than “English Poets,” since the list includes William Dunbar and other Scots. Those quibbles aside—and they are quibbles, considering the difficult compromises that editors and publishers are forced to make—the print edition of the *Elizabethan Poetry Index* is a monumental work that deserves its place in the reference sections of university libraries, where it will provide the cornerstone of future investigations.

The next clear step for these volumes is to combine all three indexes and make them available in electronic form, which will dramatically increase their availability. In electronic form, it will also be possible to constantly update the database as new information is received, ensuring that the resource maintains the primacy and usefulness so evident in the current release.

BARBARA BOND, *University of Victoria*

Richard Johnson. *The Seven Champions of Christendom (1596/7)*. Ed. Jennifer Fellows. Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2003. Pp. xxxi, 317.

Anthony Munday, tr. *Amadis de Gaule*. Ed. Helen Moore. Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2004. Pp. xxviii, 1033.

Helen Cooper. *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Pp. ix, 542.

Critical and editorial work on romances has had a significant impact on early modern scholarship, especially work on gender, sexuality, early modern women, and print culture. One should hope that as more new scholarly editions of romances become available, the limits of early modern criticism will be stretched further. The three books under review here represent the best example of how this might be achieved.

Jennifer Flowers’ edition of *The Seven Champions of Christendome*, a two-part romance by Richard Johnson, is the first modern critical edition we have of this popular early modern text. The introduction offers some new information about Johnson, locating him in the coterie of London writers trying to break into the burgeoning market for cheap print. It links Johnson’s romance closely to Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*, though one wonders whether locating this romance in the context of other prose romances, especially those that focus on chivalry and are set in the eastern Mediterranean, would have provided a better generic and intertextual point of reference. Flowers identifies the influence of Middle English romances, especially *Sir Bevis of Hampton*, as pervasive in Part I, but as Helen Cooper’s book, reviewed below, shows, such influences can be found at deeper thematic and discursive levels in most early modern romances. More interesting are the influences of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and Virgil’s *Aeneid*. It is a pity, though, that Flowers does not delve deeper into the assessment of the scope of these two classical influences on Johnson. Much could be said, for example, about the construction of heroic masculinity, and

about the ironic undercutting of it in some episodes in Johnson, by approaching the masculinity of Johnson's champions through the study of their links with the mythical heroic men in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The relationship between Ovid and early modern prose (and verse) romances continues to be an uncharted yet promising area of criticism. Introductions to critical editions are meant to offer an overview of some of the basic facts and to introduce prevailing themes, but ambitious scholarly projects such as Ashgate's "Non-Canonical Early Modern Popular Texts" should aim for a more extensive critical apparatus to new editions.

One major quibble with Flowers' textual procedures is that since her critical edition is based on four different early editions (published between 1596 and 1616), a more detailed argument about the governing principle in making choices about what to select from each would help the reader determine the status of the copy texts. It is not clear, for example, on what basis, and which, "[v]ariants from later [after 1608] editions have been included only where they elucidate corrupt or obscure readings in the copy texts" (xxx). Nevertheless, Flowers' edition is very well prepared and amply glossed. Reading the explanatory glosses, one sees ample opportunities for critical work on some of the topics borne out by this text: the relationship with the Ottoman Empire, naval projects and explorations in the eastern Mediterranean, mercantile activities between the Christian West and non-Christian East, construction of heroic masculinity, imperialism, relationships with Shakespeare and Marlowe, inter-textual crossovers with Ariosto, women and empire.

If Johnson's *Seven Champions* represents an important addition to the canon of romance literature now available to modern readers, Helen Moore's edition of Anthony Munday's translation of the French versions of *Amadis de Gaule* (the romance originated in Spain) is the book that scholars working on early modern romances have been waiting for. Moore's edition originates in her Oxford D.Phil. thesis. The result is a meticulous edition, excellently introduced and helpfully glossed. The introduction easily moves between larger topics, such as Munday's career as a writer in London, and the minutiae of his translation strategies. Moore offers a very detailed account of the textual procedures she employed in producing the edition based on one of two Bodleian copies of the 1618–19 text. Particularly interesting is her account of the French versions of *Amadis* that Munday may have used in producing his English translation.

The accessible introduction also provides a brief survey of English versions of *Amadis*, reminding us that it played a formative role for English romances. *Amadis de Gaule* is an engaging read, and Moore's textual annotations provide a very helpful guide through this long text. We could expect that this edition will stimulate work not just on romances but on other literature produced in London in the 1590s. One might speculate whether the adventurous and titillating spirit of *Amadis* was particularly suited to the spirit of London, an emerging mercantile metropolis in flux, and its turn-of-the-century literary experiments with forms and liberating passions.

Flowers' Ashgate edition is in modernized spelling, but Helen Moore's edition of *Amadis de Gaule* is in old-spelling. One wonders whether the press has a consist-

ent policy on spelling? There is no doubt that critical editions in this series, available only in hardback, are directed to libraries. Yet the publisher could make an even bigger impact on scholarship, the scholarly book market, and academic curricula if it brought out paperback editions which individual students of literature could afford.

That *Amadis* played an important role in the development of the early English romances will be clear to any reader of Helen Cooper's masterful and much needed overview of the evolution of romance in England, from medieval times (precisely, from 1138) to late Shakespeare. Cooper shows that references to *Amadis*, as a source or an intertextual resource, abound in romances of the early modern period. Cooper uses a term somewhat new to literary history. Her book is, in her words, "a study of the memes of romance" (4). She defines meme as "an idea that behaves like a gene in its ability to replicate faithfully and abundantly, but also on occasion to adapt, mutate, and therefore survive in different forms and cultures" (3). Borrowing the term from cognitive linguistics and applying it to romance, a genre notorious for its hybridity and recycling of existent stories and motifs, makes sense. It helps us trace the development of the genre as a structure that follows the path of repetition and familiarity of motifs. Memes make the reading of romance both easy and enjoyable, for they allow at once for predictability and variation.

Cooper's book is brimming with information about various motifs, clichés, themes, and sources that recur in romances. Some of the memes that Cooper explores are quest and pilgrimage, lost heirs, the woman wrongly accused, travels and tempests, rudderless boats and shipwrecks, beasts and dragons, giants and magical weapons, the return of the exile, repentance and forgiveness, and the push towards Christian lands of the eastern Mediterranean. The breadth of topics that Cooper's book deals with is impressive, and includes desire, myth, magic, penitence, Ovid and masculinity, family, marriage, adultery, women and faith, death, nationalism, royalty, and chastity. What she identifies as some of the most frequent memes of romance are germane to what early modern culture dwelt on in general.

Moore's arguments about the memes in prose romances are systematically checked against their equivalents in Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, reminding us that both prose and verse romance stem from the same generic source. Cooper also frequently invokes Shakespeare in making comparisons between the memes in prose romances and in drama. The book starts with several reflections on the bear in *The Winter's Tale* and ends with references to unhappy endings—romance reversal endings—in *Othello*, *All's Well That Ends Well*, and *As You Like It*, with cursory mentions of *Cymbeline* and *Pericles*. Although Cooper makes some very fresh observations about Shakespeare's romances—in Shakespeare we witness a shift from family romance to family tragedy—her references to Shakespeare provide signposts to much new work that can still be done with his romances.

A separate and very useful scholarly tool is the appendix which lists all medieval romances in English after 1500. This index, which is alphabetically organized by title, contains authors' names, dates, STC numbers, editions, some sources, and occasional references to romances in contemporary texts.

Throughout her book, Cooper implies that romance has always been a genre to pick up the changes and resonances of the moment that produced it. The changes, Cooper shows, were reflected both in printed and manuscript romances. (One of the many values of this book is that it takes into account, albeit selectively, manuscript romance, which few critics have examined thus far.) Yet culture and history are only discreetly invoked. Cooper's book is a sound analysis of the literariness of romance, of the ways romance signifies, means, and works as a literary structure, not a mirror of, or an agent solely within, material cultural production. Her encyclopedic approach to the history of the genre and the catalogue-like exhaustiveness of the memes that constitute romance represent a good example of British empirical scholarship in literary studies and also make this book an important resource for anyone wishing to grasp what the early modern romance was about and how it was structured.

Fellows' and Moore's editions expand the canon of Renaissance literature and Cooper's book will change what we know about romances and how we read them. All three books will be of use to scholars working on romances, to students encountering them for the first time, as well as to critics of the early modern period looking for new topics to quibble with.

GORAN V. STANIVUKOVIC, *University of Sheffield*

Katharine Gillespie. *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women's Writing and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. xii, 272.

In this welcome addition to recent scholarship on women's participation in the English civil war, Katharine Gillespie attempts to establish an alternate tradition of liberal political thought—one that does not reduce to the antifeminist premises of Locke and Hobbes, but rather establishes women's claims as originators of genuinely transformative and emancipatory political discourse. In doing so, Gillespie clearly hopes to save revolutionary women pamphlet-writers, preachers, petitioners, and prophets from the feminist rejection of liberal rights and contract theory and to encourage a revaluation of their political innovations. She takes on the sacred cows of liberalism one by one in chapters on the separation of church and state, contract theory, possessive individualism, and the free market, demonstrating that women's appropriations and creative transformations of these ideals do not merely repeat or derive from the "masculinist tradition" strenuously condemned by critics like Carol Pateman, Catherine MacKinnon, and Seyla Benhabib. By extension, then, Gillespie also implicitly defends liberal rights theory, both against its attackers, and against its lukewarm defenders: as she puts it, "it is my hope that this book will lead to the conclusion that something called 'feminism' should neither reject something called 'liberalism' out of hand as an inherently sexist tradition, nor should it settle for seeking out the ways in which that male-authored body of thought may or may not have 'trickled down' to