and secondary sources; the index consists of little over five pages and could be more elaborate..

Despite the extensive use of late Aristotelian philosophy in this book, it must be emphasized that Edwards did so because these texts served to set a firm stage on which he could develop his arguments and views, and these arguments and assumptions eventually served to locate the intricate connections to and implications in the thinking of Descartes and Hobbes about how the human subject orients him- or herself in time.

Indeed, time is a problematical concept. The author has made a strong and persuasive effort in unearthing heretofore neglected elements pertaining to time in the writings of René Descartes and Thomas Hobbes. Various elements in the commentaries on late Aristotelian natural philosophy were teased out—complex connections, though not always necessarily so—and their influence exposed in the texts of the influential thinkers we revere so much today. Edwards book offers the reader the opportunity to see Descartes and Hobbes, prominent thinkers of the seventeenth century, in a fruitful and regenerated way. And the reading audience of the book ought not to be limited to scholars who only devote themselves to seventeenth-century thought. The study of time is relevant to many fields of study. For philosophers the book has broad potential: it’s useful for those who work in philosophy of mind, metaphysics, political philosophy, ethics, and philosophy of animals, to name a few specialties.


Margaret Boyle’s two-tiered study explores and illuminates the incongruity that resulted when rigid ideals or precepts of female virtue collided with the “unruly” lives of women in seventeenth-century Spain. On one level, Boyle analyzes institutions founded to rehabilitate prostitutes and other women accused of crime. On the second, she assesses the theatrical representations of wayward women. Thus
constructed, the concise study is richly suggestive of two vital and interconnected scholarly practices: women's history and a cultural-studies focus on early-modern Spanish theater.

A few points of background are in order for readers of this journal, in particular as concerns the emergence of dedicated playhouses (corrales de comedias), standing professional theater companies, and the so-called “new comedia” in the last two decades of the sixteenth century. The comedia nueva—three-act dramas in polymetric verse in which playwrights gleefully dispensed with classical strictures—was wildly popular with city dwellers across Spain and just as problematic for a small if vocal group of moralists concerned with the potentially negative influence of love plots on the population. A key justification for allowing the playhouses to remain open was that ticket receipts supported charitable institutions, including those founded to house and rehabilitate wayward women. Hence the author’s juxtaposition of unruly women in the context of custodial institutions and the professional theater.

Boyle’s point of departure is the fascinating story of Barbara Coronel (1643-1691). A professional actor from early adolescence, Coronel gained popular renown for representing a kind of stock heroine critics today classify as the manly woman (mujer varonil); such characters resisted marriage, defended themselves at sword- or knife-point, and often dressed as men. But Coronel also travestied gender roles off stage. As well, she managed a troupe of actors, as did a good number of other women of the theater. But when her husband was murdered, Barbara Coronel’s public displays of manly strength seem to have made her a natural suspect. Intriguingly, Coronel’s defenders at this point included an uncle who performed in comic intermezzi under the stage name Juan Rana (John the Frog) and was himself famously tried for sodomy by the Inquisition. This opening anecdote is useful to give scholars of seventeenth-century England an idea of the multifaceted and often controversial public profile of the women who earned their living in the Spanish theater business of the era. In contrast to prohibitions against women acting in professional theaters in England, a crown ruling in 1587 had allowed for actresses to perform in the corrales de comedias provided they were married and
did not dress as men. Boyle notes that the restrictions were honored as much in breach as in practice.

Not surprisingly, women’s undeniable prominence in all aspects of the theater business never ceased to be a point of anxiety. Coronel’s case suggests to what extent such worries spanned the seventeenth century. Her story, briefly glimpsed as a point of departure, leads Boyle to her central argument and overarching goal. She thus states: “the early-modern Spanish subject was constructed through a variety of competing discourses, which both enforced and critiqued expected social behavior” (4).

Part 1 is comprised entirely of the first chapter, “Gendering Recogimiento in Early Modern Madrid,” in which Boyle examines the institutions that emerged in Spain’s court city in response to a perceived epidemic of unruliness. To illustrate this issue, Boyle analyzes the 1623 procession organized to celebrate the relocation and expansion of one of the foundations that sought to confine and then reform prostitutes, the Casa de Santa María Magdalena de la Penitencia. Revealingly, the king and queen watched the procession from the windows of the convent of the Descalzas Reales, a prestigious religious institution whose royal abbesses were often power brokers in the capital. From here, Boyle offers a useful and multi-layered explanation of recogimiento, a term impossible to render concisely in English, given that it covers the inward turning meditation associated with the great Spanish mystics of the later sixteenth century and public reeducation of allegedly sinful women, as displayed in the above-mentioned processions of repentant prostitutes.

Boyle devotes the latter part of her first chapter to analysis of a particularly intriguing and unsettling manifestation of this phenomenon—the woman’s prison envisioned by Madre Magdalena de San Jerónimo. Allying herself with the daughter of Philip II, the Infanta Isabel Clara Eugenia, this nun outlined a harsh regime for work and reclusion in a document titled Razón y forma de la galera y casa real (Reason and Form of the Galera and Royal House, 1608). Boyle notes that this is the first extant treaty outlining a woman’s prison, with the galera applying a term most of us associate with penal slavery on Mediterranean galleys. In her appendices, she offers a translation and transcription of the full treatise. Here too, the author reveals a telling
paradox. That is, Madre Magdalena promoted her harsh program for enclosing wayward women to an extent that she claimed a public role not associated with the ideal nun.

Boyle shifts in Part 2 to an exploration of analogous tensions in the popular theater. Chapter 2, “Stage Widow in Pedro Calderón de la Barca’s La dama duende,” focuses on the beguiling heroine of one of the most beloved of all comedias de enredo. Calderón’s plot of the “phantom woman” unfolds around Angélica, a spirited young widow enclosed in her brother’s home to protect the family property and honor. There, she discovers freedom and a new love by mastering the hidden revolving closet door intended to keep her locked inside. The author here adds fascinating insights about the public role of widows and also connects this drama to the profile of actresses, thereby continuing a point of inquiry found in part 1. Boyle’s analysis here and in subsequent chapters is targeted to readers who have a basic familiarity with the plots of the most famous Golden Age comedias. Readers outside of the field may want to consult repertories of dramatic plots to supplement Boyle’s comments.

Chapter 3, “Dramatizing Women’s Community in María de Zayas’s La traición de la amistad,” presents the case of a heroine created by one of Spain’s five known female dramatists. Zayas’s drama explores the power and limits of friendship, with its heroine, Fenisa, torn between loyalty to her closest friend and her unquenchable desire for that woman’s beloved. Boyle’s analysis of female friendship and desire is particularly interesting when it extends to our own critical practice. Here, the author laments that critics studying this play have accepted the seventeenth-century moral stricture that posited a blatantly and unrepentantly desiring woman as a bad person, essentially a female version of the arch-seducer Don Juan. Yet on this question, Boyle argues that “for scholars interested in uncovering the intricate history of female relations, it is necessary to resist the urge to relegate Fenisa to the corner of her text to join with Zayas’s cast in a celebration of marriage and the restoration of order” (76).

This query emerges from a different angle in Chapter 4, “Women’s Exemplary Violence in Luis Vélez de Guevara’s La serrana de la Vera,” a rural drama built around the character type of the mujer varonil taken to great Baroque excess. Thus, the title character, Gila, avenges
her dishonor at the hands of a faithless lover by vowing to murder every man she encounters, a pledge that leads to two-thousand dead men and a final punishment scene in which the heroine’s own body is shown after execution. As Boyle notes, this violent but seductive heroine builds on various literary models, including the lusty rural woman known as the *serrana* in Medieval literature. Though this most famous drama by Luis Vélez de Guevara has been much examined, Boyle adds the particularly compelling nuance of connecting the play to the acclaimed but controversial actress for whom the role was devised, Jusepa Vaca. Alleged by court satirists to have been the lover of powerful nobles—including Philip IV’s powerful prime minister, the Count Duke of Olivares—Vaca emerges in the study as the figure who most palpably connects the two tiers of Boyle’s study. She thus notes of the play’s dramatic execution of the murderous heroine: “As the audience members witness the execution of Plasencia’s beloved *serrana*, consider that they also witness the execution of Madrid’s beloved actress, Jusepa Vaca” (94). The quintessential Baroque space for theatrical violence—the stage discovery space where such a fate would have been revealed for the audience—becomes a place to punish a rural criminal and also evoke a high-profile court story of sexual license. Here as throughout, the author draws attention to complex negotiations, between female agency and conformity, between individual desire and normative feminine virtues.

There are, along the way, some important points within this compact study that would benefit from further development, whether by Boyle herself or those she will no doubt inspire. For instance, as a point of departure, she collapses the religious reforms that emerged from the Council of Trent (1545-1563) with Philip II’s monumental compilation in 1569 of more than 4000 royal laws, edicts, pragmatics and provisions, some going back to the Visigothic era: “The Counter Reformation in Spain was mobilized and implemented in no small part by means of a new legal code, the Nueva Recopilación de las leyes de estos reynos [...] (5). This comment—and another like it on page 22—conflates the correlation between Philip II’s efforts at reforming the legal system with the range of religious reforms initiated in the wake of the three Councils of Trent. For this reason, readers here would do well to nuance Boyle’s analysis about laws designed to maintain orderly
That said, Margaret Boyle has produced a compelling study, based on the ingenious juxtaposition of the rise of custodial institutions and their interconnections with a thriving professional theater business that nurtured many “unruly” female performers, entrepreneurs, and audience members. It will be of great interest to specialists in early-modern *comedia* studies. Scholars of English literature and of comparative drama may want to supplement Boyle’s treatment with plot summaries of the plays discussed. So doing, they can find rich rewards, in discovering all manners of unruly and unrepentant women in the vast corpus of “golden age” comedias.


In this methodologically sophisticated study, Fiona Williamson analyzes the lived experience of urban community in a leading provincial city in seventeenth-century England. Given its significance for the economically vital region of East Anglia, as well as the relatively bountiful variety of its surviving records, Norwich has long attracted the interest of historians. Williamson intends her book to add to the established scholarship by applying theoretical approaches to her subject that have been developed through research into other towns, in England but also in other countries. In particular, she seeks to demonstrate that much knowledge can be generated by studying a regional center such as Norwich, thereby diverting some attention from the study of London, which has not surprisingly tended to dominate the field of early modern English urban history.

Williamson’s analysis unfolds across five lively chapters that are arranged thematically, with each chapter including an historiographical and theoretical overview of the topic at hand. She begins with a discussion of the geographical understanding of urban identity that focuses on stylized cartographic representations of Norwich as a whole but also on the parish, the unit with which most Norwich residents