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

Annotations"—twenty-four pages in all. Annotation runs from less than half a line, when "Not available," to a page or so for most single-author books on Donne. Collections of essays by various hands—several appeared, especially around the four-hundredth anniversary of Donne's birth—usually receive more space than other volumes, because the essays are separately annotated, like articles in journals.

Roberts aims to give evenhanded, non-judgmental accounts, which I take to be as reasonable, as difficult, and perhaps more serviceable than a frankly evaluative account from a perfectly confessed point of view. One can tell—notably from the table of contents for his *Essential Articles for the Study of John Donne's Poetry* (Item #786) that Roberts' critical taste is eclectic and his spirit generous. For me, though, the effect of the non-evaluative strategy is a little like a psychology laboratory experiment in sensory deprivation. We know how subjects of those start to fantasize; and I shortly start to wonder if recurring Roberts verbs like *points out*, *discusses*, *argues*, *maintains*, *claims* are consistently part of an evaluative series that might go step-wise to *alleges*, *pretends*, *babbles*, *raves*. Slight and gratifying relaxations of neutrality appear in such wording as "interesting gloss" (#30), "minor...errors" (#353), "minor corrections" (#510), and "(Does not comment on 'Goodfriday . . .') in item #366. Surely I hear a note of Roberts wry in "highly selected bibliography" (#722,723).

Few users of this powerful bibliographical aid to scholarship will quarrel with Roberts' strategy of being "essentially descriptive, not evaluative" within each account, as suggested above. Nor should we demur at his exclusion from his listing of unpublished dissertations, book reviews, ephemeral editions or anthology-inclusions that lack critical annotation, or even works that make references to Donne judgable as nugatory, while focussing on other writers. But the problem of judgments and boundaries does arise with adjunctive and ancillary studies. Two faces of the problem are what to include, and how to index it.

Anyone reading straight through even a year or two's entries will likely be struck by the wide cast of Roberts' net. I mean not the spatial sense—although there are remarkably numerous items from Japan, and not a few from the Balkans—but in the sense of intellectual out-reach. There are historical and intellectual and literary and generic studies that focus on Donne in as little as a chapter or a couple of sub-sections. This feature makes the volume of great potential value to scholars working on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literary and cultural matters even if they are—to put the case starkly—interested in Donne only incidentally. Still, one can read from Item #1 to #1044 without getting a very rich sense of the wonderful rambunctiousness of the critical enterprise in recent years. I mean not arguments about "Extasie," which are always with us, but paradigm-challenging arguments about interpretation and presence and analysis and language, trope, and textuality. Roberts must exclude works that do not talk about Donne (must he absolutely?), and in any case he cannot annotate what has not been written. Some scholars, such as Michael McCandles in an article in *Diacritics*, have complained since 1978 of questions neglected in Renaissance and seventeenth-century studies. But include Ong's *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology* (1971)!

But—to come to my only substantial objection—a more extensive subject index could make the breadth of material that *is* here both more readily and more

suggestively present to the user of this volume. Banish the hundreds of proper names to the index of proper names, and distinguish subject names there by italics. Expand subject terms in the directions of particularity and generality both. We are presently given fifty-one items indexed under Prosody (Metrics), but no entry for *couplet* (see, inter alia, #138, 228, 515). We are given entries for Meditation, Mannerism and Baroque, but not for *mimesis/mimetic* nor *metaphysical*. We are given Hermogenes (#248), and Prose, General (in the Index of Donnean works), but not *rhetoric*. We are given Satire and Allegory, and *Elegies* (with Donnean works), but not *sonnet* (e.g. #668, 794), *stanza* (1000), or *lyric* (e.g. #927, 1042) or *genre* (e.g. #205, 343, 683). We are given Derrida (#293) but not *deconstruction* (which might venture to include #338, 422). The term *structuralism* occurs a time or two in the text, but not in the index, *phenomenology* somewhat oftener, but never in the index. There is no index entry for *linguistic analysis* (e.g. #270, 274, 280, 466, 977, 1011), no entry for *play* (e.g. #640, 1007, 1019), no entry for *psychological criticism* (e.g. #227, 282, 475, 784, 833). There is an entry for Reformation, but not a general *history* entry where valuable and various works such as Mulder (#127), Joseph (#326), Cragg (#736), and Davies (#738) would be listed together. There is no index entry for *time*, *space*, or *imagery*.

There are remarkably few misprints, but most of those I note might give students some trouble. By Item number: 41, for "imminent," read "immanent"; 276, for "ingenius" read "ingenious"; 396/631/Index, for "Northrup Frye" read "Northrop Frye"; 396/711/779, for "elegaic" read "elegiac"; 450, for "resurrection," read "resurrection"; 476, for "essay," read "elegy" (?); 538, for "thusly" read "thus"; 552, for "expansiveness" read "expensiveness"; 567, for "doddles" read "doodles"; 732/Index, for "probablirist" read "probabiliorist"; bottom of p. 307, desperate syntax; 805, for "1637" read "1687"; 819/Index, for "Guilo" read "Giulio"; 936, for "andiplosis" read "anadiplosis"; 968, for "money scrivener" read ??; Index, for "Latitudianism" read "Latitudinarianism."

This scrupulous volume will immediately prove so useful that a second edition may be hoped for—with a more elaborate index. And what Renaissance scholar will not hope for a counterpart third volume in another decade?

GALE H. CARRITHERS, JR., *Louisiana State University*

Ronald F.E. Weissman. *Ritual Brotherhood in Renaissance Florence*. New York: Academic Press, 1982. Pp. xiv, 254. \$27.50.

Ronald Weissman sets the lay confraternities of Florence in the context of a society dominated on all levels by conflict, tension, suspicion, and betrayal. He describes Florentines as participants in dense networks of relations, in which friends, neighbors, and kinsmen were bound together by multiple ties: social, economic, familial, personal. These relationships all imposed competing claims, and no one could satisfy all of these claims. Even the home was no refuge from the tension of agonistic social relations, for family members also competed with one