Un nome, mille volti: Giulio Cesare nel teatro inglese della prima età moderna. Domenico Lovascio.
Lingue e Letterature Carocci 192; Serie AIA Book Prize 2. Rome: Carocci Editore, 2015. 208 pp. €22.

As its title states, this book offers a reading of the figure of Julius Caesar as he is represented in six late Elizabethan and Jacobean English-language plays: Kyd's *Cornelia*; the anonymous Oxford play *The Tragedie of Caesar and Pompey, or Caesar's Revenge*; Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey*; the *Julius Caesar* of William Alexander, First Earl of Stirling; Ben Jonson's *Catline His Conspiracy*; and Fletcher and Massinger's *The False One*. The author, Domenico Lovascio, has already produced an annotated translation into Italian of *Catiline His Conspiracy*; the work under review, which won the 2014 Carocci Doctoral Dissertation Prize, represents a continuation of what is presumably an ongoing project to offer scholarship on non-Shakespearean English early modern drama to an Italian academic and intellectual audience.

One of the great virtues of Lovascio's book is its successful negotiation of a tension fundamental to the project. On the one hand, the book focuses on representations of Julius Caesar across a range of dramatic works that, despite their common subject matter in Roman history, proceed using quite different means toward seemingly quite disparate ends. On the other hand, the book seeks to elucidate the plays' disparate means and ends themselves. Thus Kyd's and Alexander's plays are in some sense closet dramas, Kyd's moreover being an adaptation of Robert Garnier's *Cornélie*; the anonymous Oxford *Caesar's Revenge*, based largely on classical sources, condenses eight years of civil war and political intrigue, presumably for a largely undergraduate audience; Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey*, unstaged during the poet's life, casts Cato as Caesar's principal foil; while Fletcher's and Massinger's *The False One* uses the central character of Pompey's assassin to reflect upon the tension between personal and political imperatives, virtuous and vicious. By organizing his treatment of the plays chapter by chapter in (conjectural) order of composition, Lovascio is able to highlight parallels in sources and concerns without losing sight of each play's historical specificity or its treatment of the character of its central figure. Hence, for example, Lovascio is able to use Caesar's status as cynical marginal observer in Jonson's *Catiline* to examine Jonson's interest in Roman political historiography, while Caesar's uneasy competition with Cato of Utica for dramatic centrality in Chapman's play marks a corresponding tension in Chapman's historical and philosophical interests.

Lovascio is particularly meticulous in his attention to secondary sources. Unsurprisingly, given his previous translation of the play and the availability of Inga-Stina Ewbank's impressive apparatus in the *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson* (vol. 6), the treatment of *Catiline His Conspiracy* is particularly full. But Lovascio is indefatigable in amassing and judiciously incorporating into his readings scholarly work on even the obscurer plays in his treatment. His attention to the comparative roles of

This content downloaded from 130.251.172.010 on September 15, 2016 04:41:54 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

standard Roman sources, such as Dio Cassius, Sallust, Suetonius, and Lucan, is also commendable, particularly his awareness of the ways in which genre may have tended to dictate analysis.

Inevitably, the work under review reflects the limitations as well as the virtues of published dissertations. Lovascio's impressive command of secondary literature seems to have been purchased at a certain neglect of Roman and early modern sources. Most striking is the absence of Tacitus from the primary-source list: the early modern interest in Tacitus as a source for theories of tyranny and resistance, as well as a model for political history writing, is well documented enough to render questionable the exclusion, despite the issue of periodization. The importance of Tacitus to Jonson alone should surely have militated for its inclusion. In a similar vein, a broader range of early modern texts of political theory might have allowed a deeper analysis of the treatments of tyrannicide. In a somewhat different vein, Lovascio's omission of Marlowe's *Dido Queen of Carthage* as a possible source of influence on the Oxford *Caesar's Revenge* might be questioned, as might the general omission of university Latin drama; and a closer reading of such Latin standards as Seneca might have clarified a certain number of minor interpretive puzzles. Such seeming shortcomings, however, should not disincline the potential reader (particularly the Italian reader) from this very useful and informative survey.

Robert Dulgarian, *Emerson College*

This content downloaded from 130.251.172.010 on September 15, 2016 04:41:54 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).