Stoicism and Epicureanism were obvious candidates, but they had to be modified to make them acceptable to Christian writers of the day. Two Continental philosophers, Justus Lipsius in Flanders (1547-1606) and Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655) in France, undertook this task. An international community of scholars was concerned with these issues, a fact which the book's narrow focus on England ignores. There is nothing wrong with a book's dealing with the English treatment of these issues, but the broader context of the English discussions should be acknowledged.

The book is practically devoid of discussions of natural philosophy, despite the fact that consideration of these philosophies often took place within the context of the search for a new philosophy of nature. Lack of context, more generally, is a problem with the book. Barbour is so immersed in the material that he sees no need to explain it to a wider audience. The book is chock-full of literary references but does not sufficiently contextualize either the writers or the individual works.

The reception and influence of Epicureanism and Stoicism are important themes in early modern intellectual history. This reader did not find Barbour's account of them very satisfying.

MARGARET J. OSLER, *University of Calgary*

Jeffrey Johnson, *The Theology of John Donne*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1999. Pp. xiii, 162.

Johnson's book has timely goals: to "describe the distinguishing features of Donne's theology, as revealed in . . . the *Sermons*, and to read the historical/political circumstances in which he preached in relation to these theological foundations." In his view, the *Sermons* provide no "systematic theology, yet they do present a clear theological vision" (p. x). Accordingly, he examines a range of the sermons, referring also to the *Devotions* and some *Divine Poems*. Some sermons are treated in detail, with suitable attention to the historical setting.

Johnson identifies the Trinity for Donne as the "fundamental . . . belief for regulating Christian faith and practice," and then argues that its "divine community . . . serves for Donne as a model for individuals to conform themselves to the triune God specifically through a liturgical participation in the Church" (p. x). Reminding us that Donne often inveighs against "singularity" (p. 32), Johnson highlights passages referring to the liturgy and to the communal element in the church, and gives special attention to sermons on baptism and on the churching of women.

Aware of recent writings linking Donne with Calvinism, Johnson does two good things: (1) he shows significant differences between Calvin and Donne (such as Donne's threefold division of the soul, including memory, following Augustine, and his strenuous denial of supralapsarianism); and (2) throughout his book he cites very many parallels and similarities. In fact, at a number of points Jeffrey helpfully compares Donne's ideas with those of Calvin and Hooker, showing how

much all three have in common. An excellent feature of this book is that, like Terry Sherwood but unlike many other writers on Donne, Johnson has read Calvin and profited by it.

The book's five chapters include ones on prayer, grace, and repentance — all appropriate topics, but the title and subject of the last-mentioned, "The Voice of the Turtle," is explained only at the very end. The third chapter, on pictures and iconoclasm, puzzles because Johnson implies that unspecified people in the English church opposed the use of imagery in sermons (pp. 65-66), while the Bible is full of it. What *was* controversial was the use of *potentially idolatrous* pictures in church. (Calvin like Donne used the theatre image, and title pages of some Calvin works featured nude figures.) Of course, like any imaginative writer, Donne frequently appeals to the sense of sight.

Johnson correctly identifies Donne as a moderate, who wishes to avoid "sectarian allegiance," concentrating instead on agreed-upon essentials (p. 13). Strangely, though, he barely mentions the 39 Articles, which Donne considers the essentials of his church (*Sermons* 10: 109), and which are now often recognized as Calvinistic. Although knowledgeable about some aspects of church history, Johnson seems unaware that moderate Calvinists, including many bishops, were the leading group in the Jacobean church, hardly a sect. But Johnson recognizes that Calvinism, not primarily predestinarian, included moderates, and that Donne "clearly supported a moderate Calvinism" at the time of Dort (p. 22n).

Johnson writes about *adiaphora* without sufficiently stressing (e.g., p. 88) that for Donne and his church, teachings or practices were considered "indifferent" because not explicitly scriptural (*Sermons* 2: 204; cf. Article 6). In fact, his book, though unavoidably employing biblical citations, slights the importance of the Scriptures themselves in Donne's theology. His index lists the "Book of Common Prayer" and "sacraments," but not the "Bible" or "Scripture." Any look at Donne's sermons shows that while there are few overt references to the Book of Common Prayer, Scripture is not only constantly used, but often discussed and praised. Donne's theology is manifestly biblical.

Johnson rightly urges (agreeing with Jeanne Shami [p. 75]) the need to read and quote Donne in context, but while he often does this well, there are glaring exceptions, such as the quotation from *Sermons* supposedly showing support for "auricular confession" (p. 94). Nothing in the context bears this out. Other serious misreadings involve taking Donne's comments on the Trinity (3: 357) or the church as a place for common prayer (4: 374) out of their syntactical context (6: 38). Part of Johnson's problem may be that he himself has trouble with syntax and exact diction. When he says that Donne "commissions" God (p. 58) or "alters the Great Commandment" (p. 111) — Donne would strongly object! — it may just be unfortunate wording. Unintentionally (I assume), sentences imply that Donne more clearly sides with St. Jerome than with Christ (p. 65), or that Donne regards strict Calvinism as semi-Pelagian (p. 127).

Someone writing on theology should know Calvin is no antinomian (p. 127); one need only read his substantial section (*Institutes* 2.8) on the Ten Commandments, a table of which also adorned the walls of many English churches. Salvation “by faith alone” is qualified in both Calvin (*Institutes* 3.17.11) and Donne (7: 227–29) with the realization that genuine faith will and must *result* in good works. Calvin, following Paul, wants to make sure that all credit goes to God, but Donne is somewhat more willing to give some credit to people. Both keenly accept the challenge of resolving the tension between Paul and the epistle of James.

While rightly reminding readers that Donne as a faithful churchman adheres to the prayer book and observes the Sacraments, Johnson does not adequately discern the emphasis in the *Sermons* on Scripture, preaching, and a personal relationship with God (“how it stands between God and our soul” [*Sermons* 5: 297]). It is true that the first two of these get mentioned (pp. 143–44). Johnson seems not to notice that the prayers in two Donne citations (pp. 46, 61) are private, not in church. He even makes what might be called a Laudian slip by attributing to Lincoln’s Inn *chapel* what Donne clearly seeks in *God*: a treasure and a kingdom (p. 37). He recognizes Donne’s “religious impudency” as a biblical pattern, but regards it as idiosyncratic (p. 50), rather than something shared by other [Calvinist] writers like Herbert.

According to Johnson, Donne’s distinctive theology “develops from an idiosyncratic blend of ideas and authors that attests to his own desire to locate and nurture what unifies the Church” (p. 146). *The Theology of John Donne* commendably presents Donne as a moderate, a pastor with a sense of community stemming from his view of the Trinity, seeking to conform his people to Christ by bringing them to repentance. Usefully, Johnson compares and contrasts Donne with Calvin and Hooker. But as a scholarly study this book suffers seriously because of contextual misreadings, inaccurate terminology, and gaps in the author’s knowledge of church history. It therefore cannot be recommended as a reliable guide, but should be read carefully, checking the contexts of its Donne quotations.

DANIEL W. DOERKSEN, *University of New Brunswick*