"led by their anxiety to identify predestined salvation" (74). Partly as a result of interest in natural magic and in election, there emerged a "revised Aristotelianism," the product of an urge to "reform . . . the system" rather than to replace it (81). Cook's presentation clarifies both the resemblance and the differences; concerning but one point he urges, "Zabarella uses deduction, and Harvey anatomical demonstration" (87) to arrive at much the same result. In general, the aim was to unify; "both sense and reason, employed separately, had their limitations, and to overcome them a rational scheme was required to determine the significance and use of particular observations" (90). In other words, Harvey and the scholastic writers found ways to integrate physical observation with the results of scholastic analysis.

In sum, Cook's short and snappy thesis appears to be that "conforming Calvinists" adopted Jesuit manuals, a thesis which Cook would probably complicate; but most of the presentation appears to derive from Zabarella, who does not appear in this argument as a member of the Jesuits. Still, Prof. Cook has raised a number of issues concerning the history of science, of what he terms "scholastic writers," as well as adding to the History of the University of Cambridge and Elizabethan education. Boydell Press is to be commended for undertaking the substantial work of publishing this volume.

Chris R. Kyle. *Theater of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012. X + 276 pp. $60.00. Review by MARC SCHWARZ, UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

For most Stuart historians parliament is an institution where laws are passed and where debates of great importance take place. These attributes are of tremendous importance, but Chris Kyle illuminates for us a much broader portrait of parliament, especially by bringing to life the character of the sessions and the nature of the environment in which the houses met. In fact, the author views parliament as a kind of political theatre, inhabited by actors, and viewed by the public much like a show on a stage.

The parliament that Professor Kyle describes for us is one teeming with hundreds of members and so noisy that MPs could often not

hear what is said. It is an unruly body, often greeting speeches with silence, shouting, stamping of feet and putting those it dismisses to shame. (The author sees a possible connection between the debates and behavior of MPs with their grammar school educations.) Moreover, the house is open to the outside, hears the goings on from various courts and is filled with clerks and other officials. This, as Kyle significantly demonstrates for us, is what parliament was really like.

Amongst those present were also scriveners, writers of newsletters and members acting as diarists, all trying under trying conditions to provide a glimpse of what was being said. There was reluctance to divulge parliamentary proceedings, but there was a thirst from the country for such information, so newsletter writers and others provided it to patrons of various sorts, while members took down proceedings for their own benefit. As Kyle notes the desire for news of parliament increased steadily in the early seventeenth century as issues before the county became more pressing. This is a key factor in indicating that the houses had become the center of interest and venue of importance for dealing with the public's business.

Kyle presents more evidence for parliament's centrality by citing the lobbying efforts of many guilds, localities, and individuals to try and influence parliament through petitions and lobbyists to favor legislation they supported. The author might have mentioned that this process had a precedent in the lobbying efforts of those returning Marian exiles who gathered at the opening of Elizabeth's first parliament to persuade the members to adopt a settlement in keeping with their reformist outlook. The techniques of the Puritan opposition under Elizabeth I offer a valuable backdrop to the efforts of interest groups in the early seventeenth century.

Lastly, Professor Kyle turns to the other side of the coin by discussing how parliament and particular members essayed to influence the world outside of Westminster. He considers such developments as the printing of individual speeches, proclamations and committee activity as evidence of this desire. Moreover, the fact that copies of the Protestation of 1621, for example, though torn out of the commons journal by the king himself, still circulated is another reminder of parliament's impact. As he puts it, parliament had entered the public sphere.

In these discussions the author is lucid and informative. Yet there are times when the reader receives more information than he needs. For instance, in dealing with news writers, correspondents and diarists, the number of examples he provides is unnecessarily long as if he is determined to give each one its due. Likewise the number of interest groups, such as merchant companies, that he describes seems to be too many and too repetitive. In addition, during the larger part of his monograph he is dealing with an "institutional" study of parliament so that the chronological context of the developments he describes are sometimes confusing and unclear. For Kyle the 1620s are the critical period, but it is not until the end of the book that he sets his studies clearly within this time frame.

The conclusion to *Theatre of State* begins rather abruptly by detailing the career of Sir John Eliot, thus singling out a particular MP which he has not done before. The meaning of this is unclear until we learn that Eliot is chosen as an exemplar of the kind of MP who can be identified with and utilized the procedural changes to advance his cause. Such activities as his made the 1620s with its eight parliaments and contentious issues a forerunner of the 1640s. Thus many of the of the themes of the l620s saw their fruition in the Long Parliament.

However, in dealing with parliament Professor Kyle has said too little about the house of lords which itself was transformed just as the commons in the 1620s. He does take note of the significant revival of the use of impeachment, starting with that of Bacon in 1621. This was an important development, but it was the political activities of the lords that especially showed its transformation. There was, for example, the creation of an opposition party led by Lord Saye and others which challenged the crown and helped pass the petition of right without modification. Moreover the upper house had significant influence and patronage in relation to the commons. Thus the lords took center stage at times as well.

This being said, Professor Sykes has provided scholars with an important study of the workings of parliament, its impact on the political nation culture, and the nation on it. The book is well written and is copiously researched. At times in its proliferation of evidence it loses its way, but it is a very valuable addition to early Stuart parliamentary studies.