ROMEO AND JULIET
The Legend of Romeo and Juliet

By

OLIN H. MOORE
Professor of Romance Languages
The Ohio State University

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
COLUMBUS
1950
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My interest in the novella goes back to "Comp. Lit. 17 hf," a half-course given at Harvard University in 1909-10 by Professor J. D. M. Ford, who later encouraged me to publish an article on "The Origins of the Legend of Romeo and Juliet in Italy" in *Speculum*. Thanks for valuable advice are due also the following scholars: Professor R. Altrocchi, of the University of California (Berkeley); Emeritus Professor F. Baldensperger, of the Sorbonne; the late Professor Walter L. Bullock, of the University of Manchester; the late Giulia Celenza, of the University of Florence corsi estivi; the late Professor Gustav Gruenbaum, of Johns Hopkins University; the late Professor Henri Hauvette, of the Sorbonne; Emeritus Professor Kenneth McKenzie, of Princeton University; the late G. L. Passerini, of the Laurenziana Library, Florence; and Professor John Van Horne, of the University of Illinois. I am especially indebted to the following scholars: my colleague at The Ohio State University, Professor Don L. Demorest; Professor Allan H. Gilbert, of Duke University; and Professor Urban T. Holmes, of the University of North Carolina. Of course, none of these scholars is responsible for the opinions expressed in this study.

Professor Clarence E. Parmenter of the University of Chicago kindly read the page proofs of Chapter XIV.

I have received useful suggestions from my brother, John Robert Moore, of Indiana University.

I desire to express my appreciation to the Graduate School of The Ohio State University for furnishing the funds for publishing this monograph.

Valuable editorial assistance has been given by Miss Velma Carter and Mrs. Eleanor Wilson of The Ohio State University Graduate School Editorial Office. Thanks are due also to the following Ohio State University students who helped with proofreading and indexing: Miss Barbara Acton and Miss Pattie Rector.

Thanks are due also to the editors of the following journals for permission to reprint articles of mine dealing with the Romeo and Juliet legend: *Italica; Modern Language Notes; Publications of*
the Modern Language Association of America; Revue de littéra-
ture comparée; and Speculum.

O. H. M.

Columbus, Ohio
March 14, 1949
INTRODUCTION

The long and complicated history of the plot of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* has fascinated numerous scholars. Perhaps the most valuable single contribution to the study of this plot development was made by John Dunlop. Among other contributors might be mentioned Giuseppe Todeschini, P. A. Daniel, Cino Chiarini, Gioachino Brognoligo, Robert Davidsohn, J. J. Munro, Cesare Foligno, Luigi Simeoni, Letterio di Francia, Fausto Ghisalberti and, last but not the least, Henri Hauvette.

After more than a century of progress, some of our leading investigators seem convinced that the end of the road has been reached. Even the indefatigable Henri Hauvette asserted that no further examination of the sources of *Romeo and Juliet* was needed, since J. J. Munro had already said the final word on that subject.¹ This statement was the more extraordinary in view of Munro's pronounced neglect of Sevin's *conte,*² the importance of which was demonstrated by Hauvette himself.³ I shall try to show that present studies of the sources of *Romeo and Juliet* require revision all along the line, but especially in the final and decisive stage—the transition from Brooke to Shakespeare. Indicative of the amount of work which remains to be done at this point is the frequency with which scholars, in need of an x to solve baffling problems, fall back upon the lost play mentioned by Brooke. We have also much to learn yet regarding the origins of the *Montecchi* (Montagues), the sources of Masuccio and even of Luigi da Porto, and the relations between Clizia and Bandello, not to mention certain curious features of Lope de Vega's version of the legend.

The general plan followed is chronological, and only summary notice is taken of the numerous and oft-cited legends vaguely

¹ "Au reste, l'étude des sources de la tragédie de *Roméo et Juliette* a été faite avec le plus grand soin (1); il n'y a plus à y revenir ... "—Hauvette, Henri. *La "Morte Vivante."* Paris: Boivin et Cie, 1933, p. 191 and note 1.
³ Hauvette, H. "Une variante française de la légende de *Roméo et Juliette.*" *RLC*, 1, 3 (1911), p. 336.
resembling the *Romeo and Juliet* plot, but not demonstrably connected with it. Part of the material here offered has already appeared in the form of articles, which have been rewritten. In particular, the study on “The Origins of the Legend of Romeo and Juliet in Italy” has been much revised, taking into account the constructive criticisms of Fausto Ghisalberti. Changes have been introduced also in the discussion of Masuccio, Clizia and Shakespeare, and new sections have been added dealing with Boccaccio, Bandello, Sevin, Brooke, and Grotot. The versions of the legend by Struijs and by Lope de Vega are treated in Chapter XIV, on “Lost Documents.”

For the convenience of folklorists, frequent references are made to Professor D. P. Rotunda’s *Motif-Index of the Italian Novella in Prose*, which follows the plan and classification of Professor Stith Thompson’s *Motif-Index of Folk Literature*. I hope to show, nevertheless, that the development of our legend is essentially a literary phenomenon, and is only remotely connected with folklore. In fact, so far as this legend is concerned, I am inclined to accept the general attitude of the late Joseph Bédier, and feel it especially necessary to question current theories of nebulous “lost documents,” themselves supposedly based more or less vaguely on folk tales. Consequently, it is hoped that the reader will be patient regarding the tedious minutiae necessary as evidence to establish a long line of almost purely literary transmission. It will be found that the innovations by the authors involved are usually instances not of folklore, but sometimes of psychological analysis, or concern for dramatic exigencies; sometimes the result of ecclesiastical pride, or even of nationalistic tendencies.

* See Bibliography under Moore, Olin H.
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ROMEO AND JULIET
THE MONTAGUES AND THE CAPULETS IN HISTORY

In 1930 I wrote: "The powerful families of Montague and Capulet, who figure in Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet, never resided in Verona, and in fact never existed at all. Contrary to the general impression, the term Montecchi—the Italian equivalent of 'Montagues'—like the term Cappelletti (Cappellini), meaning 'Capulets,' was the nickname of a political band or faction, not the name of a private family." Today, I should like to modify my statement regarding the Montecchi (Montagues) to this extent: The Montecchi did exist as a family during the twelfth century. From 1207 on, however, the term Montecchi, like the term Cappelletti, seems to have been applied only to a political party, the best evidence going to show that the Montecchi family had disappeared entirely.¹

According to Luigi Simeoni, the Montecchi were originally bourgeois enemies of the noble Veronese house of the Conti, having begun as negotiatores. The first of the Montecchi family


Cf. C. Cipolla, Compendio della storia politica di Verona, Verona: R. Cabianca, 1900, pp. 130, 131: "parte dei Montecchi, famiglia potente, la quale (per quanto sembra) ricevette il suo nome dal grosso villaggio di Montecchio Maggiore, che trovasi tra Verona e Vicenza."

Cf., however, A. M. Allen, A History of Verona, edited by Edward Armstrong, London, 1910. On p. 45 the writer says: "no family called Montecchi ever lived in Verona. It is more probable that the leaders of the party came in the first instance from Montecchio, a hill-fortress in the Vicentine district."

Miss Allen, while in my judgment more accurate than most writers on this point, is incorrect regarding the Montecchi of the twelfth century, as demonstrated by L. Simeoni. As for the later status of the Montecchi, she does not clearly state that they were not a family, but merely says that the alleged family did not reside in Verona. She seems misleading, moreover, in suggesting apparently that the leaders of the Montecchi party resided originally in Montecchio Maggiore. It would seem, as we shall find presently, that during the early part of the thirteenth century the castle was in the hands of the de Pilio (Pilio, or Piio) family, and that it was used by the heterogeneous Montecchi faction merely as their first recruiting station.
recorded in any document was Giovanni Monticolo, reported as living in 1136, 1140, 1145, 1146, and 1177. Documentary evidence is found also of the activities of his brother Gomberto in 1146 and 1157, and of his son Giacomo in 1177. Giacomo's son Zanino is mentioned as living in 1206.

Let it be repeated, however, that at the turn of the century, the Monticolo (Monticoli) (Montecchio) (Montecchi) family disappears so far as authentic records go. On the other hand, the chronicles of this period are replete with references to the Montecchi party or faction. Of these chronicles, probably the most reliable is that of Rolandino, the Paduan notary (died 1276), who records the career of the da Romano family, with especial reference to Ezzelino III. The notary’s work was regarded by contemporaries as so authoritative that it served as a model for several later chronicles, notably the “Annales S. Iustinae Patavini.”

According to Rolandino, the thirteenth-century term Montecchi arose in the following manner. Azzo Marquis of Este became podesta of Verona in 1207. Ezzelino da Romano was violently opposed to such political preferment for his personal enemy. He therefore called a gathering of his followers—from Verona, Vicenza, and elsewhere—in the castle of Montecchio.


Ibid., p. 93.

Ibid.

Ibid.


This circumstance served as a sort of christening for Ezzelino's followers, who were thenceforth known as Montecchi (Monticli or Monticuli).

In another passage, Rolandino repeats his assertion that the name Montecchi belonged properly to a political band. He states that Azzo VI, Marquis of Este, had forced an alliance with Bonifacio, Count of S. Bonifacio, and that his faction came to be known as the party of the Marquis. Members of the rival party of Salinguerra Torelli and Ezzelino II da Romano, he says, were known as “Montecli.” In partial confirmation of this statement, Parisius de Cereta calls Ezzelino da Romano the head of the Montecchi “party.” According to Luigi Simeoni, Rolandino’s assertion is also supported by firsthand documents.

The castle of Montecchio Maggiore was situated in the neighborhood of Montebello Vicentino, in the foothills of Vicenza, and is the only authentic landmark for the story of the Montagues and the Capulets. As indicated by the Latin form of its name—Monticulus, “little mountain”—it was built upon a small eminence. It matters little that eventually the name of the castle seems to have been adopted by members of the family resident there—“Marchixius and Confortus de Monticulo”—just as the family of Ezzelino da Romano itself derived its name from...
the ancestral castle of Romano. The fact remains that from 1207 to the end of the thirteenth century we have no authoritative mention of a da Montecchio family. For instance, in the year 1239, according to Rolandino, the castle of Montecchio belonged to Ugucio de Pilio (Piio, or Pillio), and was captured by Emperor Frederick II. In 1242, it appears, Ugucio surrendered his castle to Ezzelino da Romano.

It is perhaps noteworthy also that the Monticuli are at first invariably referred to in the plural, as if indicating their conglomerate nature, recruited as they were from all parts of northeastern Italy, or undecunque, as Rolandino significantly observes. On the other hand, the twelfth-century Monticolo family name studied by Luigi Simeoni was usually employed in the singular, although occasionally the plural form was used. Thus we find on the one hand mention of the family founder’s name, Giovanni Monticoli, but on the other hand such forms as Giacomo Monticoli and Liazarii de Monticulis.

Not only was the term Montecchi reserved during the thirteenth century for a political band in Verona, but the term Quattuorviginti (Italian Quattroventi), applied to the chief allies of the Montecchi, was apparently also the nickname of a faction. Quattuorviginti seems to have meant originally the eighty followers of the Count of S. Bonifacio who were bribed by Ezzelino da Romano and Salinguerra Torelli to become renegades. While this theory rests on no more secure basis than a marginal note in one of the manuscripts of the “Annales S. Iustinae Patavini,” it
affords nevertheless the most plausible explanation offered for the source of the name.  

On the other hand, the Counts of S. Bonifacio—the chief antagonists of the Montecchi and the Quattroventi—represented a real family, descended from Milo, Count of Verona, who ruled from 930 to 950, and from his brother Egelric. The story goes that a certain Tiresio killed Count Sauro, of this family, on the hill of S. Bonifacio. Tiresio left for the Orient after the homicide, but his brothers made peace with the heirs of Sauro by ceding to them the site of S. Bonifacio near Verona. Thereafter the Counts of Verona took the name of S. Bonifacio.

It will be impossible to follow in detail here the fluctuating fortunes of the quarrelsome Montecchi during the first third of the thirteenth century. After 1236, mention of the Montecchi becomes much rarer, but apparently their power, as well as that of their allies the Quattroventi, still continues in 1245, when a distribution of booty was made in their favor.

Under the date of 1252 occurs what is apparently a new and unauthenticated attempt to use the term Montecchi as a family name. Parisius de Cereta, who seems to have had a fondness for adding titles to proper names, makes a bare reference to a certain

---

23 Allen, op. cit., pp. 11, 45.
24 Cipolla, Compendio, op. cit., p. 131.

... et cum Guelphorum pars prevaluisset virtute potissimum Ricciardi, Ludovici S. Bonifaci filii, none penes imberibus, impign. ingentique spiritus adolescentis, Monticuli Urbis pulsas, Azo Estensis Marchio, autore Ludovico Ricciardi patre, Praetor Veronae creaturi"—Ibid. Cf. col. 123: "Ludovicus Sanbonifacius cum filio Ricciardo ... ."

As a matter of fact, Ludovico was the son, not the father, of Rizardo, whose biography this anonymous chronicler essayed to write. "(Ricardus) ... Reliquit autem unicum filium parvulum nomine Ludovicum ... "—"Annales S. Iustinae Patavini," op. cit., p. 162. Rolandino refers to this son as "Leoisius." (Monumenta, op. cit., XIX, p. 81.)

It might be noted also that Parisius de Cereta makes Bonifacio the son of Sancius (= Sauro) of San Bonifacio. (Op. cit., p. 6.)

The date of the death of Sauro is given in the "Annales Sanctae Trinitatis" as 1189. (Monumenta, op. cit., XIX, p. 5.)

Carnarolus de Monticulis as one of the numerous victims put to death of Ezzelino da Romano in that year.26 Rolandino, however, who gives a detailed account of this affair, mentions no connection between Carnarolus and the Montecchi. According to his version, “Domnus” Carnarolus, as well as his brother, Friar Felicius, of Padua, were victims of Ezzelino III da Romano. He calls Carnarolus a prominent citizen—“potentem virum et divitem”—of Verona. His brother, on the contrary, seems to have been a humble priest, and a teacher of the Germans in Padua: “Præceptor sive magister Alemannorum in Padua.”27 Carnarolus was imprisoned, compelled to do menial service in the house of the tyrant, and then publicly flogged in the streets of Verona.28

While it does not seem, consequently, that the title de Monticulis given by Parisius de Cereta was well established, there appears nevertheless towards the end of the century to have been a gradually increasing tendency to use this term as a sort of sobriquet. For example, on September 23, 1279, one of the signers of the peace between Brescia, on the one hand, and the allied citizens of Verona and Mantua, on the other, was the Mantuan Astolfinus qui dicitur Monteclus.29 Again, in 1324, according to an unedited chronicle, Crescimbene de’ Monticoli with his two sons was expelled from Verona by Can Grande della Scala, and finally took refuge in Udine.30 Perhaps this gradual application of a party nickname to private families may be compared with such expressions as “Gypsy” Smith, “Silver Dick” Bland, or

26 Parisius de Cereta, op. cit., p. 14. Parisius de Cereta not only gives a title to all the other persons mentioned in this passage, but bestows the title of comes Sancti Bonifaci upon Marcus Regulus, who died in 1142, and is referred to in the “Annales Breves” simply as comes Malregulatus (Monumenta, op. cit., XIX, p. 2). The best evidence would indicate that the title of comes Sancti Bonifaci was not adopted by the family until the latter part of the twelfth century. See Cipolla, Compendio, op. cit., p. 131.


28 “Supra dictus siquidem domnus Carnarolus in plathea Vérone est dilaceratus per frusta . . . ”—Rolandino, new Muratori ed., loc. cit. See also Monumenta, op. cit., XIX, p. 99.

29 In the “Annales S. Iustinae Patavini,” Carnarolus is spoken of simply as a “miles Veronensis,” and as a victim of Ezzelino da Romano. See “Annales S. Iustinae,” op. cit., p. 162.


"Texas" Rickard, as an indication of the alleged tribal, political, or geographical connections of the individual. It may even be conceivable that the twelfth-century Montecchi family continued to exist in obscurity during the thirteenth century, only to receive chance notice by late chroniclers. Nevertheless, the fact remains that so long as the Montecchi were active and famous during the thirteenth century, they were invariably referred to by chroniclers as, apparently, a faction. In particular, let it be repeated, the reliable chronicler Rolandino over and over specifically calls the Montecchi a political party, not a family. This situation was of major importance in the early development of our legend, as we shall see in the next chapter.

If the historical development of the term Montecchi has been little understood in the past, we have been more fortunate with regard to the term Cappelletti. The Guelph Cappelletti, far from being a family living in Verona, were a faction associated with the political affairs of Cremona. Their Ghibelline opponents were known as Barbarasi, according to reliable chroniclers, or Troncaciuffi, according to the Dante commentator Peter Alighieri. Obviously the nicknames Barbarasi and Troncaciuffi referred to the practice of shaving their beards, as a mark of distinction. In fact, they have been compared appropriately to "the Roundheads and the Croppies of English and Irish history." The Cappelletti, or Cappellini, for their part, evidently wore small hats or caps as insignia. Later, history repeated itself, and the name was adopted by a troop of Venetian light horsemen—a fact which may have had its weight with Luigi da Porto, author of the first novella concerning Romeo and Giulietta.

The fortunes of the Cappelletti may be traced briefly, if only  

---

**Notes:**


For Cappellini, the alternate form for Cappelletti, see Salimbene, *Cronaca di fra Salimbene Parmigiano dell'ordine dei minori*, translated by Carlo Cantarella, Parma, 1883, I, p. 264: "In Cremona, que' che parteggiavano per la Chiesa si chiamavano Cappellini, o Cappelletti; que' che tenevano per l'Impero, si nominavano Barbarasi."
to establish further the parallel with the fate of the Montecchi. In 1249, taking advantage of the declining authority of Emperor Frederick II, the Cappelletti attempted an uprising against the Barbarasi, without success. The insurgents were banished from Cremona, together with their leader Amadinus de Amatis.39

The following year, a band of some two thousand Barbarasi attacked the Cappelletti in their place of refuge. After a long siege, Amadinus de Amatis was captured. By a stroke of good fortune, the prisoners were all permitted to escape by their custodian Marquis Lancia, podesta of Lodi. The cause for this leniency remains a disputed point—whether bribery, or sympathy with the Cappelletti faction, or jealousy of the podesta of Cremona.37

In 1259, we find the combined authorities of Verona, Mantua, Ferrara, and Padua making an alliance with the podesta of Cremona, by the terms of which they agree to consider the Barbarasi party as being one and the same thing as the commune of Cremona, and promise to give neither aid nor counsel to the Cappelletti banished from that city.38

In 1267, it would appear, the Cappelletti had recovered some of their lost power. Through the intercession of a legate of Pope Clement IV, they were allowed to return to Cremona,39 where they seem to have caused few disturbances worth recording. The last reference to them by a contemporary occurs in Dante's Purgatorio.

Finally in 1427 we find the name Cappelletti going through a cycle similar to that of the name Montecchi, authentically applied to a family. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, or nearly three hundred years too late, a member of this family is called Giulia.40

As far as authentic records go, the Montecchi of Verona never seem to have come into conflict with the Cappelletti of Cremona. The history of the twelfth century, however, furnishes a curious parallel for the formation of their names. In that century, the mercenary troops commonly known as Brabançons derived their names from the duchy of Brabant, where they were first recruited,
much as the thirteenth-century Montecchi were named for the castle of Montecchio Maggiore, first recruiting station of Ezzelino II da Romano. The antagonists of the Brabançons were called Caputii, from the linen hoods which they wore, just as the Cappellelli were named also for their characteristic headgear. Apparently, no claim has ever been advanced that the Caputii were a private family.
EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE LEGEND OF THE MONTAGUES AND THE CAPULETS

If it be admitted that the Montecchi and the Cappelletti existed as unrelated political factions, some of the currently accepted views regarding the origins of the legend of Romeo and Juliet will have to be revised. It will be impossible to admit, for instance, the view of Cino Chiarini who says, following Todeschini, that the Montecchi and the Cappelletti were two different wings of the Ghibelline party.1 The Cappelletti, as we have seen, were followers of the Pope, not of the Emperor, while the Montecchi did not become Ghibellines until 1232.2 Naturally, we shall have to reject at the same time the very widely accepted opinion of J. J. Munro who, translating Cino Chiarini almost literally, says: “Dante’s Capulets and Montagues were both component parts of the same Ghibelline party . . . ”3 Nor will it be possible to allow the statement (later revised somewhat) of G. Brognoligo that the Montecchi and the Cappelletti were a “coppia di famiglie.”4

In fact, when we come to trace the literary tradition of the Montecchi and the Cappelletti, we shall be confronted by a new problem, similar to that presented in the historical evolution of the Montecchi. It will be our task to determine at what stage of the development the idea arose that both the Montecchi and the Cappelletti were families, rather than political factions.

1 "I Montecchi e i Cappelletti nominati da Dante . . . rappresentano . . . due delle diverse frazioni del partito ghibellino."—Chiarini, Cino. *Romeo e Giulietta.* Florence: G. C. Sansoni, 1906, p. xiv. See Chapter I, note 32, of the present study, especially the quotation from the “Annales Placentini Gibellini,” showing that the Cappelletti leader Amadinus de Amatis fought per episcopatum Cremonae, and had been banished with his troops from Cremona by the Emperor.


4 Brognoligo, Gioachino. “Montecchi e Cappelletti nella Divina Commedia.” Bologna, 1893. Reprinted from *Il Propugnatore, Nuova Serie,* VI, Parte I, Fasc. 31—32, p. 8 and passim. Cf. Brognoligo’s *Studi di storia letteraria,* op. cit., pp. 164, 165 and passim. Probably under the influence of R. Davidsohn’s article on the origins of the Cappelletti, Brognoligo in his later study alters his statement that the Cappelletti were a family, but makes no such correction regarding the Montecchi. (Ibid., pp. 181 and 193—94.)
To answer this question, for which no satisfactory solution has yet been offered by literary critics, it will be necessary to begin at the source, and trace the early development step by step, and particularly from one Dante commentator to another. To be sure, the interrelation of these commentators has already been so ably studied by Gioachino Brognoligo\(^5\) that further discussion would at first glance seem superfluous. Unfortunately, however, Brognoligo does not clarify the essential question which we have to consider: the determination of the exact moment when the Montecchi and Cappelletti factions began to be mistaken for families.

Moreover, there is another problem to which Brognoligo gives only a partial answer: Just when did the notion of hostility between the Montecchi and the Cappelletti first manifest itself and how did it manifest itself?

The earliest apparent association of the terms Montecchi and Cappelletti occurs in an oft-cited passage in the sixth canto of the Purgatorio. Here Dante, inspired by the stately presence of the troubadour Sordello, pronounced a bitter apostrophe to Italy, in which he invoked the aid of Albert of Hapsburg. He earnestly besought the emperor, who was so indifferent to Italian affairs that he neglected to be crowned in Italy, to come and behold the civil strife which was demoralizing the country:

\[\text{Vieni a veder Montecchi e Cappelletti,} \]
\[\text{Monaldi e Filippeschi, uom senza cura;} \]
\[\text{Color già tristi, e questi con sospetti.}\]

With his characteristic symmetry, Dante balanced the names of the Montecchi and Cappelletti, factions which had destroyed themselves in past strife (\textit{color già tristi}) with the contemporary and better known parties—the Monaldi and Filippeschi of Orvieto\(^7\)—who were in a dubious situation because of their dissensions (\textit{e questi con sospetti}).\(^8\)

This interpretation of the disputed passage in the Purgatorio, as we shall see presently, is in substantial accord with that of the Dante commentator Peter Alighieri, on whose testimony G. Bro-

---

\(^5\)Ibid., especially p. 9, note 1; p. 10, note 1; p. 11, notes 1 and 3; and p. 12.


\(^7\)Orvieto was in the province of Ancona. See Brognoligo, "Montecchi e Cappelletti nella Divina Commedia," \textit{op. cit.}, p. 14, and note 3.

\(^8\)Ibid.
gnoligo also relies. Fausto Ghisalberti objects, however, that Sordello would hardly have reminded the Hapsburg emperor of the Montecchi and the Cappelletti if these names had stood for political factions long since dissolved. To this dangerously subjective argument it might be replied that the learned Dante habitually remembered not only Italian political factions long after their dissolution, but also factional leaders long after their death. Farinata degli Uberti, the Ghibelline leader who figures in Canto X of the Inferno, died in 1264, or three years before the Cappelletti ceased to be active. If Dante makes Sordello mention the Montecchi, he also has a Centaur easily identify Azzolino (= Ezzelino da Romano), notorious chieftain of the Montecchi, while Dante’s Virgil can lead the way readily to Mosca de’ Lambertii, who precipitated a Florentine feud in 1215. It might be noted also in passing that even as late as the fourteenth century a none too reliable chronicler includes the Montecchi in a list of old Vicenza “families” which had been lost to sight.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that by the end of the thirteenth century the Montecchi and the Cappelletti had almost passed from popular recollection. Moreover, Dante referred to them in somewhat cryptic language, as was customary when he assumed the role of high priest. As a consequence, a series of misinterpretations arose, which became crystallized into one of the most famous legends of literature.

9 “A me il significato del passo par dunque chiaro così: vieni a veder, uom senza cura, i Montecchi di Verona e i Cappelletti di Cremona, i Monaldi, o Monaldeschi, e i Filippeschi d’Orvieto, quelli tristi per le passate discordie, questi sospettosi per le presenti . . .” — Ibid., p. 31. For discussion of Piccol da Dante, cf. especially p. 31 and note 3. Similarly in the Studi di storia letteraria, op. cit., p. 181, where, however, Brognoligo, perhaps under the influence of R. Davidsohn’s article which had appeared the year before, adds a notation that the Cappelletti were a faction, not a family: “I Montecchi di Verona e i Cappelletti,—nome di fazione, si noti, e non di famiglia,— di Cremona, . . .” (Brognoligo cites Davidsohn’s article on p. 194, note 1.)


12 Dante Alighieri. Inferno. XII, v. 110.


14 See Appendix to “Antonii Godi Nobilis Vicentini Chronica,” in L. A. Muratori Rerum italicarum Scriptores, Milan: Typographia Societatis palatinae, 1727, VIII, cols. 91, 92. “Hae sunt familie, quae in Civitate nostra Nobilis erant, et iba existenie ut de eis vix maneat memoria.” Among these “families” were mentioned the Comites Monticuli Praecalcini, who were given as ancestors not only for the Monteci of Verona, but also for their bitter rivals, the Counts of S. Bonifacio; “Comites Monticuli Praecalcini, e quibus nati sunt Comites de Sante Bonifacio et Domus Monticulorum qui potenti fuit Veronae.”
Let us now examine, in chronological order, some of the early comments upon the *Purgatorio* passage in question.

(a) *Jacopo della Lana*

1323-28.—According to Jacopo della Lana, who obviously undertakes little more than a paraphrase of the text of Dante at this point, the Montecchi and the Cappelletti were a party in Cremona, while the Monaldi and Filippeschi were a party in Ancona. Apparently the first-named factions were allies, in his opinion, although they might have been taken to be enemies.

(b) *Ottimo Commento*

1334.—The *Ottimo Commento* here follows literally Jacopo della Lana.

(c) *Peter Alighieri*

1340-41.—The first commentator furnishing accurate information regarding the political situation in Verona and Cremona during the thirteenth century was Dante's son Peter Alighieri. According to him, there were two parties in Verona, that of the Montecchi and that of the "Counts." In Cremona, the Cappelletti were opposed by the Troncaciuffi. In Orvieto, the rivals of the Monaldi faction were the Filippeschi.

By the party of the "Counts," Peter Alighieri doubtless means the faction of the Count of S. Bonifacio, which was also called the "party of the marquis," because one of its leaders was the Marquis of Este. The name Troncaciuffi, as has been observed, was an alternative form for Barbarasi.

(d) *Codice Cassinese*

Middle of fourteenth century.—The author of the *Codice Cassinese* follows closely the commentary of Peter Alighieri.

---


16 See Brognoligo, *Studi di storia letteraria*, op. cit., p. 167.


19 For paleographical reasons, the editors date the commentary about the middle of the fourteenth century (*ibid.*, pp. xviii and x).
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(e) Giovanni Villani

1348.—The chronicler Giovanni Villani does not mention the Montecchi and Cappelletti, but describes the Guelf Monaldi and the Ghibelline Filippeschi as families which were active rivals in the city of Orvieto during the early part of the fourteenth century. In 1312 the Monaldi succeeded in expelling the Filippeschi from Orvieto, almost under the nose of the Emperor himself. In 1337, after a period of tyrannical rule, the Monaldi were themselves driven out by the indignant citizens of Orvieto.

(f) Benvenuto da Imola

1379.—Benvenuto da Imola, for the passage in question, utilizes several sources. Like Giovanni Villani, he asserts that the Monaldi and Filippeschi were noble houses of Orvieto, but goes a step further, in being the first Dante commentator to state that the Montecchi and the Cappelletti were families also, both residing at Verona.

Benvenuto gives an account of the alliance of the Montecchi with Ezzelino da Romano and of their struggle against Azzo Marquis of Este, who had succeeded in returning to Verona, through the support of the Count of S. Bonifacio. As John M. Gitterman pointed out, Benvenuto here follows in general the “Monachi Patauini Chronicon” or “Annales S. Iustinae Patavini” which, as has been noted, are based on the version of Rolandino. Gitterman failed to note, however, that Benvenuto differs from the chroniclers by representing the Cappelletti and the Montecchi as allied and neighboring “families,” a notion which he may have derived from Jacopo della Lana.

(g) Francesco da Buti

1380.—Probably influenced by Jacopo della Lana, Francesco da Buti


places both the Montecchi and the Cappelletti in Cremona. He is the first writer to mention hostilities between the two parties, having perhaps some inkling of their difference in political faith.\(^{28}\)

(h) *Comento MS Tratto da Varj Chiosatori* (Barberiana de Roma)

*Fourteenth century*\(^{[?]}\).—The above-mentioned commentary, which is cited by Alessandro Torri, represents the Montecchi and Cappelletti as hostile factions, after the manner of Francesco da Buti. The author makes the Montecchi Guelfs, and the Cappelletti Ghibellines.\(^{26}\)

(i) *Anonimo Fiorentino*

*Late fourteenth or early fifteenth century.*—The Anonimo Fiorentino, abridging the commentary of Benvenuto da Imola, asserts that the Montecchi and Cappelletti were families allied against the Marquis of Este in Verona.\(^{25}\)

(j) *Edizione Nidobeatina*

1478.—According to G. Brognoligo, the author of the *Edizione Nidobeatina* follows Peter Alighieri closely for the passage in question.\(^{26}\) He seems influenced also by the language of Jacopo della Lana, as the following comparisons will show:

Qui . . . noma parte di Cremona per principio di Lombardia e parte d’Ancona per principio della Marca Anconitana.—Jacopo della Lana.\(^{29}\)

Qui . . . Cappelletti noma per parte di Cremona per principio di Lombardia. Monaldi e filippeschi noma in Orvieto per principio della marcha anchonitana.—*Edizione Nidobeatina*.\(^{28}\)

. . . in Cremona Cappelletti et Troncaciuffi; in Urberveteri pars Monaldeschia et Philippesca; . . . —Peter Alighieri.\(^{29}\)

(k) *Christoforo Landino*

1481.—For the passage under consideration, Christoforo Landino abridges the commentary of Benvenuto da Imola.\(^{25}\)


\(^{24}\) Cited by Alessandro Torri in his *Giulietta e Romeo*, Pisa, 1831, p. xviii.


\(^{27}\) Jacopo della Lana, *loc cit*.

\(^{28}\) *Edizione Nidobeatina*. Alighieri *Commedia con Commento*. Milan, 1478, fo. 97r.


\(^{30}\) "QUESTE furon due famiglie . . . lequali cacciarono Azzo Secondo Marchese di Ferrara, Governator de Verona. Ma egli con favore de’ Conti de San Bonifacio vinse, & tornò’ in Verona. Monaldi & Filippeschi due contrarie famiglie in Orvieto . . . ."—
EARLY DEVELOPMENTS

19

1) Alessandro Vellutello

1544.—Alessandro Vellutello, as usual, repeats the statements of Christoforo Landino.81

(m) Bernardino Daniello

1568.—Following Benvenuto da Imola, Bernardino Daniello represents the Montecchi and Cappelletti as being allied families. He is the second commentator to speak of the Cappelletti as Ghibellines.82

We have now reviewed the early stages of the development of our legend, and the results may be summarized as follows:

The traditional conception of the Montecchi and the Cappelletti really begins with an obscure passage in Dante's Purgatorio, where, in one verse, the names of the factions are found for the first time in juxtaposition. In the verse immediately following, the poet places the names of the Monaldi and the Filippeschi, rival factions in Orvieto, in the province of Ancona.

Three interpretations for the passage presented themselves:

(a) The Montecchi and Cappelletti were allies, and probably Ghibellines, because they were described as già tristi, and hence were proper subjects for the Emperor's solicitude.

(b) The Montecchi of Verona and the Cappelletti of Cremona were early thirteenth-century examples of civil dissension, while the Monaldi and Filippeschi were early fourteenth-century examples of the same evil.

(c) The Montecchi and Cappelletti were hostile factions—or perhaps families—just as the Monaldi and Filippeschi were said by Villani to be rival families.

The conception of the Montecchi and Cappelletti as allies, first apparently suggested by Jacopo della Lana, was developed by Benvenuto da Imola, who originated the statement that the names in question belonged to families both residing in Verona. Benvenuto also drew from Paduan chronicles details of the conflict between Ezzelino de Romano and the Este family. His ideas were later adopted by Anonimo Fiorentino, Christoforo Landino, Alessandro Vellutello, and Bernardino Daniello.

Peter Alighieri was the first commentator to explain that the Montecchi were a faction at Verona, while the Cappelletti were a party at Cremona. The author of the Codice Cassinese copied

82 Ibid., p. 187.
him, while the author of the *Edizione Nidobeatina* amplified his statements, adopting at the same time some of the language of Jacopo della Lana. Peter Alighieri’s explanation, although historically correct, proved the least popular of all.

The idea of hostility between the *Montecchi* and the *Cappelletti*, first suggested by Francesco da Buti, is found also in the *Comento MS Tratto da Varj Chiosatori*.

The foregoing summary is at variance with the views of previous writers, notably G. Brognoligo, in the following details which were of vital importance in the later development of the legend:

(a) The influential Benvenuto da Imola was the first Dante commentator to speak of the *Montecchi* and the *Cappelletti* as families, both residing at Verona.

(b) The notion of enmity between the *Montecchi* and the *Cappelletti* seems to have originated with Francesco da Buti.

In any case, it is notable that the commentators’ misunderstandings regarding the *Montecchi* and the *Cappelletti* were all directly traceable to written sources, rather than to folklore.
GIOVANNI BOCCACCIO

Giovanni Boccaccio is by consent one of the outstanding factors in the development of our legend. Critics tend to distinguish, however, between his dominant stylistic influence, which was exerted directly, and his supposedly vaguer influence on the Romeo plot which, it is alleged, was exerted indirectly.

Let us first examine very briefly the matter of stylistic influence, about which there is no disagreement. Typical is the remark of the late Henri Hauvette who said, in describing the style of Luigi da Porto, the first novelliere to mention the Montecchi and Cappelletti: "sa prose . . . dérive en droite ligne de Boccace." In similar vein, J. J. Munro commented upon the direct imprint of Boccaccio upon the prose of all the novellieri treating the Romeo and Juliet theme.

We may turn now to the consideration of Boccaccio’s influence on the Romeo plot, which, in the so far unchallenged opinion of J. J. Munro, was exerted in a roundabout manner and disappeared from sight for a time like a lost river. To avoid possible misunderstanding, I am quoting verbatim Munro’s conclusion, reached after summarizing at length first the Filostrato, or Troilus and Cressida story, and then Boccaccio’s earlier romance, the Filocolo:

It seems probable that these two stories, told by Boccaccio, passed, with others, into popular tales and gave rise to the legends which culminated in Romeo, and which, in their literary expression, came again under the direct influence of Boccaccio. Similar popular stories, which must have abounded in mediaeval Italy, were widely circulated in different forms by such people as the archer Pellegrino of Da Porto, and such evidence as we have tends to show that at an early date the Romeo legend was widespread in Italy.

The emphasis which Munro thus lays upon shadowy and as
yet undiscovered "popular stories" indicates that, like many of his contemporaries, he was still under the spell of the primitivism of Herder. I hope to show, in the first place, that Boccaccio's influence on the Romeo legend was generally as direct for plot devices as it was for "literary expression." In the second place, I shall try to demonstrate that this influence came principally from the Decameron, which Munro treats in a footnote, instead of from the Filocolo, and least of all from the Filostrato. For the present, however, nothing more will be attempted than to dispose briefly of the Filostrato, which I regard as unimportant for our purpose, and to make short introductory analyses of the plots of the Filocolo and of certain novelle in the Decameron.

Regarding the Filostrato Munro states: "The parallelism between this story and Romeo is too apparent to require pointing out." Nevertheless, aside from the fact that both the Filostrato and the Romeo story may be classed as "separation romances," it is difficult to detect much resemblance between them. To be sure, in the Filostrato there is parental interference with the union of the lovers, but this hindrance comes only from one side—from Calchas, father of the heroine Griseida—and does not even cause, directly or indirectly, the final estrangement of the lovers. An even more striking divergence from the Romeo plot is that when the parting moment arrives, it is Troilus, the hero, not Griselda, who is really afraid that Calchas will marry his daughter to another man. In fact, the fickle Griselda soon falls in love with Diomedes, and thus bears no resemblance whatever to Giulietta, who tells Fra Lorenzo that in order to be faithful to Romeo, and avoid marriage with the Conte di Lodrone (Shakespeare's County Paris), she would fearlessly pass through Hell.

We may turn now to Boccaccio's first novel, Il Filocolo, which is the tale of Florio and Biancofiore, derived from the French Floire et Blanchefleur story, of which the chantefable Aucassin et Nicolette is a variant. Florio and Biancofiore fall in love at Marmorina (Verona), and are parted as a result of the interfer-

---

ence of the hero’s father, the pagan king Felice. In a second attempt to separate the lovers, Felice sells Biancofiore to the “admiral” of the Sultan of Babylonia, telling Florio that she is dead. When Florio, blinded by grief, wishes to follow his beloved into the tomb, his mother confesses the cruel hoax which has been perpetrated upon him. After much difficulty, he is reunited with Biancofiore in Alexandria.

Elements of this story which were destined to reappear in later versions were the parental opposition to the marriage of the lovers; the false report of the death of the heroine; the hero’s impulse to commit suicide; trips by the lovers to Alexandria; and, curiously, their childhood spent in Verona. Yet it must be admitted that all these elements, except perhaps the last, might well have been taken not from the Filocolo, but from some of the earlier stories.

The Filocolo, however, contains within its framework a tale of premature burial which, because of its literary expression and also because of certain details, has a much more obvious connection with the Romeo legend. We read that Florio, during his long journey to Alexandria in search of Biancofiore, is forced by a tempest to stop at Naples. Outside the city, he finds a chosen band in a garden, who amuse themselves by propounding and answering thirteen questions concerning love, usually beginning with an illustrative anecdote. The novella preceding the thirteenth question may be summarized thus:

A wealthy gentleman has married a young and very beautiful woman. She is loved by a knight residing in the same city, but does not reciprocate his affection. Discouraged, he departs, but a messenger informs him that the lady has died in childbirth. He resolves to steal from her dead body the kiss which she refused him while she yet lived. Returning to the city, he waits for nightfall, and then goes in the darkness to the lady’s tomb, accompanied by a faithful servant. Opening the sepulcher, he enters, and as he takes the supposedly dead woman into his arms, he feels a weak movement of her pulse. The knight is so frightened that he leaves the sepulcher open, but manages to take the woman to his mother’s house. There, by the aid of a great fire, circulation is restored in the benumbed limbs of the heroine. Another effective restorative is a great bath, to which powerful herbs are added. The heroine, reviving as a result of this skillful care, is told to be of good cheer, as she is in a safe place. She gives birth to a son.

After the narration of this *novella*, the absurd question follows: Which was greater, the loyalty of the knight, or the joy of the husband on recovering the wife and son, whom he had given up for dead?\(^{21}\)

The same story reappears in the *Decameron*,\(^{12}\) the style being notably improved, and the insipid question being omitted. The *Decameron* version presents the following alterations: Names are given to the principal characters, the anonymous knight being called Messer Gentil de' Carisendi, the lady becoming Madonna Catalina (= Caterina), while her husband is Nicoluccio Cacciamimico. The "city" is identified as Bologna.\(^{13}\) Omitted are some, but not all, of the pornographic details found in the *Filocolo* version, as well as the reference to the numerous medicinal herbs added to the restorative bath, not to mention a number of other details.\(^{14}\) The *Decameron* version is not only more concise in places, but also more vivid. We may compare, for instance, the indirect discourse used in the *Filocolo* to report the heroine's words uttered when she recovers consciousness\(^ {15}\) with the direct discourse employed in the *Decameron*.\(^ {16}\)

Boccaccio's tale of Madonna Catalina and Gentil Carisendi seems to have been directly imitated to some extent by Luigi da Porto, and to a much greater degree by Da Porto's model, Masuccio Salernitano. Boccaccio also helped to popularize the premature burial *motif* by his farcical story of Rinuccio Palermini and Alessandro Chiarmontesi, lovers of Madonna Francesca de' Lazzari.\(^ {17}\) This tale, however, does not appear to have had any direct connection with the *Romeo* plot.

Not only premature burials, but also sleeping potions, form the subjects of a number of tales in the *Decameron*. Notable is the story of Ferondo, to whom an abbot administers a powder in a glass of wine. Almost immediately after drinking this potion, and while still standing, Ferondo becomes drowsy, and soon falls

\(^{13}\) Boccaccio, *Il Decamerone*, *op. cit.*, p. 353.
\(^{15}\) "... onde la donna risentendosi cominciò a chiamare la madre di lei, domandando ove ella fosse."—*Ibid*.
to the ground, remaining apparently dead for three days. At night he is secretly removed from his tomb by the abbot, who is aided by a trusted monk. Features of this story which reappear in the Thirty-Third Tale of Masuccio's *Novellino* are the nature of the potion, which is a powder rather than a beverage; the exact duration of the semblance of death—three days; the instant action of the drug; and the character of the vicious priest who plans the whole affair, and removes the body of the victim by night, aided by a companion.

Munro lists the clandestine entrance of Romeo into Juliet's chamber by means of a ladder as an episode "probably foreign" to the main sources of the legend. By way of comparison, he mentions the "ladder incidents" in Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (Ginevra episode), Canto V, and Matteo Bandello's *novella* of Timbreo di Cardona and Fenicia Lionata. Yet as we shall see later, the "ladder incident" in *Romeo and Juliet* is derived not from Ariosto, but goes back to the anonymous author of the story of *Ippolito e Leonora*—who in turn was probably influenced by Boccaccio's tale of Ricciardo Manardi—who reaches the balcony of Caterina da Valbona "collo ajuto d'una scala."

One of the most important elements in the *Romeo* legend is the heroine who expires on the body of her lover, who has already committed suicide because of frustrated love. As G. Brognoligo pointed out, this element is found in Boccaccio's tale of Girolamo, the lover of Salvestra. Girolamo's mother and sole surviving parent is opposed, for financial reasons, to his betrothal to Sal-

---

30 *ibid.*

Repeated references to the "ladder incident" occur in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Karl Young, ed., New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924, II, sc. 4, lines 182–83; II, sc. vi, lines 33–34; III, sc. i, lines 38–40; III, sc. i, lines 112–78.

vestra. He is therefore sent away to Paris; when he finally is allowed to return, he discovers that Salvestra has married during his absence. At last being convinced that Salvestra no longer loves him, Girolamo heroically commits suicide by holding his breath. At the church funeral, Salvestra falls dead on his body.  

Somewhat similar is the tale of the wife of Messer Guigielmo Rossiglione, who commits suicide as soon as she learns that her lover, Guigielmo Guadastagno, has been killed.

For convenience, the principal passages in the *Filocolo* and the *Decameron* to which reference has been made are here placed together:

(a) ... ma poiché così è avvenuto, quello che Amore nella vita di lei non mi volle concedere ora ch'el' è morta non mi potrà negare, che certo, s'io dovessi morire, la faccia che io tanto viva amai ora morta conterrà che io baci.

(b) ... io, mentre che vivesti, mai un solo sguardo da te aver non potei: per che ora, che difender non ti potrai, convien per certo che, così morta come tu se', io alcun bacio ti tolga.

(c) ... e con pietoso pianto dolendosi cominciò a baciare la donna, e a recarlosi in braccio: ... e ... con debile movimento sentì li debili polsi muoversi alquanto.

(d) ... e più volte con molte lagrime piangendo il baciò ... gli parve sentire alcuna cosa battere il cuore a costei.

(e) ... egli e il compagno a casa della madre di lui tacitamente la ne portarono, ... a quivi fatti accendere grandissimi fuochi, i freddi membri venne riconfortando, a' quali però non debitamente tornavano le perdute forze: per la qual cosa egli forse in ciò discreto fece un solenne bagno apparecchiare, nel quale molte e virtuose erbe fece mettere, ... 

(f) ... con un suo famigliare montato a cavallo, ... Era quivi la madre di lui ... la qual, ... di pietà mossà, chetamente con grandissimi fuochi e con alcun bagno in costei rivocò la smarrita vita.

(g) ... cominciò a chiamare la madre di lei, domandando ove ella fosse, ...
(h) ... gittò un gran sospiro e disse: Oimè! ora ove sono io?\[32\]
(i) ... e ritrovata una polvere di maravigliosa virtù, ... \[33\]
(j) ... e di questa tanta presane che a fare dormir tre giorni sufficiente fosse, ... \[34\]
(k) Il quale non durò guari che, lavorando la polvere, a costui venne un sonno subito e fiero nella testa, tale che stando ancora in pié s'addormentò, e addormentato cadde.\[35\]
(l) Ricciardo ... collo ajuto d'una scala salì sopra un muro, e poi d'in su quel muro appicandosi a certe morse d'un altro muro, con gran fatica e pericolo, se caduto fosse, pervenne in su'l verone, dove chetamente con grandissima festa dalla giovane fu ricevuto; ... \[36\]
(m) ... deliberò di più non vivere; e ristretti in se gli spiriti, senza alcun motto fare, chiuse le pugna, allato a lei si morì ... \[37\]

\[33\] \textit{Ibid.}, I, p. 277.
\[34\] \textit{Ibid.}
\[35\] \textit{Ibid.}
\[36\] \textit{Ibid.}
\[38\] \textit{Ibid.}, I, p. 365.
IV

THE NOVELLA OF "IPPOLITO E LEONORA"

It has been observed that Francesco da Buti, whose commentary appeared in 1380, seems to have made the first clear reference to the supposed hostility between the Montecchi and the Cappelletti. With possibly one other exception—the obscure Comento MS Tratto da Varj Chiosatori—no further mention of such a feud is found until 1530, the date of the first edition of Luigi da Porto's "Giulietta e Romeo."

On the other hand, factional disturbances were of frequent occurrence in Italian cities during the latter part of the Middle Ages, and often received literary treatment. It is therefore not surprising that the legend of the Montecchi and the Cappelletti should eventually have become confused with the more or less authentic accounts of family quarrels, of the sort that any Italian city could furnish.

Both in history and in legend, the Buondelmonte family was especially noted for chronic clan warfare. The story of their quarrel with the Amidicci, to which Dante refers twice, is vouched for by Giovanni Villani, and placed first among the novelle of Matteo Bandello. In 1200, the Buondelmonti clashed with the powerful Ubaldini family. Some of the Buondelmonti are also mentioned as being arrayed against the Giandonati, while all of them seem to have joined forces against the Cavalcanti. Somewhat later, according to the story of Ippolito e Leonora, their chief antagonists were—or had become—the famous house of Bardi.


2 Dante Alighieri. La Divina Comedia. Paradiso, XVI, vv. 136-47; Inferno, XXVIII, vv. 103-11, especially 106-8.


6 Members of the Bardi family were reputed to have been successful bankers as early
The "Istorietta Amorosa fra Leonora de' Bardi e Ippolito Buon­
delmonte" is an anonymous fifteenth-century novella. As the story goes, so great is the hostility between the Bardi and the
Buondelmonti that the chiefs of each faction always go accompanied
by 300 armed men. The eighteen-year-old Ippolito Buondelmonte and
the fifteen-year-old Leonora de' Bardi see each other at a fête, and fall
in love at sight. Ippolito, who follows Leonora at a respectful distance,
learns that she is a daughter of the Bardi.

Leonora, when she enters her house, gives Ippolito an amorous
nod, as a Parthian shot. Watching him from her window, she then
learns of his identity from a neighbor. With laments over her bad for­
tune, she bewails the ancient discord between the two families.

Ippolito, even more disconsolate than Leonora, loses sleep and appe­
tite. Formerly a handsome, witty, carefree Florentine youth, he be­
comes in a short time a melancholy, pale, thin creature, more dead
than alive. In desperation, his mother demands a confession from him,
invoking his filial gratitude. He obstinately refuses to reveal his
secret. As a last resort, she threatens him with her malediction, and
he breaks down.

Signora dei Buondelmonti, although deploring her son's choice, is
above all other things a mother. She promises to promote a meeting
of the lovers. To that end, she calls on the mother superior of the
convent of Monticelli, who is the maternal aunt of Leonora. The
sympathetic abbess allows Ippolito to visit her Sunday evening, and
invites a number of girls to be present, among whom is her niece
Leonora.
At the reception, the abbess arranges a tryst for the lovers. The following night, on promise of good conduct, Ippolito is to be permitted to conceal himself behind a curtain in the room of the unwitting Leonora. At the appointed hour Leonora, believing herself alone, confesses aloud her love for Ippolito. When she falls asleep at last, she dreams that she is embracing him, and calls to him in her slumber. Ippolito, forgetting his pledge, kisses her. She awakens, badly frightened. He says that he will die if she screams, offering her a dagger with which to stab him, if she so desires.

They fall into each other's arms. Leonora declares that her father would kill her if he knew that she loved Ippolito. As a public marriage ceremony is out of the question, she suggests that he visit her secretly in her room, at the Bardi house. Friday night he is to place a rope ladder at the foot of her window, which opens on the street. She will drop a string, to which Ippolito can attach the rope ladder. She will then pull the apparatus up to her room, and tie it to an iron bar.

Before granting this rendezvous, she insists upon carrying out an improvised wedding, in which without priest or witnesses, they swear mutual fidelity.

Friday evening Ippolito, placing his rope ladder in a large cap, goes punctually to meet Leonora. Unfortunately, his actions arouse the suspicions of a passing constable, who follows him. Ippolito flees, but his cap falls from his head, and the presence of the telltale rope ladder is revealed. The constable, who is now convinced that Ippolito is a thief, demands an explanation of his conduct. Ippolito, to protect Leonora's good name, admits that robbery has been his motive. He is brought before the podesta who, although favorably impressed by the youth's good looks and gentlemanly demeanor, is obliged to detain him.

Leonora waits in vain. Her worst fears are confirmed when she hears her father, Messer Amerigo de' Bardi, tell of Ippolito's arrest for robbery.

By order of the podesta, Ippolito's father is summoned. The young man stoutly refuses to answer his parent's questions, lest he betray Leonora. Reluctantly the podesta is compelled to order the execution bell rung.

As a final concession, Ippolito is allowed to pass before the Bardi house, ostensibly to apologize for his attempted crime. When Leonora catches sight of him, she descends a ladder, seizes the reins of the constable's horse, and declares that Ippolito is not to be executed while

---

14 Ibid., p. 287. For the rope-ladder motif, see Rotunda, op. cit., K1348.
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid., p. 291. This bell, in the Torre di S. Apollinare, annexed to the Bargello, or Palazzo del Podesta, was completed in 1381. It served, among other purposes, to announce public executions, and has not been in use since 1849.
she lives. With hair disheveled, she throws her arms around Ippolito's neck.

The lovers are now brought before the Signori, and Leonora announces that Ippolito is her rightful husband, who was merely paying her a conjugal visit.

Ippolito is acquitted, and a reconciliation of the Bardi and Buondelmonti follows.\(^{18}\)

There was also an anonymous verse redaction of this popular Italian prose tale, entitled *Il Pietoso Caso d'Ippolito e Dianora.*\(^{19}\)

Features of the tale of *Ippolito e Leonora* which seem consequential in the later development of the Romeo and Juliet legend are the following: The rival families have armed factional followers; the youthful lovers meet at a fête, and fall in love at sight; they lament inconsolably after learning each other's identity; Ippolito loses sleep, appetite, and good looks; his solicitous mother is unable at first to elicit an answer regarding his secret affair; a conniving abbess, replacing the corrupt friar in other versions, aids the lovers; Ippolito overhears a confession of love by Leonora; the heroine invites Ippolito to climb to her bedchamber by means of a rope ladder, perhaps suggested by the ladder used by Boccaccio's hero Ricciardo Manardi;\(^{20}\) there is a secret wedding, not only without witnesses as in other versions, but in this case also without a priest; the hero, attempting to see the heroine, arouses suspicion and is arrested as a thief; he is brought before the podesta and condemned to death; the rival families are reconciled.

\(^{(a)}\) \ldots parti ricchissime e \ldots nella inimicizia vecchia assai crudelmente insanguinate, per modo che nè messer Amerigo nè messer Buondelmonte ardivano d'andare con manco di trecento persone ben armate, \ldots \(^{21}\)

\(^{(b)}\) Di che essendo già Leonora d'anni quindici, e andando il di di Santo Giovanni a vedere la festa, e trovandosi Ippolito il quale era d'anni diciotto ancora lui in Santo Giovanni, gli venne risguardata la fanciulla la quale per ventura guardava lui. E siccome si scontraro con gli occhi, \ldots l'uno dell'altro fortemente s'innamorò.\(^{22}\)

\(^{(c)}\) \ldots Ippolito la seguitava assai onestamente un poco di lontano; intanto che lui conobbe lei essere figliuola del loro capitale nemico. La

---

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 293.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 294.

\(^{20}\) Cf. Chap. III, 1, of this book.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., ed., op. cit., p. 276.

\(^{22}\) Ibid.
fanciulla... fattasi alla finestra, vedendo Ippolito, domandò una vicina chi lui fusse. Intese come lui era figliuolo di messer Buondelmonte Buonelmonti, della qual cosa ella assai ne fu dolente e grama;...  

(d) (Lament of Leonora): "O iniqua e crudelissima fortuna nemica d’ogni piacere, come sofferisci tu che tante pene in me alberghi e riposì!... Oh dispietata sorte!... perchè tanta asprezza, perchè tanta crudeltà ne’ cuori della nostri padri!..."

(e) E già essendogli venuto a noia il cibo, si mutò tutto di complessione in modo, che dove egli era il più allegro, festivo, lieto, giocondo, faceto Giovane di Firenze, più bello più fresco e universale, in breve tempo divenne melanconico, magro, solitario, pallido doloroso e saturnino più che altro della città. E in fine, mancandogli li sentimenti naturali, divenia di giorno in giorno più simile ad uomo morto che vivo;...

(f) Ippolito essendo dietro alla cortina, vedeva e udiva ogni cosa;...

(g) E perchè tu non creda che io ami te con manco vigore che tu me, sappi che io sto in una camera, sola, la quale ha una finestra che risponde sopra la strada. E perchè altro partito non c’è al nostro amore, tu verrai venerdì notte alle cinque ore con una scala di corda a piè della finestra, e attaccherai la scala a quel filo che tu troverai pendere della finestra, ed io tirerò su il capo della scala e appiccherò al ferro della finestra, e tu allora sicuramente te ne verrai su per la scala in camera, ...

(h) Ma prima che di qui partiamo, voglio che a fede l’uno dell’altro ci promettiamo di non torre altra mogliera o marito.

(i) ... la maladetta fortuna gli apparecchiò uno strano caso, e questo fu che il Cavaliere del Podestà... vedendo Ippolito, cominciò a seguirlo. E fuggendo lui, la berretta gli cadde, dove'l Cavaliere veduta la scala, cominciò più volenteroso a seguirlo dubitando che non fusse qualche ladro;...

(j) E'l Podestà... volentieri non arebbe voluto che gli fusse capitato alle mani, vedendo la sua umanitate, bellezza e infinita gentilezza.

(k) ... lui sarà giustiziato come rubatore.
THE TALE OF MARIOTTO AND GANOZZA BY MASUCCIO
SALERNITANO (TOMMASO GUARDATI)

In the Thirty-Third Tale of Masuccio's *Novellino,* the scene is laid in Siena. No mention is made of the Montecchi and the Cappelletti, nor of any other supposedly rival "families." Yet this novella represents perhaps the greatest single step in the early development of the Romeo and Juliet plot, and contains most of the essential elements utilized by Shakespeare in his tragedy on that subject.

According to Masuccio's narrative, Mariotto Mignanelli is in love with Ganozza, daughter of a prominent citizen of Siena. For an unexplained reason, a secret wedding is desired, and an Augustinian friar is bribed to perform the ceremony. A few days later Mariotto, during a quarrel, strikes his adversary a fatal blow with a club. The Signori and the Podesta sentence him to perpetual banishment, proclaiming him a rebel.

After bidding Ganozza a tearful farewell and charging his brother Gargano to keep him informed of events in Siena, Mariotto escapes to Alexandria. There he takes refuge with his uncle, the rich merchant ser Nicolo Mignanelli.

During Mariotto's absence Ganozza, alleging various reasons, declines numerous offers of matrimony. Her father eventually becomes so exasperated that he demands from her an immediate decision. In despair, she sends for the friar. This trusted counselor composes for her a fluid made of divers powders; by drinking it she will not only sleep for three days, but will also appear to be dead. Ganozza, after first despatching a cousin to advise Mariotto of her project, swallows the potion and almost immediately falls to the ground in a stupor. Her father, summoned by the frightened servants, sends for a physician who pronounces her dead. The afflicted family, after watching over her all day and the following night, has her buried in a sepulcher at the church of St. Augustine.

Towards midnight the friar, aided by a companion, removes her.

---

from the tomb to his room and brings her back to consciousness by building a fire and making other necessary provisions. As soon as she has recovered her faculties, she disguises herself as a friar, and sets sail for Alexandria, intending to rejoin her husband.

Quite naturally Gargano informs Mariotto of the supposed death of Ganozza. At the same time, unfortunately, Ganozza's messenger is captured and killed by corsairs. Mariotto, believing his wife to be dead, embarks on a passing Venetian galley ship without warning his uncle and reaches Siena disguised as a pilgrim. He conceals himself within the church of St. Augustine until nightfall when, venturing forth, he attempts to pry off the lid of the sepulcher. A sexton, disturbed by the noise, arouses the friars, who surround Mariotto with cries of "Stop thief!" On being submitted to the rack, Mariotto confesses the whole story. In spite of the universal sympathy, especially on the part of the women who consider him the world's most perfect lover, he is condemned to death and beheaded.

Ganozza, on arriving at Alexandria, learns from ser Nicolò of the departure of Mariotto, and returns to Siena three days after the execution. Obtaining admission to a convent, she dies within a short time, lamenting the death of her lover.

The Argomento prefixed to the novella has a different ending. In this version Ganozza, finding Mariotto beheaded, falls upon his body and expires of grief.

Until recently, no serious attempt was made to determine the sources of this novella. Most critics have contented themselves with references to a number of more or less remote originals. Among the sources thus vaguely suggested may be mentioned Ovid's poetic version of the story of Pyramus and Thisbe, or perhaps the prose redaction in the Gesta Romanorum, which had the widest circulation in the Middle Ages and was frequently the subject of imitation. Masuccio may also have had vaguely in mind the well-known classical story of Hero and Leander, or perhaps the despairing love of Tristan, as recounted by Thomas.

In the novella of Masuccio, the Pyramus and Thisbe (or Hero and Leander) motif is combined with that of the sleeping potion.

---

Of the more ancient potion romances, the one most nearly approaching Masuccio's version is perhaps the *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon of Ephesus, which was written early in the Christian era, and once was proposed by the Shakespearean scholar Douce as a source for the legend of Romeo and Juliet. Douce admitted, however, that Xenophon's story had remained in manuscript until the seventeenth century, and the general opinion of modern scholars is that Masuccio never read it, although J. J. Munro contends that the existence of the *Ephesiaca* proves the existence of “some other source” having to do with sleeping potions.

It has been suggested that Masuccio may have been familiar with some of the later forms of the premature burial theme, such as the story of Fénice feigning death, as related in the *Cligès* of Chrétien de Troyes (ca. 1170). Or he may have read in another Old French romance how a wife of Solomon was believed to have simulated death for four days, in order to escape to her lover. He may also have been influenced by the fourteenth-century *novelliere* Giovanni Sercambi's fragmentary tale of Tamaris, wife of King Astechi, who feigns death by taking a sleeping potion, in order to be with her lover Martino, innkeeper at Luni. Another remote original which has been proposed for Masuccio concerns the premature burial of Ginevra degli Almieri.

While the stories cited above bear a certain resemblance to Masuccio's *Novella XXXIII*, no positive evidence exists that he was familiar with any of them. In fact, our information concerning the life of Masuccio is distressingly small. Not even regarding the dates of his birth or of his death is there any certainty.

---


fact, however, may be stated positively. His contemporaries considered him the imitator *par excellence* of Boccaccio. Luigi Pulci referred to him as "molti imitatore del nostro M. Giovanni Boccaccio." Furthermore, Masuccio himself, in the proemium of the third part of his *Novellino*, boasted of his indebtedness to the author of the *Decameron*.

Now, Francesco Flamini once observed that the "Giulietta e Romeo" of Luigi da Porto was occasionally suggestive of the Fourth Day of the *Decameron*. I will here venture the assertion that it is to Masuccio, far oftener than to Da Porto, that we should look for direct borrowing from Boccaccio.

For instance, Masuccio’s Ganozza, like Boccaccio’s Ferondo, after drinking a sleeping potion is stricken as she stands and falls to the ground apparently dead. Masuccio’s corrupt Augustinian friar here plays a role strikingly similar to that of the vicious priest in the *Decameron* who administers the potion to Ferondo and who, with a companion, removes the body of the victim at night.

Masuccio’s priest takes Ganozza to his room, just as Boccaccio’s Gentil Carisendi removes the unconscious Madonna Catalina to his house. Gentil Carisendi’s mother warms Madonna Catalina back to life "con grandissimi fuochi e con alcun bagno." Similarly, Masuccio’s priest restores Ganozza "con fuoco e altri necessarii provvedimenti." Owing to the exigencies of his plot, Masuccio has no lady at hand to administer a bath to Ganozza and, it would seem, attempts to cover this lacuna by the words "altri necessarii provvedimenti."

In describing the death of the lovers, Masuccio seems to follow the *Decameron* rather than the *Metamorphoses*. According to the *Argomento* prefixed to Masuccio’s *Novella XXXIII*, Ganozza expires of grief when she finds Mariotto beheaded, just as Boccaccio’s Salvestra falls dead on the lifeless body of Girolamo. In

---

16 See Chap. III, k.
Masuccio's tale itself, however, a slightly different ending is provided.

It might be noted also in passing that Ganozza, who seeks Mariotto in Alexandria, recalls the tale of Florio's going to the same city in search of Biancoflore, in Boccaccio's *Filocolo*. The grandfather of Florio is the great "admiral" of Alexandria, much as the uncle of Mariotto is a great merchant of Alexandria, ser Nicolò Mignanelli. Moreover, if Biancoflore is the victim of Mediterranean corsairs, so also is Ganozza's messenger.

The very fidelity with which Masuccio follows Boccaccio leads him into a glaring inconsistency in his treatment of the marital relations between Mariotto and Ganozza. Masuccio states that Mariotto, returning to Siena, wished to enter Ganozza's tomb, in order to accompany forever quello delicatissimo corpo, che vivendo non gli era concesso lo godere.20 Here the author, representing Mariotto as a frustrated lover, uses almost the exact words employed by Boccaccio to explain Gentil Carisendi's entrance into Madonna Catalina's tomb.21 The trouble is that in so doing Masuccio contradicts himself flatly; he has already stated that Mariotto’s marriage to Ganozza was happily consummated.22

Masuccio's self-contradiction has been strangely overlooked by critics, but seems to be telltale evidence that he was striving unsuccessfully to weld together two different sources. At the same time, it furnishes an argument against the generally accepted theory of a single lost source.28

It is probable that Masuccio's second model was the popular anonymous tale of *Ippolito e Leonora*. The wedding ceremony in Masuccio's novella, performed by a corrupt friar, recalls the highly informal marriage of Ippolito and Leonora, which was brought about through the connivance of an abbess.24 If Ippolito is falsely accused of robbing the house of his bride,25 Mariotto also

20 "... e volentieri, se avesse potuto, sarebbe dentro la sepultura intrato, a tale che con quello delicatissimo corpo, che vivendo non gli era stato concesso lo godere, morendo lo avesse col suo eternamente accompagnato;"—Masuccio, Mauro, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 275.
21 See Chap. III, a.
22 "E per dare al fatto con opera compimento, corrotto per dinari un frate augustinense, per mezzo del quale occultamente contrasse detto matrimonio, e appresso, da sì fatta colorata cagione pigliatase sicurtà, con non meno piacere de l'uno che de l'altro, interamente adimpiero loro bramosse voglie. E avendo de tal furto e licio in parte amato alquanto con felicità goduti, . . . "—Masuccio, Mauro, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 271.
23 See Munro, *loc. cit.*
24 Cf. Chap. IV, a.
25 See Chap. IV, i.
is wrongly charged with pilfering his wife’s grave. Both heroes are brought before the podesta and sentenced as thieves.\textsuperscript{26} The podesta hesitates to condemn Ippolito because of his handsome appearance and courteous bearing.\textsuperscript{27} Similarly, Mariotto is bewept not only by the podesta, but also by all the women who regard him as a \emph{perfetto amatore}. With grave robbery a common-place in Mediaeval and Renaissance fiction,\textsuperscript{28} it would have been a simple matter for Masuccio to transform the alleged house-breaking of Ippolito into the more serious charge against Mariotto.

Whatever suggestions Masuccio may have obtained from the \emph{Ippolito e Leonora} story, his chief model remains the \emph{Decameron}. A different theory for the sources of his famous Thirty-Third \emph{novella} was proposed, nevertheless, by the late Henri Hauvette, according to whom Masuccio borrowed from Sermini’s tale of la Montanina and Vannino the following features of the Romeo and Juliet legend:

\begin{enumerate}
\item emploi d’un narcotique permettant d’escompter le réveil au bout d’un temps déterminé;
\item complicité d’un ou de plusieurs moines, dont l’intervention n’est pas désintéressée.\textsuperscript{29}
\end{enumerate}

An attempt will be made to show that these features were probably taken directly from Boccaccio, rather than from Boccaccio’s imitator, Sermini.

\textbf{1.} Hauvette wrongly implies that Sermini invented the idea of a drug which would induce sleep for a given length of time. Boccaccio had already described a narcotic which would cause a semblance of death for three days,\textsuperscript{30} exactly like the one mentioned by Masuccio. This coincidence is the more remarkable in view of the variants later introduced. According to Luigi da Porto, the sleeping potion was effective for about forty-eight hours.\textsuperscript{31} Bandello changes the approximate time to forty hours,\textsuperscript{32} while Shakespeare compromises with forty-two hours.\textsuperscript{33} In Sermini’s \emph{novella} we are told that la Montanina, who had taken the drug earlier in the evening, regained consciousness

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. Chap. IV, 7.
\textsuperscript{27} Cf. Chap. IV, 7.
\textsuperscript{28} Cf. e.g. Boccaccio, \emph{Decameron}, Second Day, Fifth tale, and Ninth Day, First Tale.
\textsuperscript{30} Cf. Chap. III, 7.
\textsuperscript{31} Chiarini, Cino. \emph{Romeo e Giulietta.} Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1906, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{33} Shakespeare, \emph{Romeo and Juliet}, \emph{op. cit.,} IV, i, v. 105.
aille ventidue ore. She thus remained unconscious a far shorter time than in any other version of the Romeo and Juliet story which I know,44 in sharp contrast with the period of three days on which Boccaccio and Masuccio are exactly agreed. Furthermore, the duration of la Montanina's sleep is not announced in advance, as in the other versions. In fact, la Montanina's schedule is so loosely arranged that she has enough spare time on her hands to chat with her lover Vannino until six o'clock in the morning, when the monks come to open the tomb. In Masuccio's version, the friar and his companion enter Ganozza's tomb, as agreed, before the time for her awakening, just as Boccaccio's abbot, accompanied by a Bolognese monk, removes Ferondo from his sepulcher before he regains consciousness.35

What is even more extraordinary, Masuccio agrees with Boccaccio in the time required for the drug to take effect. Masuccio's Ganozza, like Boccaccio's Ferondo, is stricken as she stands and falls immediately, apparently dead.36 On the other hand, Sermini's heroine la Montanina, while waiting for her narcotic to work, has time to conceal her lover Vannino; to receive an unwelcome visit from her husband Andreoccio; to send for two monks, and to dictate to them her will.37 Other variants are numerous. According to Luigi da Porto, more than two hours were necessary to put Giulietta to sleep.38 Bandello reduced the required time to uno o duo quarti d'ora.39 For the immediate effectiveness of the drug, Masuccio thus agrees exclusively with Boccaccio.

Masuccio also seems to follow Boccaccio, rather than Sermini, for his description of the drug. Boccaccio had introduced una polvere di maravigliosa virtù.40 Masuccio also mentions a powder—or rather powders.41 Sermini, however, refers vaguely to a beverage, not to a powder.42

2. Masuccio agrees with Boccaccio in describing a single friar, or abbot, who is interested in disinterring a person buried alive,43

44 Boccaccio's abbot could regulate the length of Ferondo's sleep. In the first instance, Ferondo was to remain unconscious three days, as stated above. Later, the abbot gave Ferondo enough of the drug to cause sleep forse quattro ore. Boccaccio, Giovanni. Il Decamerone di Messer Giovanni Boccaccio. Pietro Fanfani, ed., Florence: Successori Le Monnier, 1904, Third Day, Eighth Tale, I, p. 281.


41 Ibid.


42 Bandello, op. cit., II, p. 391. When Giulietta drank the potion, however, the effect was more rapid than Bandello's Fra Lorenzo had estimated: "... e guari non stette che s'addormentò."—Ibid., p. 395.


43 "una certa acqua con certa composizione de diverse pulvere ..."—Masuccio, Mauro, ed., op. cit., p. 273.

44 "certa bevanda che avea in casa nascosta ..."—Sermini, op. cit., p. 18.

although in both instances the physical aid of a subservient companion is invoked. In Sermini’s account, there are two apparently equal monks who know nothing about the premature burial. As Hauvette himself pointed out, their role is substantially that of the grave robbing friar who is described by Boccaccio as being startled out of his wits by the unexpected emergence of Andreuccio from the tomb (Decameron, Second Day, Fifth Tale). Hauvette might have added, moreover, that Sermini borrows the same motif again from Boccaccio when he makes the friars, on the way to the burial, drop Vannino’s casket precipitately when they hear him cry from within: “Che diavolo mi fate voi?”

3. Last but not of least importance, the fact should not be overlooked that Sermini’s Vannino is buried with his lady love, la Montanina, a fate not at all shared by Masuccio’s Mariotto Mignanelli, nor by Boccaccio’s Gentil de’ Carisendi, principal model for Mariotto.

It would seem that Ireneo Sanesi was correct in classifying Sermini’s first novella primarily as a variant of the Decameron, X, 4 (the tale of Carisendi). Hauvette, however, was doubtless justified in stating that Sermini’s chief interest lies in the “combinaison d’éléments, empruntés à droite et à gauche, qu’il a réalisée.” Of these extraneous elements, the most important is surely the tale of Andreuccio da Perugia (Decameron II, 5), which, as has been observed, Sermini imitates at least twice. By his vagaries, nevertheless, Sermini so far separates himself from the main Romeo and Juliet theme that his influence on such a writer as Masuccio becomes, in my judgment, negligible.

In conclusion, and to summarize: The Thirty-Third Tale of Masuccio’s Novellino was patterned closely on the Decameron, with certain elements taken also from the Filocolo. Boccaccio’s influence was exerted directly, and not in a roundabout manner, through folk transmission. A secondary model was probably the story of Ippolito e Leonora, but the theory of Sermini’s influence, proposed by H. Hauvette, lacks adequate proof. Masuccio’s attempt to weld together materials from different sources was on the whole successful, but led to self-contradiction in at least one important instance, which is almost proof positive that his novella was not based on a single “lost document.”

44 Sermini, op. cit., p. 20.
46 Ibid., pp. 22–23.
48 Hauvette, op. cit., p. 124.
VI

LUIGI DA PORTO'S "GIULIETTA E ROMEO"

That Masuccio's tale of the adventures of Mariotto and Ganozza was the principal source for Luigi da Porto's "Giulietta e Romeo," a novella which agrees rather closely in plot with Shakespeare's tragedy, is generally acknowledged. It is my purpose to show that many of Da Porto's deviations from Masuccio are due to neglected literary influences rather than, as has commonly been supposed, to Da Porto's originality.

We may estimate the general extent to which Da Porto has diverged from his model by comparing the plot of his novella with that of the Thirty-Third Tale of Masuccio's Novellino. Here is a summary of the story of Giulietta and Romeo:

At the time of Bartolommeo della Scala, according to the narrative, two noble but hostile families resided in Verona—the Cappelletti and the Montecchi. Wearied with fighting and somewhat intimidated by the threats of the rulers of the city, the quarrelsome factions had lately observed a kind of truce. One night Romeo Montecchi, disguised as a nymph, followed his indifferent lady to a masquerade ball given by Messer Antonio Cappelletti. When the desperate youth was finally obliged to unmask, all the guests were astonished not only at his beauty, which surpassed that of any of the ladies present, but also at his audacious entrance into his enemy's house. As soon as Giulietta,
the only and supernaturally beautiful daughter of Antonio Cappelletti, caught sight of Romeo, she realized that she no longer belonged to herself.

The entertainment concluded some time after midnight with the *torchio* or *cappello*, a circular dance in which partners were exchanged. Romeo soon found himself by chance at the right side of Giulietta. At her left was Marcuccio Guercio ("Squint-Eyed"), an awkward but noble youth whose hands were always cold, in July as well as in January. When Giulietta took Romeo's hand, in accordance with the custom, she remarked that she was happy at his arrival, because of the warmth of his hand. Romeo boldly replied that her eyes warmed his heart. Giulietta, who was fearful that she would be observed in company with Romeo, managed to assure him nevertheless that he appeared to her more beautiful than any of the ladies present.

On his way home Romeo, after reflecting on the coolness of his first lady, resolved to devote himself to the second. Giulietta, in a soliloquy, at first upbraided herself for falling in love so uselessly. She declared that Romeo did not love her, and sought only to humiliate her for revenge upon the Cappelletti family. Upon reflection, she later admitted that perhaps she might marry him to reconcile the rival houses.

The youthful lovers promptly took advantage of their meager opportunities to see each other. At church, and through windows, they exchanged fond, clandestine glances. Heedless of the danger to his life, Romeo would often stand before Giulietta's house. He would even climb up to her window sometimes, and sit unobserved while he listened to her speak.

One moonlight night, as Romeo was about to climb to her balcony, Giulietta opened the window. Fearing the presence of an enemy, Romeo started to flee. Giulietta halted him, and asked an explanation of his conduct. He replied that he was following the dictates of love. "And if you were caught here," she objected, "would you not run great risk of being killed?" Romeo replied that he preferred to die as near her as possible. She answered him that she would willingly be united with him in honorable marriage.

One evening when the snowfall was exceptionally heavy, Romeo

"una sera che molta neve cadesa . . ."—Da Porto, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

The traditional date for the story of *Giulietta e Romeo*, as recorded by the chronicler Girolamo dalla Corte, is 1301. It is barely possible that Luigi da Porto may have had in mind the year 1300, in which the snowfall seems to have been exceptional:


An error of one year in the date would not be an unusual matter among chroniclers of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries.
LUIGI DA PORTO

requested Giulietta to permit him to enter her chamber, so that they could converse more freely. She declined, but urged that they be married secretly before her confessor, Friar Lorenzo da San Francesco. This friar, described as a great experimenter in natural phenomena as well as in magic, had already made Romeo his confidant, and had confessed to him his occult interests which were scarcely in harmony with his reputation for orthodoxy. He would not have dared therefore to refuse Romeo the favor of performing the wedding ceremony. Like Giulietta, he hoped that such a step might result in the pacification of the hostile houses. Accordingly Giulietta visited the monastery during Lent under the pretext of confession, and was married to Romeo in the presence of the friar, but without other witnesses.

The secret wedding bliss of Romeo and Giulietta lasted for a few nights only. Unfortunately the Montecchi and the Cappelletti soon came to blows again in the "Corso," or main thoroughfare of Verona. Romeo, who was unavoidably involved in the fracas, at first took care not to strike any of the Cappelletti, out of regard for Giulietta. When he observed finally that most of his own party were either wounded or dispersed, he attacked and slew Tebaldo Cappelletti, the fiercest of his antagonists who, we are told later in the story, was a cousin of Giulietta. The Cappelletti charged Romeo with homicide, with the result that he was perpetually banished from Verona.

Giulietta, who never betrayed signs of grief for her lost relative, was greatly agitated about the fate of Romeo. As she was unable to discuss matters freely with her parents, she resolved to consult the friar, and sent Pietro to arrange the interview. She met Romeo at the confessional, and suggested that she accompany him to Mantua, disguised as a page. For reasons of prudence, Romeo decided to go alone, leaving Pietro to inform him of events in Verona.6

When Romeo departed, Giulietta wept so bitterly that her beauty was marred. Her anxious mother, Madonna Giovanna Cappelletti, after a vain attempt to extract a confession from her, confided to Messer Antonio Cappelletti her own opinion that Giulietta desired to get married and was ashamed to mention the matter. The father then entered into matrimonial negotiations with the Count of Lodrone. In the meantime the mother, by way of consolation, promised Giulietta that she should promptly be married to a great gentleman. As Giulietta still remained dissatisfied, Madonna Giovanna asked her what she desired. Giulietta replied: "To die, nothing else."

Messer Antonio now attempted without result to force Giulietta to confess. Giulietta confided to Pietro that she would take poison rather

---

6 The status of Pietro seems peculiar, as he was not only one of the servants of Messer Antonio Cappelletti, but also a loyal friend of Romeo's. His primary role corresponds to that of Mariotto's brother, in the novella of Masuccio.
than give up her husband—a decision which was promptly communicated to Romeo.

In view of Giulietta’s distress, the Cappelletti family decided to hasten the wedding. Giulietta induced her mother to take her directly to San Francesco, ostensibly for the purpose of confession. As soon as she was alone with the friar, Giulietta informed him that the wedding was to take place in a palace belonging to her father, some two miles from Verona in the direction of Mantua. She declared that unless he would give her poison, she would stab herself. The friar protested that as he was confessor to half the city of Verona, he did not desire to allow his name to be involved in a scandal. Instead of poison, he provided her with a powder which would cause her to sleep, apparently dead, for a space of forty-eight hours. He promised that after her burial in the vault of the Cappelletti, in the Franciscan cemetery, he would remove her to his cell. Thence he would take her, disguised as a friar, to Mantua. When he inquired whether she would be afraid of the corpse of Tebaldo, who was buried in the Cappelletti vault, she replied that she would not hesitate to pass through Hell in order to reach Romeo. After cautioning her to warn Romeo by letter of her project, the friar produced a small jar of powder, which she was to drink with water about three or four o’clock in the morning. The powder would take effect about two hours later.

After her departure from the confessional, Giulietta spoke enthusiastically to her mother about the good qualities of the friar. Her parents, who were quick to observe that her mood had become more cheerful, would readily have suspended matrimonial negotiations, had not matters already gone too far. Giulietta was sent to the Cappelletti country house, accompanied by two aunts, in order that she might meet there members of her fiancé’s family.

Giulietta now decided to lose no time. Towards four o’clock in the morning, feigning thirst, she had her maid bring a cup of cold water. She remarked, in the presence of this servant, as well as of her aunts: “My father certainly will not give me a husband against my will, if I can help it.” Thereupon she put the powder in the water, ostensibly to refresh herself. The women present, who suspected nothing, went back to sleep. After drinking the mixture, Giulietta arose and dressed. Then crossing her hands over her chest, she awaited the effects of the beverage.

When she was later discovered apparently dead, her maid and her aunts quickly recalled her strange words of the preceding night. The maid went into paroxysms of grief and embraced the still form of her young mistress. Messer Antonio Cappelletti, all trembling, sent for a physician, who pronounced Giulietta dead. The news finally traveled from mouth to mouth to Madonna Giovanna Cappelletti, who fell in
a faint. On recovering consciousness, she berated Giulietta for leaving her without a last farewell.

Giulietta was buried with great pomp in the Cappelletti vault. Meanwhile Friar Lorenzo had entrusted the explanatory letter to another friar who was on his way to Mantua. After a futile attempt to find Romeo at home, this messenger kept the letter, rather than deliver it to a stranger.

Pietro, who naturally believed that Giulietta was dead, tearfully related to Romeo the story of her burial. Romeo turned pale, and drew his sword to kill himself, but was restrained by Pietro. Disguised as a peasant, Romeo then started for Verona, taking along a vial of "serpent's poison," which he habitually kept in a chest for emergency use.

Romeo reached Verona undetected, and betook himself after nightfall to the vault, which he entered and closed behind him. When he beheld the apparently lifeless body of Giulietta, by the light of a lantern, he broke into laments and repeatedly kissed her. Finally he drank his poison, and again embraced Giulietta.

At this juncture, Giulietta awoke, and feared at first that the friar had attempted to betray her. As soon as she recognized Romeo, she kissed him a thousand times, while he explained to her his fatal error. She begged leave to die with him, but he entreated her to live on so that she might remember him.

About an hour before dawn, Friar Lorenzo opened the sepulcher, with the aid of a companion, and saw that Giulietta was all disheveled. He called on Romeo to look at her. At the sound of her name, Romeo raised languid eyes, then died, with a sigh.

In vain, the friar begged Giulietta to leave the vault, promising to have her secluded in a convent. She had resolved to die, and her only request was that the secret of her death be not divulged, so that she might remain buried with Romeo. Then she held her breath for a long time and expelled it with a loud cry, falling dead on Romeo's body.

The constabulary of the Podesta, in pursuit of a robber, surprised the friar and his companion at the tomb. When the friar was arrested, the Cappelletti, aware of his confidential relations with Romeo, demanded that he be put on the rack and made to explain his strange actions at the vault. He replied that he had gone to say prayers over Giulietta's body, in order to liberate her soul from Purgatory.

Unfortunately for the friar, some hostile brethren opened the tomb and found the bodies. Thereupon Friar Lorenzo, who was obliged to confess that he had lied in order to keep faith with the dead lovers, related their story. Bartolommeo della Scala was moved to great pity. The parents of the young couple became reconciled at the graves, and ordered a beautiful monument erected.

Let us consider first the conclusion of "Giulietta e Romeo,"
where the widest divergence from Masuccio's plot is manifest.' Even so reliable a scholar as the late Henri Hauvette felt that Da Porto's dénouement represented an entirely new departure from all previous versions of the legend, including the story of Hero and Leander, as well as the Pyramus and Thisbe tragedy. According to Hauvette, Da Porto differed from his precursors in allowing to the lovers a brief moment of heart-rending mutual recognition, when Giulietta awakens before the expiring Romeo's eyes. Yet a textual comparison will show that this alleged invention of Da Porto's is taken, so far as its essential elements are concerned, from Ovid's Metamorphoses.

It will be recalled that according to Ovid Pyramus, who sees the torn veil which Thisbe has left behind in her panic, concludes that she is dead. In despair he presses a dagger into his heart. Thisbe, returning, obtains one look of recognition from the dying Pyramus, and then kills herself. Before committing suicide, however, she pleads with her lover to answer her:

Pyrame, . . . quis te mihi casus ademit?
Pyrame, responde: tua te carissima Thisbe
Nominat; exaudi, vultusque attolle iacentes!11

According to Da Porto, as we have seen, Romeo supposes that Giulietta is dead, and drinks poison. In the name of Giulietta, Friar Lorenzo begs the dying Romeo to reply: "O Romeo! vedi la tua carissima Giulietta, che ti prega che la miri! perchè non rispondi, almeno a lei, nel cui grembo ti giaci?"12 The sound of

8 "sur un point, il a été créateur, en ce sens qu'il a inventé un motif profondément tragique, celui qui constitue le dénouement. Il ne manque certes pas d'aventures célèbres, depuis Héro et Léandre ou Pyrame et Thisbé, où l'on voit des amoureux incapables de se survivre l'un à l'autre; mais Luigi da Porto a imaginé une complication qui crée une situation nouvelle."—Hauvette, op. cit., p. 158.
9 "Roméo, lui, arriverait à temps pour assister au réveil de Juliette, s'il n'avait eu la fâcheuse idée de commencer par avaler son poison; or celui-ci n'agit pas si vite que Juliette ne se réveille sous ses yeux, et alors il y a un court moment où les deux amants se retrouvent vivants, juste assez de temps pour comprendre qu'ils sont irrémédiablement perdus l'un à l'autre."—Ibid., p. 159.
10 Hauvette writes: "Parmi les moyens ingénieux auxquels les romanciers ont eu recours pour ordre les nefs de leurs héros—ou par contrecoup ceux de leurs lec teurs et lectrices—celui-ci est assurément un des plus remarquables."—Ibid.
12 Da Porto, op. cit., p. 35.
Thisbe's name produces such a powerful effect on Pyramus, that for one brief moment he raises his drooping eyes:

Ad nomen Thisbes oculos iam morte gravatos
Pyramus erexit, visaque reconditid illa.\textsuperscript{13}

The mention of Giulietta's name produces an identical effect upon Roméo:

Romeo al caro nome della sua donna alzò alquanto i languidi occhi dalla vicina morte gravati, e, vedutala, li rinchiuse; e poco dappoi tutto torcendosi, fatto un breve sospiro, si morì.\textsuperscript{14}

Note the following expressions which Da Porto translates more or less literally from Ovid: The Latin tua . . . carissima Thisbe reappears as the Italian la tua carissima Giulietta. Pyrame, responde becomes O Romeo! . . . perchè non rispondi? Ad nomen Thisbes is rendered by al caro nome della sua donna. Oculos iam morte gravatos . . . erexit is given as alzò . . . i languidi occhi dalla vicina morte gravati. In this last clause, Da Porto has added the adjective languidi which, however, may readily have been suggested by Ovid's vultusque . . . iacientes.

The message which Giulietta sends to her parents by Friar Lorenzo is a free translation of the unheard dying words of Thisbe. Giulietta says: “. . . vi prego, che i nostri miseri padri in nome di ambo noi vogliate pregare, che quelli, i quali amore in uno stesso fuoco arse e ad una stessa morte condusse, non sia loro grave in uno stesso sepolcro lasciare.”\textsuperscript{15} Thisbe's prayer is likewise addressed, in the name of her lover as well as of herself, to all their parents. Like Giulietta, she begs that just as love has joined them in death, they may be buried in the same tomb:

\begin{quote}
o multum miserī, meus illiusque parentes,
\textit{ut quos certus amor, quos hora novissima iunxit, componi tumulo non in videatis eodem.}\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Giulietta addressing the dead Roméo says that only death can separate her from him, and that she is determined that even death cannot separate her; “. . . acciocché da te, dal qual solo la morte mi potea separare, la stessa morte separare non mi possa.”\textsuperscript{17}
Thisbe’s language is almost identical, even to the wistful repetition of the word morte:

... quique a me morte revelli
heu sola poteras, poteris nec morte revelli.\(^\text{18}\)

It may be objected that Thisbe *comes back* to the dying Pyramus, whereas Giulietta *awakens* in the presence of the expiring Romeo. This apparently original touch, nevertheless, is also traceable in part to Ovid, by Da Porto’s own admission.\(^\text{19}\) Romeo, as he kisses the deathlike Giulietta, and marveling, feels the warmth of life returning to her veins, is consciously like Pygmalion as he kisses the ivory statue of the virgin which, to his amazement, warms under his lips.\(^\text{20}\) At the same time, some of Romeo’s words recall those of Boccaccio’s Gentil de’ Carisendi.\(^\text{21}\) For the passage in question, we may conclude that Da Porto’s originality consists principally in the prolongation of the recognition scene found in Ovid, for Romeo is allowed sufficient time before expiring to learn of Giulietta’s sleeping potion, and to discover that her letters have gone astray.\(^\text{22}\)

So far as I am aware, there are no more cases of word for word borrowing from Ovid by Da Porto. Yet it is perhaps in order to list a few instances where Da Porto diverges from Masuccio, but in a general manner agrees with Ovid.

1. The tale of “Giulietta e Romeo,” like that of Pyramus and

\(^{18}\) Ovid, *op. cit.*, IV, vv. 152–53.

\(^{19}\) “Romeo, la donna viva sentendo, forte si maravigliò, e forse di Pigmalion ricordandosi disse: . . .”—Da Porto, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

\(^{20}\) Ovid describes the scene thus: “Ut redit, simulacra suae petit ille puellae, /incumbensque toro dedit oscula; visa tepere est”—Ovid, *op. cit.*, X, vv. 280–81. For Ovid’s account of Pygmalion’s amazement, see line 287: “Dum stupebit,” et cetera. Cf. the story of Alcyone who, while she was being transformed into a kingfisher, kissed with her newly grown beak the senseless body of her shipwrecked husband Ceyx, and restored him to life. Husband and wife although transformed into birds, continued their conjugal relations:

\textit{Ut vero texit mutum et sine sanguine corpus,}
directos artus amplexa recentibus alis,
frigida nequiquam duro dedit osca rostro.
Senserit hoc Ceyx, an vultum motibus undae
tollerere sit visus, populus dubitabat; at ille
senserat, et tandem, saperis miserae, ambo
alio mutantur. Fatis obnoxius idem
tunc quoque mansit amor, nec coniugale solutum
foedus in alitibus; coeunt, fiuntque parentes, . . .


Thisbe, is related. For Ovid, the narrator is one of the daughters of Minyas; for Da Porto, it is the Veronese archer Pellegrino.

2. For Da Porto, as for Ovid, the lovers have the handicap of parental opposition. By way of contrast, in Masuccio’s narrative the reasons for the secret wedding of Mariotto and Ganozza remain unexplained.

3. Giulietta, like Thisbe, commits suicide. On the other hand Masuccio, in two different versions, makes Ganozza die of grief. According to Masuccio’s dénouement, as we have seen, Ganozza obtains admission to a convent and dies within a short time, lamenting the loss of her lover. In the Argomento prefixed to Masuccio’s novella, Ganozza finds Mariotto beheaded and falls upon his body, dead from grief. Da Porto retains Masuccio’s ending only to the extent that he has Friar Lorenzo propose in vain to Giulietta that she retire to a convent.

4. For Da Porto, as for Ovid, the death of the lovers results in a post-mortem parental blessing, a feature which is completely lacking in Masuccio’s version. According to Ovid, the cremated bodies of Pyramus and Thisbe repose, with parental consent, in the same urn. In Da Porto’s novella, the hostile Montecchi and Cappelletti families order a common monument for the deceased Romeo and Giulietta.

We may therefore conclude that there were two main sources of “Giulietta e Romeo”; namely, Masuccio and Ovid. If we assume the sleeping potion to be the basic element of our novella, then we may perhaps suppose that Da Porto began by imitating Masuccio, and added as an afterthought features from Ovid’s

According to the well-known version of Ovid, Pyramus and Thisbe are neighbors (Metamorphoses, IV, v. 57), who are smitten with mutual love, in spite of parental opposition (ibid., IV, v. 61). As H. Hauvette notes, Paolo and Daria, the hero and heroine of the poem Di Paolo e Daria amanti (1495), are separated by reasons of family. Daria is descended from a legitimate branch of the Visconti family, while Paolo, who is also a Visconti, but with the baton of illegitimacy, is of course no proper suitor for her. During the absence of Paolo, Daria is buried, apparently dead. Paolo, on his return, forces open the tomb. Suspecting that Daria is still alive, he summons a doctor, who heals her. The poem has many points of resemblance to the chante-fable of Ancassin et Nicolette, the roles of the lovers being to some extent reversed. —Cf. Hauvette, op. cit., pp. 57–60; and Rodolfo Renier, “Gaspare Visconti,” in Archivio Storico Lombardo, XIII (1886), p. 526. Cf. Rotunda, op. cit., T95.


Cf. ibid., p. 270.

Cf. Rotunda, op. cit., p. 35.


“Quel ordinate un bel monumento, sopra il quale la cagione della loro morte scolpita fosse, i due amanti con pompa grandissima e solenne, dal signore, da’ lor parenti e da tutta la città pianti ed accompagnati, seppelletti furono . . .” —Da Porto, op. cit., p. 40.
**Metamorphoses.** If, on the other hand, we consider as basic the false report of, or belief in, the heroine's death, resulting in the suicide of both hero and heroine, then we may suppose that Ovid furnished to Da Porto his first model, and that the borrowing from Masuccio came later.

A very tenuous support for the second theory is found in the apparently subjective character of Da Porto's inspiration. It is well known that he served in the imperial Venetian army against Udine and that he left an important record of his military career in his *Lettere storie.* On the basis of these letters, C. Foligno has conjectured that Da Porto was in love with la Ginevra, of the anti-imperial faction at Udine, and that she discouraged his advances for political reasons.

Such a case of frustrated love, if authentic, would seem to lend to the tale of “Giulietta e Romeo” the semblance of an autobiographical setting. In the introduction to his novella the author represents himself as following a military career during his youth, as traveling, disconsolate and lovesick, towards Udine, and as accompanied by a faithful companion, the Venetian archer Pellegrino. By way of warning to the author, Pellegrino is supposed to relate *en route* the tale of Giulietta and Romeo, whose love was blighted by political strife.

Thus if we were to judge simply from the framework which Da Porto furnished for “Giulietta e Romeo,” and forget how artificial Renaissance literary settings were likely to be, we might suppose that the basic idea from which our novella sprang was a personal experience of love brought to nought through factional strife. Granted such an assumption, we might possibly conjecture that our author, in quest of literary parallels to his situation, would be more likely to turn first to Ovid, with his tale of love thwarted by the harsh opposition of neighboring parents, rather

---

30 These elements are of course found also in the myth of Hero and Leander. In fact, Hero's tower seems closer to Giulietta's balcony than the hole-in-the-wall where Pyramus and Thisbe communicated secretly. Furthermore, Leander first met Hero at a fête. Parental opposition appears both in the stories of Pyramus and Thisbe and of Hero and Leander. Cf. Rotunda, *op. cit.,* T83.


32 Da Porto, *op. cit.,* p. 4. Hauvette (*op. cit.,* p. 139) says that this recital supposedly concerns the ride from Gradisca, on the Isonzo, to Udine. This trip probably occurred in 1511. Luigi da Porto decided to write out the story and dedicate it to a cousin of his, Maddona Lucina Savorgnana.
than to Masuccio who, as has been noted, assigns no motive for the secret marriage of Mariotto and Ganozza. To be sure, Da Porto could not be absolutely certain from Ovid's words, \textit{sed vetuere patres}, that the families of Pyramus and Thisbe were hostile to each other, but such would probably have seemed a natural inference to the chronicler of the civil strife in Friuli between the Guelf chief Antonio Savorgnano and his relentless neighbor across the street, Messer Alvise dalla Torre, head of the Ghibelline faction.\textsuperscript{28} Da Porto's natural interest in warring factions would account too for his early garbled citations from \textit{alcune vecchie croniche},\textsuperscript{34} which were in reality taken from the Dante commentator Benvenuto da Imola, or more likely, from the abridgment by Christoforo Landino.\textsuperscript{36}

Whatever Da Porto's starting point may have been, his principal contribution lies in his adaptation of Masuccio's narrative to the Ovidian framework. Such an adaptation involves the abandonment of Ovid's gory-mouthed lion, which apparently killed Thisbe, and the substitution of Masuccio's \textit{motif} of the premature burial of the heroine. Once this feature has been altered, however, the two narratives have been joined with such skill that it is rarely possible to discover seams. Let us take, for example, the case of Masuccio's hero Mariotto who, as has been seen, during a quarrel and for no assigned reason, strikes his unnamed adversary a fatal blow with a club. Da Porto, who insists always on precision for the sake of realism, gives a name to this unknown adversary. He becomes Tebaldo, a cousin of Giulietta. Thus, at one stroke Da Porto supplies a motive for Romeo's quarrel and welds Masuccio's \textit{novella} with the Ovidian story of apparently hostile families.

Where perfect assimilation is impossible, Da Porto usually


\textsuperscript{34}Da Porto, "Giulietta e Romeo," \textit{op. cit.}, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{36}Luigi da Porto seems familiar with the commentaries of both Christoforo Landino (\textit{cf. Brognoligo, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 73-74}) and Francesco da Buti. In the opening paragraph of his \textit{novella}, he writes:

"E avvegnaché io alcune vecchie croniche leggendo abbia trovato, come queste due famiglie unite cacciarono Azzo da Esti governator della detta terza, il quale poscia col favore de' Sambonifazi vi ritornò; . . ."

Here he agrees perfectly with Benvenuto da Imola and Christoforo Landino, and with no known chronicler.

For the story of the hostility of the two "families," he perhaps follows da Buti.

Apparently he has also read the \textit{Cronaca MS Udinese} already referred to. (\textit{Cf. Chapter I, note 30, of the present study.})
accepts Ovid's version, and rejects Masuccio's. Such is notably the case in the dénouement, although even there the author contrives, while reversing the roles of certain characters chiefly for the sake of verisimilitude, to preserve at the same time a portion of the conclusion found in Masuccio's novella.

As a first example of such a reversal, it will be recalled that Masuccio's Ganozza, on awakening, encounters the corrupt Augustinian friar, who according to prearranged schedule comes to take her away from the tomb. Here Da Porto agrees with Masuccio only so far as the heroine's original design is concerned. His Giulietta plans to be attended by Friar Lorenzo, but on recovering consciousness unexpectedly finds herself in the embrace of Romeo, whom she at first mistakes for the Franciscan brother. By the dramatic substitution of Romeo for Friar Lorenzo, Da Porto accomplishes the double purpose of welding Masuccio's narrative with the Pygmalion theme, and of emphasizing the churchman's weakness of character. By a second reversal of roles, Da Porto puts into Friar Lorenzo's mouth the words of Thisbe: tua te carissima Thisbe... nominat, et cetera, this time fusing Masuccio's narrative with the Ovidian tragedy of Pyramus and Thisbe. By a third reversal of roles, Da Porto sheds further light on the dubious character of Friar Lorenzo when he represents him as being arrested for grave robbing, and making a miserable defense of himself, thus playing, with greater plausibility, a part which belonged in Masuccio's novella to the hero Mariotto. At the same time, by this substitution still another reconciliation is effected between the versions of Masuccio and of Ovid, making it possible for Romeo to commit suicide in the Ovidian manner, and not be hanged, according to the dénouement of Masuccio.

It might be remarked that Da Porto, following always the same technique, assimilates not only Ovid's story of Pyramus and Thisbe, as well as Masuccio's Thirty-Third Tale, but also bits of novelle by other authors. For example, let us revert a moment to Da Porto's account of the death of Giulietta which, as has been observed, agrees generally with Ovid's story of the fate of Thisbe. Nevertheless, it will be recalled that while Thisbe kills herself with the bloody dagger of Pyramus, Giulietta, on the other hand, holds her breath until she expires, precisely after the manner of

---

81 Ibid., p. 36. See Hauvette, op. cit., p. 156; Brognoligo, op. cit., p. 71.
Boccaccio’s hero Girolamo, the lover of Salvestra. It will be recalled also that unfortunately for Da Porto, Boccaccio’s heroine Salvestra, like the Ganozza of Masuccio’s *Argomento*, does not commit suicide in the Ovidian manner, but falls dead upon the lifeless body of her suitor. To reconcile his own narrative with that of Boccaccio, Da Porto is thus obliged to resort to a particularly violent reversal of roles, substituting his heroine, Giulietta, for Boccaccio’s hero, Girolamo.

Possibly Da Porto incorporated also into his *novella* elements from *Ippolito e Leonora*, a tale which had in common with “Giulietta e Romeo” the themes of love thwarted because of factional rivalry, and of a marriage resulting in the healing of party strife. In particular, the following features of *Ippolito e Leonora* reappear in “Giulietta e Romeo”: the leaders of both factions go about accompanied by armed bands; the hero and heroine meet at a *festa* and fall in love immediately; the heroine laments because fate has made her love an enemy of her house; and the hero is guilty of eavesdropping, not on the balcony, as in Da Porto and Shakespeare, but in the heroine’s bedchamber. If Da Porto utilized the tale of *Ippolito e Leonora*, we are confronted with at least one more instance of the substitution of the heroine for the hero. Ippolito, not unlike Giulietta, loses sleep, appetite, and handsome looks because of his passion. He alarms his mother, with whom he has relations strikingly similar to those existing between Giulietta and her mother Madonna Giovanna. Ippolito’s mother, like Giulietta’s, attempts to elicit a confession from him. Such a reversal of roles would have been necessary to amalgamate the *Ippolito e Leonora* story with Masuccio’s narrative, because in Masuccio’s version only the heroine can possibly be subjected to such parental criticism, since she remains at home, while the hero is in exile.

In spite of his extensive borrowing, it must be admitted, however, that Luigi da Porto’s originality goes far beyond the mere

---


reconciliation of more or less conflicting sources. He apparently invents the names of Romeo and Giulietta,\textsuperscript{44} characters of Mar­cuccio, Tebaldo and the Count of Lodrone, and the fante, or maid. He is even quite fertile in the matter of plot construction. To him we owe such episodes as the following: Romeo ventures to attend the Cappelletti ball, in pursuit of his disdainful mistress.\textsuperscript{46} When, during an outbreak of hostilities between the rival factions, Romeo kills Tebaldo, Giulietta weeps because of Romeo’s banishment, not because of her relative’s death.\textsuperscript{46} Obliged to accept the Count as her husband, Giulietta asks the friar for poison, threatening to stab herself in case of refusal. She takes the sleeping potion while she is on a visit to the Cappelletti country place, near Verona, whither she has been accompanied by two aunts, but not by her mother.\textsuperscript{47} The friar fails to deliver the letter sent by Giulietta, because he can not find Romeo.\textsuperscript{48}

Notable advances are made in the psychology of some of the characters. The actions of the elder Cappelletti are vividly portrayed. More especially the phases of the love of Romeo and Giulietta, their poetic if slightly euphuistic dialogue, are given a permanent form which often has been mistaken for historic fact.\textsuperscript{49}

For his psychological analyses, Da Porto repeatedly resorts to the technique later known as the \textit{préparation du dénouement}, which was dear to the dramatic school of Scribe. Da Porto’s Giulietta, for example, unlike Ganozza, threatens in the presence of Friar Lorenzo to kill herself,\textsuperscript{50} thus giving the reader a foretaste of the heroine’s final suicide before the corpse of Romeo. Furthermore, Da Porto’s Romeo who, unlike Mariotto, has to be restrained by the servant Pietro from stabbing himself,\textsuperscript{51} forecasts the Romeo who takes poison beside the funeral couch of Giulietta.

\textsuperscript{44}Brognoligo, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 74. Brognoligo associates the name of Giulia (Giulietta) with Giulio Cesare, and connects Romeo with pilgrimages to Rome.

\textsuperscript{46}Da Porto, “Giulietta e Romeo,” \textit{op. cit.}, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., p. 15 and passim.

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., pp. 24–25.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., p. 28.

\textsuperscript{50}Cf. especially the untrustworthy Girolamo dalla Corte, the only Italian chronicler who mentions Romeo and Giulietta. A pertinent extract from his \textit{Istorie di Verona} which first appeared in 1594 was reproduced by Alessandro Torri in his \textit{Giulietta e Romeo}, Pisa, 1831, pp. 133–28. Torri used the edition of Verona, 1596. Torri himself was convinced that the story of Romeo and Juliet was a historic fact. Even as late as 1907, Alethea Wiel wrote: “The enmity between the houses of Montagu and Capulet was indeed a fact historically true, . . . ”—Wiel, A. \textit{The Story of Verona}. London, 1907, p. 264.

\textsuperscript{51}Da Porto, “Giulietta e Romeo,” \textit{op. cit.}, p. 22.

\textsuperscript{60}Ibid., p. 29.
Virtually along the same lines is Da Porto’s treatment of the friar, whose actions remain unaccountable in Masuccio’s novella. Da Porto gives us an early hint of Friar Lorenzo’s future conduct by introducing him as a sort of necromancer, bound to Rome by confidential relations, yet careful of his reputation in the community.

To summarize: Ovid’s tale of Pyramus and Thisbe, as well as his Pygmalion story, were important direct sources for Luigi da Porto’s “Giulietta e Romeo.” It is indeed conceivable that they were Da Porto’s original model, and that the use of Masuccio’s Thirty-Third novella was an afterthought. Among Da Porto’s minor sources may certainly be mentioned Boccaccio, and possibly also the author of Ippolito e Leonora. Da Porto’s literary sources seem to have been utilized directly, and not through folk transmission. Usually Da Porto has welded his materials skillfully, resorting frequently to the expedient of reversing the roles of important characters. In case of conflict between Masuccio and Ovid, however, he has generally preferred Ovid as his guide, the one important exception being the abandonment of Ovid’s gory-mouthed lion which apparently killed Thisbe and the substitution of Masuccio’s motif of the premature burial of the heroine. Despite the extensiveness of his borrowings, however, Da Porto possessed much originality, both in the invention of plots and in the creation of characters. His psychological analysis represents a remarkable advance over Masuccio, and particularly notable is the technique by which he carefully prepares the reader for the final tragic actions of the protagonists.

For convenience, the principal passages in “Giulietta e Romeo” to which reference has been made are here placed together.

(a) E avvegnachè io alcune vecchie chroniche leggendo abbia trovato, come queste due famiglie unite cacciarono Azzo da Esti governator della detta terra, il quale poscia col favore de’ Sambonifazi vi ritornò; . . .

(b) . . . avvenne un carnevale che in casa di messer Antonio Cappelletti, . . .

(c) . . . un giovane de’ Montecchi, una sua crudel donna seguendo,

(d) E passando la mezza notte e il fine del festeggiare venendo, il

\[\text{Ibid., p. 5.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., p. 6. Cf. Chap. IV, a.}\]
\[\text{Da Porto, “Giulietta e Romeo,” loc. cit.}\]
ballo del _torchio_ o del _cappello_, che dire il vogliamo, e che tutto di nel finir delle feste veggiamo usare, s'incominciò; nel quale in cerchio standosi, l'uomo la donna, e la donna, l'uomo a sua voglia permutando si piglia ... e come in tal ballo si usa di fare, la bella sua mano in mano presa, ... 55

(e) Onde fra due pensieri di continuo vivendo, a sè stessa più volte disse: O sciocca me, a quale vaghezza m i lascio io in così strano labirinto guidare, ove, senza scorta restando, uscire a mia posta non ne potrò? giacchè Romeo Montecchi non m'ama, perciocchè per la nimistà che ha co' miei, altro che la mia vergogna non può cercare; e posto che per isposa egli me volesse, il padre mio darmegli non consentirebbe giammai. Dappoi nell'altro pensiero venendo, dicea: Chi sa? forse che per meglio rappacificarsi insieme queste due case, le quali già stanche e sazie sono di farsi tra loro più guerra, mi potrebbe ancor venire fatto d'averlo in quella guisa ch'io lo disio. 56

(f) ... ed ora sopra la finestra della sua camera per forza tiratasi, ivi, senza ch'ella o altri il sapesse, ad udirla parlare si sedea, ... 57

(g) Era questo frate dell'Ordine Minore, filosofo grande, e sperimentatore di molte cose così naturali come magiche; ed in tanta amistà con Romeo era, che la più stretta forse in que' tempi tra due non si sarebbe trovata. 58

(h) Allora in presenza del frate, che il tutto in confessione diceva accettare, per parola di presente Romeo la bella giovane sposò; ... 59

(i) ... nè Montecchi a Cappelletti, nè Cappelletti a Montecchi ceder volendo, nella via del corso si attaccarono una volta insieme; ove combattendo Romeo, e alla sua donna rispetto avendo, di percuotere alcuno della sua casa si guardava. Pure alla fine essendo molti de' suoi feriti, e quasi tutti della strada cacciati, vinto dall'ira, sopra Tebaldo Cappelletti corso, che il più fiero de' suoi nemici parea, d'un solo colpo in terra morto lo distese; e gli altri, che già per la morte di costui erano come smarrìti, in grandissima fuga rivolse. 60

(j) Pure alla fine diss'ella a lui: Che farò io senza di voi? certo di più poter vivere non mi dà il cuore; meglio sarebbe che io con voi, ovunque ve ne andaste, mi venissi: io m'accorcerò queste chiome, e come servo vi verrò dietro, ne da altri meglio, o più fedelmente che da me, potrete esser servito. 61

(k) Partito da molti giorni Romeo, e la giovane sempre lagrimosa mostrandosi (il che la sua gran bellezza faceva mancare), fu più fiate

66 _Ibid.,_ p. 7.
69 Da Porto, "Giulietta e Romeo," _op. cit._, p. 12.
72 _Ibid.,_ p. 15.
dalla madre, che teneramente l'amava, con lusinghevoli parole addi­mandata, onde questo suo pianto derivasse, . . .

(7) . . . io sento preparare le mie nozze ad un palagio di mio padre, il quale è fuori di questa terra da due miglia verso Mantova, ove menare mi debbono, acciocchè io men baldanza di rifiutare il nuovo marito abbia, . . .

(m) . . . datemi tanto veleno che in un punto possa me da tal doglia e Romeo da tanta vergogna liberare; se no, con maggior mio incarico e suo dolore, un coltello in me stessa insanguinerò. . . .

(n) . . . io ti darò una polvere, la quale, bevendola, per quarantotto ore, ovver poco più o meno, ti farà in guisa dormire, che ogni uomo, per gran medico ch'egli sia, non ti giudicherà mai altro che morta. . . .

(o) Onde volendo il conte di Lodrone, che alcuno suo la donna vedesse, essendo madonna Giovanna alquanto cagionevole della persona, fu ordinato, che la giovane accompagnata da due zie a quel luogo del padre, che avemo nominato, poco fuori della città andar dovesse; al che ella niuna resistenza fece, ed andovvi. . . .

(p) . . . chiamata una sua fante, che seco allevata s'era e che quasi come sorella tenea, . . .

(q) Messer Antonio . . . prestamente per un suo medico, che molto dotto e pratico reputava, a Verona mandò. Il quale venuto, e veduta ed alquanto tocca la giovane, disse, lei essere già più ore per lo bevuto veleno di questa vita passata; . . .

(r) Aveva frate Lorenzo . . . la lettera che la Giulietta scrisse, e che egli a Romeo doveva mandare, data a un frate che a Mantova andava; il quale giunto nella città, ed essendo due o tre volte alla casa di Romeo stato, nè per sua gran sciagura trovatolo mai in casa, e non volendo la lettera ad altri che a lui proprio dare, ancora in mano l'avea; . . .

(s) Romeo . . . tirata fuori la spada si volle ferire per uccidersi; pure da Pietro ritenuto, . . .

(u) O Romeo! quale sciagura mi ti togli? parlami alquanto; drizza a me un poco gli occhi tuoi. O Romeo! vedi la tua carissima Giulietta, che ti prega che la miri! perché non rispondi, almeno a lei, nel cui grembo ti giaci? Romeo al caro nome della sua donna alzò alquanto i languidi occhi dalla vicina morte gravati, e, vedutala, li rinchiusi; e poco dappoi tutto torcendosi, fatto un breve sospiro, si morì.

(v) Esci fuori, chè quantunque io non sappia che farmi di te, pur non ti mancherà il racchiuderti in qualche santo monistero,...

(w) ... deliberando di più non vivere, raccolto a sè il fiato e per buon spazio tenutolo, e poscia con un gran grido fuori mandandolo, sopra il morto corpo morta ricadde.

(x) Quand'ecco la famiglia del Potestà che dietro alcun ladro correvano, vi sopraggiunse; e trovatigli piangere sopra questo avello, nel quale una lucerna vedevano, quasi tutti là corsono, e tolti fra lor i due frati, dissero: Che fate qui, domini, a quest'ora? Fareste forse qualche malia sopra questo sopolcro?... e se non ch'io conosco voi, frate Lorenzo, uomo di buona condizione, io direi che a spogliare i morti foste qui venuti.

(y) Ed ordinato un bel monimento, sopra il quale la cagione della lor morte scolpita fosse, i due amanti con pompa grandissima e solenne, dal signore, da' lor parenti e da tutta la città pianti ed accompagnati, seppelliti furono.

72 Ibid., p. 35.
73 Ibid.
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75 Ibid., p. 37.
76 Ibid., p. 40.
Adrien Sevin published, in 1542, a translation of Boccaccio’s *Filocolo*. Included in the preface was a *conte*, based on Luigi da Porto’s “Giulietta e Romeo” and dedicated “A haulte, excellente et illustre dame, madame Claude de Rohan, Comtesse de saint Aignan.”

Sevin attempts to disguise his Italian source by a pseudo-Greek setting; the action of the story takes place in Courron, a city in Morea, or the ancient peninsula of Peloponnesus. The author also essays to select Greek names for his principal characters, with incongruous results. Romeo is Halquadrich, son of Malehipho Phorhiach. Giulietta is Burglipha, daughter of Karilio Humdru m. Tebaldo, who is made a brother of the heroine, is Bruhachin, while Pietro is Bostruch.

The Phorhiach and Humdru m families are on excellent terms, and their children are reared together, Karilio Humdru m loving Halquadrich Phorhiach as his own son. Karilio Humdru m and Malehipho Phorhiach fall victims to the plague, and leave the care of the children to their wives, Kalzandra and Harriaquach. At this time, Bruhachin is twelve years of age. Halquadrich and Burglipha, who are both eleven years old, already love each other with a growing flame, which gradually arouses the jealousy of Bruhachin. One day Bruhachin abruptly warns Halquadrich that he must discontinue his visits to Burglipha, for reasons of propriety. Otherwise a scandal may result which will render it impossible to marry Burglipha to a man in her station in life. Furious at this insult, Halquadrich challenges Bruhachin to a duel, with the declaration that he will give up Burglipha only at the cost of his life. The next day, Halquadrich returns after donning his coat of mail. As he enters Burglipha’s room by an open door, he finds that she is dressing beside her brother. A duel immediately ensues, with fatal results for Bruhachin, because Halquadrich is

2 Cf. Hauvette, who denies that the names are really Greek (*op. cit.*, pp. 330–31).
rendered invincible by love. In the inevitable tumult which results, Halquadrich escapes with difficulty. He finally contrives to take refuge on a small brigantine, which bears him to safety in a castle situated on a lonely rock.

Burglipha is torn between two feelings: her genuine grief for her brother’s death, and the resentment which she is obliged by the proprieties to harbor against Halquadrich. Two days after the duel, Halquadrich sends her a letter by his faithful servant Bostruch. In this message, Halquadrich attempts to excuse himself for slaying Bruhachin and declares that he will surely die if she ceases to love him. For reply, she calls him “the world’s greatest traitor” and asserts that she desires to see him strangled according to his deserts. She burns the letter in the presence of Bostruch and affirms that she wishes that she had seen Halquadrich suffer a similar fate. Then she dismisses Bostruch, whom she forbids ever to return. When Halquadrich hears the response of Burglipha, he falls, like Dante, in a dead faint.

Through the persistent intercession of Bostruch, Burglipha is persuaded to receive Halquadrich again as a suitor. In fact, she is even more ardent than he, and takes the initiative by confiding her troubles to an old priest, in whose presence she threatens to commit suicide unless he aids her. The priest points out the difficulties which threaten her. He argues that her mother and other relatives will refuse to see her again if she marries her brother’s murderer. When Burglipha remains obdurate, he gives her a powder to drink dissolved in white wine, which will cause her to remain apparently dead for twenty-four hours. According to the custom of the country, she will be delivered to the priest for burial. He will then take her secretly to his chamber, disguise her and transfer her to a brigantine sailing for the château of Halquadrich.

The next morning Burglipha takes the powder in accordance with the directions of the priest, and falls into a profound stupor which resembles death. Towards seven o’clock in the morning a maid draws the bed curtain, with the intention of inquiring about Burglipha’s health. On finding Burglipha unconscious, she cries out in a loud voice and attracts the attention of the other servants, as well as of the girl’s mother.

Unfortunately Bostruch soon appears, bearing salutations from his master to whom, naturally, he now reports the supposed death of Burglipha. Halquadrich determines to kill himself. Less foresighted
than Romeo, who kept on hand a constant supply of serpent's venom for emergency purposes, Halquadrich visits an apothecary, who sells him a stick of poison four fingers long. Before dying, however, Halquadrich resolves to see Burglipha for the last time. Consequently, he boldly returns to Courron, albeit he has been banished from that city on pain of death—not to mention the fact that the friends of Bruhachin are awaiting him there, eager to wreak vengeance upon him. On arrival at the grave, he eats half the poison. Burglipha awakens and learns that Halquadrich is committing suicide for her sake. A final scene between the lovers takes place, in which many words and long kisses are exchanged, all in the most proper manner, as Sevin carefully assures us. Halquadrich grants Burglipha's request for the unused half of his poison stick, so that she is enabled to die simultaneously with her lover. Halquadrich and Burglipha are buried together in a beautiful tomb.

The sources of Sevin's *conte* have given rise to much discussion. Ludwig Fränkel conjectured that the model used by both Sevin and Da Porto was a lost redaction of Masuccio's Thirty-Third novella. Admittedly for Sevin, as for Masuccio, no initial hostility divided the families of the lovers. Nevertheless, such a divergence from Luigi da Porto's narrative seems correctly explained by H. Hauvette as imitation of Boccaccio's *Filocolo*, of which Sevin made a readable translation.

Hauvette might have added that Sevin's *conte* contains reminiscences also of the *Filostrato*, or Troilus and Cressida story. Let us consider first the role of Burglipha, who at times acts more like Boccaccio's Griseida (Cressida) than she does like Giulietta. Burglipha, unlike Da Porto's heroine, has such a great regard for the *pundonor* that she refuses to see her lover Halquadrich after he has slain her brother. The widow Griseida also insists on the *convenances*. She avoids a meeting with Troilo, alleging that she is still in mourning for her late husband. Admittedly such a parallel, if there were no complications, might have been accidental, because Sevin, the contemporary of Rabelais and Marguerite de Navarre though he is, never loses an opportunity to

---

9 “la longueur de quatre doits de poisson . . .”—Sevin, *op. cit.*, Feuillet V,

7 “print iustement la moytié de la masse de poisson qu’il mangea . . .”—Ibid.

8 “apres longs baisers, entretiens, & avoir totalement accompli ce qui est decent & permis en honnesté & sincere amour . . .”—Ibid.


stress the proprieties." The author's predilection for *la décence* would not explain, however, the closely related case of Bostruch, who recalls Boccaccio's famous character of Pandaro far more than he does Luigi da Porto's Pietro. To be sure, both Bostruch and Pietro are servants, but there the resemblance almost stops. Moreover, even in their domestic capacities, the roles of Bostruch and Pietro are reversed. Pietro is attached to the Cappelletti household, although well acquainted with Romeo. Bostruch is in the employ of Halquadrich, but is well acquainted with Burglipha. Thus, despite the difference in social status involved, Bostruch's duties are brought in line with those of Pandaro, who is the loyal friend of Troilo, but also has the ear of his cousin Griseida. Bostruch, like Pandaro, is a go-between, and is so efficient at his task that the reader soon forgets his humble official status. Bostruch, for instance, bringing a letter from his master Halquadrich to the recalcitrant Burglipha, is on the level of Pandaro attempting to deliver poor Troilo's letter to Griseida. Like Pandaro, Bostruch is rebuffed, but never dismayed. Bostruch sees Burglipha indignantly burn the letter in his presence, but undauntedly notes that she has taken the precaution first to read the missive. In the same way, Pandaro watches his cousin Griseida, as she more coyly refuses at first to receive Troilo's letter, but he probably observes with satisfaction that she eventually puts it safely in her bosom. The efforts of Bostruch and Pandaro are crowned with success, although the second-rate Sevin lacks Boccaccio's finesse in describing the details of the winning technique.

The scene apparently imitated from the *Filostrato* was carried over into Boaistuau's adaptation of Bandello's version, and eventually found its way into Shakespeare's tragedy.

Most important of the contributions of Sevin to the development of our legend is the apothecary scene. Unfortunately, Sevin's narrative lacks the description of the scene where, according to Shakespeare, the desperate Romeo enters the apothecary shop.

---

11 See H. Hauvette, "Une variante française de la légende de Roméo et Juliette," *op. cit.*, pp. 334-35 and passim. As Hauvette notes, Sevin's passion for propriety leads him to make the priest an honorable character (p. 334).


13 Sevin says, insisting always on the proprieties: "Et par tant de foiz & avec lettres de Halquadrich, telles que bien sçauez estre licites en amours, Bostruch s'en alla vers Burglipha, & la pouruoyit si violement qu'elle s'acorda faire entièrement sa volonté, oubliant l'homicide en son frere."—Sevin, *op. cit.*, Feuillet V.
Missing also is the portrayal of the gaunt vendor of poison, whose "sharp misery had worn him to the bones." Yet Sevin's bald account of Halquadrich's visit to "vng Appothicaire qui luy bailla la longueur de quatre doitz de poysun" is the germ of one of the most dramatic episodes in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, as Henri Hauvette pointed out.

It would seem, however, that Hauvette probably went too far in making Sevin a precursor of Shakespeare for the scene where the heroine attempts to take the same poison as her lover. Sevin is here probably imitating Luigi da Porto, whose Giulietta asks Friar Lorenzo for enough poison to end her sufferings, and at the same time to "liberate Romeo from such great shame."\(^{14}\)

\((a)\) Lequel Bostruch qui estoit fort ancien familier & cogneu de Burglipha, semblablement de sa mere & serviteurs de leaus (aussi qu'ilz ignoroient sa demeure avec Halquadrich) presenta aysemment la lettre. Et feit tresbien son messaige, & icelle leue de Burglipha, & ayant bien entendu les paroles de Bostruch, ne les voulant declarer à sa mere ny a autres (craignant ce qui en fut aduenu) elle luy dist. Bostruch, je m'esmerueille quelle hardiesse tu maintenant conduct en ce lieu, pour faire seruice au plusgrand traistre du monde: ne quelle audace t'a meu la langue de me requérir faire mercy à celluy que (pour auoir exterminé l'honueur de ceans) je desire selon son merite veoir estranger. Pource va & luy diz que is brusle (toy present) sa lettre, . . . \(^{16}\)

\((b)\) Et par tant de foiz & auec lettres de Halquadrich, telles que bien sçauez estre licites en amours, Bostruch s'en alla vers Burglipha & la poursuyuit si viuement qu'elle s'accorda faire entièrement sa volunté, oubliant l'homicide en son frere: . . . \(^{10}\)

\((c)\) . . . & s'en alla vers vng vieil prebstre de la loy qui auoit lors la cure des cermonies, . . . \(^{17}\)

\((d)\) . . . s'adressa à vng Appothicaire qui luy bailla en masse la longueur de quatre doitz de poysun.\(^{18}\)

\((e)\) Et en mauldissant & despitant le Ciel, Soleil, Lune, Estoilles, & Elemens, confessant des sa naissance auoir toujour esté nourry en

----


\(^{15}\) Sevin, op. cit., Feuillets IV\(^{r}\) et V\(^{r}\).

\(^{16}\) Ibid., Feuillet V\(^{r}\).

\(^{17}\) Ibid.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., Feuillet V\(^{r}\)
pleurs & gemissements, qui encore lui renforceoient à cestuy malheureux & dangereux paz, print iustement la moytié de la masse de poisson qu'il mangea . . .

(f) . . . voyant prochaine la fin de son amy, le requist lui octroyer par vraye amytié l'autre moytié de son poisson, ce que non sans grand peine & ennuy il luy accorda.20

20 Ibid.
21 Ibid., Feuillets V and VI.
CLIZIA

In Italy, the first important imitator of Luigi da Porto’s masterpiece was the Cavaliere Gerardo (or Gherardo) Boldieri, who adopted the feminine pseudonym of “Clizia.” Boldieri’s narrative took the form of a versified novella, which appeared in 1553—or twenty-four years after the death of Luigi da Porto and one year before the publication of Bandello’s tale of Romeo and Giulietta.

Boldieri makes a number of important innovations which reappear in later versions of the Romeo and Juliet story. These alterations relate principally to the character of the friar; the flowery speeches of the hero and his duel with Tebaldo; and the psychology of the heroine.

Let us consider first the case of the friar. Clizia seems determined to put the cleric Batto Tricastro’s relations with his accomplice Romeo into a more favorable light. Clizia describes the Franciscan’s association with Romeo as intimate, but not necessarily unorthodox. Moreover, in the dénouement, Clizia’s friar, who arrives at the Cappelletti vault after the death of Romeo, undergoes no humiliating arrest and public questioning on charges of necromancy and grave robbing. This abbreviated dénouement involves changes in the farewell

---

3 Passing note may be made of the following minor features introduced by Clizia, which did not meet with public favor: Giulietta is called Giulia. Frate Lorenzo’s name is altered to Frate Batto Tricastro. The Count of Lodrone is referred to as Francesco di Lodrone.

Some of Clizia’s changes in the episodes are in keeping with the almost flippan general tone of the poem. Thus, Romeo does not make a tragic attempt to commit suicide on hearing the news of Giulia’s supposed death. He merely removes a gold chain which he habitually wears about his neck, and presents it to Pietro. In return for this magnificent tip, Pietro is requested to inform Frate Batto Tricastro faithfully that Romeo will arrive that night in Verona. Pietro fails to carry out the commission, although presumably he keeps the chain.

---
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speeches of Romeo, whose role it is now time to consider. No place is left for the touching scene—borrowed from Ovid—where after several hours of coma Romeo revives for a moment on hearing the name of Giulietta pronounced. Instead, a merciful death carries off the stricken youth before he can explain the cause of his fatal error.4

If Clizia cuts short Romeo’s dying words, however, he is more liberal in reporting the lyrical language employed by the lover while he was thoroughly alive. It will be recalled that in Da Porto’s novella, the first advances are made by Giulietta, who feels that she no longer belongs to herself, from the instant that she sets eyes on Romeo. In fact, during the entire lovers’ interview at the Cappelletti ball, Da Porto’s Romeo has the opportunity to speak only one brief sentence, because of the greater fluency of Giulietta. At this point, Clizia develops Romeo’s speeches—which were to become so important in Shakespeare’s play—and even makes Romeo, instead of Giulia, declare that he no longer belongs to himself.5 Furthermore, Clizia’s Romeo indulges in précieux rhetoric about the peril of Giulia’s eyes, in a manner almost worthy of Shakespeare:

Mi dier’ morte i vostri occhi, e mi privaro
Del cuor, quando pur dianzi gli mirai.6

The new phraseology which Clizia introduces into Romeo’s speeches, however, is probably less important than the modification of Da Porto’s account of the duel between Romeo and Tebaldo. It will be recalled that, according to Da Porto, the battle between Romeo and Tebaldo begins as a general brawl, in which the Montecchi and Cappelletti appear equally at fault.7 The mêlée has narrowed down to a few individual hand-to-hand fights when Romeo, infuriated at the defeat of his comrades, impetuously assails Tebaldo and kills him. Clizia has the mêlée start with a deliberate attack on the Montecchi:

4 *Ibid.,* VI, 16.
5 “Essi (Giulia’s eyes) l’alma per sempre mi legaro, 
Si che più mio so do non esser mai . . .”  
—*Ibid.,* I, 34.
7 *Clizia,* loc. cit. For these words, as well as for the rest of Romeo’s speech, Da Porto has simply; “Se io a voi con la mia mano la vostra riscaldo, voi co’ be’ vostri occhi il mio cuore accendete.”—*Da Porto, op. cit.,* p. 8.
8 Cf. Chap. VI, i.
Dico ch'un di Tebaldo, ardito e forte
Giovin de' Cappelletti, in compagnia
Di molti altri, assai presso alle porte
Dei Borsari il gentil Romeo per via, . . .

It will be observed that in this passage Romeo is not alone, but
is the leader of the Montecchi forces, just as Tebaldo is described
as having many comrades. Romeo's followers are specifically
mentioned in the second stanza below:

Eran già i suoi dalle ferite tutti
Tinti di sangue; . . .

At this stage of the combat, Romeo makes a vindictive attack
upon the Cappelletti, exactly as in the Luigi da Porto version.
However, for the hand-to-hand battle between Tebaldo and
Romeo, which occurs only at the very end of the mêlée, Clizia
introduces a new version. His Romeo endeavors for Giulia's
sake to spare Tebaldo. So vicious is the attack of the Cappelletti,
however, that Romeo is compelled to kill him to save his own
life.

Clizia, in his description of the mêlée, introduces also a detail
of localization which reappears in a later version of the story.
According to Luigi da Porto, the battle between Romeo and
Tebaldo begins in the "via del corso." Clizia, more precisely,
has the struggle take place "alle porte dei Borsari," at the west
end of the Corso dei Borsari.

Let us turn now to Clizia's treatment of the heroine, whom he
attempts to make more natural and perhaps more feminine. In
so doing, he assigns to her a more passive role than in any other
Italian version of this story. She is content for the most part to
make rather conventional—although encouraging—responses to
the raptures of Romeo:

A Romeo chetamente fu con quella
Modesta e riverente cortesia
Risposto dalla nobile donzella,
Ch'al loco, al tempo, ed ad ambi convenia.
Si mandavan del cuor certa novella
I lor occhi e le mani tuttavia . . .

* Clizia, op. cit., II, 24.
* Ibid., II, 27.
* Ibid.
* Clizia, op. cit., I, 35.
Clizia's effort to "feminize" Giulia's character is especially manifest in his account of the heroine's conduct after the death of her kinsman Tebaldo. At this stage of the narrative, the Giulietta of Luigi da Porto weeps copiously, without alleging any reasons for her tears. Against the cajoling and menacing of her parents, she preserves the most obstinate and heroic silence. Clizia's less Spartan Giulia tries to escape the parental inquisition by inventing a plausible pretext for her laments: her pretended grief for the death of her cousin Tebaldo, whose relationship to the heroine is explained earlier and becomes much more important than in Da Porto's version. So convincingly does Giulia lie, that she soon makes an ally of her mother, who in turn wins over Antonio Cappelletti.\textsuperscript{14}

It should be noted that Clizia modifies also the monologue in "Giulietta e Romeo" where the heroine, in a soliloquy, wavers between two thoughts. First she believes that Romeo does not really love her, but seeks to humiliate her for revenge against the Cappelletti family. Then, without transition, she takes comfort in another idea, that perhaps by marrying Romeo she can bring about a reconciliation between the rival families.\textsuperscript{15}

Clizia attempts to explain, with a semblance of feminine logic, Giulia's sudden change of heart. He represents her as repenting because she cannot believe that a fair countenance can hide a villainous heart.\textsuperscript{16}

The most obvious feature of Clizia's "feminization" of the heroine, however, is his insistence on the proprieties. It will be remembered that in Da Porto's novella Giulietta is able to go to the confessional the first time unaccompanied by Madonna Giovanna, who is not even introduced until after the secret marriage of her daughter to Romeo.\textsuperscript{17} According to Clizia, the mother accompanies her daughter to the confessional the first as well as the second time.\textsuperscript{18}

Clizia also tries to conventionalize somewhat the highly irregular marriage of the hero and heroine. Da Porto says simply that in the presence of the friar, Romeo married the fair young lady

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., II, 41, and II, 43.
\textsuperscript{15}Cf. Chap. VI, e.
\textsuperscript{16}Clizia, op. cit., I, 42.
\textsuperscript{17}Da Porto, op. cit., p. 18.
\textsuperscript{18}Clizia, op. cit., II, 9.
Clizia retains the significant word *presente,* and goes on to specify that the Christian ritual was followed, with Romeo placing the ring upon Giulietta’s finger.\(^{20}\)

Moreover, Clizia does not like Da Porto’s account of Giulietta’s stay in the Cappelletti country house, near Verona, chaperoned only by a couple of aunts. He remedies this impropriety by having Madonna Giovanna also accompany her daughter. In this way, as it turns out, the mother is one of the first to discover the apparent death of Giulietta, instead of hearing the news after a lengthy delay, as in Da Porto’s *novella.*\(^{21}\)

I have reserved for final mention a few miscellaneous innovations by Clizia which were widely adopted. He starts the fashion for a more detailed description of the *torchio,* or circular dance, at the Cappelletti house. He informs us that the sleeping potion contains distilled simples, and was a liquor rather than a powder. He describes the sunrise, observable as Giulia drank the potion. He says that when Giulia was discovered, apparently dead, she was reproached at first for being a sleepyhead, and that later, not one, but many famous doctors were sent for.

Clizia was the first poet to deal with the story of Romeo and Juliet. The tendency towards a lyrical treatment of this theme may be said to have its beginnings with his *ottava rima.* But Clizia’s most important contributions to the development of the legend, aside from a few minor details, consisted of his favorable treatment of the character of the friar, and his analysis of the psychology of the hero and of the heroine.

\[(a)\]  
\[
\text{Nel mezzo della nobil compagnia} \\
\text{Primo usci con un torchio acceso in mano} \\
\text{Un giovin, che con vaga leggiadria} \\
\text{Una donna gentil prese per mano,} \\
\text{A cui con riverente cortesia} \\
\text{Dopo un breve girar sciolta la mano,} \\
\text{Consegnotole il torchio, il cerchio aperse,} \\
\text{E rinchiudendol poi fra duo s’offese.} \\
\text{Quella un altro pigliò, del qual già amore} \\
\text{Nell’anima le avea l’effigie impressa:}\]

Così nutriva l'un dell'altro il core
Un fuoco, un duolo, un'alegrezza istessa; . . . 22

(b) E perché in nodo d'amicizia stretto
È seco si dispon di contentarlo; . . . 23

(c) E (Iddio) sa quanto è ver voi l'obbligo mio.24

(d) Fuggita la vil turba e quasi spenta,
Tra i padron si ridusse la battaglia.
Tutto schiumoso il fier Tebaldo tenta
Di mille solo un colpo far che vaglia:
Fa l'amor della moglie a Romeo lenta
La man; ma sì l'innico lo travaglia,
Che al fin per dar a se medesma aiuta
Con una punta a lui tolsela vita.25

(e) Chi dirà 'l gaudio estremo ch'ei sentiro?
Chi le soavi lor parole rotte
Or da questo or da quel dolce sospiro?
Ch'i baci spessi, dal cui mel condotte
L'alme alle labbra fuor quasi n'usciro?
E chi l'alta dolcezza che la notte
Congiunti in un gustaro ambi egualmente?
Dillo, Amor, tu ch'a ciò fusti presente.26

(f) Chè non le par che inganno o indegno affetto
Possa capir sotto sì dolce aspetto.27

(g) Ma perchè il sempre lagrimar scemava
Più a Giulia la belta di giorno in giorno,
Che del morto cugino si scusava
Vedersi ognora il tristo spirto intorno; . . . 28

(h) Se lei il morto Tebaldo attristi, o segno
Di qualche suo desir sia che l'affanni,
Non so; . . . 29

(i) Onde lieta oltra modo con la madre
Dopo 'l prandio la Giulia entra in cammino,
E tosto fur presenti al santo padre.30

23 Ibid., I, 66. Cf. Chap. VI, g.
24 Ibid., op. cit., I, 67.
26 Ibid., op. cit., II, 21.
27 Ibid., I, 42.
29 Ibid., op. cit., II, 43.
30 Ibid., II, 9. For this, Luigi da Porto has simply: "Ed essendo la quadragesima, la
giovane un giorno fingendo di volersi confessare, al monastero di Santo Francesco andata,
. . . ".—Da Porto, op. cit., p. 13.
Romeo seguendo la cristiana norma,
Come si suol con assentir presente,
Or quella il dito d’auréo cerchio informa,
. . . . .  

... Io ho un liquor, che se da te bevuto
Fia, duo di quasi ti farà dormire; . . .

È mio parer che nella prima notte
Che giugnerai di fuora al tuo giardino,
Sendo voi donne in camera ridette,
L’acqua, che dentro un vaso piccolino
Darotti, uscita da sacre erbe e cotte
Con temperato fuoco di verzino, . . .  

Nel digerir del cibo proverai
Cosa maravigliosa; . . .  

Quando le par che già s’appressi l’ora
Che dar devea principio e fine all’opra,
Ascendendo già il sol verso l’aurora,
Forza è che l’fuoco interior discuostra:
Onde in furor quasi di senso fuora,
Pigliato il vaso e voltolo sozzopra,
Tutto il liquor, che l’ultima bevanda,
Lassa! le fu, nel ventre ardita manda.

Si ch’ella e la sorella curiose
Più dell’altre, in la stanza prime entraro,
E in voci dolcemente corrucciose
Si lungo sonno a Giulia improveraro.

. . . a questo con maggiore
Impeto dietro grida, ch’ivi tutti
Sieno i medici saggi a lui condutti.

E perché un miglio a pena lontan era
L’effetto rio della città successo,
Troovessene in tempo ivi una schiera
Che non avrebbe ad Esclapio cesso.

---

13 Ibid., III, 17.
14 Ibid., III, 26. For this, Luigi da Porto has simply: “la notte vicino alle quattro ore . . . fattasi dare una coppa d’acqua fredda . . . postele dentro la virtuosissima polvere, tutta la si bebbe; . . . ”—Da Porto, op. cit., p. 25.
Matteo Bandello’s “Romeo e Giulietta” was published in 1554, although the first draft of it may have been composed much earlier. For the main incidents of the story, Bandello is content merely to elaborate the language of Luigi da Porto, not always in the happiest vein. Bandello’s principal deviations from Luigi da Porto fall into three categories: The first consists of minor alterations of incidents and characters, due to the author’s own invention. The second comprises two or three episodes borrowed from the novella of Ippolito e Leonora. The third is composed of miscellaneous borrowings from the poem of Clizia. These divergences from the main source will now be considered in order.

Bandello apparently invents the following incidents:

Antonio Cappelletti, head of the famous “family,” invites a large number of the nobility to attend a festa given at his house. Nothing is said, however, about a formal invitation list, and Bandello’s language may have been merely an amplification of that of Clizia.

Bandello’s Romeo, harking to the advice of a friend, ceases to pursue the indifferent lady whom he first admired and begins deliberately to distract himself at social festivities. When he attends the Cappelletti ball, his purpose is not to follow his first

2 G. Brognoligo states that Bandello’s novella was composed between 1531 and 1545.
4 Clizia says: “Convitò ognun per la vicina sera.”—“L’infelice Amore de’ due fedelissimi amanti Giulia e Romeo scritto in ottava rima da Clizia, nobil veronese ad Ardeco suo,” in Alessandro Torri’s Giulietta e Romeo, Pisa, 1841, I, 9. Luigi da Porto has simply: “ove quasi tutta la città concorreva.”—Da Porto, Luigi. “Giulietta e Romeo.” Second edition, 1535, reprinted by Cino Chiarini in his Romeo e Giulietta. Florence: G. C. Sansoni, 1906, p. 6. He thus has no definite statement about an invitation list, which was to become quite important in later versions of the story.
lady—as in the version of Luigi da Porto—but to find another
who will reciprocate his affections. At the ball, Romeo makes
the first advances, directing amorous glances at Giulietta. It will
be recalled that in the earlier novella, Giulietta has first been
smitten, and has looked so fixedly at Romeo that his curiosity is
aroused. Bandello gives the name of Anselmo to the friar who
bears Giulietta's letter to Romeo at Mantua. To explain Fra
Anselmo's failure to deliver the missive, he resorts to an account
of a plague epidemic which causes the friar to be quarantined.
Bandello invents a letter which Romeo writes to his father before
leaving Mantua, confessing the secret marriage and requesting
that mass be said for Giulietta. Romeo then comes to Verona
disguised as a German.

Bandello's description of the scene between the lovers at the
tomb differs in several particulars from that of Luigi da Porto.
For instance, Bandello supplies naturalistic details about the con­
dition of the corpse of Tebaldo, remarking that putrefaction is
not far advanced, because Tebaldo was of slight build and lost all
his blood during the combat. Fra Lorenzo removes the body to a
corner of the vault, so that it will cause as little offense to Giulietta
as possible. The friar, in order to add to Giulietta's comfort, also
places a pillow under her head.

Pietro, the servant of the heroine, is lost sight of in the dénoue­
ments of Luigi da Porto and of Clizia. On the other hand, Ban­
dello's Pietro, who is in Romeo’s service, enters the vault with his
master. It may be noted also that while Bandello's Giulietta
commits suicide by holding her breath, as in the earlier version,
she does not utter a cry.

The following characters developed by Bandello deserve espe­
cial mention: Marcuccio becomes an indispensable leader in

---

9 Bandello, op. cit., II, p. 373. Luigi da Porto has: "Alla quale il giovane, che già
del suo mirare accorto s'era, maravigliato del parlar di lei, disse: . . ."—Da Porto,
op. cit., pp. 7-8.
10 Bandello, op. cit., II, p. 397. In Luigi da Porto's novella, the friar could not deliver
the letter because Romeo was not at home.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid., p. 398.
14 Ibid., p. 399. In Luigi da Porto's story, Giulietta places the pillow under Romeo's
head: "Romeo, il cui capo sopra un origliere, che con lei nell'arca era stato lasciato . . . "
—Da Porto, op. cit., p. 36.
16 Ibid., p. 407.
festivities. The old nurse acts as a confidante, informing Giulietta of Romeo’s identity and attempting to dissuade her from her madcap love affair. The nurse assumes also the functions of Luigi da Porto’s Pietro and bears letters to Romeo both before the marriage ceremony and after the fateful duel with Tebaldo.

From the foregoing observations, it is evident that Bandello’s own inventions are for the most part slight. We shall find that his more radical deviations from his principal source are to be explained by his indebtedness to the novella of Ippolito e Leonora and to Clizia’s poem.

Letterio di Francia has traced two important features of Bandello’s novella to the influence of Ippolito e Leonora. The first is the statement that the lovers were not previously acquainted with each other, whereas Luigi da Porto’s Giulietta calls Romeo by name at their first meeting. The second is a balcony scene, to which only a bare reference can be found in Luigi da Porto.

After the Cappelletti ball, Bandello’s Giulietta goes to a window. Pointing towards the brilliantly lighted street, she warily asks her confidante the name of the young man who carries a mask in hand. When she hears that he is called Romeo Montecchio, she almost faints. In Ippolito e Leonora the heroine, from a window, sees Ippolito pass by, and learns his name from a woman neighbor. The discovery of his identity causes her great grief.

Bandello gives the following account of the principal balcony scene: Giulietta writes to Romeo, urging him to appear before her window at “five o’clock at night,” bringing a rope ladder. When he arrives, Giulietta drops a string, to which Romeo attaches the rope ladder. She then pulls up one end of the ladder which, with

14 “Marcuccio il guercio, che era uomo di corte molto piacevole e generalmente molto ben visto per i suoi moti festevoli e per le piacevollezze ch’egli sapeva fare, perciò che sempre aveva alcuna novelluccia per le mani da far ridere la brigata e troppo volentieri senza danno di nessuno s. sollazzava.” —Ibid., p. 375.
15 Ibid., p. 376.
16 Ibid., p. 380.
17 Ibid., pp. 380, 384.
the aid of her nurse, she fastens to an iron rail, thus enabling Romeo to climb rapidly to her chamber.\textsuperscript{22}

Ippolito likewise has been told by Leonora to come at "five o'clock at night" bringing a rope ladder, which he is to tie to a string left dangling from the window. It is Leonora's intention to pull up one end of the ladder, fasten it to an iron bar, and make access perfectly secure for her secret husband.\textsuperscript{23} While the parallels cited by Letterio di Francia seem to prove that Ippolito e Leonora was a model for Bandello, attention has already been called to the well-known ladder used by Boccaccio's Ricciardo Manardi. It has been noted, moreover, that the Ginevra episode in Ariosto's Orlando Furioso, as well as a similar episode in Bandello's own novella of Timbreo di Cardona and Fenicia Lionata, source of Shakespeare's Much Ado About Nothing, belong to the same lover's ladder tradition.\textsuperscript{24}

We come now to the disputed question of the literary relationship between Bandello and Clizia. On the affirmative side, P. A. Daniel says simply: "Bandello while following the main incidents of Da Porto's story, varies from it in many minor details: in some he appears to have followed Clitia . . . "\textsuperscript{25} Contrary to his usual practice, Daniel fails to give examples of the influence of Boldieri, while J. J. Munro is equally vague.\textsuperscript{26} Letterio di Francia, representing an opposite point of view, not only does not refer to the obligations of the novelliere to Clizia, but by implication actually denies their existence.\textsuperscript{27} Even more emphatic is the position of G. Brognoligo, for whom the versions of Bandello and Clizia are absolutely distinct. Brognoligo maintains, on the one hand, that Clizia could not possibly have been a model for Bandello. Brognoligo's argument, based entirely on the authority of a foreword by Bandello, is that the latter's Romeo and Juliet novella was composed between 1531 and 1545, and therefore antedates Clizia's poem published in 1553. On the other hand, Brognoligo is satisfied,

\textsuperscript{22} Bandello, op. cit., II, p. 380. Cf. Chap. VI, i, and also D. P. Recunda, op. cit., K 1348.
\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Chap. IV, g.
\textsuperscript{24} Cf. Chap. III, i and note 21.
\textsuperscript{26} Cf. Arthur Brooke, Romeo and Juliet, J. J. Munro, ed., London: Chatto and Windus; New York: Duffield and Co., 1908, p. xxxiii. Here as in numerous other places Munro follows Daniel very closely, with acknowledgment of his indebtedness in the Introduction (p. xiii).
\textsuperscript{27} "Per tutto il resto, il nostro A. non si allontana dal testo originario, tranne nella forma; . . . "—Di Francia, op. cit., LXXXI (1923), p. 5.
because of internal evidence, that Clizia did not copy Bandello.  

Although the views of Letterio di Francia and of Gioachino Brognoligo thus appear to coincide, they are really at variance regarding the basic question of the trustworthiness of Bandello’s prefaces. It is therefore advisable to pause for a moment to reappraise the documentary value of these prefaces in general, and particularly of the preliminary confessions of obligations to the Boldieri family which Bandello repeatedly makes. Adopting a more skeptical attitude than Brognoligo, Letterio di Francia dismisses such acknowledgment as the “consueto artifizio bandelliano, per dissimulare la derivazione da un’opera scritta . . . ” He cites as a typical example the introduction to the tale of Romeo and Giulietta, where Bandello, in order to divert attention from the fact that his novella was plagiarized from Luigi da Porto, pretends that it was related by “Captain Alessandro Peregrino.” Nevertheless, Bandello’s mythical Peregrino, army captain, and tale-teller extraordinary, greatly resembles the Veronese archer Pellegrino, who is the supposed narrator of Luigi da Porto’s “Giulietta e Romeo.” Consequently, Bandello’s foreword has a certain significance, in that it helps to establish the very literary source which he attempts to conceal.

In the light of this circumstance, perhaps we may review with renewed curiosity the prefatory references which Bandello makes to the Boldieri family. In the second part of his collection of tales, Bandello dedicates Novella XII to Gherardo Boldieri, in these words: “Il Bandello al molto magnifico messer Gherardo Boldero salute.” Still more interesting is the fact that Bandello is the author of two different versions of the Romeo and Juliet story, both of which, according to the prefaces, are closely associated with the name of Boldieri. The most famous of these versions, now under consideration, was supposedly narrated in the house of Messer Matteo Boldieri, uncle of Gherardo Boldieri. The other version concerns a certain Gerardo, who marries Elena, after rescuing her from the tomb. The narration of this tale was

---

29 “Prima di essere pubblicata per le stampe essa ( = Bandello’s novella) non deve essere stata molto conosciuta, se a Clizia pare affatto ignota: infatti ne’ luoghi dove ella si scosta dal da Porto non si avvicina punto al piemontese.” — Brognoligo, op. cit., p. 76.
30 Di Francia, op. cit., LXXXI (1923), p. 3.
32 Ibid., II, pp. 369-70.
directly inspired, according to the author, by *una pietosa novella* related a short time earlier by the "magnifico messer Gerardo Boldiero il cavaliere."³⁴

It must be admitted, however, that the documentary value of Bandello's prefaces is slight. Moreover, granted that these prefaces seem to support Brognoligo's early date for the Romeo and Juliet novella, they furnish just as good evidence that Clizia influenced Bandello, or vice versa. We may possibly surmise the probable direction of this influence, in view of Bandello's notable lack of originality.³⁵

It is now time to examine the internal evidence which, according to Brognoligo, proves a lack of literary relationship between Boldieri and the novelliere. In the first place, Clizia and his Dominican friend Bandello seem almost to have entered into a conspiracy to treat favorably the unorthodox association between Romeo and his Franciscan friend, Fra Lorenzo. Bandello, agreeing with Clizia rather than with Da Porto, says specifically that not only were Fra Lorenzo's relations with Romeo correct, but also that they did not differ from those existing between the friar and numerous other young gentlemen of the country.³⁶ Like Clizia, Bandello omits Da Porto's charges against the friar of necromancy and of grave robbing, and also the account of his humiliating public confession.

For his account of Romeo's first meeting with Giulietta, and for his dénouement, Bandello is in accord with Da Porto rather than with Clizia. Nevertheless, in describing the duel between Romeo and Tebaldo, Bandello agrees with his friend Clizia in the following respects: (a) he makes the Cappelletti definitely the aggressors in the mêlée;³⁷ (b) his Romeo fights Tebaldo in self-defense, and not for revenge, as in Da Porto's novella.³⁸ The self-defense motive introduced either by Clizia or Bandello survives through the versions of Boaistuau and Brooke down to Shakespeare, who restores the revenge motive of Luigi da Porto.

Further possible confirmation of Bandello's probable indebtedness to Clizia is afforded by a detail of localization already noted. Clizia, more precisely than Da Porto, has the duel take place

---

³⁴ Bandello, *op. cit.*, III, p. 403.
"alle porte dei Borsari." Bandello, following Clizia, says: "... su il Corso vicino a la porta dei Borsari verso Castelvecchio."\(^{38}\)

Bandello seems to sympathize with Clizia's desire to "feminize" the heroine. It will be recalled that Da Porto's Giulietta had wavered irrationally between two thoughts: "He loves me not; he loves me." Bandello accepts Clizia's explanation of the heroine's abrupt burst of optimism—her belief that Romeo's fair countenance could not possibly hide a black heart.\(^{39}\)

For Giulietta's strange demeanor after the death of Tebaldo, whose relationship to the heroine Bandello explains even earlier than Clizia, Bandello apparently attempts again a fusion of the versions of Da Porto and of Clizia. Following Da Porto, he has Giulietta unable at first to explain the cause of her melancholy.\(^{40}\) Then suddenly the heroine begins to talk like the Giulia of Clizia, and to hint that her depressed spirits are somehow associated with the death of her first cousin.\(^{41}\) As if to confirm this supposition, Bandello has the servants also suggest a connection between Giulietta's grief and the killing of Tebaldo.\(^{42}\) Furthermore, Bandello, apparently following Clizia rather than Da Porto, makes Madonna Giovanna Cappelletti suppose at first that Giulietta's sorrow is caused by the loss of her cousin.\(^{43}\)

Bandello also shares Clizia's concern for the proprieties. Following Clizia, Bandello has Madonna Giovanna accompany her daughter to the confessional the first as well as the second time.\(^{44}\) Moreover, in his description of the formalities of the wedding, Bandello is closer to Clizia than to Da Porto. He drifts so far from the original of Da Porto that he omits the words \textit{di presente} altogether, but closely follows Boldieri's phrasing.\(^{45}\) Moreover, Bandello, like Clizia, indulges in a series of rhetorical questions to describe the wedded bliss of the young couple.\(^{47}\)

There remain to be considered some minor points of resemblance between the versions of Clizia and Bandello. Both Bandello and Clizia give the following details concerning the \textit{torchio} not

\(^{42}\) Bandello, op. cit., II, p. 388.
\(^{43}\) Ibid., II, p. 386.
found in Da Porto’s *novella*: The gentleman dancer, carrying a *torchio*, took a young lady by the hand. Then letting go her hand, he gave her the *torchio*. In Luigi da Porto’s *novella* nothing is said about passing the *torchio* from one dancer to another. In fact, it is not made clear why the dance was called the *torchio*. Furthermore, the lady took the gentleman’s hand, and not vice versa, as in the versions of Clizia and Bandello.\(^\text{48}\)

In his description of the sleeping potion, Bandello agrees with Clizia rather than with Da Porto in the following respects: The potion contained distilled soporific herbs. This concoction was to be “digested,” instead of “drunk,” as in Luigi da Porto’s account.\(^\text{49}\)

Luigi da Porto says simply that Giulietta drank the potion at four o’clock in the morning. Bandello adopts the following details invented by Clizia: The dawn was already visible. Giulietta drank the potion down in one gulp. (Clizia says that the container was turned upside down.)\(^\text{50}\)

In Da Porto’s *novella*, for the scene where Giulietta was discovered unconscious, the reader is merely told that it was impossible to awaken her. Bandello, like Clizia, adds words of reproach addressed to the supposed sleepyhead.\(^\text{51}\)

Bandello, apparently following Clizia, has the mother present when Giulietta’s strange condition is discovered, whereas in Da Porto’s version Madonna Giovanna has stayed behind in Verona.\(^\text{52}\)

According to Bandello, the mother’s grief would have “mollified tigers when they are angriest because of the loss of their young.”\(^\text{53}\)

This comparison, not found in Da Porto, recalls Clizia’s reference to the mother love of tigresses:

\[
\text{Qual tigre ircan, poi ch’altri gli sottrasse}
\text{I cari figli, in più rabbioso ardore,}
\text{Che in dolcezza, in pietade or non cangiasse}
\text{La maggior crudeltà, il maggior furore?}\]

Bandello also agrees with Clizia in saying that Messer Antonio sent for not one, but many doctors, to examine Giulietta.\(^\text{54}\)

From the preceding comparisons, it seems evident that Ban-
dello, on the few occasions when he deviated from Da Porto, was apt to follow the path of his friend Clizia. The probable influence of the poet on the celebrated prose writer is most manifest in the favorable treatment of the friar, and in the psychology of the hero and of the heroine. However, there were also about a dozen minor details regarding which Bandello seemed to agree with Clizia, rather than with Da Porto.

(a) Romeo ascoltò pazientemente quanto detto gli fu e si deliberò il savio consiglio metter in opra. Il perché cominciò andar su le feste, e dove vedeva la ritrosa donna, mai non volgeva la vista, ma andava mirando e considerando l'altre per sceglier quella che più gli fosse a grado, come se fosse andato ad un mercato per comprare cavalli o panni.  

(b) Questa infinitamente gli piacque . . . onde cominciò a vagheggiarla molto amorosamente, non sapendo da la di lei vista levarsi;  

(c) Andò il frate ed arrivò a Mantova . . . trovò che molto poco innanzi era morto uno dei frati di quel convento, e perché era un poco di sospetto di peste, fu giudicato dai deputati de la sanità il detto frate esser senza dubio morto di pestilenza, e tanto più che se gli ritrovò un gavocciolo assai più grosso d'un ovo ne l'anguinaia, che era certo ed evidentissimo indizio di quel pestifero morbo.

(d) Partito che fu Pietro, scrisse Romeo una lettera a suo padre e gli domandò perdono se senza sua licenza s'era maritato . . . Pregavalo poi molto affettuosamente che a la sepoltura di Giulietta come di sua nora che era, volesse far celebrar un ufficio da morti solenne, e questo ordinasse dc le sue entrate che fosse perpetuo.

(e) Prese poi un' ampolletta piena d'acqua velenosissima e vestito da tedesco montò a cavallo, . . .

(f) Come l'arca fu aperta, fra Lorenzo fece tantosto in una de le bande de l'avello ritirar il corpo di Tebaldo, il quale perché di natura era stato molto magro ed a la morte aveva perduto tutto il sangue, poco era marcito e non molto putiva.

(g) . . . avendo egli la cura di far la giovane sepellire, dentro ve la fece quanto più soavemente si puote distendere e porle un origliero sotto il capo.

(h) Aveva Pietro per commissione di Romeo portato seco una picciola lanternetta che altri chiamano “ceca,” altri “sorda,” la quale, scoperta, diede loro aita ad aprir l'arca e ben puntellarla.


Bandello, _loc. cit._. Cf. Da Porto, _op. cit._, pp. 7–8.


Bandello, _op. cit._, II, p. 401.

Bandello, _op. cit._, II, p. 401.
RISTRETTI ADUNQUE IN SE GLI SPIRITI, CON IL SUO ROMEO IN GREMBO, SENZA DIR NULLA SE NE MORI.  

LA BUONA VECCHIA CHE QUASI TUTTI CONOSCEVA, LE NOMINAVA QUESTI E QUELLI, ED OTTIMAMENTE CONOSCIUTO ROMEO, LE DISE CHI FOSSE. 

E QUANTUNQUE LA VECCHIA ASSAI LA SGRIDASSE E DISSUADESSE DA COTAL IMPRESA, . . . 

... CONDESCESCE AL VOLER DI GIULIETTA, LA QUALE TANTO SEPE DIRE CHE INDUSSE QUELLA A PORTAR UNA LETTERA A ROMEO . . . 

... GLI SCRISSE UNA LETTERA TUTTA PIENA DI LAGRIME E PER MANO DE LA VECCHIA AL FRATE LA MANDÒ. 

NON CONOSCENDO ANCO ELLA ROMEO, . . . 
AL COGNOME DEL MONTECCHIO RIMASE MEZZA STORDITA LA GIOVANE, . . . 

QUella gli scriveva che a le cinque ore de la notte egli venisse a parlare a la finestra per iscontro il casale e portasse seco una scala di corda. Aveva Romeo un suo fidatissimo servidore . . . se n'andò con Pietro—ché così il servidore aveva nome—al luogo ove trovò Giulietta che l'aspettava. La quale come lo conobbe, mandò giù lo spago che apprestato aveva e su tirò la scala a quello attaccata, e con l'aiuto della vecchia che seco era, la scala a la ferrata fermamente accostata, attendeva la salita de l'amante. 

ERA QUESTO MESSER LO FRATE, DE L'ORDINE DEI MINORI, MAESTRO IN TELOGIA, GRAN FILOSOFO ED ESPERTO IN MOLTE COSE E DISTILLATORE MIRABILE E PRATICO DE L'ARTE MAGICA . . . Aveva tra gli altri amici che in Verona il favorivano, il padre di Romeo, ch'era gentiluomo di gran credito ed in buona stima appo tutti, il quale portava ferma opinione esso frate esser santissimo. Romeo medesimamente molto l'amava ed era dal frate sommamente amato, conoscendolo giovine prudente ed animoso. 

... quando avvenne che sul Corso vicino a la porta dei Borsari verso Castelvecchio molti de quelli de Capelletti incontrarono alcuni dei Montecchi e con l'arme fieramente gli assalirono. 

GIÀ ERANO PER TERRA DUE O TRE PER BANDA CADUTI, QUANDO INDARNO AFFATICATOSI ROMEO PER FAR A DIETRO RITIRAR I SUOI, VENNE TEBALDO PER TRAVESSO E DIEDE UNA GAGLIARDA STOCCATÀ A ROMEO IN UN FIANCO. MA PERCHÉ EGLI AVEVA LA CORAZZINA DE LA MAGLIA NON FU FERITO, CHÉ LO STOCCO NON PUOTÉ PASSAR LA CORAZZINA. ONDE RIVOLTO VERSO TEBALDO, CON PAROLE AMICHEVOLI GLI DISSE: . . . —QUESTE PAROLE FUROG QUASI DA TUTTI UDITE; MA TEBALDO O NON INTENDESSE CIÒ CHE ROMEO DICEVA O FACESSE VISTA DI
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non intenderlo, rispose:—Ah traditore, tu sei morto!—e con furia a
dosso se gli avventò per ferirlo su la testa. Romeo . . . rivoltata la
punta de la spada verso il nemico, quello dirittamente ferì ne la gola
e gliela passò dì banda in banda, . . . 72

(r) Ma tale non è la generosità de l'animo suo che sopportasse
ingannar chi l'ama e adora. Non son le vaghe sue bellezze, se il viso
dá indizio manifesto de l'animo, che sotto quelle si ferrigno e spietato
core alberghi; anzi mi giova credere che da così gentil e bel giovine
altro non si possa aspettare che amore, gentilezza e cortesia. 73

(s) La madre veggendo il pianger de la figliuola, più e più volte le
dimandò la cagione di quella sua mala contentezza e che cosa si
sentisse, dicendole che oggimai era tempo di por fine a tante lagrime
e che pur troppo la morte del suo cugino pianto aveva. Giulietta
rispondeva non saper che cosa s'avesse . . . Tutti quei di casa altro non
sapevano che dire se non che Giulietta dopo la morte del cugino sempre
era stata di malissima voglia e che non cessava mai di piangere, né
dopoi a le finestre era stata veduta . . . onde Giulietta presa questa
occasione, trovata sua madre, così le disse:—Madre mia cara, io non so
né posso imaginarmi onde sia nasciuta questa mia fiera malinconia che
tanto m'affligge, perché dapoi che Tebaldo fu morto mai non ho potuto
rallegrarmi, . . . 74

(t) . . . madonna Giovanna che era madre di Giulietta, presa la
figliuola e le sue donne, andò a San Francesco . . . dette quelle parole
che si costumano seconde l'ordine de la Chiesa dir nei sposalizi, Romeo
diede l'anello a la sua cara Giulietta con grandissimo piacere di tutti
dui. 75

(u) . . . venne il fine de la festa del ballare e si cominciò a far la
danza o sia il ballo del “torchio” che altri dicono il ballo del “cappello.”
Facendosi questo giuoco, fu Romeo levato da una donna; il quale
entrato in ballo fece il dever suo, e dato il torchio ad una donna, andò
presso a Giulietta, ché così richiedeva l'ordine, e quella prese per
mano . . . 76

(v) E come tu l'averai digerita, . . . : Si che bevendo quest'acqua
là ne l'apparir de l'alba, poco dopoi ti addormenterai, . . e sopra il
tutto conosceva la vertù de l'erbe e de le pietre, ed era uno dei gran dis­
tillatori che a quei tempi si trovassero. E tra l'altre sue cose egli com­
poneva alcuni sonniferi semplici insieme . . . che poi riduceva in
minutissima polvere che era di meravigliosa vertù. 77

(w) . . . ne l'ora che già l'Aurora aveva cominciato a por il capo

fuor del balcone de l'oriente, ella in un sorso . . . la polvere con l'acqua animosamente bevendo, . . . La vecchia che seco dormiva . . . non pertanto del beveraggio da quella bevuto s'accorse; . . .

(x) . . . Venuta poi l'ora del levarsi de la giovane, tornò la vecchia a la camera dicendo come fu dentro:—Su su, chè gli è tempo di levarsi. —Ed aperte le finestre e veggendo che Giulietta non si moveva né faceva vista di levarsi, se le accostò e dimenandola disse:—Su su, dormigliona, levati.—Ma la buona vecchia cantava a' sordi . . .

(y) Corse la madre con frettoloso passo tuttavia lagrimando, e trovata la figliuola accocca del modo che udito avete, se fu dolente . . . Ella mandando le pietose voci fino a le stelle avrebbe . . . ad dolcite le tigri quando per la perdita dei figliuoli più irate sono.

(z) Fu subito mandato per i più famosi medici de la città, . . .

81 Bandello, loc. cit. Cf. Chaps. VIII, o and VI, q.
In 1559 appeared the first edition of Pierre Boaistuau's *Histoires tragiques*, a collection of tales selected and adapted from Bandello's *Novelle*, which had been published five years earlier. As his third tale, Boaistuau tells the "Histoire . . . de deux amans dont l'un mourut de venin, l'autre de tristesse." The author, however, makes numerous alterations in the work of Bandello, whose style he dislikes. The result has been a long and oscillating debate over the question of Boaistuau's originality.

According to a view prevalent several decades ago, Boaistuau was an imitator of Luigi da Porto, rather than of Bandello. This theory was vigorously opposed in 1913 by René Sturel, who, while admitting a few unimportant borrowings from Da Porto, believed thoroughly in Boaistuau's originality. According to Sturel, Boaistuau invented not only the famous scene of the apothecary of Mantua, but also the miserable defense which Frere Laurens made before the magistrates. Moreover, Sturel felt that Boaistuau gave evidence of powers of psychological analysis when he introduced the scene where Juliet first upbraids her husband in his absence and then condemns her own injustice.

Already a reaction has set in against this high appraisal of Boaistuau's originality. As we have seen, Henri Hauvette demonstrated that the true creator of the apothecary scene was Adrien Sevin. Sevin, it will be recalled, states that Halquadrich purchases from an apothecary a stick of poison four fingers long.
Here Boaistuau’s originality consists solely in enlarging as usual on his model, furnishing a somewhat detailed description of the apothecary shop and of its owner. The pharmacy, he says, is so poorly supplied with boxes and other equipment that Rhomeo is encouraged to draw the proprietor aside and offer him five hundred ducats, in exchange for a poison guaranteed to prove fatal in a quarter of an hour. The wretched apothecary, pretending before the other persons present that he is making a legitimate transaction, delivers to Rhomeo a dose of poison, half of which will kill the strongest man alive within an hour. Hauvette says nothing about Boaistuau’s feeble psychological analysis. On the other hand, Hauvette observes significantly that the far more original Sevin introduced the idea of the pundonor: Burglipha, after the slaying of her brother Bruhachin, begins by calling her lover Halquadrich the greatest traitor in the world. However, her pundonor is quickly satisfied, and after a little persuasion by the messenger Bostruch, she is reconciled with her lover, “oubliant l’homicide en son frère.” Hauvette might have noted also that in the dénouement Boaistuau perhaps follows Sevin in his account of the heroine. Instead of her holding her breath until she is dead, like the Giuliettas of Da Porto and Bandello, Iuliette kills herself with Rhomeo’s dagger, much as Burglipha takes half Halquadrich’s poison. In the argument placed at the beginning of Boaistuau’s Histoire, however, Iuliette dies of grief, as in the Argomento of Masuccio’s Thirty-Third novella.

It is my purpose to add a few words to the excellent article of H. Hauvette, and to reopen the question of Boaistuau’s literary obligations to Luigi da Porto.

Hauvette, in his discussion of Burglipha’s pundonor, notes simply that Sevin is a precursor of Corneille. He might have observed also that Sevin with his idea of pundonor is the direct source of Boaistuau, and consequently of Shakespeare. Boaistuau’s Iuliette has a pundonor very similar to that of Sevin’s Burglipha. Consequently, when Iuliette first hears of the death of Thibault, she curses Rhomeo because of his “acte si lasche & vituperable,” behaving of course in a manner utterly unlike the heroines of Da Porto and Bandello. But for Iuliette, as for Burglipha, the pundonor is a thin veneer. A few moments later, Iuliette readily changes her mind without explanation, and curses her “langue
meurtrière” for criticizing Rhomeo “duquel chacun approuve l’innocence.”

To be sure, both Da Porto and Bandello describe a sudden change of heart by Giulietta. The situation, however, is quite different: Giulietta, who has just met Rhomeo, hesitates at first, then decides to marry him. This scene, considerably diluted, is also found in Boaistuau, who thus affords Juliette the luxury of two important and extremely lachrymose revirements. He thus completely outdistances his Italian precursors, who never thought of a Chimène-like heroine who detests her lover out of a sense of duty to family. Luigi da Porto, as we have observed, actually omits all reference to any grief by Giulietta for the death of Tebaldo. Clizia’s Giulia merely pretends to grieve over the loss of her cousin, and, as we have seen, Bandello’s Giulietta behaves in substantially the same manner.

If Boaistuau is indebted to Sevin for the motive of the pundonor, as well as for the apothecary scene, he is under even greater obligations to Luigi da Porto, the most important of which concern the character of Frere Laurens. We have already noted the transformation of Fra Lorenzo by Bandello, including his omission of all references to improper relations between the friar and Romeo, as well as charges of necromancy and of grave robbing leveled against the churchman during a most embarrassing public trial. Boaistuau restores completely the more sinister character depicted by Luigi da Porto. He speaks of the “particulière amitié” existing between Rhomeo and the friar. The Frere Laurens of Boaistuau acts in a suspicious manner when he is arrested at the vault of the Capellets, and is readily accused of black art and desecration of tombs. Like the Frate Lorenzo of Luigi da Porto, he makes the painful public confession that he has lied—or rather, that he has “eslargi sa conscience,” preferring to place a slight stain upon his soul, rather than permit the young girl to commit suicide and be forever damned. As in the version of Luigi da Porto, his only excuse is his good intentions.

We may recall that René Sturel, while refusing to admit the importance of the influence of Luigi da Porto on Boaistuau, admitted certain slight points of resemblance between the two

---

9 Ibid., fos. 44—45.
10 Ibid., fos. 73v.
11 Cf. Chaps. VIII, g, and IX, s.
12 Boaistuau, op. cit., fo. 73v.
13 Ibid., fo. 75v.
authors. Considered separately, these relationships are negligible. But in view of the fact that Boaistuau completely restored the sinister character of Frere Laurens, according to the conception of Luigi da Porto, it becomes necessary to give a new appraisal to the parallels cited by Sturel, of which the following are examples: Boaistuau agrees with Da Porto in having Rhomeo go directly to Saint-François after leaving Iuliette; like Da Porto, he omits the letters written by Rhomeo to Iuliette during his exile. These petits faits become now what Hippolyte Taine would have considered very significatifs. They are in fact the proof that Boaistuau had before his eyes, at all times, not only Bandello, but also Luigi da Porto.

So far as the story of Romeo and Juliet is concerned, the true originality of Boaistuau consists almost exclusively of rather naïve details which he adds to the Italian narratives, frequently for the purpose of rendering his exotic story more plausible to French readers. For instance, he states that the servant Pierre experienced no difficulty in obtaining for his master Rhomeo a rope ladder equipped with two strong hooks at each end, for such contrivances were commonly used in Italy. He explains that Frere Anselme was commissioned by Frere Laurens to carry a message to Mantua, because in Italy the Franciscans regularly have in their monasteries obliging brethren who are accustomed to perform errands in the city.

In numerous instances, Boaistuau added details for realistic effect, just as Bandello himself had done when recasting the work of Luigi da Porto. One or two examples of the author’s attempted improvements upon his originals will suffice here: Iuliette receives Rhomeo in a brilliantly lighted bedroom. She is simply dressed, her only finery being a kerchief, which slips down upon her neck, as soon as she spies Rhomeo. Rhomeo, when informed by Pierre of the burial of Iuliette, weeps bitterly. Before leaving the room, he washes his face so that traces of his grief will not be visible.

Boaistuau carries his tendency towards realism into the field of character analysis. He seems to feel that the manners of Bandello’s Giulietta are far too independent for a well-bred girl. For this reason, he not only adopts readily the idea of the pundonor

15 Boaistuau, op. cit., fo. 68°.
16 Ibid., fo. 49°.
introduced by Sevin, but also continues the movement already begun by Clizia for the conventionalization of the heroine. His Iuliette listens meekly while her father Antonio invokes the harsh power of life and death which Roman parents exercised over their offspring, and threatens to incarcerate her in the gloomiest of prisons if she fails to marry the man of his choice. Instead of contesting such an arbitrary assertion of authority, she remains humbly on her knees, sobbing.

It is no wonder that such a dutiful daughter greets Rhomeo at the Capellets’ ball with a modesty not described by Italian writers. Her voice trembles, not with the passion of love, as in Bandello’s novella, but with maidenly reticence. When she welcomes Rhomeo, she dares not squeeze his hand amorously, as Luigi da Porto’s Giulietta had done. Rather she is so overwhelmed that her feelings make her inarticulate.

Such relatively forward heroines as Leonora and Bandello’s Giulietta had offered the suggestion that their lovers provide themselves with rope ladders, in order to pay clandestine visits. It is not surprising that Boaistuau, more conventionally, makes the mention of such a ladder come from Rhomeo himself.

Another character altered by Boaistuau is the nurse, or confidente, whose classic role seems to grow in importance in proportion to the conventionalization of Iuliette. The nurse prepares the nuptial bed for Rhomeo, and consoles Iuliette at the time of Thibault’s death. For concealing the clandestine marriage from Rhomeo’s father, she is banished by the Seigneur Barthelemy de l’Escale.

As for the plot, most of Boaistuau’s deviations from Bandello occur in the dénouement: Rhomeo expires before Iuliette awakens, his death being precipitated by the violence of the effort which he makes to fall upon her body. Frere Laurens, who enters the tomb with Pierre, discovers the fate of Rhomeo. At the same time

20. Ibid., fos. 42r-43r.
22. Boaistuau, op. cit., fo. 76v.
23. Ibid., fo. 71r. J. J. Munro says: “Romeo’s man and Laurens arrive after Romeo’s demise, while Juliet still sleeps, a circumstance which may be due to the influence of Clizia, or to another version of the legend.”—Munro, J. J. Brooke: ‘Romeus and Juliet,’ London: Chatto and Windus; New York: Dufield and Co., 1908, p. xxxv. However, Boaistuau here differs materially from Clizia, whose Giulia recovers consciousness before Romeo dies (Clizia, “L’infelice Amore e de’ due fedelissimi amanti Giulia e Romeo scritta in ottava rima da Clizia, nobile veronese ad Ardeo suo,” in Alessandro Torri’s Giulietta e Romeo, Pisa, 1831, IX, 14) and uses almost the exact words of Luigi da Porto’s Giulietta, who says to Romeo: “Se voi per la mia finta morte morete, e che non debbo io
Juliette awakens. While she grieves over the loss of her lover, Pierre and Frere Laurens depart, frightened by a noise. Pierre is exonerated by the Seigneur Barthelemy de l’Escale because he has faithfully obeyed his master, while Frere Laurens is pardoned in consideration of his former services to the Republic of Verona, as well as of his excellent general reputation. The most noteworthy omission made by Boaistuau is thus the touching farewell scene between the dying lovers, which Luigi da Porto, followed by Bandello, had introduced after the model of the Pyramus and Thisbe story.

It is evident that so far as really essential changes in the story of Romeo and Juliet are concerned, Boaistuau gives evidence of little originality. We may recapitulate his principal borrowings as follows: For the celebrated episode of the apothecary he is indebted to Adrien Sevin, as H. Hauvette demonstrated. From Sevin also comes the idea of the Cornelian honor of the heroine, and perhaps the manner of her suicide. Luigi da Porto furnishes Boaistuau the model of a corrupt priest who maintains compromising relations with Romeo. Luigi da Porto, not Boaistuau, is the first to depict a Frate Lorenzo who is a great liar and is suspected of necromancy.

The one important alteration of the plot by Boaistuau—the omission of the last touching farewell of the hero and heroine—is most unfortunate.

(a) Ah Rhomeo, Rhomeo quand au commencement i’eu accointance de vous, & que ie prestois l’aureille à vos fardees promesses confirmees par tant de iuremens, ie n’eussie iamais creu qu’au lieu de continuer nostre amitié & d’appaiser les miens, vous eussiez cherché l’occasion de la rompre par vn acte si lasche & vituperable, que vostre renommée en demeure à iamais interessée, & moy miserable que ie suis sans confort & espoux: Mais si vous estiez si affamé du sang des Capellets, pourquoi aucez vous espargné le mien, lors que par tant de


Morrete voi pel finto morir mio,
E che io non debba uccidermi crede.te
Pel vostro morir vero? . . .

—Clizia, op. cit., IV, r5.

The sole possible point of resemblance between the versions of Clizia and Boaistuau is the death of Romeo before the friar’s arrival. Bandello, however, says Romeo is almost dead before Fra Lorenzo appears.

59 Boaistuau, op. cit., fo. 72r.

60 ibid., foos. 76r—77.
fois & en lieu secret m’auez voulu exposer à la merci de vos cruelles mains? La victoire que vous aviez eu sur moi ne vous semblait elle assez glorieuse, si pour la mieux solemniser elle n’estoit couronnée du sang du plus cher de tous mes cousins? Or allez donc désormais ailleurs decouvrir les autres malheureuses comme moy, sans vous trouver en part ou ie sois, ne sans qu’aucune de vos excuses puisse trouver lieu en mon endroit. Et ce pendant ie lamentery le reste de ma triste vie avec tant de larmes, que mon corps esquisé de toute humidité cherchera en brief son refrigere en terre. Et ayant mis fin à ses propos, le coeur luy serra si fort qu’elle ne pouvoit ny plorer ny parler, & demeura du tout immobile, comme si elle eust esté transie, puis estant quelque peu reueneue avec une voix foible disoit: Ah langue meurtrière de l’honneur d’autruy, comme oses tu offender celui auquel ses propres ennemis donnent louenge? comment reiectes tu le blasme sur Rhomeo, duquel chacun approuue l’innocence? ou sera désormais son refuge, puisque celle qui d’eust estre l’unique propugnacle & asseuré rampart de ses malheurs, le poursuit & diffame? Rejoy, rejoy donques Rhomeo la satisfaction de mon ingratitude par le sacrifice que ie te feray de ma propre vie: . . .

(β) Le ieune Rhomeo (comme auons ià dit) des son ieune eage awoit tousjours eu ie ne scay qu’elle particuliere amitié auecques frère Laurens, & luy communiquoit ses secrets.

(ε) . . . les gardes de la ville passoient fortuitement par là aupres, lesquels aduisans la clarté en ce tombeau, soupconnerent incontinent que ce estoient Nicromanciens qui auoient ouuert ce sepulchre, pour abuser des corps morts, & s’en aider en leur art.

(δ) . . . toutesfois pressé d’importunité & de pitié, & craignant que Iuliette exerceast cruauté contre elle mesme, il auroit eslargi sa conscience, & mieux aimé donner quelque legiere attainte à son ame que de souffrir que ceste ieune Damoselle defeit son corps & meist son ame en peril.

(ε) . . . & luy commanda de recouurer promptement vne eschelle de cordes auec deux fors crochets de fer, attachiez au deux bouts, ce qu’il feit aisément, par ce que elles sont fort frequentes en Italie.

(φ) Et pour ce que la coustume d’Italie est que les Cordeliers doivent prendre vn compagnon à leur convoyce pour aller faire leurs affaires par ville.
(g) ... sans aucun peril il entra en la chambre, laquelle estoit aussi claire que le iour à cause de trois mortiers de cire vierge que Juliette auoit fait allumer pour mieux contempler son Rhomeo. Juliette de sa part pour toute pareure seulement de son couurechef s'estoit coiffée de nuict, laquelle incontinent qu'elle l'apperceut se brancha à son col.81

(h) A raison dequoy apres s'estre laué la face de peur qu'on cogneust son deuil il part de sa chambre.9

(i) Vien ça ingrate & desobeissant fille, as tu desia mis en oubly ce que tant de fois as ouy racompter à ma table, de la puissance que mes anciens peres Romains auoient sur leurs enfans auxquels il n'estoit pas seulement loisible de les vendre, engager & aliéner (en leur nécessité) comme il leur plaisoit, mais qui plus est, ils auoient entiere puissance de mort & de vie sur eux. De quels fers, de quels tourments, de quels liens te chastiroient ces bons peres, s'ils estoient resusctez? & s'ils voioient l'ingratitude, feonnie & desobeissance de laquelle tu vses enuers ton père, lequel avecques maintes prieres & requestes t'a pour­ueue de lvn des plus grands seigneurs de ceste prouince, des mieux renommez en toutes especes de vertus, duquel toy & moy sommes indignes, tant pour les grands biens (ausquels il est appele) comme pour la grandeur & generosité de sa maison de laquelle il est issu: & neantmoins tu fais la delicate, & rebelle; & veux contreuenir à mon vouloir.88

(j) ... elle ... se tourna vers luy, & la voix tremblante avec une honte virginale entremeslee d'vne pudicité, luy dist: Benoiste soit l'heure de vostre venue, à mon costé, puis pensant acheuer le reste, amour luy serra tellement la bouche qu'elle ne peut acheuer son propos.84

(k) Puis saisi d'vne douleur desesperée se laissa tomber sur le corps de lujette de telle vehemence, que le coeur attenué de trop grand tour­ment, ne pouuant porter vn si dur & dernier effort, demeura abandonné de tous les sens & vertus naturelles: en facion que le siege de l'ame luy faillit à l'instant, & demeura roide estendue.88

(l) Et comme elle pensoit continuer ses plainctes, Pierre aduertit frere Laurens, qu'il entendoit vn bruit pres de la citadelle, duquel intimidez, ils s'esloignerent promptement, craignans estre surpris.86

81 Ibid., fo. 49v.  
83 Boaistuau, op. cit., fos. 60v–61r.  
84 Ibid., fos. 42v–43v. Bandello writes: "Giulietta . . . con lieto viso alquanto verso lui rivolta, con tremante vece gli disse—Benedetta sia la venuta vostra a lato a me! —e così dicendo amorosamente gli strinse la mano."—Bandello, op. cit., II, p. 375.  
85 Boaistuau, op. cit., fo. 7r.  
86 Ibid., fo. 72v.
Boaistuau's "Histoire troisième de deux amans, dont l'un mourut de venin, l'autre de tristesse" became known in England chiefly through the metrical adaptation of Arthur Brooke, and the prose translation by William Painter (1566). Painter's version was faithful to the original, aside from errors due to ignorance of the French language. Brooke, in his 3020 lines, embroidered upon the text of Boaistuau and even added entire scenes which seem to be largely of his own invention. While Shakespeare was probably familiar with the work of Painter, he seems to have utilized rather the poem of Brooke, which has properly been called the basis of the tragedy. Consequently, for the remainder of this chapter, it will be advisable to neglect Painter's "Rhomeo and Julietta" and to concentrate attention upon Brooke's Romeus and Juliet.

It is barely possible that Brooke may have been influenced somewhat by a play which he had recently witnessed on the subject of Romeo and Juliet. The text of his reference to this unidentified play is here reproduced:

Though I saw the same argument lately set foorth on stage with more commendation, then I can looke for: (being there much better set forth then I haue or can doe) yet the same matter penned as it is, may serue to lyke good effect, if the readers do brynge with them lyke good myndes, to consider it. which hath the more incouraged me to publishe it, suche as it is.

---

1 Imprinted at London in Flete strete within Temble barre, at the signe of the hand and starre, by Richard Tottill the xix day of Nouember, An. do. 1562.


2 Printed in Painter's Palace of Pleasure. Ibid., p. xix.


4 Daniel, ed., op. cit., p. 4.
According to J. J. Munro who here closely follows P. A. Daniel, Brooke departed from his original in significant fashion:

he practically created the character of the Nurse; it is in his version first that the names of Capulet's guests are written; he made the apothecary; he developed Romeus' ravings at the cell,—though such a scene, as it occurs in Struijs, must have been in the earlier English source,—and he pictured his sorrow in exile; he introduced the scenes between Romeus and the Nurse, and between the Nurse and Juliet in connexion with arranging the marriage, and created the incident of Romeus giving the money to the Nurse. 5

Let us now examine in order these allegedly original features of Brooke's poem.

Brooke's chief contribution, we shall find, was his characterization of the Nurse. Boaistuau had represented her as a loyal soul, thoroughly amenable to Juliette's logic, and not requiring financial arguments on the part of Romeo. The more mercenary Nurse described by Brooke receives the gold of Romeus, bending her crooked knees lower than she had done for fourteen years, and then vows to devote the best of her craft to furthering the wedding plans of the lovers. When she returns to her mistress, she relates fully the results of her interview with young Montague, but is reticent only about the gold which she has accepted as compensation for her services. 6

For all her mercenary disposition, the Nurse of The Tragicall history of Romeus and Juliet seems to feel a genuine affection for her mistress. She revels in the recollection of the beauty of the infant Juliet, and of her pretty prating "with it tong." She boasts that she gave to the babe "sucke in youth." Indeed, her staunch loyalty to Juliet, combined with her avarice, and her readiness to sacrifice principle for the sake of expediency, render her character very inconsistent, and very human. She is never more herself than when she advises Juliet to marry County Paris, in order to avoid the rage of the senior Capilet, and also because Romeus may

5 Munro, J. J. Brooke's 'Romeus and Juliet.' London: Chatto and Windus; New York: Duffield and Co., 1908, pp. lvii-lviii.


7 Daniel, ed., op. cit., v. 654.
never return. Even if he does so, she explains, Juliet will be better off. "For one she shall haue twayne," with ample opportunity to avail herself both of husband and of paramour.

Although the independent Nurse who replaces Boaistuau's colorless confidante may fairly be called Brooke's creation, it will be necessary to make decided reservations regarding the other allegedly original features listed by J. J. Munro. While Boaistuau mentions no guest list issued by Antoine Capellet, he says that this gentleman invited all the nobility of Verona. The transition to the written list of names described by Brooke would appear to be a very simple matter. Moreover, the statement that Brooke "made the apothecary" is misleading. As already observed, H. Hauvette demonstrated that the apothecary was the invention of A. Sevin. Boaistuau developed the character somewhat, and Brooke's additions seem of little value. Thus, where Boaistuau is content with the statement that the apothecary is taken, tortured, and hanged, Brooke adds that as compensation for professional services rendered the executioner receives the condemned man's coat.

The poison sold by Boaistuau's apothecary requires a full hour to kill the most robust man in the world. Brooke's more efficient apothecary furnishes a poison that will "kill the strongest man aliue" in less than half an hour.

Let us pass now to the consideration of the allegedly original scene where Romeus, in despair after the killing of Tybalt, conceals himself in the friar's cell. Hoarse from sobs and plaints, with faltering tongue, and "with tender handes ywrong," he laments his fate, hurling reproaches against nature, "the author of his lyfe," which had meant for him "ioyes" that were "so scant," "the time and place of byrth," and "the starres aboue: The fatall sisters three." For good measure, he curses also his nurse, and "the hand that gaue him pappe," as well as the midwife "with tender grype that held him in her lappe." For this episode, Brooke could have found in Boaistuau only the suggestion that the friar was acquainted with Rhomeo's movements after the

---

*Ibid., vv. 2297-2308.
*Ibid., vv. 150-62. Here Boaistuau translates Bandello almost literally: "Et par ce que Antoine Capellet estoit chef de sa famille, & des plus apparents seigneurs de la cité, il feist vn festin, & pour le mieux solenniser, il conuia toute la noblesse tant des hommes que des femmes, en laquelle on peut voir aussi la plus grand part de la jeunesse de Veronne."
death of Thibault. On the other hand, Brooke here deserves little credit for originality, for the Job-like passage in question is quite similar to one found in Sevin's _conte_. There Halquadrich is described as being desperate because of the supposed death of Burglipha. Much like Romeus, Halquadrich curses not only the Stars, the Sky, Sun, Moon and Elements, but also complains that life for him has meant only tears and groans, from the day of his birth. The resemblances here noted seem evidence not that Brooke knew Sevin, but that both authors were following a conventional pattern.

The noteworthy innovations attributable to Brooke are thus reduced to one: his characterization of the Nurse. However, Brooke makes certain minor changes which may merit brief mention. He invents the name of “Frier Iohn” for the monk who in Boaistuau's _Histoire troisième_ is called “Frere Anselme.” Somewhat more important is an alteration which Brooke makes in two balcony scenes. In the first, Boaistuau's Juliette, from her window, perceives Romeo standing in the moonlight. At a later visit Romeo, inspired by love, scales the walls with great agility and reaches the window from which dangles the piece of cord that Juliette keeps in readiness. Brooke, who combines these two scenes, describes the approach of Romeus, who waxes so light that without difficulty he leaps over the wall. Promptly he espies Juliet, who watches from her window where she has carefully installed a “ladder made of corde” in anticipation of his visit. Boaistuau's Juliette tearfully whispers to her “Seigneur Romeo” that he seems too prodigal of his life in exposing himself to the attacks of those who have little cause to love him. Brooke's heroine complains in more vigorous language that Romeus is

12 “Et à fin que nous soyons plus assurées en quel estât il est, si me voulez promettre de ne vous plus contrister ainsi, ie sauray ce iourd'huy de frère Laurens ou il est retiré, ce que Juliette luy accorda. Et ceste bonne dame alors print le droit chemin à saint François ou elle trouua frère Laurens qui l'aduertit que ce soir Romeo ne faudrait à l'heure accoustumee visiter Iuliette, ensemble luy faire entendre quelle estoit sa delibera­tion pour l'aduenir.”—Ibid., fo. 55v.
14 Daniel, éd., _op. cit._, vv. 2955-56.
“too lasus sure” regarding his life, surrounded as he is by his “dedly foes, my kynsmen.”

In a few instances, Brooke evinces a certain power of metaphor, as when he says that Romeus “swalloweth downe loues sweete empoysonde baite.” Perhaps Boaistuau approaches this expression closest when, in a somewhat mixed metaphor, he makes Iuliette declare that Rhomeo seeks to dishonor her “under the veil of honeyed words.”

Nevertheless, many of the details which apparently have been credited to Brooke by such critics as Malone, Daniel and others, represent no essential deviation from the text of Boaistuau. Thus, Brooke’s Lady Capilet gives to her daughter a glowing description of the youth, fair features, grace, and bearing of the County Paris. In almost identical language, Boaistuau makes her praise Paris for handsome looks, grace, virtues, wealth, and position.

Brooke’s friar boasts to Iuliet that he is an authority on the powers of stones, plants, metals, “and divers other things that in the bowels of earth do looke.” His words are virtually a literal translation of the text of Boaistuau. If Boaistuau states that Rhomeo washes his face in order to remove evidence of his grief, Brooke adds merely that the water was “cleene,” and consequently efficacious in washing away all “staynes of dried teares.”

Whether by accident or not, Brooke agrees with Luigi da Porto, rather than with Boaistuau or Bandello, in at least one instance. It will be recalled that in Da Porto’s “Giulietta e Romeo,” the hero attends the ball of the Cappelletti, disguised as
a nymph. The ladies who see him, at first not suspecting his sex, compare him with the fairest women and find that he surpasses them all in beauty. Giulietta, with a characteristic frankness which is much attenuated in later Italian versions, actually tells Romeo that he appears to her more beautiful than any of the ladies present. Bandello, who neglects to describe Romeo's mask, naturally omits all comparison between the pulchritude of the hero and that of the ladies who attend the ball. Boaistuau likewise is content to refer simply to the "nayfue beauté" of Rhomeo. Brooke restores almost the exact language of Luigi da Porto:

    That Ladies thought the fayrest dames / were fowle in his respect.²¹

From the foregoing observations, it would therefore appear that the extent of Brooke's innovations has been greatly overestimated by critics. This fact is the more noteworthy since it was Brooke—and Brooke alone—who said that he "saw the same argument lately set foorth on stage with more commendation, then I can looke for." The lost play, witnessed by Brooke but apparently not utilized by him, has caused a great deal of ink to be spilled by critics. The curious fact is that all attempt to prove that other writers—Shakespeare, Struijs, et cetera—were influenced by this play, not Brooke himself.

(a) Then he * vi * crownes of gold / out of his pocket drew:  
    And gaue them her, a slight reward / (quod he) and so adiew.  
    In seuen yeres twose tolde / she had not bowd so lowe,  
    Her crooked knees, as now they bowe, / she sweares she will  
    bestowe.  
    Her crafty wit, her time, / and all her busy payne,  
    To helpe him to his hoped blisse, / and, cowring downe agayne:  
    She takes her leaue, and home / she hyes with spedy pace:  
    . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Nothing was done or said, / that she had left vntolde,  
    Saue onely one, that she forgot / the taking of the golde.²²

(b) And then she sweares to him, / the mother loves her well:  
    And how she gaue her sucke in youth / she leaueth not to tell.  
    A prety babe (quod she) / it was when it was yong:  
    Lord how it could full pretely / haue prated with it tong.  


A thousand times and more / I laid her on my lappe,
And clapt her on the buttocke soft / and kist where I did clappe.
And gladder then was I / of such a kisse forsooth:
Then I had been to haue a kisse / of some olde lechers mouth.  

She setteth foorth at large / the fathers furious rage,
And eke sheprayseth much to her / the second mariage;
And County Paris now / she praiseth ten times more,
By wrong, then she her selfe by right / had Romeus praysde before.
Paris shall dwell there still, / Romeus shall not retourne;
What shall it boote her life / to languish still and mourne.
The pleasures past before / she must account as gayne;
But if he doe retourne, what then? / for one she shall haue twayne.
The one shall use her as / his lawfull wedded wyfe,
In wanton loue with equall joy / the other leade his lyfe;
And best shall she be sped / of any townish dame,
Of husband and of paramour / to fynde her chaunge of game.

No Lady faire or fowle / was in Verona towne:
Nor knight or gentleman / of high or lowe renowne:
But Capilet himselfe / hath byd vnto his feast:
Or by his name in paper sent, / appoynted as a geast.

And more there is then you shall nede / for halfe of that is there
Will serue, I vnder take, / in lesse then halfe an howre
To kill the strongest man aliue; / such is the poysons power.

With wofull cheere, his wayling frend, / he standeth to beholde.
And then, our Romeus, / with tender handes ywrong:
With voyce, with plaint made horce, w* sobs, / and with a foltring tong,
Renewed with nouel mone / the dolours of his hart,
His outward dreery cheere bewrayde, / his store of inward smart,
Fyrst nature did he blame, / the author of his lyfe,
In which his ioyes had been so scant, / and sorrowes aye so ryfe:
The time and place of byrth, / he fiercely did reprowe, 
He cried out (with open mouth) / against the starres aboue:
The fatall sisters three, / he said, had done him wrong,
The threed that should not haue been sponne / they had drawne foorth too long.

Ibid., vv. 651-58.
Ibid., vv. 2297-2308.
He wished that he (ne) had / before this time been borne,  
Or that as soone as he was light, / his life he had forlorned.  
His nurse he cursed, and / the hand that gave him pappe,  
The midwife eke with tender grype / that held him in her lappe:  
And then he did complaine, / on Venus cruel sonne  
Who led him first unto the rockes, / which he should warely shonne.  
By meane whereof he lost, / both lyfe and libertie,  
And dyed a hundred times a day, / and yet could never dye.28

(4) So light he wox, he leapt the wall, / and there he spyde his wife.  
Who in the windowe watcht / the cumming of her lord:  
Where she so surely had made fast / the ladder made of corde:20

(i) Oh Romeus (of your lyfe) / too lauas sure you are:  
That in this place, and at this tyne / to hasard it you dare.  
What if your dedly foes / my kynsmen, saw you here?30

(j) But only seeketh by her sight / to feede his houngric eyes  
Through them he swalloweth downe / loues sweete empoysonde baite, . . .  
As oft the poysond hooke is hid, / wrapt in the pleasant bayte?31

(k) The person of the man, / the fewters of his face,  
His youthfull yeres, his fayrenes, and / his port, and semely grace,  
With curious wordes she payntes / before her daughters eyes,  
And then with store of vertues prayse / she heaues him to the skyes.32

(l) What force the stones, the plants, / and metals haue to woorke,  
And divers other thinges that in / the bowels of earth do loorke,83

(m) Wherfore when he his face / hath washt with water cleene,  
Lest that the staynes of dryed teares / might on his cheeks be seene.84

31 Daniel, ed., op. cit., vv. 2109-10, and p. xiv; Boaistuau, op. cit., fo. 63V.  
34 Daniel, ed., op. cit., vv. 2109-10, and p. xiv; Boaistuau, op. cit., fo. 63V.  
Let us now return for a moment to Italy where the blind poet and actor, Luigi Groto, known also as the "Cieco d'Hadria," composed in 1578 a blank verse tragedy entitled *La Hadriana*.\(^1\) While following in essential respects the earlier versions of the Romeo and Juliet story, Groto changed the scene from Verona to Hadria and transformed the names of the characters. Hatrio, King of the city of Hadria, replaced Antonio Cappelletti. His wife was Queen Orontea. His daughter, the Infanta Hadriana, was substituted for Giulietta. Instead of Romeo, Groto introduced Prince Latino, son of Mezentio, King of Latium, who was besieging Hadria. Fra Lorenzo gave way to "Mago," a priest of the Moon.

The earlier critics were almost unanimous in designating Luigi da Porto as Groto's principal source.\(^2\) J. J. Munro, while holding a different view, nevertheless says:

*La Hadriana* possesses in common with Da Porto and with no other Italian work: (1) The ironical statement that the heroine might rather wed their family enemy (a Montague or Latino) than him who has been chosen by her parents (Paris or the Sabine prince). (2) The heroine's asking for water in the night to quench her thirst, but really to mix her potion, (3) her drinking it in the presence of the servant, and (4) her statement before the servant that her father (Capulet or Mezentio) should not wed her that day. (5) The gift by the hero of his cloak to the messenger who brought the news of the heroine's supposed death.\(^3\)

Munro might have noted also that a most important exclusive

---

\(^1\) Groto, Luigi. *La Hadriana Tragedia Nova di Luigi Groto Cieco d'Hadria.* Venice, 1586. On fo. 5\(^r\) is the dedication: "Di Hadria, il di 29 di Novembre 1578."


agreement between Groto and Da Porto lies in the common omission of the ladder and balcony scenes, which were notable features of the story with most of our writers beginning with Bandello. Groto seems to follow Da Porto exclusively also in his account of the experiences of Mago’s messenger, who is unable to deliver a letter to Latino, not because of a plague epidemic, as in Bandello’s novella, but merely from inability to find the young prince. 4

Munro continues: “In common with Bandello, La Hadriana possesses: (1) The character of the Nurse as confidante and go-between. (2) The parting of the lovers at the heroine’s house, where the hero arrives by stealth.” 5

Nevertheless, Groto seems to have profited in other respects from his reading of later Italian versions of the Romeo and Juliet story. In the first place, he makes Prince Latino kill Hadriana’s brother in self-defense. He thus rejects the revenge motive introduced by Da Porto, and coincides with Clizia and Bandello, who represent Tebaldo as the aggressor in the fatal duel with Romeo. 6 Groto also agrees with Da Porto’s imitators in his account of the grief of Hadriana, who pretends to mourn for the death of her brother. It has already been remarked that Da Porto makes no reference to Giulietta’s sorrow for the loss of Tebaldo, a feature found in Clizia and adopted by Bandello. 7

In some respects, Groto seems to agree exclusively with Boaistuau. As Munro observes: “The conclusion in La Hadriana is different from that in both Da Porto and Bandello; in Groto’s tragedy, the heroine stabs herself, and the hero dies before the Mago arrives. This is precisely the ending in Boaistuau.” 8

It should be added that one of Boaistuau’s principal inventions was the noise which frightens Frere Laurens and Pierre while they are in Iuliette’s tomb. Groto parallels this scene by making Mago enter the tomb, accompanied by a “Ministro.” They are frightened by the stealthy approach of two unknown persons. 9

5 Munro, op. cit., p. xxxvii.
7 Groto, op. cit., Act III, Sc. 1, fo. 39r; cf. Act I, Sc. 3, fo. 22v; Chap. IX, s and Chap. VIII, a.
8 Munro, loc. cit.
Despite these similarities to Boaistuau, Groto leaves out the famous character of the apothecary, thus reverting to the versions of Da Porto and Bandello.

Several passages in *La Hadriana* have given rise to the surmise either that Shakespeare must have been directly influenced by Groto or, more probably, that both poets had access to a lost source. One bit of evidence concerns the letter which Mago sends by a messenger to Latino, advising him of the true fate of Hadriana. Here Groto, at variance with Bandello and Boaistuau, makes the “Ministro” return the undelivered letter to Mago. Let it be repeated, however, that this feature of *La Hadriana* seems to be due simply to imitation of Luigi da Porto, according to whom the messenger of Frate Lorenzo, unable to find Romeo at Mantua, keeps the letter in his hand. By an easy inference, apparently, Groto says that the “Ministro” brings the letter back with him.

Another argument for a connection between Groto and Shakespeare has been “the hero’s talk of his readiness to die in the parting scene with the heroine.” After killing Hadriana’s brother, Latino offers her his sword so that she may take vengeance upon him, if she desires. She prefers to exchange with him vows of eternal love. The same conventional scene occurs later, as we shall see, in Lope de Vega’s “Castelvines y Monteses,” and earlier in *Ippolito e Leonora*, where the heroine, declining the hero’s proffered dagger, chooses rather to be married to him, without priest or witnesses. On the other hand, Shakespeare’s Romeo merely tells Juliet:

> Let me be ta’en, let me be put to death.
> I am content, so thou wilt have it so.15

These words are little more than an echo of the chivalrous code which required a knight to risk his life at his lady’s caprice:

> Je fais ce que sa fantaisie
> Veut m’ordoner,
> Et je puis, s’il lui faut ma vie,
> La lui donner.

10 Munro, op. cit., p. xli.
12 Munro, op. cit., pp. xxxviii—xxxix.
If an Italian parallel for Shakespeare's lines is sought, it would be from Da Porto's "Giulietta e Romeo" rather than from La Hadriana and Ippolito e Leonora, for Da Porto's hero vows that he has no fear of capture or death, provided Giulietta is satisfied to reciprocate his love.16

Still another argument listed by Munro is "the mention of both poisoning and stabbing at the heroine's death,—in Grotto's play, Hadriana tells the Mago she has poisoned herself, and afterwards stabs herself; in Shakspere Juliet chides dead Romeo for leaving none of the poison, and also afterwards stabs herself."17 But here again we probably have only another instance of direct imitation of Luigi da Porto, whose Giulietta, in a somewhat earlier scene, also mentions both poisoning and stabbing. As will be recalled, she begs Frate Lorenzo for enough poison not only to kill herself, but also to liberate Romeo from disgrace. In case her request is denied, she threatens to slash her throat.18 In the tomb, however, Giulietta offers the friar a slightly different alternative: He is to leave her to die shut up in the vault, or furnish her with a knife with which she may slash her breast.19

Munro stresses also another point of resemblance between Grotto and Shakespeare, namely "the ironical words, in one case by the mother to the daughter and in the other by the daughter to the mother, that the daughter might rather wed the enemy who has slain her kinsman (Romeo or Latino) than her father's choice."20 Nevertheless, this scene, too, obviously goes back to Luigi da Porto, whose Madonna Giovanna assures Giulietta that a satisfactory husband will be provided for her, even in the improbable event that she wishes to marry one of the Montecchi.21 Without giving his reasons, Munro refuses to admit the possibility of a direct connection between Da Porto and Shakespeare.22

Grotto, like Shakespeare, greatly expands the role of the Nurse, and agrees exclusively with Shakespeare in two passages dealing with the Nurse: (a) her "entry . . . at the conclusion of the parting scene"; (b) "her interference in the arranging of the sec-
16 Da Porto, op. cit., p. 10.
17 Munro, op. cit., p. xxxix.
18 Cf. Chap. VI, m.
19 Da Porto, op. cit., p. 35.
20 Munro, loc. cit.
21 "Vedi, figliuola mia dolcissima, non piangere oramai più, chè marito a tua posta ti si darà, se quasi uno dei Montecchi volessi, il che sono certa che tu non vorrai . . ."—Da Porto, op. cit., p. 20.
22 Munro, op. cit., p. xxxix, note 4.
ond wedding (with Paris or the Sabine prince)." In general, it may be observed that the prominence given by Groto to the character of the Nurse may plausibly be explained by the influence of Bandello and Boaistuau, as well as by the exigencies of the construction of his play, which is after the classical manner. With the expansion of the role in question, the mathematical probability of coincidence with Shakespeare is naturally increased.

Another resemblance between Groto and Shakespeare lies in the consolation offered the father upon the supposed death of his daughter. In La Hadriana, the comforter is the "Consigliere"; in Shakespeare's tragedy, it is the Friar. Condolences, which were really reproaches for mourning, had of course been a literary convention for centuries. In Chrétien de Troyes' Yvain, for instance, the maid consoles the widow Laudine as follows on the loss of her husband:

Cuidiez vos ore recovrer
Vostre seignor por feire duel?

In Boaistuau's Histoire troisième, Juliette is not only consoled by her mother for the loss of Thibault, but told to rejoice because God has called him:

... parquoy moderez vous pour l'aduenir, & mettez peine de vous resioury sans plus penser à la mort de vostre cousin Thibault, lequel s'il a pleu à Dieu de l'appeller, le pensez vous reuoquer par vos larmes et contreuenir à sa volonté?

Groto goes slightly further than Boaistuau: the bereaved relatives should rejoice because the loved ones are actually better off dead than alive:

Se amate i figli, habbiate estrema gioia,
Che siano fuor de le miserie humane.
Se gli odiate allegratevi altretanto,
Che leuati ui sian dinanzi a gli occhi.

Groto and his model Boaistuau are thus in a sense precursors not only of Shakespeare, but also of Malherbe, author of the famous Consolation de Monsieur du Périer sur la mort de sa fille.

Ibid., p. xxxix.


Boaistuau, Pierre. XVIII histoires extraictes des oeuvres italiennes de Bandel, et mises en langue française... Les six premières par Pierre Boisteau, surnommé Launay, natif de Bretaigne. Les douze suivans par Franc. de Belle Forest, Comingois, Lyon, 1578, fo. 58.

The consolations offered by Iuliette’s mother and by Groto’s Consigliere bear nevertheless only a very general resemblance to the comforting words spoken by Shakespeare’s Friar to bereaved Capulet. On the other hand, some of the older critics have fancied that a close verbal similarity exists between the scene where Latino beholds the approach of dawn, and the second balcony scene in Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*. Groto writes:

**LAT** . . .

E (s’io non erro) è presso il far del giorno.
Vdite il Rossignuol che con noi desto,
Con noi greme fra i spini, e la rugiada
Col pianto nostro bagna l’herbe. Ah! lasso,
Riolgete la faccia a l’Oriente.
Ecco incomincia a spuntar l’alba fuori
Portando un altro Sol sopra la terra,
Che però dal mio Sol resterà uinato.

**HAD** . . .

Ahimè, ch’io geio. Ahimè ch’io tremo tutta.
Questa è quell’ora, che ogni mia dolcezza
Affatto stempra. Ahimè, quest’è quell’hora,
Che m’insegna a saper, che cosa è affanno.
O del mio ben nimica auara notte,
Perchè si ratto corri, fuggi, uoli.
A sommerger te stessa, e me nel mare
Te ne lo Ibero, e nel mar del pianto? 27

Here, nevertheless, Groto will be found to coincide with Shakespeare only in the references to the lark, and to the approach of day—well-known commonplaces in the Mediaeval aubes.

Perhaps the strongest argument against the alleged influence of Groto on Shakespeare is that advanced by G. Chiarini—the almost impassable barrier of style which separates the two tragedians. Groto’s play is written to fit a mode of acting ridiculed in *Hamlet*—with interminable monologues, couched in absurdly unnatural language. In place of a balcony scene, where Romeo woos Juliet in verses palpitating with emotion, Latino delivers to Hadriana an uninterrupted speech of 349 lines, followed by other

monologues only less wearisome. Another example of the way in which Groto handles highly emotional scenes is found in the cold reply which Hatrio makes to the counselor who consoles him for the supposed death of Hadriana:

Duolmi di questo sfortunato Regno,
Che dopo me restar de senza herede.\textsuperscript{28}

Let us contrast this speech with the reply which Shakespeare's Capulet makes to the Friar who attempts to console him:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Capulet}: All things that we ordained festival
Turn from their office to black funeral—
Our instruments to melancholy bells,
Our wedding cheer to a sad burial feast;
Our solemn hymns to sullen dirges change;
Our bridal flowers serve for a buried corse;
And all things change them to the contrary.\textsuperscript{29}
\end{quote}

Everywhere in Groto's dreary tragedy are lacking the vivid speech and action which form the very essence of Shakespeare's \textit{Romeo and Juliet}.

It is quite possible, therefore, that whatever apparent borrowings Shakespeare may have made from Groto may readily be explained as literary indebtedness—direct or indirect—to earlier Italian writers. By the same sign, there is no further logical necessity for the mysterious source which critics have proposed for Groto. The basic argument for the existence of such a version is that Groto "either made use of Da Porto, Bandello, and Boaistuau, all three, or borrowed from some third Italian source a novel or play, now unknown, which led Boaistuau to alter his ending, and which was based on, or similar to, Da Porto and Bandello."\textsuperscript{30} Critics of the "lost document" school are opposed to the idea of multiple sources, and Munro says in particular that "it is highly improbable . . . that Groto made use of Boaistuau."\textsuperscript{31} Munro states no reason why Groto may not, like numerous other Italians, have been very familiar with French literature. Moreover, in literary history, multiple sources have been the rule rather than the exception, a matter discussed in Chapter XIV.

\textsuperscript{28} Groto, \textit{op. cit.}, Act IV, Sc. 3, fo. 54*.
\textsuperscript{29} Shakespeare, \textit{op. cit.}, \textit{Romeo and Juliet}. Act IV, Sc. 5, vv. 84–90.
\textsuperscript{30} Munro, \textit{op. cit.}, p. xli.
\textsuperscript{31} ibid.
(a) Ma per me ti darei qual ti piacesse,
Quando fosse anco il figlio di Mezentio.
(Benche so che nol uuoi che l'odij a morte) . . .

(b) La lettera, che uoi mi commetteste,
Che non si desse ad altri, che a Latino
(Perche spiegata, altrui non ispiegasse
La vostra mente) altrui fidar non uolsi.
Me la riportai meco, e ue la rendo,
Verg(i) ne com'io l'hebbi la gran fretta
Che mi deste al tornar, non mi diè tempo
D'aspettarlo iui, o di cercarlo altroue.

(c) Hadriana speaking to her mother Orontea:
Lasciate almen, ch'io mi rihabbia alquanto
Dal dolor del fratel.

(d) Advice of Nurse to Hadriana:
Nel perder de lo sposo hai questo bene,
Che puoi dolerti almanco apertamente
E sotto uista d'un pianger l'altro.

(e) Mini. Due persone in qua uengon si strette,
E si celate, che (quantunque splenda
Cinthia nel ciel) conoscer non si ponno.

Mag. Il disegno m'è guasto, entriamo dentro,
E passati costor, tornerem fuori.

(f) Latino says to Hadriana:
Ecco la iniqua man, che 'l ferro strinse.
Ecco la spada nuda. Ecco la spada,
Empia ministra del dolente ufficio.
Questa ui porgo, altissima Reina,
Voi la pigliate. Onde dal nostro braccio.
Alzata al fin, giu declining poi
Soura me, porti il flagel nostro seco.
E'l colpo, che feci io faccia, e gastighi.

SHAKESPEARE’S DEVIATIONS FROM “ROMEUS AND JULIET”

The only known source of Romeo and Juliet is Arthur Brooke’s poem on Romeus and Iuliet.1 It is the general opinion that Shakespeare’s few deviations from his original concern the minor characters almost exclusively.2 My purpose is to call attention to seven changes in the roles of important characters, and to compare these changes with the original version of Luigi da Porto.

1. Let us consider first Romeo’s object in attending the Capulet ball. According to Luigi da Porto, Romeo goes to this festivity because he hopes to see his lady there.3 Bandello alters this motive, it will be recalled. He invents a counselor who advises Romeo to attend social functions for the opposite purpose of forgetting his first love. Bandello’s version is adopted by Boaistuau, and developed in a long passage by Brooke.4 Shakespeare follows the Bandello-Boaistuau-Brooke account to the extent that he retains the counselor of Romeo, to whom he gives the name of Benvolio. For his psychological analysis of Romeo, he agrees with Luigi da Porto, making the hero remain faith-
ful to his first lady until he actually catches sight of Juliet. Benvolio urges:

At this same ancient feast of Capulet's
Sups the fair Rosaline whom thou so lov'st;
With all the admired beauties of Verona.⁵

Loyal Romeo, who is not yet interested in the other “admired beauties of Verona,” replies: “I'll go along, no such sight to be shown, / But to rejoice in splendour of my own.”⁶ In thus apparently following the version of Luigi da Porto, rather than that of Brooke, Shakespeare represents Romeo as being far less fickle than he appears to be in Brooke's poem.

2. Shakespeare differs even more sharply from Brooke in the first balcony scene. Shakespeare's Juliet, in a soliloquy, avows her love for Romeo. Romeo at length intervenes, and Juliet, startled at the interruption of the unseen visitor, answers:

What man art thou that, thus bescreen'd in night,
So stumblest on my counsel?⁷

By way of contrast, it should be noted that in Brooke's poem Iuliet's soliloquy is finished at dawn, when Romeo is just getting out of bed.⁸ The hero arises after a night's slumber, passes his lady's house in broad daylight, and is promptly espied by her.⁹ A little further on Brooke introduces a moonlight scene,¹⁰ but here again Iuliet sees


Note also the following divergences in language between Shakespeare and Brooke:

**Jul.** If they do see thee, they will murther thee.
**Rom.** Alack, there lies more peril in thine eye
Than twenty of their swords! Look thou but sweet,
And I am proof against their enmity.

—Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, op. cit., II, ii, vv. 70–73.

Brooke accords with Shakespeare here only for Iuliet's speech:

What if your dedly foes / my kynsmen, saw you here?
Lyke Lyons wynde, your tender partes / asonder would they teare.

Romeo without the slightest difficulty. According to Luigi da Porto, however, Romeo frequently climbs upon Giulietta’s balcony at night, and sits listening to her talk, while she remains unaware of his proximity. For the time and eavesdropping of the first balcony scene, therefore, Shakespeare is in accord with the original Italian tale, rather than with Brooke’s poem.

3. Shakespeare, unlike Brooke, allows Juliet to go to the wedding unaccompanied by the Nurse. It is perhaps noteworthy that also in the novella of Luigi da Porto, Giulietta goes unescorted on her way to be married at the monastery of Santo Francesco. In Clizia’s poem,

Romeo replies (vv. 499-516) merely that he is willing to lay down his life for his lady. There is no hint that his chief danger lies in unrequited love, or that, once freed from this danger, he need no longer fear his enemies. Luigi da Porto, who is again much closer to Shakespeare than Brooke, seems clear on these points:


Shakespeare applies better psychology than Brooke, and at the same time amplifies the role of the Nurse. At first Juliet rails against Romeo (Romeo and Juliet, op. cit., III, ii. vv. 73-74). Presently the Nurse interrupts, criticizing all men in general, and Romeo in particular. She concludes: “Shame come to Romeo!” (v. 89). Immediately Juliet rushes to her lover’s defense, replying: “Blister’d be thy tongue / For such a wish! He was not born to shame:” (vv. 90—91). In this manner, what in Brooke’s poem is merely a soliloquy of Juliet with a capricious change of mood, becomes in Shakespeare’s play the natural reaction of the heroine to the criticism of the Nurse.

In Brooke’s poem there is an earlier soliloquy of Juliet which occurs shortly after her first meeting with Romeo. First she fears that he does not really love her. Then she changes her mind because of his handsome looks:

“/in no wise can it be, /That where such perfect shape /with pleasant beauty rests, /There crooked craft and treason blacke /should be appointed genes.”—Daniel, ed., op. cit., vv. 406-8.

Shakespeare seems to have had this earlier scene in mind when he has Juliet say to the Nurse: “Upon his brow shame is ashamed to sit;”—Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, op. cit., III, ii. v. 92.

Giulia goes to the monastery with her mother. Bandello’s Giulietta, with even greater propriety, is escorted not only by her mother, but also by her maids. Boaistuau dispenses with the chaperonage of the mother and specifies two contrasting companions, “la bonne vieille,” and “une ieune damoiselle.” Brooke identifies “la bonne vieille” as the “nurce,” while “une ieune damoiselle” is indefinitely translated as a “mayde.” Consequently, when Shakespeare has Juliet go alone to the cell of Friar Laurence, he is brushing aside the variants favored by Clizia, Bandello, Boaistuau, and Brooke, and is reverting to the original account of Luigi da Porto. At the same time, it should be noted, Shakespeare completely rejects Brooke’s conception of the heroine as a “wily wench.” In so doing, he is probably influenced also by Marlowe's Hero and Leander.

4. One of the capital scenes in Shakespeare’s play is the combat between Mercutio and Tybalt, in which Mercutio is slain, whereupon Romeo revengefully kills Tybalt. In Luigi da Porto’s “Giulietta e Roméo,” as we have observed, the hero, in order to avenge the wounding of his companions, attacks and kills Tebaldo. Bandello, followed by Boaistuau and Brooke, has Romeo try to separate the combatants, only to be assaulted by Tebaldo for his interference. Finally Romeo is forced to defend himself because of a treacherous blow aimed at him by his adversary. Shakespeare virtually restores the version of Da Porto to the extent that he makes Romeo fight Tybalt not for self-defense, but to avenge the death of a friend. With greater vividness, he has a single ill-starred duelist, Mercutio, personify the company of badly wounded Montecchi avenged by Da Porto’s Romeo.

24 Cf. Chap. VIII, i.
25 Cf. Chap. IX, i.
26 Boaistuau, op. cit., fo. 48v.
30 Cf. Chap. VI, i.
31 Cf. Chap. IX, 9, and Boaistuau, op. cit., fos. 51v, 52v, and 52v.
32 And then at Romeus hed, / a blow he strake so hard,
That might haue close him to the brayne/ but for his cunning ward.
In v. 1030 Brooke says: “When he him shope, of wrong receaude / tauenge himselfe by fight.” Here the idea, however, is personal revenge, amounting to self-defense; not vengeance for fallen comrades, as in Luigi da Porto’s novella.
5. Luigi da Porto says rather vaguely that the combat between Rome o and Tebaldo begins in the “via del corso.” We have seen that Clizia and Bandello add a more detailed reference to the “porta dei Borsari,” called by Boaistuau the “porte de Boursari,” which Brooke translates as “Pursers gate.” Shakespeare agrees with Da Porto in omitting all mention of this gate.

6. Let us consider now the fateful scene where Lady Capulet brings word that her husband “hath sorted out a sudden day of joy” for his sorrowing daughter. The mother explains that lucky Juliet is to be married the following “Thursday morn” at Saint Peter’s church to the County Paris, a “gallant, young and noble gentleman.” But Juliet flatly rejects the proposed happiness:

   I pray you tell my lord and father, madam,
   I will not marry yet; and when I do, I swear
   It shall be Romeo, whom you know I hate,
   Rather than Paris.

For this passage, Shakespeare agrees exclusively with Da Porto, and with Da Porto’s imitator, Groto. We have already noted that in “Giulietta e Romeo” Madonna Giovanna declares that Giulietta shall marry according to her inclinations, even though, contrary to all probability, she decides to wed one of the Montecchi. The only important deviation by Shakespeare is to put into the mouth of the daughter approximately the words originally ascribed to the mother.

7. As already observed, Shakespeare agrees exclusively with Da Porto and Groto in “the mention of both poisoning and stabbing at the heroine’s death.”

A discussion of the minor characters lies beyond the scope of this investigation. Suffice it to note that events which in earlier versions were relegated to the middle or end of the story are often foreshadowed in the first act of Shakespeare’s play, with a corresponding development of minor roles. For instance, the character of Tybalt appears in Brooke’s poem only once—at the time of his last and fatal battle. Shakespeare introduces him in the first act, giving us a foretaste of the young man’s prowess by his duel with Benvolio, and by his threatened brawl with Rome o at the Capulet ball. The projected marriage of Juliet to the County
Paris, which in earlier versions is discussed only towards the end of the story, is forecast by Shakespeare in two scenes of the first act. Here are introduced also the elder Capulets and Montagues. In earlier versions, the Montagues appear for the first time after the death of Romeo, while the Capulets can scarcely be said to be introduced before the time of Juliet’s marriage. The County Paris himself, whom Brooke mentions by name only late in the narrative, has a speaking role in the first act of Shakespeare’s play. It may be significant, however, that Shakespeare, reverting to the version of Luigi da Porto, makes Peter a servant of Juliet’s household; Bandello, Boaistuau, and Brooke far more logically make him Romeo’s man. Passing mention will be made, moreover, of one instance in which Shakespeare deviates from Brooke in the treatment of the character of Friar Laurence. According to Brooke, the “gostly syre” is at first very reluctant to marry Romeo to Juliet:

A thousand doutes and moe / in thold mans hed arose:
A thousand daugners like to come, / the olde man doth disclose,
And from the spousall rites / he readeth him refrayne:
Perhaps he shalbe bet aduisde / within a weeke or twayne.

Shakespeare’s Friar Laurence merely chides Romeo “for doting, not for loving,” and makes not the slightest attempt to dissuade the young man from marrying Juliet. In fact, he rather welcomes the opportunity to “turn your households’ rancour to pure love.” Thus Shakespeare is once more in accord with Luigi da Porto, whose Frate Lorenzo, far from objecting to the wedding plans of Romeo, is delighted at the prospect of reconciling the warring Cappelletti and Montecchi.

We are confronted with the problem: Did Shakespeare read Luigi da Porto’s “Giulietta e Romeo,” of which no known English or French translation existed in the sixteenth century, just as he apparently used in his Merchant of Venice the untranslated

---

54 Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, op. cit., I, ii, vv. 1-37.
56 Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, op. cit., II, iii, vv. 82 and 92. Brooke’s “fryer” finally comes to the conclusion that “both the householdes wrath / this mariage might appease.” (Daniel, ed., op. cit., v. 609.) The conclusion is reached, however, only after a long argument and much “earnest sute” (v. 607) and is not spontaneous as in Shakespeare’s play.
57 “Il frate di ciò contento fu, si perché a Rome o niuna cosa avrebbe senza suo gran danno potuta negare, si anco perché pensava, che forse per mezzo suo sarebbe questa cosa succeduta a bene: il che a lui di molto onore sarebbe stato presso il signore ed ogni altro, che avesse desiderato queste due case veder in pace.”—Da Porto, op. cit., pp. 12-13.
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Pecorone of Ser Giovanni Fiorentino and Novellino of Masuccio? The standard observation in such cases, that at most Shakespeare could have done no more than resort to long-lost vernacular translations, is becoming decidedly shopworn, if not actually threadbare. Why could not Shakespeare, like that other great actor-dramatist Molière, have been influenced directly by Italian literature? We must bear in mind the extraordinary exactness, even in the sequence of events, with which Shakespeare has usually followed Brooke, and the notoriously servile fidelity with which Bandello has regularly copied Luigi da Porto. Yet, in spite of mathematical probability, Shakespeare agrees in at least six or seven instances exclusively with Luigi da Porto. In each case an important scene is concerned, such as the significant passing of Romeo “from the sphere of fancy to the sphere of imagination”; the duel with Tybalt, where Shakespeare ties “the central knot of his play”; Juliet’s wedding; the first of the celebrated balcony scenes; the fateful news of the proposed marriage to Paris; and the heroine’s suicide.

Three solutions for the puzzle present themselves. We can ignore the remarkable coincidence that in practically every important divergence from Brooke, when dealing with the lovers, Shakespeare finds himself in agreement with Luigi da Porto, and explain all changes involved as the result of psychological analysis by the poet. We can invoke the long-lost tragedy, witnessed by Brooke, and presumably also by Shakespeare, and overlook the fact that the nature of this tragedy is even more conjectural than that of the Roméo et Juliette by Châteauvieux, first played at the courts of Charles IX and Henri III, and revived in Normandy in 1581. Or we may adopt the simplest and most natural expla-

88 Maurice Jonas is convinced that Shakespeare was totally unacquainted with the novella of Luigi da Porto. He promises: “In a subsequent volume I intend analysing these two versions, and then it will be clearly shown that Shakespeare followed this poem (= Arthur Brooke) and this poem only.” — Jonas, Maurice. Romeo and Juliet: A photographic reproduction of Luigi da Porto’s prose version of Romeo and Giulietta dated 1535. London, 1921, p. xxxii. (Cf. pp. xxvii–xxxi.) So far as I have been able to discover, the projected volume of proof has never appeared.

89 I leave out of account the shortening of time which Shakespeare introduces for dramatic effect.


93 Fränkel, Ludwig. “Untersuchungen zur Entwickelungsgeschichte des Stoffes von Romeo und Julia.” Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte and Renaissance-
nation, that Shakespeare had access, directly or indirectly, to the original Italian version of Luigi da Porto.⁴⁴ We need only divorce ourselves from the reactionary logic of Richard Farmer’s *Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare*, and make proper allowance for “what he may have learnt through books and the visits of others, or through converse with some of the many Italians resident in London.”⁴⁵

---


The real name of Châteauvieux was Gérin la Gamme, and he was “valet de chambre du Roi et de Monsieur le duc de Nemours.” The argument of his play was apparently taken from Bandello, and the last authenticated performances occurred, with musical accompaniment, at Neufchâtel-en-Bray, “les lundi et mardy gras de ladite année 1581,” before a daily audience of more than 3000, who were permitted to enter or leave whenever they liked. An account of these performances is given by Adrien Miton, citizen of Neufchâtel, in his *Mémoire*, a bad eighteenth-century copy of which was edited by F. Bouquet in 1884 for the Société de l’Histoire de Normandie: *Documents concernant l’Histoire de Neufchâtel-en-Bray et ses environs*.

⁴⁵ We need not necessarily side with those unorthodox investigators who contend that Shakespeare traveled in Italy some time during the period 1592–94. Moreover, it is of course possible that friends of Shakespeare who knew Italian translated or outlined the Italian originals.

LOST DOCUMENTS, WITH A DISCUSSION OF THE “ROMEO EN JULIETTE” OF JACOB STRUIJS AND THE “CASTELVINES Y MONTESES” OF LOPE DE VEGA

It is now time to assay if possible the numerous “lost documents” which scholars have proposed in connection with the Romeo and Juliet legend. Ever since Leverrier, basing his calculations upon the perturbations of Uranus, was able to predict the discovery of the remote planet Neptune, it has been the ambition of many scholars, using as evidence the variants of known stories, to prove the existence of unknown novelle and plays. Two important differences are observable, unfortunately. On the one hand, the discovery by Leverrier remains after a century—with one possible exception—unique in the field of astronomy, whereas impatient literary scholars insist on prognosticating the discovery of scores and hundreds of lost documents. On the other hand, Leverrier stuck to his calculus, while literary scholars have too often adopted methods which a mathematician would abhor.

Generally investigators of the “lost document” school make two basic assumptions: (a) multiple sources are impossible; (b) no author can possess any considerable degree of originality, so that all discoverable deviations in his work from what has been considered a known source call for an explanation by a single unknown source. In rare instances, an argument for a “lost source” is made without the first assumption. On the other hand, a few scholars are inclined to waive the second assumption in the case of authors of rare genius, such as Shakespeare and Lope de Vega.

As a good example of the combined assumptions (a) and (b), let us consider again J. J. Munro’s theory regarding Luigi Grotto’s sources. It will be recalled that Munro, arguing for an unknown precursor of Grotto, says:

Grotto either made use of Da Porto, Bandello, and Boaistuau, all three, or borrowed from some third Italian source a novel or play, now unknown, which led Boaistuau to alter his ending, and which was based on, or similar to, Da Porto and Bandello . . . the play (=» la Hadriana) seems to be too distantly removed from the story of the
Italian novels to warrant the assumption of immediate connexion with
them; and it is highly improbable, too, that Grotto made use of
Boaistuau. If then, as seems likely, there was a third Italian version
of the 
Romeo story, other than Clitia, it must have been some adap­
tation or translation of this, which apart from Brooke, influenced
Shakspere.

It will be observed that Munro assumes that: (a) multiple
sources being impossible, Grotto could not have known Boaistuau,
in spite of the well-known Italian predilection for French litera­
ture; (b) Grotto could not possibly have been endowed with
sufficient originality to account for a play so “distantly removed
from . . . Italian novels.” By taking for granted these two funda­
mental “principles,” Munro is able to hypothesize two lost sources:
(a) a lost novel or play; (b) “some adaptation or translation of
this . . . apart from Brooke . . .”

It should be remarked, however, that Munro apparently
regards assumption (b) alone as nearly sufficient basis for hypothes­
sizing a lost source. In a note concerning the duration of Juliet’s
sleep, he says: “In Sh. L. says the trance shall last forty-two hours,
IV. i. 105. In Boaistuau, p. 69, and in Struijs he says at least forty
hours. Painter followed Boaistuau. It may be that Sh. got his
forty-two hours from the old play(?) . . ..” To be sure, the
proof for a missing document is here so tenuous that Munro
queries it. Nevertheless, it may be interesting to see to what
extremes Munro’s suggested line of reasoning would lead us. Let
it be recalled that Masuccio, following Boccaccio exactly, says
that the narcotic is to be effective for three full days. However,
Boccaccio’s abbot could regulate the dose, so that the victim
Ferondo would sleep about four hours only, if desired. Sermini’s
heroine la Montanina lost consciousness for only a few hours; the
Giulietta of Da Porto, about forty-eight hours; Bandello’s heroine,
fifty hours; and the Iuliette of Loys Guyon, more than thirty
hours. If each difference of duration of stupor is evidence of a
lost document, how many such documents shall we have to con­
jure up to explain the varying figures above cited?

In a slightly different category is Harold de Wolf Fuller who,
although accepting whole-heartedly assumption (a), is inclined
to modify somewhat assumption (b). Fuller maintains that the

1 Munro, J. J., Brooke’s ‘Romeus and Juliet.’ London: Chatto and Windus; New
York: Duffield and Co., 1908, p. xli.

2 Ibid., p. 140, note 6.

Romeo en Juliette of Jacob Struijs was not based on Shakespeare's play, but upon a common source, "perhaps indeed the play referred to by Brooke." Fuller observes, in support of his own contention, that Struijs agrees in turn exclusively with Boaistuau, with Brooke and with Shakespeare, whose Romeo and Juliet had appeared nearly forty years before. Fuller believes it unlikely that Struijs made use of all three of these works, and thinks consequently that he must have consulted a lost document which was also accessible to Shakespeare. As J. J. Munro remarks: "Here, again, we are presented with the same alternatives as in the case of Luigi Groto and the Italian novelists, either that Struijs used Boaistuau and Brooke and Shakspere, or that he used Boaistuau for basis and some now lost composition which influenced Brooke's poem and Shakspere's play."

At this point we may pause to inquire whether it is not the common practice of authors to use many different sources. It might be instructive, for instance, to peer for a moment into the workshop of a more modern writer, and see what deductions can be reached from the author's own notes. To cite a typical example: Victor Hugo, in Notre-Dame de Paris, demonstrably interweaves the basic Preciosa and Cinderella themes with an extremely large number of passages borrowed here and there, without benefit of a single "lost play" or "lost novel." Numerous other modern novelists have likewise adopted the principle of a jagotage de tant de diverses pièces advocated by Montaigne, who to some extent shared the ambition of numerous other Renaissance writers to produce works which were veritable mosaics of literary allusions, usually but not always classical. Something similar seems to have happened in the development of the legend of Romeo and Juliet. Boaistuau draws from Sevin, as well as from Bandello. Bandello is indebted to Luigi da Porto, but also to the author of Ippolito e Leonora, and probably also to Clizia. Luigi da Porto draws materials from Masuccio, from Ovid, from the Cronaca MS Udinese, from one or two Dante commentators, as well as from his own life. Masuccio shows by a surprising self-contradiction that he is trying unsuccessfully to reconcile at least

2 Fuller, loc. cit.
3 Munro, op. cit., pp. xlii-xliv.
two different narratives by Boccaccio. Unless we are to hypothesize an extraordinary number of “lost documents” all along the line, it would seem that so far as the legend of Romeo and Juliet is concerned, multiple sources are the rule—that the single source advocated by so many scholars is distinctly open to question.

Regarding assumption (b), H. de Wolf Fuller’s position is extreme. He differs from other critics of his school by allowing even less originality to the average author, and far more originality to the superior author. Let us observe first one of his arguments regarding Struijs, an average writer: Fuller asks why, if Struijs was “pilfering” Shakespeare, “did he choose to obliterate the important feature of Paris’ visit to the tomb, and to conform thereby to the older versions?” He adds: “What better proof could there be that an English source of D (= Struijs) served as a link somewhere between Boaistuau and S (= Shakespeare)?”

Apparently Fuller considered Struijs as so pitifully devoid of initiative that not only what he wrote, but even what he chose to omit, had to be explained by a “lost” English source. If we carry this argument to the logical extreme, we shall have to invent a great many other “lost” Continental sources, to supplement the “lost” English source. Otherwise, how can we understand why Luigi Groto rejects the second balcony scene, although frequently following Bandello elsewhere; and why he omits the important character of the apothecary? We must conjure up lost documents also to account for the strange case of Boaistuau, who leaves out the touching farewell of Rhomeo and Juliette in the tomb, and is thus indirectly responsible for what some critics consider the greatest flaw in Shakespeare’s play. In fact, we shall need an infinite number of lost documents to explain why authors have ever been as erratic as publishers—or let us say critics—in their judgments. Struijs, leaving out Paris’ visit to the tomb, is no more extraordinary than Petrarch repenting of writing his *Rime*.

We pass now to the consideration of Fuller’s opinions regarding the greater originality of superior authors. These views he introduces in connection with a discussion of the close parallelism between Shakespeare and Struijs, which Fuller regards as evidence not that Struijs copied Shakespeare, but that he followed an unknown “English” source with very slight alteration. Fuller adds: “Let the unconvinced but place side by side the *Romeo and

---

8 Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
LOST DOCUMENTS

Juliet of Shakspere and Lope de Vega’s dramatization of this fable. The absolute dissimilarity of the two plays is proof of what results when playwrights of imagination attack the same story. On these grounds, therefore, it seems highly probable that Struijs did not bother to make many changes.”

As a matter of fact, Lope de Vega agrees exclusively with Shakespeare in one or two important passages, a matter which will be discussed presently. As for the rest, it is pertinent to inquire: Is it at all safe to rate an author by the number of changes which he makes from his original? On that basis, Sevin and Grotto, not to mention poor Ducis, would rank far ahead of Shakespeare.

We find, then, that the “lost sources” proposed by scholars for the Romeo and Juliet legend remain in a nebulous state. On the other hand, there can be little doubt regarding the very real origins of the “lost document” school of critics. As is well known, “lost documents” were a favorite device of German scholars who, to cite one notable instance, stoutly favored the theory of a large number of hypothetical short ballads, long ballads and Zeitgedichte as the forerunners of the Chanson de Roland. The German argumentation, which was sehr tief und sehr dunkel, found universal acceptance until a challenge was made by the late Joseph Bédier. It is not surprising, therefore, that Ludwik Fränkel lists one compatriot, Stiefel, who maintained that Lope de Vega’s “Castelvines y Monteses,” a tragicomedy with farcical elements, on the Romeo and Juliet theme, was based on a lost Italian version. Fränkel mentions another German scholar, Schulze, who thought that both Masuccio and Da Porto used a lost source. Fränkel adds that Cohn also was convinced that Sevin copied a suppositional earlier Italian model. Fränkel himself seems to favor a lost source used by Da Porto but apparently not by Masuccio. He observes also that both the Merchant of Venice and Measure for Measure represent an abundance of mysterious sources—uns verdeckte Kanäle! Obviously, this literary nebular hypothesis means that all Shakespeare’s works were little more than a dramatization of myriads of undiscovered novelle and plays.

*Ibid., p. 100.

The alleged “lost sources” for Luigi da Porto and Adrien Sevin have already been discussed in Chapter VII. There remains for final consideration the question of Stieffel’s theory of the origins of Lope de Vega’s “Castelvines y Monteses.”

In the first place, it should be noted that in Lope de Vega’s tragicomedy, the names of the principal characters are confused. To be sure, Giulietta is Julia; Romeo is recognizable as Roselo; while Antonio and Paris are actually unchanged. On the other hand, Fra Lorenzo becomes Fray Aurelio; Marcuccio is altered to Otavio, a cousin and suitor of Julia; while Teobaldo is made the father of Otavio. This muddling has been explained by Hauvette as an indication that the author was trusting to a hazy memory, rather than copying directly from a written source.

Now, if Lope de Vega had been using an older version, dimly recollected, it must apparently have been the same as that supposedly used by Shakespeare. According to J. J. Munro, one of Shakespeare’s seven main deviations from Brooke was “Tybalt’s outcry against Romeo at the feast.” Munro explains that Shakespeare probably got this incident from the “older version” where “there was probably some reference to, or representation of, Tybalt’s storm at the feast.” However, as Hauvette has pointed out, the same incident is also found in “Castelvines y Monteses,” Antonio replacing Tybalt. Especially notable here is the apology

13 Munro, op. cit., p. lviii.

ANTONIO ¿Hay mayor atrevimiento?
¡Roselo en mi casa! . . .

TEOBALDO . . . es una noble llaneza
Y que con su poca edad
No siente la enemistad
Que es en él naturaleza:
Y es señal que no ha tenido
Odio jamás á esta casa . . .

ANTONIO ¿No puede venir armado
É intentar una traición?

TEOBALDO Eso es hablar con pasión.
De noble el mancebo ha entrado
Sin reparar si era error
Estando junto un linaje.

ANTONIO ¿Y no es de mi casa ultraje?
which Teobaldo makes for Roselo, which is quite comparable to that made for Romco by Capulet.

The difficulty is that Lope de Vega’s “lost document” had to be not only the one allegedly used by Shakespeare, but at the same time the one which supposedly inspired Groto. According to Lope de Vega, after the duel Julia comes to see Roselo, who offers her his sword so that she may kill him in case she desires to avenge the death of Otavio. She declines, professing greater loyalty to her husband than to her relatives. Here Lope de Vega agrees exclusively with Groto, whose Latino, in the same situation, offers his sword to Hadriana so that she may take vengeance upon him. As we have seen, J. J. Munro uses this scene to prove a close agreement between Groto and Shakespeare, explainable only by a lost “third Italian version.” Let it be repeated, however, that the resemblance between Groto and Shakespeare is very superficial, and not at all comparable to the identical situation found in Groto and Lope de Vega. Are we then to conclude that Lope de Vega consulted a very special “lost document,” which conveniently agreed exclusively with Shakespeare for “Tybalt’s storm at the feast,” and equally exclusively with Groto for the episode of the sword heroically proffered by the hero to the heroine? Even if we discover such a document, however, we shall still have to explain what lost novella was consulted by the author of Ippolito e Leonora, where the hero offers the heroine a dagger with which to kill him if she so desires, not to mention Victor Hugo, who uses similar episodes both in Bug-Jargal and in Notre-Dame de Paris.

Manifestly, the case for a “lost source” for Lope de Vega is no better and no worse than for Luigi da Porto, Sévin, Boaistuau, Struijs, and the others for whom such theories have been so
abundantly and so ingeniously devised by critics. In fact, the case is exactly the same as for Shakespeare and for Grotto, with each of whom Lope de Vega strangely coincides in at least one instance, as we have just seen. It might be added that even if one of the numerous "lost documents" so freely proposed should be unearthed, it might easily prove to be a great disappointment. Let it be repeated: So far there is authentic evidence of just one lost play on the Romeo and Juliet theme witnessed by a writer on the subject. This play was witnessed by Arthur Brooke, who gives little or no evidence of being influenced thereby.
OTHER DOCUMENTS, WITH A DISCUSSION OF GIROLAMO
DALLA CORTE'S "ISTORIE DI VERONA" AND LOYS
GUYON'S "LES DIVERSES LECONS"

Only passing mention is due to Girolamo dalla Corte, a
nephew of Gerardo (or Gherardo) Boldieri, better known as
"Clizia." Dalla Corte's "Istorie di Verona" first appeared in 1594,
and is the only Italian chronicle to contain mention of Romeo and
Giulietta. The untrustworthy author, who was formerly taken
seriously by Veronese and Paduan scholars, copies Bandello almost
verbatim except for omissions.¹

Relatively unimportant for our purpose also is Loys Guyon,
the earliest edition of whose Les Diverses Leçons was published
in Lyon in 1604, although Ludwig Fränkel attempted to date the
collection as early as 1560, and to magnify its significance.² Guyon
seems to be summarizing Boaistuau from memory, with even less
accuracy than was displayed by Lope de Vega when he likewise
trusted to his recollections in "Castelvines y Monteses." Guyon's
Juliette, for instance, is of the noble house of the "Monteschès,
while her secret husband Romeau is a gentilhomme of the
"Capelets."³ Romeau is attacked by Juliette's uncle,⁴ not by her

¹"Giulietta che... si sentì pigliar per mano,... gli disse:Benedetta sia la
venuta vostra a lato a me!—e così dicendo amorosamente gli stringe la mano. Il giovine...
dolcemente a lei stringendo la mano... le ripose:—Madonna, e che benedizione è cotesta che mi date?... Ella alora dolce ridendo rispose:—Non vi meravigliate, gentil
giovine, che io benedica il vostro venir qui, perció che messer Marcuccio già buona
pezza... tutta m'aggiaccia, e voi la vostra merce con la dilicata mano vostra mi
scaldate."—Bandello, Matteo. Le Novelle. Gioachino Brognoligo, ed., "Scrittori d'Italia"

²"... la quale, tantosto che da lui si sentì toccar la mano, gli disse: benedetta sia
la vostra venuta; ed egli stringendogli la mano, rispose: e che benedizione è questa,
signor mia? ed essa sorridendo ripigliò; non vi maravigliate, signore, che io benedica la
venuta vostra, percióché m. Marcuccio già buona pezza tutta m'aggiaccia, e voi per
vostra cortesia siete venuto a riscaldarmi."—Dalla Corte, Girolamo. "Istorie di Verona.
Verona, 1596, I, Bk. 10, pp. 589-90, cited by A. Torri in his Giulietta e Romeo, Pisa,
1837, p. 124.

³Fränkel, Ludwig. "Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Stoffes von
Romeo und Julia." Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte und Renaissance-

⁴Guyon, Loys. "Histoire d'une damoiselle Veronoise." Les Diverses Leçons. Lyon,
1625, I, p. 606.

⁵Ibid.
cousin. Both Romeau and Iuliette are already dead when the Cordelier arrives at the tomb, whereas in Boaistuau’s Histoire Romeo has expired, but Iuliette is sleeping. Curiously, Guyon agrees with Masuccio and Da Porto in one respect. The Franciscan friar proposes that Iuliette escape from the tomb en habit de Cordelier, comme novice. Similarly, Masuccio’s Ganozza sets out, clothed as a friar, to join her husband in Alexandria, while Luigi da Porto’s Giulietta plans to disguise herself in the same manner. On the other hand, neither Bandello nor Boaistuau specifies how the heroine is to be dressed. Perhaps the Dominican Bandello was shocked at what may have seemed to him the irreverent use of a friar’s costume found in Da Porto’s novella. Guyon’s agreement with Masuccio and Da Porto may or may not be due to coincidence.

Guyon’s nécessiteux Apoticaire seems taken directly from Boaistuau. It may be of interest to note, however, that Guyon elsewhere describes another corrupt apothecary, patronized in this case by an illicit lover.

It is the purpose of this study, however, merely to retrace the pathway to Shakespeare. For the numerous other writers after 1600 who treat the subject of Romeo and Juliet, the reader is referred to the concluding chapter of Henri Hauvette’s La “Morte Vivante.”


" . . . il te pourra emmener secrètement à Mantouë, . . . "—Boaistuau, op. cit., fo. 64*.

"Contre les reins, vescie & parties genitives, je ne veux mettre que les cantarides, desquelles si on en fait prendre quantité, & plus que les doctes Medecins ont laissé par escri, sans doute la mort s’en ensuyt. Ce que j’ay veu advenir à une ieune fille de chambre, d’une dame de ceste Guyenne, à laquelle un mal-advisé capdet, son beau frere, amoureux de ceste fille, trouva moyen de luy faire avaler le poids de trois drachmes de poudre de cantarides, parmy des herbes, comme choux verds, cappus, blancs & fridez, pour l’induire à luy obeir en ses voluptez, par le conseil d’un pauvre nécessiteux & meschant ignorant Apoticaire, qui luy vendit trois escus lesdites cantarides en poudre. Ladite fille, trois heures après, tomba en de grands accidents, comme en une chaleur estrange, & exulceration des reins, & vescie, ayant volonté à tous moments d’uriner, avec de grandes cuisans, en fin elle en mourut: . . . "—Guyon, Loys, op. cit., pp. 83-84. I quote here from the edition of Lyon, 1604.
XVI

CONCLUSION

A few points will now be stressed regarding which, in my opinion, Shakespearean scholars have gone astray:

The Montecchi (Montagues) seem to have existed as a family during the twelfth century. Throughout the thirteenth century, however, when the foundations of our legend were being laid, the term Montecchi, like the term Cappelletti (Capulets), meant not a family, but a political party or faction, and was so understood by Dante, the first author to mention the Veronese Montecchi and the Cremonese Cappelletti together. Later, as a result of confusion, Benvenuto da Imola had the impression that both the Montecchi and the Cappelletti were families residing at Verona. Francesco da Buti went a step further, originating the idea of enmity between the Montecchi and the Cappelletti. The misunderstandings which arose concerning the Montecchi and the Cappelletti were thus traceable to written sources, and not examples of folklore.

One of the most important and most neglected sources for the Romeo and Juliet legend was Boccaccio, model for all later novellieri. Boccaccio's influence was exerted for plot devices as well as for literary expression, in the most direct manner possible, and not in the roundabout way described by certain Shakespearean scholars, bent on establishing at every stage "lost sources" that allegedly survived in popular tradition. Especially influential in the development of our legend were Boccaccio's Filocolo and Decamerone. On the other hand, the Filostrato, often proposed as an important source for the legend, was probably of little or no influence until it was imitated to some extent by a French author, Adrien Sevin, in 1542. Among the plot devices borrowed by later novellieri directly from Boccaccio may be listed several stories of premature burials, especially the tale of Madonna Catalina and Gentil Carisendi; the account of the corrupt abbot who administered sleeping potions with the greatest of skill, and removed the body of one of his victims by night, with the aid of a companion; the "lovers' ladder incident," which is found again not only in
Bandello, Boaistuau, et cetera, down to Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*, but also in Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso*, and reappears in Bandello, to be used once more in Shakespeare’s *Much Ado About Nothing*, and repeatedly mentioned in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*; and last but not least, the heroine who expires on the body of her lover in the Thisbean tradition.

Masuccio in particular freely acknowledged his indebtedness to Boccaccio. Masuccio’s corrupt Augustinian friar plays a role strikingly similar to that of the vicious priest in the *Decamerone* who administers a sleeping potion to Ferondo. Moreover, the restoratives administered by Masuccio’s priest to Ganozza recall those employed by Gentil Carisendi’s mother on Madonna Catalina. In fact, the very fidelity with which Masuccio followed his master probably led him into the glaring inconsistency of stating in one place that the secret marriage of Mariotto and Ganozza had been most happily consummated, and in another place that Mariotto was a completely frustrated lover, like Boccaccio’s Gentil Carisendi. Masuccio may also have read the anonymous tale of *Ippolito e Leonora*. However, H. Hauvette’s theory of a close connection between Masuccio and Sermini seems untenable.

Luigi da Porto, in his “Giulietta e Romeo,” made extensive use of Masuccio’s Thirty-Third *novella*. Nevertheless, Da Porto’s real starting point may well have been Ovid’s stories of Pyramus and Thisbe, and of Pygmalion. Da Porto also certainly read the *Decamerone*, possibly also the anonymous tale of *Ippolito e Leonora*. Usually Da Porto welded his varied materials skillfully. In case of conflict between Masuccio and Ovid, he generally preferred Ovid as his guide, the one important exception being his abandonment of Ovid’s gory-mouthed lion which apparently killed Thisbe and the substitution of Masuccio’s *motif* of the premature burial of the heroine. However, Da Porto displayed some originality in the invention of plots and in the creation of characters. He was especially superior to Masuccio in psychological analysis.

Adrien Sevin was an imitator not only of Boccaccio’s *Filocolo*, which he translated into French, and of Da Porto’s *novella*, but also probably of Boccaccio’s *Filostrato*. Sevin’s heroine Burglipha at times behaves more like Boccaccio’s Griselda than she does like Giulietta. Sevin does not invent, but borrows from Da Porto, the
scene where the heroine attempts to take the same poison as her lover.

Bandello, on the few occasions when he deviated from Da Porto, was likely to follow the path of his friend Clizia, whose influence manifests itself in the favorable treatment of the friar, and in the psychology of the hero and of the heroine. There were also about a dozen minor details regarding which Bandello agreed with Clizia, rather than with Da Porto.

Despite a modern theory to the contrary, the direct influence of Luigi da Porto on Boaistuau was important, especially for the treatment of the character of Frere Laurens. Bandello had omitted all references to improper relations between Fra Lorenzo and Romeo, as well as charges of necromancy and grave robbing made during an embarrassing public trial. Boaistuau restored completely the more sinister churchman depicted by Luigi da Porto. Boaistuau's true originality consists in very trivial details and in his tendency to conventionalize the heroine.

There is no substantial evidence that Groto, in La Hadriana, made use of a lost document, nor in particular that he shared with Shakespeare access to a lost source.

Brooke's alleged innovations can all readily be traced to well-known sources.

On at least seven occasions, Shakespeare agrees exclusively with the original novella of Luigi da Porto in his treatment of important characters. There are also several such exclusive agreements in Shakespeare's treatment of minor characters.

On the other hand, the evidence is quite unsatisfactory for the "lost sources" too frequently proposed for the versions of the legend by Shakespeare, Struijs, and Lope de Vega, et alii. In fact, it must be admitted that in only one instance do we have adequate proof that any of the authors here studied actually had access to a lost document. That author was Arthur Brooke, who witnessed a missing play on the Romeo and Juliet theme, but manifestly made little or no use of what he saw. The sources of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet thus appear to be almost purely literary, with probably only remote connection with folklore.
APPENDIX I

INCOMPLETE OUTLINE
DANTE, ITALIAN COMMENTATORS AND CHRONICLERS

DANTE, Purgatorio VI, 106-8.—Distress of Montecchi and Cappelletti; dubious situation of Monaldi and Filippeschi.

(1323-28) Jacopo della Lana.—Montecchi and Cappelletti in Cremona (Lombardy), apparently as allies.

(1334) Ottimo Commento.—Same as Jacopo della Lana.

(1340-41) Peter Alighieri.—Montecchi in Verona, Cappelletti in Cremona.

(Mid-fourteenth century) Codice Cassinese.—Amplifies Peter Alighieri.

(Mid-fourteenth century) “Monachi Patauini Chronicon” (based on Rolando).—Monticuli at Verona, allied with Ezzelino da Romano.

(1348) Giovanni Villani.—Filippeschi (Ghibellines) oppose Monaldi (Guelfs) at Orvieto.

(1379) Benvenuto da Imola.—Follows “Monachi Patauini Chronicon,” but makes Cappelletti join forces with Montecchi. Perhaps influenced by Jacopo della Lana. First Dante commentator to speak of the Montecchi and Cappelletti as families, both residing at Verona.

(1380) Francesco da Buti.—Montecchi and Cappelletti at Cremona (cf. Jacopo della Lana). First direct mention of hostility of the alleged families.

(Fourteenth century [?]) Comento MS Tratto da Varj Chiosatori (Barberiana de Roma.—Montecchi (Guelfs) and Cappelletti (Ghibellines) at Verona.

(Late fourteenth or early fifteenth century) Anonimo Fiorentino.—Abridges Benvenuto da Imola.

(1478) Edizione Nidobeatina.—Follows Peter Alighieri. Geographical explanations from Jacopo della Lana.

(1481) Christoforo Landino.—Abridges Benvenuto da Imola.

(1544) Alessandro Vellutello.—Follows Christoforo Landino.

(1568) Bernardino Daniello.—Follows Jacopo della Lana and (slightly) Benvenuto da Imola. Calls Montecchi and Cappelletti Ghibellines.

NOVELLERI

(About 1350-53) Giovanni Boccaccio. Il Decamerone.—This collection was an outstanding factor in the development of the legend, not only stylistically, but also as a source for plots. Il Decamerone not only helped to popularize tales of premature burials, but also of sleeping potions. The “ladder incident” in Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet can be traced to Boccaccio’s tale of Ricciardo Manardi. The old motif of the heroine who expires on her lover’s dead body because of frustrated
love finds in the Decameron a literary form which directly affects the development of the Romeo plot. Of minor importance in the development was the Filocolo (ca. 1338-41) which contains a novella that is the basis of Il Decamerone, X, 4. For the development of the legend, the Filostrato (ca. 1338) was apparently negligible up to the time of Adrien Sevin (1542).

(Before 1476) Ippolito e Leonora. (Scene in Florence).—The rival families have armed factional followers. Ippolito and Leonora meet first at fête; love at sight. The lovers lament inconsolably after learning each other's identity. Mother (confidante) extracts confession from emaciated, lovesick Ippolito. She persuades a conniving abess to arrange tryst. Ippolito, concealed, overhears Leonora confess her love. Summary wedding, with pledge of fidelity, but neither priest nor witnesses. Ippolito uses rope ladder to reach Leonora's balcony. Attempting to see Leonora, he is arrested as thief, and condemned to death. Leonora claims him as husband. Hostile factions reunited.

(1476) Masuccio. Il Novellino, No. 33. (Scene in Siena).—Mariotto arranges clandestine marriage with Ganozza. (No motive for secrecy.) A corrupt friar performs the irregular ceremony. (Cf. role of abess.) They enjoy conjugal relations for a short time. Mariotto, guilty of murder, is banished, and goes to Alexandria. Brother acts as informant. Ganozza, required by her father to marry, obtains sleeping potion from the friar, who despatches warning messenger to Mariotto. Ganozza buried, then disinterred by friar and sent to Alexandria. Friar's messenger killed by pirates. Mariotto informed by brother of Ganozza's supposed death, returns and attempts to enter her tomb. Arrested as thief, condemned to death and executed. Two fates for Ganozza: (a) becomes nun, and dies shortly, lamenting her lover (in novella); (b) dies at once of grief (in argomento).

(From Il Decamerone).—Corrupt friar administers sleeping potion. Takes Ganozza to his room and administers restoratives. Mariotto (according to Masuccio's contradictory statement) never enjoys conjugal relations with Ganozza. She dies of grief for her lover.

(Possibly from Ippolito e Leonora).—Mariotto falsely accused of pilfering his wife's grave, and sentenced by Podesta as thief. The Podesta hesitates to sentence such a courteous and handsome hero. Mariotto is bewept by all women, who regard him as a perfetto amante.

(First edition ca. 1530; reprinted 1535) Luigi da Porto. "Giulietta e Romeo." (Scene in Verona).—Generally follows Masuccio. Additions: Romeo, pursuing ladylove, attends Capulets' ball. Romeo attacks Tebaldo, to avenge companions. Giulietta weeps for Romeo's banishment, not for Tebaldo's death. Romeo, believing Giulietta dead, attempts suicide, but is restrained by Pietro, who has role of Mariotto's brother. Author invents fansee, to whom Giulietta confesses her aversion to Count. Friar fails to deliver letter, because he cannot find Romeo.

(Possibly from Francesco da Buti.—Hostility of Montecchi and Cappelletti.

(From Ovid, Pyramus and Thisbe).—Lovers' farewell in the
tomb. Reconciliation of warring parents, who build a monument to deceased lovers.

(From *Il Decamerone*).—Giulietta kills self by holding her breath.

(Possibly from *Ippolito e Leonora*).—Rival families prevent marriage. Sketch of balcony scene. Romeo overhears Giulietta’s soliloquy. Giulietta (like Ippolito) loses sleep, appetite, good looks. Mother attempts to elicit confession. Factions eventually reunited through lovers (although here Luigi da Porto is probably rather following Ovid).

(1553 but begun much earlier) Gerardo (Gherardo) Boldieri, “Clizia.”—Additions: Giulia’s mother sends Pietro to make appointment with priest. Accompanies daughter at time of wedding. (In Da Porto, only present at second confession.) Author, insisting on proprieties, regularizes wedding ceremony, with ring, although with no witnesses. Tebaldo starts general fight, and attacks Romeo personally, alle porte dei Borsari. Cappelletti believe Giulia’s weeping due to Tebaldo’s death. Mother accompanies Giulia to Cappelletti country house. Friar placed in better light—no charges of necromancy. Romeo’s lyrical speeches developed. Numerous details changed.

(1554) Bandello. *Le Novelle*, II, ix.—Additions: Romeo attends ball merely for distraction. Author extends role of confidante, who tells Giulietta name of Romeo and tries to dissuade her from marrying him. Counselor for Romeo invented. Romeo becomes his servant. It is not clear that Romeo overhears Giulietta’s confession.

From *Ippolito e Leonora*.—Lovers not previously acquainted. Balcony scene with rope ladder. [Possibly] old woman confidante for Giulietta. (Cf. role of Ippolito’s mother, and fante in Da Porto.)

(Probably from Boldieri).—All additions mentioned under his name.

(1578) Luigi GROTO. *La Hadriana*.—Blank verse tragedy based on versions of Da Porto and Bandello. Prince Latino kills Hadriana’s brother in self-defense. Hadriana pretends to mourn the death of her brother. (Cf. Bandello.) Author omits ladder and balcony scenes. Mago’s messenger, unable to find Latino, is unable to deliver a letter to him. (Cf. Luigi da Porto.)

**French Conteurs**


Names changed: Halquadrich = Romeo; Burglipha = Giulietta; her brother Bruhachin = Tebaldo.

Additions: Cornelian hatred of heroine for hero, because of murdered kinsman. Later she relents. Character of apothecary.

Sources: Luigi da Porto’s tale, and probably *Il Filostrato*.

(1559) Boaistuala. *Histoires tragiques*.—French adaptation of Bandello, and to some extent of Luigi da Porto.

Additions: Amplifies character of apothecary, and accepts idea of the *puadonor*. (Cf. Sevin.) Conventionalizes heroine. Juliette finds Romeo dead, when she awakes. She stabs herself with Romeo’s dagger. (Cf. drinking of lover’s poison, in Sevin.) Develops character of
Nurse, who is banished by ruler, while the Apothecary is racked and hanged.

**English Versions**

[Date?] English play on *Romeo and Juliet*, witnessed by Arthur Brooke.  
—(Cf. following paragraph.)

(1562) **Arthur Brooke.**—Poem on *Romeus and Iuliet*.  


(Printed 1597, first performance?) **William Shakespeare.** *Romeo and Juliet*.—Shakespeare's only known source was Arthur Brooke. He probably was familiar with William Painter, but seems to have made no use of Painter's adaptation of the story.

Additions: Shakespeare vigorously develops many of the minor characters which he found in Brooke. For instance, Mercutio, previously rather insignificant, becomes a close friend of Romeo. The counselor of Romeo, mentioned first by Bandello, receives the name of Benvolio, and is made to separate the servants of the Montagues and the Capulets. Tybalt, introduced much earlier than in Brooke, has a fight with Benvolio, and threatens Romeo at the ball, in addition to his final fatal battle. The elder Capulets and Montagues appear in the first act, where Paris also has a few speeches to make, at the time when Capulet promises him the hand of Juliet. Juliet blames Romeo for the murder of her kinsman, as in Brooke, but defends him from the criticisms of the Nurse—a new psychological note.

In the following episodes, Shakespeare seems to agree with Luigi da Porto rather than with Brooke:

Romeo attends the Capulet ball to see Rosaline, and not for mere diversion. He remains faithful to Rosaline up to the moment that he sees Juliet.

Romeo overhears the soliloquy of Juliet.

Juliet goes to the wedding unaccompanied by the Nurse.

Friar Laurence is glad to marry Romeo to Juliet, to reconcile factions.

Shakespeare omits mention of the "Pursers gate."

Romeo fights to avenge a comrade, not for self-defense.

Juliet tells her mother she will marry Romeo, "whom you know I hate, / Rather than Paris."

Shakespeare agrees exclusively with Da Porto and Grotto in "the mention of both poisoning and stabbing at the heroine's death."

That Shakespeare may have made these departures from Brooke through psychological analysis of his characters is conceivable, but difficult to admit in many cases. Furthermore, the fact should be borne in mind that for practically all other parts of the plot of *Romeo and Juliet*, Shakespeare followed Brooke with great fidelity. The natural conclusion is that Shakespeare had access, directly or indirectly, to Italian originals.
APPENDIX II

Adrien Sevin

"LE PHILOCOPE DE MESSIRE IEHAN BOCACE FLORENTIN," BY ADRIEN SEVIN

Feuillet III. A haute, excellente et illustre dame, madame Claudine de Rohan, Contesse de saint Aignan, Adrian Seuin donne salut . . .

Feuillet III. Verso

C'est qu'il y eut en une forte place et ville en la Morée nommée Courron située en levant deux puissans personnages et de grand estime, desquels la renommée s'espendoit en diverses contrées, l'ung estoit appelé Karilio Humdrum lequel auoit vng seul filz et vne fille, le filz nommé Bruhachin et la fille Burglipha. Et l'autre auoit nom Malchipo Phorhiach qui auoit vng seul filz nommé Halquadrich. Ces deux grands personnages pour estre voisins et bons amys, tel que s'ilz fussent freres, faisans eulx deux leur traficq en communaulté, firent nourrir en vng lieu pres de la cité leurs trois enfants ensemble l'espace de dix ans, le dict Karilio repuutant et ayment le filz de Malchipo comme sien, aussi faisoit le semblable Malchipo des deux enfants de Karilio et pareillement leurs femmes qui se nommoient l'une Kalzandra et l'autre Harriaquach. Or aduint que les deux peres trespasserent de peste en vng meme temps, delaissant iecelluy Karilio son filz de douze ans et la fille d'unce, et Malchipo laissant aussi son seul filz et heritier de pareil aage à la fille: ieculx recommandans à tous leurs parens et amys, nommement à leurs femmes qui pour la raison eurent entièrement la charge et tutelle de leurs enfants. Apres la mort des peres les trois enfants s'entraymerent trop plus qu'auparauant, speciallement Halquadrich et Burglipha, lesquelz d'autant qu'ilz croissoyent et venoient en aage, de tant plus s'augmentoit leur amytié, laquelle pour estre commencée en leurs ieunes ans fut si aspre et grande qu'a peine la peurent celer que chascun n'en eut cognoissance, tellement que le commun bruict en fut si grand par Courron qu'il paruist à Bruhachin frere d'elle. Si s'en doubta fort et en entra en telle ialousie qu'il ne se peut garder le demonstrer. Et vng iour estant Halquadrich en la maison de la mere de Bruhachin et deuisant avec s'amye Burglipha qui moins ne l'aymoit que luy elle, icelluy Bruhachin le print par la main et le supplya ouyr de luy en recoy vng sien secret. Or ne se doubitoit encore aucunelement Halquadrich de la ialousie d'icelluy Bruhachin, lequel luy dist en ceste maniere. Cher frere, depuis huit iours aucuns de mes singuliers amys et proches parens m'ont fort reprins de vous laisser en vostre aage.

The text here reprinted is that of the rare Paris edition of 1542. The spelling has been modernized to the extent that "et" is substituted throughout for the sign "&."
ROMEO AND JULIET LEGEND

si familiarem continuer venir cœans parler, danser, et deuizer au seu de tout le monde, avec ma soeur, me remonstrans l’inconuenient qui en pourroit aduenir, et qui tant de foiz est ia aduenu en ceste terre par la legereté de ieuiness que ie cognois par moy estre difficile à eviter, bien que ie vous estime mon meilleur amy, et que ne vouldriez (ayant esgard à l’amytié de noz feuz pcres) vilipender nostre maison. Mais pour ne tumber en plus grief scandale, perdicion de noz maisons et dangers de noz corps et ames, aussi que vous sauez assez la coutsume qui est de ne frequenter trop vne pucelle de bonne et ancienne maison, et que l’honneur y gist: Daduantaige que autres filles tenues au contraire en grande liberté et à la veue d’ung chascon sont quasi vilipendées, et ne les peuent leurs freres ou parens marier sinon en bas lieux: Je vous requiers pour ces causes en vray et loyal amy doresnauant ne parler ou entretenir ma soeur aucunement, et pour mieulx l’oublier différez en ma faueur (s’il vous plaist) de venir en ceste maison, quoy faisant vous obseruerez cause de continuelle augmentation à nostre amytié, laquelle pourrait autrement prendre fin. Et de rechef ie vous supplie n’en estre mal content, mais le prendre d’aussi bonne part que ie le vous diz, ce que ie vouldrois en pareil faire de vous. Halquadrich... quasi hors du sens pour telles paroles, et de se voir ainsi privé de la veue de Burglipha que tant il auyoit chère, tellement qu’il aymast trop mieulx la mort que viure en tel martire, respondit à Bruhachin. O Bruhachin si ie t’ay tousiours réputé faussement mon meilleur amy, auquel seul ie eusse manifesté mon secret, tu ne me deburois maintenant reprendre de la pudicque et sincere amour que iay avec ta soeur, car tu ne me pourrois mieulx defendre ta maison ne trouver meilleure excuse qu’en tes parens et amys. Or scait on bien que l’amytié que ie porte à Burglipha est causée des nostre enfance, et que l’oublier me seroit impossible: de sorte que plus grief deplaisir ne me pourroit estre que m’en defendre la presence, parquoy ie ne puis me condescendre à ton dire: Pource auvant que me priuer de tel bien il me fauldroit oster la vie. Sur ce point ilz se departirent, et Halquadrich s’en alla chez soy, ne plustost fut le lendemain venu qu’icelluy Halquadrich desesperé et trop plus aecuglé et confuz en lamour de Burglipha qu’apparuant, et reuestu d’une cotte de maille, s’en alla en la maison de Bruhachin, de laquelle il trouua la porte ouuerte. Si entra furieusement droict en la chambre de Burglipha qu’il apperceut s’habillant et assise auprès d’son frere. Ne plustost se furent veuz qu’ilz mirent les mains aux espées, et sans autres paroles, sinon, maintenant on cognostra quelles sont les vertuz d’amours, se tirent fierement terribles coups, de sorte que Halquadrich (amoureux et voyant s’amye) tua Bruhachin. À l’heure tant pour le son des espées que pour les criz, pleurs, gemissemens, et lamentations de Burglipha sur l’homicide de son frere par
son amy, s'eslesua tel bruict par la maison qu'il sembloit propre­ment vng tonnerre. Les vngs cryans à mort, Les autres prenez le brigant, le larron, le violateur de virginité, celluy qui a meschamment tué Bruhachin, tant qu'a peine se peut le fortuné Halquadrich sauuer et eschapper des mains de ses aduersaires: Mais tellement luy fut prospere et favorable l'instable fortune qu'elle le iecta en vng petit brigantin sur mer, et fut incontinant rendu a sauueté en vne roche et fort chasteau près de la, non sans grand misere, peine, trauail, et ennuy de s'estre absenté et exilé de s'amy et sa terre. Et pareillement pource penser le martire de Burglipha, de veoir pour elle son cher frere mort, et son amy pour tel mefïaict fuytif, dont il conuenoit le prendre en mortelle hayne. Nonobstant deux iours apres le meurdr, icelluy Halquadrich habandonné de tout conseil, et lequel ne peut oublier s'amy Burglipha et de plus en plus enflammé en son amour, enouya vers elle en tout diligence vng sien familier seruiteur nommé Bostruch, luy porter vne lettre d'excuse du meurdre de son frere: la suppliant luy remettre le mefïaict et considérer la raison d'icelluy, et qu'a ceste cause elle ne differast continuer de l'aymer, autrement qu'il estoit mort. Lequel Bos­truch qui estoit fort ancien familier et cogneu de Burglipha, semblablement de sa mere et seruiteurs de lean's (aussi qu'ilz ignoroient sa demeure auec Halquadrich) presenta aysemement la lettre. Et feit tresbien son message, et icelle leue de Burglipha FEUILLET V. et ayant bien entendu les paroles de Bostruch, ne les voulant declarez a sa mere ny a autres (craignant ce qui en fust aduenu) elle luy dist. Bostruch, ie m'esmerueille quelle hardiesse t'a maintenant conduict en ce lieu, pour faire seruice au plusgrand traistre du monde: ne quelle audace t'a meu la langue de me requérer faire mercy à celluy que (pour auoir exterminé l'honneur de cesans) ie desire selon son merite veoir estrangler. Poura va et luy diz que ie brusle (toy present) sa lettre, et que ie vouldrois auoir veu le semblable de luy, aussi qu'il n'aura de moy sinon toute poursuite à sa ruyne et vituperable mort, et te defends le retour ceans de par luy. Lors icelluy Bostruch bien fasché retourna vers son maistre qu'il trouua seul en sa chambre pensant à sa venue, auquel il feit la vraye response, parquoy il s'esuanouyt et cheut quasi mort. Son seruiteur le reprint fort de sa bestialité, et peu a peu reuenu à conualescence le remist en meilleure esperance que deuant, luy asseurant l'importuner de sorte qu'a la fin elle se condescendroit à son vouloir. Et par tant de foiz et avec lettres de Halquadrich, telles que bien sçauez estre licites en amours, Bostruch s'en alla vers Burglipha et la poursuyuit si viuement qu'elle s'accorda faire entierement sa volunté, oubliant l'homicide en son frere: et l'aduisa par lettres qu'elle bailla audict Bostruch qu'a elle ne retarderoit l'accomplissement de leurs amours, ains seulement restoit d'en eslier le moyen. O quel grand contentement et incompréhen-
sible ioye luy fut à l'heure, si le muable hazart de Fortune ne luy eust contraryé: car elle desia du tout en feu (comme il se veoit l'amour de femme estre trop plus vechement et ardent que de l'homme) se delibera seule donner fin à leur intention, et s'en alla vers vng vieil prebstre de la loy qui auoit lors la cure des cerimonies, auquel aprés longs propos, faisant autre chose, luy declaira entierement l'amytie de Halquadrich et elle: luy requerant conseil à l'exécution de l'entreprise, autrement et ce jour mesmes elle se mettroit à mort. Quoy oyant ce prebstre luy monstra la faulte qu'elle faisoit d'aymer le meurdrier de son cher frere, et que s'il estoit pris on le feroit honteusement mourir, qu'il auoit ia perdu son bien, aussi que sa mere et ses parens ne la vouldroient iamais veoir, et le grand deshonneur et charge de conscience que c'estoit, dont elle ne feit compte, mais du tout suyuit sa folle opinion. Lors pour n'estre occasion de sa mort et desespoir luy dist. Ma fille coignoissant votre fermeté et que ie ne vous puis diuertir, ie vous baille ceste pouldre que vous prendrez en vin blanc le matin à vostre leuer: et icelle beue, vous tumberez en vne forte pasmoison, combien que ne sentirez aucun mal, et serez en icelle vingt quatre heures, tellement que chacun pensera que soyez morte, et vous apporteron incontinent ceans en estre accoustumée, puis vous laisseront en ma charge pour vous inhumer avec les autres: à l'heure ie vous porteray secretement en ma chambre, et aprés que ceste pasmoison sera passée, ie vous conduyray en auberge dissimulé et de nuit au mesmes briguantin qui a sauve Halquadrich, lequel vous rendra soudainement ou il sera. Et ainsi sans le seue ou veu de personne donnez ordre à la besongne, pourrez toutesfois qu'ayez bon cueur à boyeure la pouldre. O que divin et consolatif luy sembla ce conseil, et quantesfois elle loua et remercya le prebstre qui le luy donnoit, de sorte que des lors elle se retira seule en sa chambre, ou faignant estre malade se mit au lict. Puis au matin couchée ainsi que diet luy auoit esté, beut la pouldre et demoura comme morte. Et environ sept heures vne damoyssel qui rien n'en scauoit, pensant luy demander de sa santé tira le rideau, et la voyant immobile, toute froidde et roidde s'escrya à haulte et piteuse voix, tant que pour son cry la mere et serviteurs vndrent à l'effroy veoir que c'estoit, lesquelz pour veoir la belle Bur­glipha ainsi pasmée, croyans n'y trouuer autre remède fut par euxx reuesta et mise à leur vaisage au lict de la mort selon sa qualité grande: puis fut portée pour mettre en terre, ou ce pendant suurint à la malheure Bostruch serviteur de Halquadrich voulant luy présenter de par son maistre le deu et accoustumé salut. Et croyant comme les autres qu'elle fut morte il retourna hastieulement l'annoncer à son seigneur, lequel hors du sens et en desespoir pour ceste fascheuse nouvelle, et deliberé contraindre la fiere Atropos luy aduancer le coup mortel,
s’adressa à un apothicaire qui lui bailla en masse la longueur de quatre doits de poisson. Et combien qu’il eust été bien conseillé par son serviteur de n’aller à Courron, par ce qu’il estoit fort menacé de justice et de tous les amis du trespassé, toutesfois il s’y fit conduire hastivement : et alla sans aucune crainte et en grande assurance trouver sa douce et chère amye la abandonnée de tout le monde. Si plora amèrement le complaignant en grande compassion de sa tant malheureuse et aspre fortune qui l’auoit conduit à si dur passaige. Et en mauldissant et despitant le Ciel, Soleil, Lune, Estoilles, et Elements, confessant des sa naissance avoir toujours esté nourry en pleurs et gemissements, qui encore lui renforceoient à cestuy malheureux et dangereux paz, print iustement la moytié de la masse de poisson qu’il mangea. Puis peu après et pendant son grand trouail (venu à la fin le terme de la pasmoyson) Burghipha reuint en conuaclescence et premiere santé, laquelle n’auoit autre souhait et désir que de veoir son loyal amy Halquadrich : Laquelle estonné d’ainsi l’appeceoir déconforté auprès elle, l’embrassa, baisa, et acolla estroitement, luy declarant l’entier effet de son entreprinse: pareillement luy à elle, et qu’il la croyoit morte : Laquelle sçachant que pour son amour il avoit la prins la poison, et n’y auoit remède pour le garentir de mort: après longs baisers, entretiens, et auoir totallement accomplly ce qui est decent et permis en honnest et sincere amour, voyant prochaine la fin de son amy, le requist luy octroyer par vraye amyté l’autre moytié de son poisson, ce que non sans grand peine et ennuy il luy accorda. Et à lors elle la mangea et auança sa mort quand et quand Halquadrich. Les deux amans doncques en la presence du prebstre et autres qui y suruindrent, en parlant et louant leur amyté, rendans graces à Dieu pour icelle, et implorant sa beatitude de les conduyre à son royaulme luy rendirent leurs esperitz en grand contentement, joie et liesse. Et furent leurs deux corps mis et inhumez ensemble en vng fort beau et riche cercueil.
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