derstood—but, for the most part, Herendeen offers a sympathetic, well-researched account of this famous, but strangely understudied man. This, flaws and all, is one of the most important books ever written about William Camden. There will be worthwhile debate about how Herendeen positions Camden in the early modern English historiographical landscape and we should all be grateful that he has taken the trouble to reveal Camden the man: a far more interesting figure than most of us (or I, at least) ever imagined.


In his diary entry for 3 May 1664, Increase Mather did not mince words when recording the disconcerting verdict of First Church of Boston against John Cotton, Jr. He straightforwardly recorded that the Church had voted to excommunicate Cotton, Jr., for lascivious behavior involving three women and also for lying about his involvement. Nearly two weeks before this diary entry, Cotton, Jr. had visited Mather’s home to privately discuss his situation. How much Cotton, Jr., admitted to his stepbrother is unknown, but Mather’s agitated reaction to what he was told might be gauged from the illegibleness of his scrawled two-line journal comment concerning that meeting.

Mather was on the spot. During his lifetime, family honor, blood allegiance and lineage politics ran deep. However, when he met with Cotton, Jr., in 1664, Mather was scheduled to be ordained in a matter of weeks. At that point, as throughout his later life, Mather was particularly keen on safeguarding the status of his personal legacy from the first generation of New England divines.

It is not surprising, then, that the twenty-four year old Mather, with ambitions of his own at stake, was thoroughly stymied by young Cotton’s behavior. “Troubled about J. C.,” he confessed in his diary, “being very desirous to testify more fully for him, & yet afraid to doe it, because I could not say (*sana conscientia*) that his carriage & demeanore had bin all along suitable to his condition” (Michael G. Hall, *The Last American Puritan* [1988], 64).
Demeanor unbecoming to a minister was certainly an issue, as editors Sheila McIntyre and Len Travers document in *The Correspondence of John Cotton Junior*. An investigative General Court committee for the Connecticut Colony had concluded as early as 20 March 1662 that the young minister had exhibited a propensity for using “sinfull Rach unpeacabell” language “of a veary high defaming natur” (sic, 44). This General Court finding would not cost Cotton, Jr., the pulpit in Wethersfield, but that outcome was waiting for him just around the next corner.

And so was his excommunication from Boston’s First Church in 1664. Just prior to and after this particular unexpected turn of events, Cotton, Jr., made at least four appeals to John Winthrop, Jr., the governor of the Connecticut plantations. Cotton, Jr., was looking for solidarity based on *noblesse oblige*, but Winthrop, Jr., was no fool.

Improper comportment was the least of young Cotton’s problems. Far more egregious—though his male peers were slow to admit it—was the young minister’s inability to control his sexual urges. Even as late as 1697, when Cotton, Jr., was 57, the brethren of the Plymouth church met to consider “scandalous reports” of “some miscarriages in the Pastor towards Rebekah Morton” (541). Eventually, Cotton, Jr., would lose his long-held pulpit there. And soon, too, there were more unpleasant rumors, stirred by the fact that his wife now lived apart from him.

All of this was just too much for Increase Mather, who had heard these rumors and likely many others over the years. Doubtless he also recalled how 33 years ago his stepbrother had put him on the spot when Mather’s own incipient career was especially vulnerable to a setback. In 1697, according to Samuel Sewall’s journal, Mather admitted that he and other ministers had been too lax for too long in responding to Cotton’s bad character and subsequent misadventures.

Late in 1698, Cotton decided to move to recently founded Charles-town, South Carolina. He would arrive there alone, and in less than a year he would die from yellow fever.

Cotton’s correspondence was extensive, and Sheila McIntyre and Len Travers have worked wonders with these letters. Never mind that some of the quotations in their “Introduction” are not faithful to the texts that follow it. That is a small defect compared to each
meticulously introduced, edited and footnoted letter. This book does more than merely illuminate a previously obscure life; this work also provides an useful primary resource for early American studies. The uncommonly lavish layout of this handsome volume aptly suits the editors’ exemplary dedication to and execution of their editorial undertaking—a model of its kind.


Michael Armstrong-Roche quite correctly points out that most critics view *The Labors of Persiles and Sigismunda* as a “turning away from modernity” (3), an example of Cervantes’ late-life embrace of the Counter-Reformation. Some even consider the byzantine novel a misstep by the author of *Don Quixote* while, ironically, Cervantes himself saw his last book as his crowning achievement. In this perceptive monograph, Armstrong-Roche makes the case that *Persiles* can best be appreciated if, instead of looking forward toward the novel, we look back to the epic. Seen from this viewpoint, Cervantes’ last work summarizes and reinvigorates the epic trajectory by inverting its premise. The author argues that the strong focus on love in Cervantes’ last work does not distract from the protagonists’ epic duty, but rather constitutes the main plot of the heroic adventure of *Persiles and Sigismunda*.

The carefully crafted monograph centers on four themes—empire, religion, love and politics—each of which is studied in its own chapter following a structure that is clearly laid out in the book’s introduction. First we are presented with a characterization of verse and/or prose epic handling one of the four themes; then the author engages *Persiles* in the discussion. The argument, therefore, takes the epic frame as a point of departure to study each particular theme, but does not limit its claims to the genre. Each chapter also explores analytical paradigms that have emerged from a perception of historically significant and recurring features of Cervantes’ text around keywords