James Anthony Froude, except those who have recently begun to study "the social foundations of the Reformation." There are two peculiarities here. First, the close O'Day comes to the present, the less she concerns herself with historians' contexts and their politics, and two, political history fades from view.

Once O'Day's preconceptions have been dragged into the open, it is easier to praise her contributions to the social history of the Reformation. She stresses the variety of responses to evangelization, and suggests that any complete picture can only come from detailed local studies. She singles out the role of "cadres," particularly of the clergy. Indeed, her final chapter largely argues a new interpretation of how the clergy became professionalized in the course of Elizabeth's reign. She offers a carefully argued discussion of wills as historical evidence for religious belief. She emphasizes the mechanics of the Reformation's spread, especially patronage and education. Ultimately, O'Day argues that historians have only cleared the ground for "the most important issue of all." "How are we to measure the process" of Reformation?

This last statement will rock many historians back on their heels, as may O'Day's larger conclusion that the Reformation was a matter of institutions and the people who staffed them. If this excludes the vital dimension of doctrine and belief, O'Day's aggressive brief for social history together with her call for much greater awareness of and sophistication about methodological issues may yet provoke a more comprehensive and subtle approach to a hitherto almost intractable phenomenon.

THOMAS F. MAYER, *Augustana College*

Paul R. Sellin. *So Doth, So is Religion. John Donne and Diplomatic contexts in the Reformed Netherlands, 1619–1620*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988. Pp. xi, 295.

Rehistorizing Renaissance English texts has recently become fashionable, although, as Paul Sellin suggests, the insular emphasis on domestic politics and patronage has often given a distorted view of matters of foreign policy and relations with the world at large. This book attempts to right this imbalance by focusing on the social and political circumstances surrounding Donne's participation in the Doncaster embassy to the Netherlands in 1619 and 1620 at a crucial turning point in England's relations with the Continent.

There is much to like about Sellin's approach. He brings a wealth of Dutch sources, many of them previously unknown to Donne scholars, to bear on this important period of Donne's life. In doing so, he sets the situation in England more fully into the context of Continental religious and political controversies. This detailed account of the activities of Doncaster's embassy in the United Provinces,

and its reception by James I in 1620 provides insight into the complex politics of James's foreign policy on the eve of the Thirty Years War.

For Donne specialists, Sellin's book throws important light on Donne's Puritan and Calvinist connections, continuing the work on Donne's theological politics begun in an earlier work: *John Donne and "Calvinists" Views of Grace* (1983). His challenge to the perceived view of Donne's *via media*, High-Church Anglicanism is persuasively argued from the sermons preached in Heidelberg and The Hague. The distinction between infra- and supralapsarian Calvinist positions (which distinguished orthodox Contra-Remonstrants as much from the double predestination of the Gomarists as from the Arminians) is particularly germane to Sellin's assessment of Donne's theology and politics, and although he does not go on to develop his comments with reference to Donne's later sermons, I believe the case for Donne's infralapsarian Calvinist orthodoxy is at least as plausible as counterclaims for Donne's Arminianism assumed, but not proven, by historian such as Nicholas Tyacke in *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590–1640*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, 182, 261).

Less convincing, because inadequately substantiated, is Sellin's argument (advanced as early as 1980) that Donne's disillusionment with James's "stubborn indecision" regarding English involvement in the Palatine culminated in the writing of Satyre III and may even have been the cause of James's unspecified displeasure with Donne noted in Walton's *Life*. Sellin bases his argument for the 1620 date of Satyre III on the similarity between the emblem on the medal commemorating the Synod of Dort (which Donne received from the States General in 1620 for his part in the embassy) and the Hill of Truth image in Satyre III.

Sellin is right to challenge earlier datings, many of them based only on critics' unproven assumptions about Donne's religious state at any point in his career. My disagreement with Sellin as to the dating of Satyre III centres on our different interpretations of the place of satire in Donne's career and the nature of Donne's "nonconformity" during this period. Sellin believes that Donne's Reformed orthodoxy was combined with a willingness to conform in outward things, such as episcopalian church government. This, Sellin argues, made him an ideal spokesman for Britain on the embassy. Sellin also argues that his Reformed sympathies and support of the Bohemian cause forced Donne underground in his criticism of James. Satyre III expresses the outrage which he could not openly avow in his sermons.

The question of Donne's outward conformity, however, is more complex than Sellin allows here. To assume, for example, that Donne's sermon in 1622 defending James's *Instructions to Preachers* was a show of mere "obeisance" (170) weakens Sellin's argument about the nature of Donne's "nonconformity" and does not take fully into account how Donne combined criticism with obedience in his sermons. Donne's own insistence on his vocation as a preacher, not as a satirical prophet, and his specific recognition in the sermons of the ineffectiveness of satire in promoting moral change also suggests that Donne would not have meddled in the calling of

the satirist at the expense of his authorized calling as preacher. Sellin in fact draws attention to the key passage in Donne's sermon preached at The Hague in which Donne criticizes the "intrusion into other mens callings" as an "unjust usurpation" (124). If Donne is a nonconformist, as Sellin suggests from Donne's network of Calvinist connections, he is not quite the nonconformist that Sellin images here.

Sellin has not yet succeeded in toppling the collective view that all the satires were written before 1599 and transmitted in manuscript as a collection. I am not persuaded by his conclusions, but the challenge is appropriate and the refusal to assume anything without hard historical evidence admirable.

Despite this disagreement, I find that Sellin is generally persuasive in the conclusions he draws from his information. Some critics, however, may take exception to the quantity of hypothetical and conjectural material amassed by Sellin to present a detailed picture of what really happened on the embassy. Where particular record of the time are not informative about the actual reception of Doncaster's embassy on the continent, Sellin infers a great deal about what probably happened. Much of the content describing Doncaster's reception in various Dutch cities is of this nature.

More difficult to deal with is the argument, attractive to Donne scholars but difficult to prove conclusively, that Donne played an important diplomatic role on the embassy, second only to Doncaster and his secretary, Sir Francis Nethersole. Sellin's arguments for Donne's importance rely on several subordinate arguments: Donne's Reformed orthodoxy, his skill with modern languages and possibly Dutch, his reputation as a wit and satirist on the continent, and his proven verbal and diplomatic skills. Sellin marshals the evidence persuasively, and is probably correct about Donne's status, but it is still at least possible that much of the information in the book is not as relevant to Donne and his activities as Sellin indicates.

Nonetheless, the arguments advanced in Sellin's book are provocative and many of them are convincing. If readers cannot agree with all of Sellin's conclusions, they will have to interpret for themselves the new information he has offered here. *So Doth, So is Religion* challenges all readers to continue the rehistoricizing process that Sellin has begun for this period of Donne's career.

JEANNE SHAMI, *University of Regina*