Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. *The Drama of Landscape: Land, Property, and Social Relations on the Early Modern Stage*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998. Pp. xii, 292.

In this outstanding book, Garrett Sullivan considers aspects of landscape in a variety of early modern English plays. Like Richard Helgerson's influential *Forms of Nationhood* (1992), *The Drama of Landscape* addresses the ideological significance of spatial representations, conceptions, and practices as found in, for example, maps and map-making. Following geographers such as Denis Cosgrove and Barbara Bender, Sullivan defines landscape as both a construction and a way of seeing the world. "Landscape," he explains, "refers not merely to the landscape arts, but to a relationship to the land, or, more precisely, to one among many possible conceptions of social relationships mediated by land" (p. 4). Sullivan's project is to retrieve landscapes lost in the shift to a capitalist economy, a shift which involved the gradual reconceptualization of land as private property in the early modern period. To the landscape of private, or as he calls it, "absolute" property, Sullivan opposes the "landscape of stewardship" — the kind nostalgically celebrated in Jonson's "To Penshurst," premised on a land-based moral order centered on a beneficent landlord — and the "landscape of custom," structured by immemorial customary activities. Since custom involved tenant and landlord in a relationship of reciprocal, if unequal, obligation, tenants enjoyed certain rights — for example, gathering firewood on rented land. Such rights were threatened by the reconceptualization of land as private property. (Readers of E. P. Thompson's work on eighteenth-century England will recognize the landscape of custom and its contested nature.) To illustrate the landscape of custom, Sullivan asks the reader to "imagine what 'To Penshurst' would be like if the landscape it produced were centered on the village or marketplace and not the manor house" (p. 13).

In six interrelated essays, Sullivan draws deeply and fruitfully on social theory, early modern history and drama, and a wide array of other texts, ranging from ballads and pamphlets to maps and atlases. Chapter One relates the anonymous *Arden of Faversham* (1591) to the development of surveying technology, arguing that the play valorizes an ethic of stewardship at odds with a rent-based economy and cartographic conceptions of the land. Chapter Two focuses on another anonymous play, *Woodstock* (1592), in which, Sullivan contends, a cartographic landscape again clashes with an ethic of stewardship: in this case, the monarch — Richard II — behaves like an exploitative landlord, provoking a rural revolt. Sullivan reads this conflict in terms of the tension between the national and the local, between the landscape of nation (as absolute property) and the regions (landscapes of customs) it subsumes. In Chapter Three, Sullivan turns to Shakespearean maps, situating them in the social history of the early modern map: "[a]n elite document that seemed to allow gentlemen directly to 'behold' — both look at and hold near — that which was only represented, the map nonetheless engendered an epistemological confusion" (p. 24), a confusion Sullivan explores in map-reading scenes in *1 Henry IV* (1597) and *King Lear* (1605). He concludes the

chapter with a consideration of *Richard II* (1595), focusing on John of Gaunt's "famous map-inspired description of England" (p. 24). "The map," he argues, "aids Richard in the construction of a landscape of sovereignty, and that landscape is finally revealed to be both incoherent and exploitative" (p. 121).

As the title of Sullivan's fourth chapter, "Civilizing Wales: *Cymbeline*, Roads, and the Landscapes of Early Modern Britain," suggests, it is as much about British landscapes as about Shakespeare, but its wide scope in no way diminishes its value as a comment on *Cymbeline*. Starting from Imogen's repeated questions in Act Three, Scene Two, about the distance to Milford Haven, Sullivan discusses the measurement of land in the early modern period, tracing a rift between the rationalized calculation of atlases and measurement by "customary miles" (131), as well as between a panoramic view of landscape and the landscape of custom and practice. Next, turning to the place of Milford Haven in the English imagination, Sullivan cites various sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources to show that the Welsh harbor was "a focal point for anxieties about or the celebration of military incursions" (p. 139). On this basis, he contends that "Milford Haven can also stand in for all of Wales, and that the play concerns itself with the position of Wales in relation to English culture" (p. 139). Through discussions of early modern Anglo-Welsh relations and the Roman conquest of Britain, Sullivan argues finally that *Cymbeline* offers a Jacobean fantasy of "a completely integrated British landscape, one that incorporates not simply Wales but also Scotland" (p. 149).

I have dwelt more fully on this essay to give some sense of the complexity and range of Sullivan's arguments. In doing so, however, I have privileged Shakespeare in a way the book declines to do. The final two chapters take up Brome's *A Jovial Crew* (1641) — which Sullivan reads as a vindication of estate-based hospitality (the landscape of stewardship) and of the eponymous crew of vagabonds who move through a landscape of custom — and Heywood's *1 Edward IV*. Sullivan contrasts the latter's representation of London as a city under siege with that in Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI*: Heywood's London, he argues persuasively, is a landscape of custom, shaped by guild culture, while Shakespeare's is a "landscape of sovereignty," the empty stage on which aristocrats play out their struggle for the crown.

The Drama of Landscape is intellectually engaging, continuously rewarding, and a pleasure to read. Sullivan combines theoretical sophistication with exemplary lucidity, and as befits an author concerned with topography, he clearly signposts his argument. A truly interdisciplinary work, this book will be of interest to all advanced students and scholars of early modern culture. It is also aesthetically satisfying: Stanford University Press has produced a volume as elegant as its author's prose. My only complaint is the lack of a bibliography. The reader who returns to the work in search of a half-remembered reference has to hunt through the endnotes. Fortunately, given the range of Sullivan's references, the search will inevitably be an interesting one.

KAREN BAMFORD, *Mount Allison University*