Donnean studies from 1912 through 1967. This review attempts to outline the work, and then to suggest how far one must go (Ultima Thule, some might say) to map the limits of that mastery.

The book consists of a five-page preface on method, with acknowledgements, a four-page table of abbreviations, and 399 pages of annotated entries, each alphabetized by author within its year of publication. Then follow three indexes: authors, editors, and translators; subjects; and "Donne's Works Mentioned in