

Renaissance and Reformation
Renaissance et Réforme



Poole, Kristen, and Owen Williams, eds. Early Modern Histories of Time: The Periodization of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England

Goran Stanivukovic

Volume 43, Number 3, Summer 2020

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1075327ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v43i3.35345>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Stanivukovic, G. (2020). Review of [Poole, Kristen, and Owen Williams, eds. Early Modern Histories of Time: The Periodization of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 43(3), 338–341. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v43i3.35345>

and Southeast Asia, places of utmost interest for the Portuguese. (This was due in part to the conquest of Malacca in 1511, which went on to be a Portuguese possession until 1641 and which was a lively hub of commercial activity, attracting merchants from a variety of places, becoming a veritable meeting places of peoples and beliefs for centuries.)

Loureiro's new edition is surely to become the standard version of Pires's text, on account of the careful reconstruction of the Paris manuscript with which readers of Portuguese can easily work. As a respected scholar of early modern Luso-Asian history, Loureiro is well-equipped to take on so monumental a task as the edition of this work. His notes provide readers with extensive geographical and historical knowledge of the places and people described by Pires. Aside from the text itself, the edition provides readers with a table comparing the Paris manuscript with Cortesão's English translation and Portuguese edition of the text, along with four of Pires's letters which had been previously published but which are here newly annotated and edited.

Stunning in the breadth of its scope and the sheer extent of its geographic description, Tomé Pires's work is of clear interest to scholars of Portuguese and Asian history and European-Asian interactions in the early modern period. Loureiro's edition is a faithful rendering of this important text, with extensive notes that are never burdensome or excessively erudite. Loureiro's edition should place the *Suma Oriental* where it belongs: at the forefront of scholarship on European interest in and knowledge of Asia.

JAMES NELSON NOVOA

University of Ottawa

<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v43i3.35344>

Poole, Kristen, and Owen Williams, eds.

Early Modern Histories of Time: The Periodization of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England.

Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019. Pp. vii, 362. ISBN 978-0-8122-5152-4 (hardcover) US\$79.95.

Two ideas of time are explored in sustained, sometimes overlapping, and always suggestive analyses in this excellent collection of essays. The first idea,

of course, is measurable time, but the heart of the book consists in studying time's other manifestations—temporality, chronology, and/or periodization—that is, “timeline” and “the notion of human time” (11)—while exploring “new models of time and chronology” (10). Given that “the modern habit” (11) of periodization is the book's primary concern, that temporality has significant currency in the scholarship on both literary and cultural history, and that temporality is a flexible and even slippery concept, one wonders whether “temporality” rather than “time” would be a more precise term with which to title this collection. “Time” and “temporality,” as well as “periodization,” are not interchangeable notions, even though their meanings stem from a common source: formulated, as they were, in the early modern period and in modern criticism about time in that same period. Just as this book treats the duality of time, so, too, is its critical angle based on a duality of perspective, not only is time explored in its own right, but criticism about temporality is itself the subject of critical inquiry.

This volume is therefore an experiment in the analysis of time from multiple perspectives as well as a critical interpretation of periodization as an intellectual and historical aspect of an understanding and use of time. Different methods—from micro-historical analysis to a more panoramic discussion of defining phenomena, like the Reformation, which affect how time is read in a redefined idea of periodization—are used to recover a rather estranged view of time in the early modern period and to clarify the affinity between our contemporary understanding of time and time as it was comprehended in the sixteenth century. Rarely do edited volumes achieve the right measure of cohesion they strive for, and that publishers encourage; indeed, this book comprises greatly varying topics and models of time, ranging from a discussion of the materiality of time and place in Stratford-upon-Avon in the age of Shakespeare, to love poetry and periodization, to material culture across the long early modern time, to the English Civil War and the “subaltern perspectives” that underlay it. This topical diversity, however, is not a limitation but a virtue of this book: it demonstrates the vast reaches of temporality as a concept; how temporality both is and is not the sense of a period; and how historical chronology is as ambivalent as any effort to define it.

Much of this book, therefore, deals with definitions. Tim Harris discusses a chronology of the definition of the very period to which this volume is devoted: the early modern. Nigel Smith offers a compact and illuminating

discussion of the relationship between time and “shifts” in the literary study of early modernity, from the historicist and new formalist perspectives, and as a political and philosophical endeavour. We understand a historical period, he concludes, “through modes of critical analysis” (50). Church historians’ definition of the early modern period as a time of chaos and order forms the subject of Euan Cameron’s essay. The essays in which religion and church history are brought to bear on the understanding of time brilliantly erase the boundary that separated the medieval from the early modern period in historical accounts. As Ethan H. Shagan shows, the idea of “secular”—etymologically derived from the Latin meaning of a historical period—allows us to explore the nuanced understandings of the notion of secularity across the early modern time and at the beginning of the separation of religion from the world (87) in the seventeenth century. James Simpson’s excellent essay stands out for the revisionary force of his argument: “ecclesiological revolutions” (89) represent moments of “religious convulsions” (91) that deeply affect societies; and hence the Reformation, his topic, is explored as the most profound historical change that affected England in the sixteenth century and beyond. His push for “Trans-Reformation Studies,” a scholarly focus on the Reformation as the key historical-temporal watershed moment that defined the historical and cultural time that followed it, is presented as a becoming critical paradigm.

Temporality and material history expand even further, and creatively, the application of temporality to researching the early modern period. Kate Giles’s analysis of the civic architecture of the guild buildings in Shakespeare’s hometown, Stratford-upon-Avon, methodologically belongs to what she calls “the discipline of postmedieval archaeology” (111). Natasha Korda’s illuminating essay on the linen ruff, that perishable and almost perished “cultural icon” (124) of the Elizabethan period, linked with social ascendancy, redirects the study of temporality, materiality (specifically laundering), and periodicity in yet another new direction with originality across time—to Virginia Woolf. Gordon Teskey’s essay considers the role of periodicity in scholarship on seventeenth-century poetry. Individual poems are read against an overview of how the notion of the “period” affected both the research and teaching of these poems. Engagement with other critics’ ideas of time and periodicity is inevitable throughout the book. It is inescapable in Julianne Verlin’s interpretation of love poetry in relation to the writing of literary history, but also—brilliantly—in the context of historical time, and the relationship between lyrical poetry and social time:

specifically, the plummeted rate of marriage in the 1590s and the consequences for erotic writing and complaints. (Maybe this is also the context that benefited the burgeoning of the sonnet in the 1590s.)

Shakespeare is inescapable, too, in thinking about the past, because, as Douglas Bruster argues in his lucid essay full of fresh critical claims, Shakespeare has been equated *with* the past (181); Bruster thus examines, not Shakespeare's approach to time, but rather how a modern critic and reader think about time through Shakespeare. Julia Reinhard Lupton writes about post-secular Shakespeare in new approaches in which ethics and dramatic art interrelate.

Chronologically, the book ends with the essays on late seventeenth-century writing, beginning with Steven N. Zwicker's essay on John Dryden and Restoration time; here, Zwicker considers how Dryden imagined time (217). Mihoko Suzuki's writing about the Restoration returns to the idea of historical convulsions as discussed by James Simpson, although her point about re-defining discrete periods, from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century, comes out of the mid-century English Civil War, Revolution, and the execution of Charles I, via Antonio Gramsci's revisionist ideas about the Reformation and the Renaissance as sites of conflict. Space is proposed in addition to time, an element of periodization in Heather Dubrow's broadly critical and theoretical essay on spatiality and periodization. The book ends with Kristen Poole's prolegomena for a "new typological historiography" (267), a speculative experiment proposing the use of typology as a binding principle between texts across time.

All the essays in the book make as much use of the concept of "period" and "periodization" as possible. The essays approach the writing of a literary history through engaging with historiography and their practitioners, as starting points. The breadth of the critical vision, the magnitude of the task handled, and the inclusion of many original angles will make this book invaluable for anyone writing a literary history, writing about a literary history, and thinking about the very nature of literary and cultural histories in the early modern period.

GORAN STANIVUKOVIC

Saint Mary's University, Halifax

<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v43i3.35345>