

# Love and Fortune in Boccaccio's Tancredi and Ghismonda Story and in Wilmot's *Gismond of Salerne*

FREDERICK KIEFER

In 1566 or 1568 Robert Wilmot and four colleagues at the Inner Temple pooled their talents and brought to the stage a story from Giovanni Boccaccio's *Decameron* (4.1).<sup>1</sup> Their play, *Gismond of Salerne*, possesses considerable historical significance, for it is both the earliest surviving English play based upon a *novella* and the earliest extant tragedy of romantic love in English. In choosing to adapt an Italian narrative, the playwrights displayed the penchant for seeking love stories in Continental *novelle* that governed so many of their successors. And in profoundly altering their source, Wilmot and his collaborators anticipated the dramaturgy of writers in the later Elizabethan period who also adapted Italian and French stories. What sets *Gismond of Salerne* apart from such later plays as *Soliman and Perseda* (c. 1588-92) and *Romeo and Juliet* (c. 1595) is the complete transmutation of the tale which inspired it. The general indifference of Wilmot to the spirit of his source has been noted by Irving Ribner in a discussion of *Romeo* and by Annette T. Rottenberg in a consideration of "early love drama."<sup>2</sup> Neither of these writers, however, explores the underlying attitudes responsible for the peculiar dramatic adaptation. In the present study I shall, by examining the treatment of Love and Fortune in Boccaccio's story and in *Gismond*, attempt to make clear the divergent values that shaped the *novella* and the play.

What the authors of *Gismond of Salerne* found in Boccaccio's *novella* was a tale of fervent, youthful love temporarily winning out against parental opposition but ultimately succumbing to adversity. With considerable sensitivity the Italian writer characterizes Ghismonda, the widowed daughter of Tancredi, and Guiscardo, the man of inferior social station with whom she falls in love. Scarcely less important to Boccaccio than the lovers themselves, however, is the nature of their love. For love powerful and benevolent, emerges as the chief preoccupation of the story. Guiscardo affirms the might of love when he appears before Tancredi to answer for his illicit assignation with Ghismonda. After listening quietly to the Prince's indictment, he "gave no other answer, but that Love was of greater force, then either the Prince, or hymself" (fol. 103).<sup>3</sup> The

awesome intensity of love thus mitigates any personal culpability; the lovers are driven irresistibly along. Yet, mighty as that force may be, it is not a self-destructive passion. For Boccaccio, love does not wrench the lover's personality, leaving him emotionally contorted and wasted. Rather, it represents entirely natural and humanizing behaviour. Boccaccio's wholly sympathetic treatment of the mutual affection of Ghismonda and Guiscardo extolls the positive value of love and sex.

Love constitutes an extraordinary force in the world of Boccaccio's *novella*, but alone love is insufficient to bring Ghismonda and Guiscardo together. Their actual rendezvous depends upon a felicitous conjunction of time and place. And, just as Boccaccio personifies love, rendering it as both an internal disposition and an external entity, so too he personifies the force of circumstance. If Love furnishes the motivating impulse for the couple, Fortune arranges the conditions under which they consummate their desire. Fortune and Love thus assume, in effect, the status of participants—indeed, machinators—in the story. Together, they preside over the destiny of the lovers.

The relationship between Love and Fortune proves to be a volatile one, although the lovers learn this only gradually. Initially, they view the two powers as cooperative. Confronted by her father with evidence of her transgression, Ghismonda explains that "pitifull Love, and gentle Fortune have founde out, and shewed a waie secrete enough, whereby without knowledge of any man, I am come to the effect of my desires" (fol. 104). And when she explains her choice of a lover, Ghismonda again cites external agency. In answer to her father's objection to Guiscardo's social rank, she observes "you doe not consider, that the fault is not mine, but rather to be ascribed to Fortune who ought to bee blamed, bicause many tymes she exalteth the unworthie, and treadeth under foote, those that be moste worthie" (fol. 104<sup>v</sup>). What neither Ghismonda nor Guiscardo realizes at first is how frail must be a human relationship dependent upon the continued amity of two such powers. Only later do the lovers come to see that Love and Fortune are not always solicitous of human well-being. They learn that Fortune in particular may enlist her power to destroy love as well as to foster it. Indeed, even as she brings the lovers together, Fortune lays the groundwork for their demise. The author explains how, once united, the lovers become the prey of the capricious deity: "Fortune envious of that pleasure, so long and greate, with dolorous successe, tourned the joye of those twoo lovers, into heavie and sorrowfull ende" (fol. 102). Fortune attains her purpose by having Tancredi fall asleep in his daughter's chamber and awaken to find the lovers in flagrante delicto. Later Ghismonda alludes to Fortune's hostility when she addresses the heart of the slain Guiscardo: "Thou has finished thy course, and by that ende, whiche Fortune vouchsafed to give thee thou art dispatched, and arrived to the ende, whereunto all men have recourse" (fol. 106). Much

to her dismay, Ghismonda has discovered that Fortune is as puissant as Love though not nearly so indulgent.

The duel between Love and Fortune is not so obtrusive that it ever obscures the relationship of Ghismonda and Guiscardo. And we would be justified in describing the story simply as one in which two lovers, caught between the demands of their own emotions on the one hand and the circumstance of parental opposition on the other, become martyrs to the cause of innocent affection crossed by adversity. Boccaccio's treatment of Love and Fortune, however, is hardly superfluous; it must have evoked in the minds of his readers memories of other such combats. For centuries writers had said that human affection blossomed under the joint hegemony of Love and Fortune.<sup>4</sup> The two are linked as early as the composition of *Octavia*, a Roman tragedy formerly ascribed to Seneca.<sup>5</sup> Toward the end of the Middle Ages, this conjunction became a literary commonplace, finding perhaps its best known expression in the *Roman de la Rose*. In fact, John V. Fleming notes that "it is probably to the *Roman*, if a particular source is to be adduced, that the widespread popularity of the Love-Fortune *topos* in late medieval and Renaissance literature is to be traced."<sup>6</sup> Boccaccio, by locating the love affair of Ghismonda and Guiscardo under the aegis of Love and Fortune, relates his own brief narrative to the canon of medieval love literature. In so doing he must have satisfied the expectation of his readers. Moreover, Boccaccio's representation of the *topos* is directly related to the impact of the story, for the interplay of Love and Fortune heightens the poignancy of the lovers' plight even as it seals their doom. Love and Fortune thus help to create the aura of pathos and sentimentality which undoubtedly contributed to the great popularity of Boccaccio's tale.

Wilmot and his colleagues could not have chosen a more affecting story on which to base a tragedy of romantic love. They were, however, little interested in its charm or pathos. Their purposes are perhaps most clearly revealed in their treatment of Love, whom they bring to the stage as a full-fledged character named Cupid.<sup>7</sup> In so doing they profoundly alter the spirit of Boccaccio's *novella*, for their Cupid is a savage creature, bristling with hostility and fury. We gain some inkling of the metamorphosis wrought by Robert Wilmot and his collaborators when, in the first scene of the play Cupid announces that his purpose is not to unite the lovers but rather to refurbish his own tarnished reputation. To this end he will enter the palace "and there enflame the faire Gismonda soe,/in creping thorough all her veines within,/ that she thereby shall raise much ruthe and woe" (I. i.62-64).<sup>8</sup> His intent at once characterizes the god of love as cruel and malicious

Loe, this before your eyes so will I shoue,  
that ye shall iustly say with one accord,  
we must relent and yeld: for now we knowe,  
Loue rules the world, Loue onely is the Lorde. (65-68)



In the English adaptation the benevolent deity of the Italian story is converted into a fierce, destructive force.

Those under the spell of such a power will necessarily bear little resemblance to the lovers depicted by Boccaccio. Thus in *Gismond of Salerne*, the young woman no longer yields to natural, innocent impulse. Now she is seized by a dangerous and uncontrollable passion, one which violates the spirit of temperance. Throughout the play the dramatists enlist the Chorus to urge the virtues of restraint and moderation and, by implication, to condemn Gismond. The opprobrium which attaches to her actions is suggested when, at the conclusion of Act II, the Chorus laments the diminution of virtue that has occurred since the end of the golden age. With pointed reference to Gismond, the Chorus cites exempla of feminine virtue: "Vlysses wife (such was her stedfastnesse)/abode his slow returne whole twenty yeres,/and spent her youthfull dayes in pensiuenesse,/bathing her widowes bed w<sup>th</sup> often teres" (25-28). Deploing the disappearance of such figures as Penelope, the Chorus reflects,

I think those good ladies, that liued here  
a mirrour and a glasse to womankinde,  
and in their liues their vertues held so dere,  
had them to graue, and left them not behinde:  
ells in so many yeres we might haue seen  
as good and vertuous dames as they haue ben. (45-50)

Not only are the unchaste reproached but so too evidently are any who fall prey to Cupid. At the conclusion of Act III, the choral speaker warns against the "slye snake" that "lurkes vnder those flowers gay" and concludes aphoristically, "seldome times is Cupide wont to send/vnto a joyfull loue a joyfull end" (49-50). Perhaps even more astonishing in this love story is the sentiment that "Cupide is but a childe, and can not daunte/the minde that beares him on his vertues bold" (39-40).

Choral admonitions are reinforced by the comments of Gismond's aunt and father. Lucrece presents her niece's case for remarriage to Tancred. But when the Prince explains his objections, Lucrece returns to Gismond with this counsel:

And therfore myne aduise shalbe, to stere  
no farther in this case: but sins his will  
is grounded on his fatherly loue to yow,  
and that it lieth in yow to saue or spill  
his old forwasted age, yow ought t'eschue  
to seke the thing that shold so much agreue  
his tender hart: and in the state yow stand  
content yo<sup>r</sup> self: and let this thought releue  
all your vnquiet thoughtes, that in yo<sup>r</sup> hand  
yo<sup>r</sup> agēd fathers life doeth rest and stay,  
sins without yow it may not long endure,  
but rūne to ruthefull ruine and decay. (II.iii.24-35)

Even the insensitive Tancred, so highhanded in dealing with his daughter, movingly pleads his case. Reflecting upon his discovery of Gismond and Guishard in bed together, he cries,

O daughter (whome alas most happy had I ben  
if liuing on the earth the sōne had neuer seen)  
is thys my hoped ioy, my comfort, and my stay,  
to glad my grefefull yeres that wast and wear away?  
For happy life, that thow receiuēd hâst by me,  
ten thousand cruel deathes shall I receiue by thee? (IV.ii. 17-22)

Such speeches have the effect of altering fundamentally the orientation of Boccaccio's narrative. No longer is love a force to be embraced but rather a menace to familial loyalty and even a potential threat to one's moral probity.

The remarks of the Chorus and principals make clear that the god of love is an outward manifestation of the passion that overwhelms Gismond and her lover. If the sinister character of Cupid seems monstrous to us, so too should the spectacle of those figures wracked by violent emotion. In this treatment of the god of love, the English playwrights display their lack of sympathy with Boccaccio's purposes. The *Decameron*, one writer has observed, is characterized by a "complete absence of the sense of sin."<sup>9</sup> Such a sense of wrongdoing, by contrast, pervades *Gismond of Salerne*. What was a forthright celebration of love in the Italian *novella* has in the English play become a severe warning against vice.

If Love undergoes a transformation at the hands of the English playwrights, so too does Fortune. Unlike Love, however, Fortune is not brought to the stage as a dramatic character. In fact, the dramatists eschew for the most part any effort to make Fortune a viable presence in the play. This is not to say that they exclude Fortune entirely, for in a lengthy refrain the first-act Chorus expounds upon the instability of all things earthly:

Here fortune rules, whoe, when she list to play,  
whirleth her whele and bringes the hie full lowe,  
to morrow takes what she hath geuen to day,  
to shew she can aduaūce and ouerthrowe. (37-40)

And when in the last act Renuchio delivers his eyewitness account of Guishard's death, he punctuates his speech with frequent allusions to Fortune. While more elaborate perhaps than Boccaccio's references, these actually convey less thematic import. For the invocations to or deprecations of Fortune are confined chiefly to a single choral interlude following the first act and to the single speech of a minor character in the last. The protagonists themselves fail to convey any real sense of being threatened by Fortune's power.

The disparity between Boccaccio's handling of Fortune and that of the dramatists is epitomized in the first-act Chorus. There we learn that Fortune cannot tyrannize the virtuous individual:

he may scorne fortune, that hath no power  
on him that is cōtent with his estate.  
He seketh not her swete, ne feares her sower,  
but liues alōne within his bounded rate,  
and marking how these worldly thīges do wade,  
reioiseth to him self, and laughs to see  
the follie of mortal men, how they haue made  
Fortune a god, and placed her in the skye. (53-60)

A greater contrast with Boccaccio can scarcely be imagined. Whereas for the Italian narrator Fortune is a wily manipulator of events, she possesses no real power for Wilmot and his colleagues. As far as they are concerned, she lacks any true divinity; Fortune exists merely as a figment of the foolish man's imagination.

Clearly, Fortune cannot play the vital role in *Gismond of Salerne* that she did in Boccaccio's *novella*. Stripped of her authority, she no longer can account satisfactorily for the adversity that overtakes the lovers. The dramatists therefore must work a major alteration in their materials. If the fickle goddess foils the lovers in the *novella*, the just vengeance of the gods brings about their demise in the play. Nearly everyone, including the god of love, is affected by the spirit of revenge. For instance, when Cupid appears at the beginning of Act III, he tells the audience that he plans to ascend to heaven where he will report to Jove how "by sharp reuenge on earthly wightes" he has restored his formidable reputation and will "hense-fourth cease vnserued to sitt in vaine/a God whome men vnpunished may disdaine" (III.i.31-32). *Gismond of Salerne*, however, concerns itself not primarily with the pique of any single deity. Purely personal revenge gives way to a corporate quest for divine vengeance against human malefactors. This is demonstrated by Megaera, a Fury apparently adapted from Seneca's *Thyestes*, who appears in Act IV to sanction the destruction of the royal family: "Vengeance and blood out of the depest helles/I bring the cursed house where Gismond dwelles" (IV.i.1-2). She comes not as a fiend who capriciously torments mankind but rather as an executrix of justice. Her presence represents the general condemnation of the lovers by a synod of deities; the gods are offended because "Loue that blinded boy" has induced Gismond to "throw away/chastnesse of life, to her iñortal shame" (22-23). The Fury goes on to explain that the gods of the underworld have directed her to rise

aboue the earth, with dole and drere to daunt  
the present ioyes wherwith Gismonda now  
fedes her disteinēd hart, and so to make  
Cupide Lord of his will. (34-37)



Megaera's mission is thus one of chastisement: "Furies must aide, when men will ceasse to know/their Goddes: and Hell shall send reuëging paine/to those, whome Shame frō sinne can not restraine" (42-44).

Even Gismond, so gentle by temperament in the *novella*, is touched by the spirit of retribution. If her life and love represent a nearly complete antithesis to that described by Boccaccio, so too does her death. Boccaccio's heroine takes her own life so that she may join her slain lover. By contrast, the young woman in Wilmot's play commits suicide largely to spite her father. She even frames her own epitaph to memorialize her motive:

Loe here within one tōbe whear harbour twaine,  
Gismōda Quene, and Counte Palurine:  
She loued him, he for her loue was slayen,  
for whoes reuenge eke lyes she here in shrine. (V.iii.45-48)

This is surely an appropriate conclusion not only for Gismond's life but also for a drama that is at least as concerned with retribution as it is with eroticism and love. Justice in the shape of revenge informs the play from beginning to end; practically every character is either an executor or victim of revenge.

Without question, the dramatists have decisively altered the *topos* bequeathed them by Boccaccio; Love and Fortune no longer are the adversaries they were in the *novella*. Instead, the playwrights substitute a contrariety of their own: they recast the opposition delineated by the author of the *Decameron* and counterpose cupidity with the retribution which it invites. The protagonists, instead of being victimized by the strife between Love and Fortune, are now pinioned between the impulse of passion and the claims of retributive justice.<sup>10</sup>

The inspiration for the modifications wrought by Wilmot and his colleagues probably cannot be identified with any certitude. We can, however, at least speculate about their motives in so profoundly modifying Boccaccio's story. And, given their use of the revenge motif, the chorus, such stock characters as the messenger and confidant, such stylistic features as stichomythic dialogue, long speeches, and sententious precepts, and, of course, their borrowing from *Thyestes*, our conjecture may well begin with Seneca, who seems to have had a considerable impact on *Gismond of Salerne*, directly and perhaps indirectly as well through Renaissance Italian drama.<sup>11</sup> That the play should have a distinctly Senecan flavor is not at all surprising since it was written for the same kind of sophisticated audience at the Inns of Court that enjoyed the performance of such Senecan plays as *Gorboduc* (1561) and *Jocasta* (1566). Indeed, William Webbe in his prefatory epistle to Wilmot's revision of the play, printed in 1592, writes that the original performance was "of the whole honorable audience notably applauded: yea, and of al men generally desired, as a work, either in statelines of shew, depth of conceit, or true ornaments of poetickall arte, inferior to none of the best in that kinde: no, were the Roman *Seneca* the

censurer."<sup>12</sup> In addition to certain character types and stylistic features, the English playwrights may also have adopted Seneca's characteristic treatment of passion. Although the Roman tragedian was never much concerned with dramatizing romantic love, he was interested in depicting individuals in the grip of some overwhelming emotion. As a Stoic, he distrusted anything that threatened to corrupt the rule of reason, and his dramatization of reason in retreat may have been intended as cautionary. Yet Seneca seems not only horrified but also fascinated by the exhibition of powerful feelings. The tragedian displays the ravages of passion in a negative light. At the same time, that very portrayal has a lurid quality, as though he were unable to avert his eyes from what intellectually repelled him. Something of the same ambivalence characterizes *Gismond of Salerne*, where the severest kind of moral condemnation is juxtaposed with the most eloquent pleas for the fulfillment of physical desire.

The English dramatists, of course, brought to the play their own attitudes, which their reading of Seneca may simply have reinforced. They were certainly no less concerned with the sovereignty of reason than was their Roman predecessor. It is interesting that despite the range of passion they depict—Gismond's grief, Guishard's love, Tancred's rage—the larger environment of the play remains stubbornly rational. However torn by emotion they may be, the various characters seldom fail to exercise their mental faculties. We witness Gismond choosing her course of action, Guishard contemplating the consequences of his, and Tancred pondering his response to both. We even hear, by way of Megaera, about the deliberations of the gods. The tragedy seems, oddly since a love story, more cerebral than sensual. Law instead of nature appears to represent the greatest good. Gismond may lament the fading of her "fresh grene youth" and wonder aloud "whearto hath nature decked/me with so semely shape?" (II.i.27, 28-29). However, the playwrights do not invite us to condone her surrender to desire. The actions of Gismond and Guishard, they remind us, are consciously and deliberately taken. These are no mere victims of circumstance buffeted by the irresistible winds of passion.

This rationalistic bias is, in all likelihood, chiefly responsible for the playwrights' modification of their source, particularly for their rendering of Love as grotesque and for their suppression of Fortune. As a violation of virtue, Gismond's passion has to be made unattractive; it must offend by its excess. And in this drama devoted no less to castigating the lovers than to heralding their love, the role of Fortune must remain circumscribed. Adversity, inflicted by enigmatic Fortune in Boccaccio's *novella*, is no longer especially mysterious in *Gismond of Salerne*. It results from transgression against human and divine law, and it is applied with an almost mathematical precision. By neutralising Fortune, the dramatists shift the burden to the individual, suggesting that the lovers have the capacity to resist unreason and that their failure to do so precipitates their demise.



Robert Wilmot's prefatory letter to his revision of the play hints at this motive. There he writes that "my purpose in this Tragedie, tendeth onely to the exaltation of vertue, & suppression of vice." Even allowing for a certain degree of exaggeration, Wilmot's declaration conveys the earnestness of his moral bent. And it suggests the nature of the sentiment which allowed Boccaccio's *Love and Fortune* to be purged in the interests of a grim moral didacticism.

*University of Arizona*

#### Notes

- 1 The names of the authors, indicated by initials appended to each of the five acts, are generally assumed to be: Roderick Stafford (I), Henry Noel (II), G. Al. (III), Christopher Hatton (IV), and Robert Wilmot (V).
- 2 See Irving Ribner, "Then I Denie You Starres: A Reading of *Romeo and Juliet*," in *Studies in the English Renaissance Drama in Memory of Karl Julius Holzknacht*, ed. Josephine W. Bennett et al. (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1959), pp. 269-86; Annette T. Rottenberg, "The Early Love Drama," *College English*, 23 (1962), 579-83. Leonora Leet Brodwin's treatment of *Gismond of Salerne* in *Elizabethan Love Tragedy, 1587-1625* (New York and London: New York Univ. Press, 1971) does not deal with the relationship between the *novella* and the play.
- 3 William Painter, *The Palace of Pleasure* (London: Henry Denham for Richard Tottel and William Jones, 1566). Painter's translation of the story was probably available to the playwrights. John W. Cunliffe, however, argues that they worked directly from the original Italian. See "Gismond of Salerne," *PMLA*, 21 (1906), 435-61. In any case, Painter's translation adheres very closely to the original; all of the quotations cited here have been checked against the Italian in Vittore Branca's edition of the *Decameron* (1960; rpt. Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1965).
- 4 Howard Rollin Patch has discussed the medieval background of the *topos* in *The Goddess Fortuna in Mediaeval Literature* (1927; rpt. New York: Octagon Books, 1974), "The Fortune of Love," pp. 90-98. And Samuel C. Chew has treated the iconographic expression of the *topos* in *The Pilgrimage of Life* (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1962), pp. 44, 67-68.
- 5 See *Seneca: The Tragedies*, ed. and trans. Frank Justus Miller, Loeb Classical Library (1917; rpt. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1968), II, 454, 11.561-65.
- 6 *The Roman de la Rose: A Study in Allegory and Iconography* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969), p. 112.
- 7 Virtually all commentators on the play believe that the figure of Cupid was borrowed from Lodovico Dolce's *Didone* (Vinegia: Aldus, 1547).
- 8 I have used the text edited by John W. Cunliffe in *Early English Classical Tragedies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912).
- 9 Aldo D. Scaglione, *Nature and Love in the Late Middle Ages* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1963), pp. 81-82.
- 10 Later English dramatists would prove more sympathetic to the theme of romantic love and to the Love-Fortune *topos*. In *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* (printed, 1589), Venus and Fortune appear as characters. And in *Soliman and Perseda*, Love and Fortune, together with Death, serve as Chorus.

- 11 The general significance of Continental Senecan tragedy for the English stage is discussed by Cunliffe in his introduction to *Early English Classical Tragedies*. The most comprehensive treatment of Senecan influence is that by H.B. Charlton, *The Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1946). (This study originally appeared as the Introduction to *The Poetical Works of William Alexander, Earl of Stirling*, ed. L.E. Kastner and H.B. Charlton, I [Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood, 1921].) It is possible that the Senecan quality of *Gismond of Salerne* may, in part, derive from an earlier Italian dramatization of the story, Antonio da Pistoia's *Filostrato e Panfila* (performed, 1499). In this earliest of Italian tragedies of romantic love, the ghost of Seneca speaks the prologue. Whether the English dramatists were familiar with *Filostrato e Panfila* is, however, uncertain. Marvin Herrick in *Italian Tragedy in the Renaissance* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1965) writes, "There is no evidence that the English authors knew Pistoia's play, but one wonders if they might have heard of it" (p. 32). Herbert G. Wright, less tentative than Herrick, suggests a number of resemblances between Pistoia's work and the English play. See *Ghismonda, A Seventeenth-Century Tragedy* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1944), pp. 63-65.
- 12 *The Tragedy of Tancred and Gismund*, 1591-2, ed. W.W. Greg, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1914), sig. [\*3]. This later version of the play differs in several respects from the original. When Wilmot rewrote *Gismond*, he substituted blank verse for rhyme, added more extensive stage directions and four dumb shows, gave the Chorus a greater role, made more use of dialogue in place of set speeches, substituted Christian allusions for pagan, made Tancred a more sympathetic figure, and accentuated the moralizing of the earlier version. For comparisons between *Gismond of Salerne* and the revision, *Tancred and Gismund*, see David Klein, "'According to the Decorum of These Daies,'" *PMLA*, 33 (1918), 244-68; John Murray, "*Tancred and Gismund*," *Review of English Studies*, 14 (1938), 385-95; Herbert G. Wright, *Boccaccio in England from Chaucer to Tennyson* (London: Athlone Press, 1957), pp. 178-84; and Wright, *Ghismonda, A Seventeenth-Century Tragedy*, pp. 66-80.