EARLY MODERN LITERARY STUDIES

'Exchange is no robbery': Hospitality and Hostility in Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon* and *John of Bordeaux*

Jenny Sager

Beijing Normal University - Hong Kong Baptist University,
United International College

Sometime between 1611 and 1615, the Venetian ambassador, Antonio Foscarini, visited the Curtain playhouse. At the end of the play, a Florentine diplomat reliably informs us, the actor speaking the epilogue encouraged the audience to shout out suggestions for a play they would like to see the following day. The riotous crowd began:

> to shout '*Friars, Friars*' because they wanted the one that usually took its name from the friars, meaning "frati". Whereupon our blockhead turned to his interpreter [who] explained that this was the name of a comedy about friars. So loosening his cloak, he began to clap his hands just as the mob did and to shout 'frati, frati'.[1]

Unfortunately for Foscarini, the crowd mistook his Italian for Spanish and immediately turned on him with jeers and insults. As James J. Marino has established, the play which provoked this 'diplomatic discomfiture is mostly likely Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*'.[2] This story rather helpfully illustrates the two central topics of this article. First, this anecdote testifies to the way in which commercial motives propel drama in this

[1] Glynne Wickham, Herbert Berry and William Ingram (eds.), *English Professional Theatre, 1530-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 415-16.

[2] James J. Marino, 'Adult Playing Companies, 1613-1625', in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*, ed. by Richard Dutton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 88-103 (pp. 90-1).

period. *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* was already over twenty years old and yet it still retained a palpable grip on the audience's imagination. *Friar Bacon* had proved to be a long-term money spinner on both the commercial stage and at court. This was a play that audiences would pay to see again, making it of course the ideal material for a sequel. Secondly, this story demonstrates the way in which hospitality towards guests and hostility towards strangers often go hand-in-hand in the early modern period. These two Italian gentlemen had presumably been invited to England on a diplomatic exchange but, rather than being treated with hospitality, they were met with a torrent of xenophobia, sparked essentially by ignorance.

This article concerns itself with an early modern dramatic diptych, structured around a series of cultural exchanges between England and Germany, in Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (1589) and its apparent sequel *John of Bordeaux* (1589-91).[3] In *Friar Bacon*, Emperor Frederick II of Germany and the Duke of Saxony visit Oxford at the invitation of King Henry III to watch an academic disputation between Friar Bacon and the German scholar, Vandermast. In *John of Bordeaux,* Emperor Frederick returns the hospitality, inviting Friar Bacon and his servant Miles to visit Hapsburg. Robert Maslen has written of the first play, *Friar Bacon*, as being 'a kind of conjurer's World Cup' between England and Germany; if so, that would make *John of Bordeaux* the away game.[4] But if you are not much of a football fan, it might be helpful to think of these two plays as an example of an early modern Erasmus staff mobility exchange gone awry; *Friar Bacon* depicts German academics on exchange at the University of Oxford and in *John of Bordeaux* Oxbridge goes to Germany.

On the one hand, *Friar Bacon* and *John of Bordeaux* seem to advocate an open exchange between England and Germany, between European institutions of learning and, with its near constant references to feasting and drinking, between the cultural practices of both nations. But as the play develops, cracks start to appear in this most idealistic of rhetoric. As 'exchange' slowly turns to 'robbery' and, as 'hearty welcome' ultimately turns to 'dire revenge', the plays start to reveal the darker side of early modern European relations, as

---

[3] All quotations from *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* are taken from *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, ed. by Daniel Seltzer (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963). All quotations from *John of Bordeaux* are taken from *John of Bordeaux or the Second Part of Friar Bacon,* transcribed by W. L. Renwick for The Malone Society (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936). The modernization of spelling and punctuation is my own. I have chosen to modernize the text of *John of Bordeaux* in order to remove any false disparity between it and the modernized text of *Friar Bacon.*

[4] Robert W. Maslen, 'Robert Greene and the Uses of Time', in *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Writer*, ed. by Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 157-88 (p. 176).

strident patriotism, xenophobia and hostility are revealed beneath the veneer of mutual hospitality (*JB.* 213, 24, 970).

While *Friar Bacon* has been edited relatively frequently in recent times (Seltzer 1963, Lavin 1969, Bevington 2002), the only edition of *John of Bordeaux* remains that of W.L. Renwick's Malone Society Reprint Edition of 1936.[5] As a consequence of this discrepancy, while Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* has attracted a reasonable amount of scholarship, with interest increasing in recent decades, *John of Bordeaux* is still yet to be fully appreciated.[6]

The authorship of *John of Bordeaux* has long been a matter of dispute. The manuscript of *John of Bordeaux or the Second Part of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* at Alnwick Castle appears to be a sequel to *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*.[7] McMillin and MacLean have concluded that while *Friar Bacon* was performed by the Queen's Men, *John of Bordeaux* was performed by Lord Strange's Men.[8] Although the manuscript's provenance is unknown, *John of Bordeaux* is now bound with the anonymous seventeenth-century play, *The Wasp*. The text is an annotated playbook, with insertions in another hand and revisions by at least three hands, including a passage written by Henry Chettle. The manuscript is in a fragmentary state; the play is missing two scenes, includes two substantial lacunae (one filled in by Chettle, the other left blank) and the final page of the

---

[5] Daniel Seltzer (ed.), *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963); J. A. Lavin (ed.), *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (London: Benn, 1969); David Bevington (ed.), *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002); W. L. Renwick (ed.), *John of Bordeaux* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936).

[6] See, for example, Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes (eds.), *Writing Robert Greene: Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Writer* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); Kirk Melnikoff (ed.), *Robert Greene* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2011); Sarah Knight, 'The Niniversity at the Bankside: Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*', in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama*, ed. by Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 355-370; Jenny Sager, *The Aesthetics of Spectacle in Early Modern Drama and Modern Cinema: Robert Greene's Theatre of Attractions* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). For recent scholarship on *John of Bordeaux*, see Brian Walsh, 'Charismatic Authority and Political Subversion in *John of Bordeaux*', *Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama* 48 (2009), 1-21; Bronwyn Johnston, 'Who the Devil is in charge? Mastery and the Faustian Pact on the Early Modern Stage', in *Magical Transformations on the Early Modern English Stage*, ed. by Lisa Hopkins and Helen Ostovich (London: Routledge, 2014), pp. 31-46.

[7] MS. 507. *The Waspe, and John of Bordeaux or the Second Part of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Alnwick Castle Library.

[8] Scott MacMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean, *The Queen's Men and their Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 90.

manuscript is so badly mutilated that the play's finale is virtually unreadable.[9] Laurie Maguire has convincingly argued that the manuscript of *John of Bordeaux* may have been the result of a collaborative effort between Thomas Nashe and Greene, which was subsequently altered and added to by Henry Chettle after Greene's death.[10] Greene may have worked alongside a number of collaborators (perhaps in an attempt to speed up the process of composition and capitalise on the success of *Friar Bacon* before interest waned), or perhaps after Greene's death Chettle came across a draft of *John of Bordeaux* and, after some substantial additions and corrections, sold the manuscript on (a money-making strategy that we suspect Chettle also deployed in regard to Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*).[11]

But even if this is the work of someone other than Greene, the playwright/s clearly were familiar with Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. As Paul Dean has observed, *John of Bordeaux* shares a close structural unity with *Friar Bacon*; both plays include a love triangle, a contest between two magicians, a clownage subplot and a nationalistic theme.[12] Furthermore, as Laurie Maguire has noted, *John of Bordeaux* reworks many of Greene's dramatic devices from *Friar Bacon*, including the conjuring of devils, magical transportations to different locations and magic beingused to paralyse weapons.[13] In fact, *John of Bordeaux* in many ways reads like a compilation of Greene's greatest hits: the sequence where the doom-laden John of Bordeaux converses with shepherds feels reminiscent of the pastoral melancholy of Greene's *Orlando Furioso*; while the arrival on stage of the Turkish Emperor's son, Selimus, in a dream sequence seems to borrow rather obviously from the play *Selimus,* which has been long suspected to have been written by Greene.[14] As a sequel then, *John of Bordeaux* does not merely continue the

[9] Waldo F. McNeir, 'Reconstructing the Conclusion of *John of Bordeaux*', *Modern Language Association* 66 (1951), pp. 540–3; Renwick (ed.), *John of Bordeaux*.

[10] Laurie E. Maguire, '(Mis)diagnosing Memorial Reconstruction in *John of Bordeaux*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 11 (1999), 114-28 (p. 124).

[11] For further discussion of the substantial role played by Chettle in the composition of *Greene's Groatsworth*, see John Jowett, 'Johannes Factotum: Henry Chettle and *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit*', *Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America* 87.4 (1993), 453–86.

[12] Paul Dean, '*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and *John of Bordeaux*: A Dramatic Diptych', *English Language Notes* 28 (1981), 263-4.

[13] See Maguire, p. 115, and Johnston.

[14] For further discussion of the authorship of *Selimus*, see Alexander B. Grosart (ed.), *The Tragical Reign of Selimus, Sometime Emperor of the Turks* (London: J.M. Dent); Kenneth Muir, 'Who wrote *Selimus*?', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society: Literary and Historical Section* 6 (1949), 373-4; Jean Jacquot, 'A propos du *Tragicall Raigne of Selimus*: le problem des emprunts aux classiques à la Renaissance', *Etudes Anglaises* 16 (1963), 345-50; 'Ralegh's "*Hellish Verses*" and the *Tragicall Raigne of Selimus*', *The Modern Language Review* 48 (1958), 1-9; Peter Berek, '*Locrine* Revised, *Selimus*, and

plot of its predecessor, as one might expect, but is defined by its promiscuous intermingling and reworking of Greene's oeuvre as a whole.

Examining *Friar Bacon* and *John of Bordeaux* from within the context of early modern notions of hospitality, this article will argue that there is always a certain amount of hostility implicit within every act of hospitality. This paradox within the ethics of hospitality has an etymological basis. The word 'hospitality' stems from the Latin *hospes*, meaning 'host', 'guest', or 'stranger' but paradoxically *hospes* is itself derived from *hostis*, which means 'stranger' or 'enemy' (the latter being where terms like 'hostile' derive).[15]

During the 1990s, the French philosopher Derrida wrote extensively on the ethics of hospitality. Derrida identified a contradiction or a double imperative within the concept of hospitality in western culture. On the one hand, there is the law of unlimited hospitality that promises unconditional hyperbolic welcome to a stranger:

> absolute hospitality requires that I open up my home and that I give not only to the foreigner […] but to the absolute, unknown, anonymous other, and that I give place to them, that I let them come, that I let them arrive, and take place in the place I offer them, without asking of them either reciprocity […] or even their names.[16]

On the other hand, there are the conditional laws of hospitality:

> "Make yourself at home" means: please feel at home, act as if you were at home, but, remember, that is not true, this is not your home but mine, and you are expected to respect my property.[17]

Early Responses to *Tamburlaine*', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 23 (1980), 33-54; G. K. Hunter, *English Drama, 1586-1642: The Age of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997), p. 63; Nadia Mohamed Riad (ed.), *A Critical Old-Spelling Edition of The Tragicall Raigne of Selimus,* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis (Ontario: Queen's University, 1994); Daniel J. Vitkus (ed.), *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

[15] Gerasimos Kakoliris, 'Jacques Derrida on the Ethics of Hospitality', *The Ethics of Subjectivity*, ed. by Elvis Imafidon (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 144-156 (p. 149). Derrida is following the etymology of Emil Benveniste, in *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* I Paris: Minuit, chap. 7, "L'hospitalité."

[16] Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, trans. by R. Bowlby (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), p. 25.

[17] John Caputo, *Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida* (New York: Fordam University Press, 1997), p. 111.

These two concepts of hospitality, unconditional and conditional, are dependent upon one another in order to operate. Conditional hospitality is guided by the theory of unconditional hospitality. According to Derrida's theory, diplomatic exchange needs to be guided by the somewhat utopian concept of unconditional hospitality in order not to be reduced to the demands of the moment. But at the same time, without rules, without limits to hospitality, the concept of hospitality would remain abstract and little more than wishful thinking.

As has been previously observed, Derrida's logic of hospitality can be usefully projected onto the opening scene of Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*.[18] As the play opens, we are introduced into a world in which inhospitableness, and at times open hostility, lies beneath the thin veneer of courtly hospitality. We discover that Polixenes and his Bohemian courtiers have been enjoying the 'entertainment' and hospitality of the Sicilian court for nine months (1.1.8). The Bohemians fear the 'shame' of being unable to reciprocate this generosity, when the King of Sicilia will make a 'visitation' to Bohemia that 'coming summer' (1.1.5-8). Quickly the language of unconditional hospitality, with its free 'interchange of gifts, letters, loving embassies' transforms into the language of money, debt and obligation: 'I think this coming summer the King of Sicilia means to pay Bohemia the visitation which he justly owes him' (1.1.28, 5-7). Camillo's observation that the Bohemians 'pay a great deal too dear for what's given freely', further serves to emphasise the paradoxical nature of the social logic of hospitality (1.1.17-18). Being both unconditional and conditional, hospitality is both freely given and not freely given. Indeed, these opening insights regarding hospitality, which envisage it as little more than a form of submerged rivalry, offer a foreboding premonition as to Leontes's future behaviour. As James Kearney has observed, Leontes's loss of faith in the fidelity of his wife, Hermione, is a direct consequence of 'hospitality's peculiar position between idealized and agonistic relations', which quickly transforms her from a trusted wife to a reviled foreigner.[19]

---

[18] All quotations from Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale* are taken from John Pitcher (ed.), *The Winter's Tale* (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2010).

[19] James Kearney, 'Hospitality's Risk, Grace's Bargain: Uncertain Economies in *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare and Hospitality: Ethics, Politics and Exchange*, ed. by Julia Reinhard Lupton and David B. Goldstein (New York: Routledge, 2016), pp. 89-111 (p. 90). See also John Cox, 'Hospitality as a Virtue in *The Winter's Tale*', in *The Routledge Companion to Literature*, ed. by Mark Knight (London: Routledge, 2016), pp. 379-88; Sandra Logan, *Shakespeare's Foreign Queens: Drama, Politics and the Enemy Within* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); Daryl W. Palmer, *Hospitable Performances: Dramatic Genre and Cultural Practices in Early Modern England* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1992); Ken Jackson, '"One Wish" or the Possibility of the Impossible: Derrida, The Gift and God in *Timon of Athens*',

A similar social anxiety surrounds the exchange of hospitality in Greene's *Friar Bacon* and *John of Bordeaux*. In Scene 4 of *Friar Bacon*, King Henry III of England warmly welcomes Emperor Frederick II of Germany and other '[g]reat men of Europe' to 'England's shore' (*FB*. 4.1.6). As Cecile Williamson Cary has observed, Greene 'characteristically closes scenes with invitations to eat or drink' and this scene proves to be no exception.[20] Promising to introduce the visitors to the famous Friar Bacon on their arrival in Oxford, Henry closes the scene with the invitation to 'banquet in our English court' (*FB*. 4.67). As gracious and generous as Henry's welcome might be, however, it carries with it an element of one-upmanship. Throughout the scene, he boasts that the wealth and sophistication of England demonstrate that 'Albion is another little world' (*FB*. 4.7). He also takes great delight in telling the German scholar, Vandermast, that Friar Bacon's knowledge of 'magic spells' and 'mathematic rules' are without equal (*FB*. 4.61-2). Equally problematic is the treatment of Eleanor, Edward's future bride who, despite being treated with every courtesy, is ultimately little more than a pawn in this geo-political scheme to foster peace between nations. Indeed, the irony can hardly be lost on the audience that at the very moment Eleanor speaks lovingly of Prince Edward's 'virtuous fame', he is actually busy elsewhere, pursuing Margaret, the 'bonny damsel' (*FB*. 4.25; 1.16). The final scene of *Friar Bacon* makes a hasty job of ironing-over the awkward realities of this cross-dynastic marriage, with Edward vowing 'perpetual homage' and 'honors unto Eleanor' and the scene closes with one more final invitation to a 'royal feast' (*FB*. 16.4-5, 73).

In *John of Bordeaux,* many of the characters demonstrate a self-reflexive awareness that they are in a sequel. Not only do they reminisce about the goings on in the previous play but they also seem anxious that Part 2 should outdo Part 1. This anxiety is expressed for the most part through the discourse of hospitality, in terms of a duty to repay the hospitality the German visitors received during their visit to Oxford in the previous play. In the opening scene of *John of Bordeaux*, the German Emperor extends a 'hearty welcome' to his English visitors, plies them with large volumes of 'Rhenish wine' and expresses his desire for academic cooperation between the English academic Friar Bacon and the German scholar Vandermast (*JB*. 24, 70):

Shakespeare Quarterly 52 (2001), pp. 34-66; David Ruiter, 'Shakespeare and Hospitality: Opening *The Winter's Tale*', *Mediterranean Studies* 16 (2007), 157-77.

[20] Cecile Williamson Cary, 'The Iconography of Food and the Motif of World Order in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*', *Comparative Drama* 13 (1979), 150-163 (p. 150).

> Tis thy disgrace, I tell thee Vandervast, if Bacon's welcome fits not his content, scholars should link in sympathy of love. What Germany affords in honour or in wealth is thine to grace Friar Bacon with and Hapsburg and their schools may hold them proved that English Bacon lives within their cell (*JB*. 25-31).

Bacon, by way of response, expresses his gratitude for this hospitality and states his own altruistic purpose in travelling to Germany:

> I thank your grace. Bacon left not his English schools to gain a proud wealth or promotion, desire of deeper skill made me cast unto the German clime (*JB*. 41-3).

But the cultivation of these international friendships is scarcely altruistic. Frederick's authority and power rests on his ability to put on a good social performance. As Felicity Heal has outlined in her monumental study, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, early modern hosts used 'the coded language' of hospitality and shows of generosity to enhance their power 'by asymmetrical acts of largess' in order to gain 'political advantage'.[21] In other words, Frederick does not merely desire to return the English hospitality he received in Oxford, he means to outdo it. Indeed, it is telling that throughout this scene, although both the English and German contingent declare themselves to not be motivated by 'wealth', 'promotion' or 'honour', the scene is littered with references to all three (*JB*. 42, 28).

Likewise, before Frederick formally welcomes Bacon to the German court, he congratulates his general, John of Bordeaux, for his 'martial' and 'warlike excellence' in the war in Ravenna 'against the Turk', thus emphasising his nation's military power to his English visitors (*JB*. 1-3). Hence, in *John of Bordeaux*, Germany adopts a similarly paradoxical political stance towards foreigners as that espoused by England in the previous play. In Greene's *Friar Bacon*, foreign monarchs are welcomed to Oxford, where an English academic is simultaneously at work on a 'brass head', which will 'compass England with a wall of brass' and thus deter incomers (*FB*. 2.25, 30); while in *John of Bordeaux*, the host nation Germany welcomes the English delegation and emphasises its mutual dedication to peace, whilst simultaneously working to expand its empire in Italy.

These troubling political undercurrents in the first scene are quickly brought to fruition, when Bacon starts to defy his German host. When the German emperor discovers that

---

[21] Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 12.

'Bacon that envious English man' has come to the aid of the now exiled and disgraced John of Bordeaux, thoughts of political cooperation are quickly put aside (*JB*. 956-7):

> Bacon unkind for such great entertainment, wert thou as welcome unto Frederick, as might a sorcerer be unto a prince and in requital of my royal glee, seekest thou the baleful overthrow of me. Favour farewell and welcome dire revenge (*JB*. 966-970)

Vowing that Bacon will 'taste the upmost of the law' because of his 'conspiracy' with Bordeaux, Bacon is sentenced to prison by Frederick (*JB*. 978, 981). Rather depressingly, this is where the play takes a xenophobic turn for the worst, Bacon then uses his 'magic spells' to break free of 'the prison and let[s] the captives forth', in a secular reworking of the harrowing of hell, which clearly envisages Emperor Frederick as 'the proudest Devil', Germany as 'hell' (*JB*. 1240, 1167).

In the final scene of the play, the Emperor's son Ferdinand, who has spent much of the play trying to seduce or rape John of Bordeaux's wife and plotting the downfall of Friar Bacon, is forced to challenge his enemies to open combat. One by one, in a spectacular set piece, his challengers – John of Bordeaux, his loyal son Rossacler, and Friar Bacon – enter the stage as 'trumpets sound' (*JB*. 1247). In his final magic spell, Bacon conjures up 'the show of Lucrece', explaining the significance of this political allegory to his audience as he does so:

> As would thy son, so Tarquin did in Rome,
> Abuse chaste Lucrece with unlawful lust.
> But heavens that hate conspiring treachery,
> Revenged her death by martial Collatine
> Who banished Tarquin from the Royal Crown. (*JB*. 1267-1272)

Clearly this allegory works on both a personal and political level; Ferdinand has been behaving like the rapist Tarquin but Bacon is also likening Emperor Frederick's Germany to the tyranny of the Tarquin's Rome.

In a similar way to Greene's *Friar Bacon*, in *John of Bordeaux* 'the university and the country are not separate worlds and actions in one have consequences in the other'.[22] Indeed, throughout the play the academic state frequently functions as a microcosm of the goings on in the nation state. Despite Bacon's altruistic protestations, the intellectual

---

[22] Knight, 'The Niniversity at the Bankside: Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*', 362.

atmosphere quickly descends into one of egoism and competition. Bacon's servant Pierce ridicules a series of German scholars for their apparent stupidity:

> I think thy head was made of an old bagpipe that hath no wind but what is blown into it, nor thou no wit in thy head but what must be put into it. (*JB.* 527-9)

Further reflective of this attitude, the language of learning and teaching undergoes a distinct shift. Bacon began the play by suggesting that he travelled to Germany because of a 'desire of deeper skill' and the German Emperor responded warmly by inviting his court to 'blithely teach the English friar our Rhenish wine can make a merry heart' (*JB.* 42, 69-70). But very soon, the only occasion that the verb 'to teach' is used in the play is in terms of a threat of revenge (*OED* 6d). Thus, in response to Bacon's provocations towards the end of the play, Vandermast threatens to 'teach you how to jest with German Vandervast' (*JB.* 1055). In this sequence, the German academic echoes the language of academic point-scoring of the previous play, when Bacon threatened to 'teach him what an English Friar can do' (*FB.* 7.24). Hence in both plays, the verb 'to teach' undergoes a dramatic shift of meaning, from being used to express a desire for the mutual exchange of knowledge and hospitality, to a verb associated with hostility and violence.

As the political and social atmosphere takes a turn for the worst, the atmosphere of hospitality which characterised the opening scene also disappears. Instead of enjoying the hospitality of the German emperor and all the 'Rhenish wine' and delicious 'dishes' that seem to accompany it, as a consequence of their apparent treason, the foreigners Bacon, Bordeaux and his wife Rossalin face starvation (*JB.* 70, 60). Hence the helpless Rossalin is forced to 'beg for want' of 'alms' and 'bread' (*JB.* 874, 880, 843). Similarly, despite having previously enjoyed the hospitality of the German Emperor, Friar Bacon later mockingly derides the 'drunken German'; this stereotype was of course a commonplace English xenophobic refrain, which also features heavily in Nashe's pamphlet of 1594, *The Unfortunate Traveller* (*JB.* 1160).[23]

After his new-found German student friends complain of being 'hungry' and that they 'know not what to do' because they 'have no money', Pierce comes to the rescue promising to 'teach' the scholars the trick of how to get 'a pasty of venison or a rib of

---

[23] For further discussion of xenophobia in Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*, see *Thomas Nashe, The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works* (London: Penguin, 2006); Neil Rhodes, *Elizabethan Grotesque* (London: Routledge and Kegan, 1980); Ann Jones, 'Inside the Outsider: Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller* and Bakhtin's Polyphonic Novel', *Journal of English Literary History* 50 (1983), 61-81; Andrew Fleck, 'Anatomizing the Body Politic: The Nation and the Renaissance Body in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller'*, *Modern Philology* 104.3 (2007), 295-328.

roast beef' and a bottle of brandy for free (*JB*. 503, 510, 514, 521). They walk into an alehouse disguised as gentlemen and impose themselves upon the hospitality of an unsuspecting old woman, who serves them 'black pudding' and copious amounts of alcohol (*JB*. 551). They ask for their bill to be 'put on the tab' and then they make a run for it. This scene clearly has a lot of comic potential for slap-stick humour and improvisation, particularly for the actor playing the part of the clown Pierce. But the scene also reworks the central themes of the main plot and, by doing so, offers a commentary on the problematic social, cultural and political exchanges going on elsewhere in the play. In this alehouse scene, the definition of an 'exchange' has been pushed to breaking point, 'exchange' has quite literally become 'a robbery', just as the mutual 'love' and respect between fellow academics has become stained by nationalism and 'envy' and just as shows of hospitality between nations have ultimately broken out into violent hostility (*JB*. 213, 27, 37).

By way of conclusion, I wish to reflect on how *John of Bordeaux* functions as a sequel and what this might tell us about the interaction between repetition and artistic innovation in early modern drama. In his seminal text *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973), Harold Bloom identified a tension between the 'repetition compulsion' and 'discontinuity' in great works of literature, which he likened to Freud's concept of the uncanny.[24] Moving more up-to-date, Linda Hutcheon has sought to offer a critique of fidelity discourse, which she argues has unfairly denigrated adaptations – and other reiterative texts – in terms of their faithfulness to their source.[25] In *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006), she observed that sequels – like adaptations, remakes and spin-offs – offer the pleasure of 'repetition with variation', providing audiences with both the 'comfort of ritual' and the 'piquancy of surprise'.[26] In a similar vein, Terry Castle has argued that readers and audiences of sequels

> persist in demanding the impossible: that the sequel be different, but also exactly the same. Their secret mad hope is to find in the sequel a paradoxical kind of textual doubling – a repetition that does not look like one [27]

---

[24] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 77.

[25] Gary R. Bortolotti and Linda Hutcheon, 'On the Origin of Adaptations: Rethinking Fidelity Discourse and "Success" – Biologically', *New Literary History* 38 (2007), 443-458.

[26] Linda Hutcheon and Siobhan O'Flynn, *A Theory of Adaptation* (London: Routledge, 2013), p. 4.

[27] Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilisation: The Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Literature and Fiction* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986), p. 134.

The rhetoric of hospitality in *Friar Bacon* and *John of Bordeaux* operates on a metatheatrical level. *John of Bordeaux* was written to replicate the success of *Friar Bacon* but the play seemingly attempts – like all sequels – to somehow outdo the original. The action of *John of Bordeaux* attempts to achieve this paradoxical desire. The Emperor Frederick's decision to return the hospitality shown to him in Oxford during the first play, by inviting Friar Bacon to visit Germany in the second, allows the playwright, or playwrights, to replicate the plot of *Friar Bacon* but as a mirror image. Frederick must perfectly replicate the hospitality showed to him in the previous play, whilst simultaneously seeking to outdo it. This is because the exchange of hospitality, like the relationship between a text and its sequel, demands that we apply the logic of Derridean supplementarity. In his reading of the work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau in a chapter in *Of Grammatology* (1967) entitled '...That Dangerous Supplement...', Jacques Derrida describes the *supplément* as both 'a surplus, a plenitude enriching another plenitude' and as substitute filling a void: 'it is not simply added to the positivity of a presence... its place is assigned in the structure by the mark of an emptiness'.[28] Hence the sequel is both a *supplement* to the first play and simultaneously a *substitute* – a threat its legacy.

Friar Bacon and *John of Bordeaux* are plays of their times and plays for our times. Their patriotic hero, Friar Bacon, is a relic of the 1580s when England was fearful of foreign incursions, when levels of xenophobia were on the increase, when England was finding itself increasingly isolated in Europe and beginning to look inwards in a quest to forge some mythic sense of a uniquely English identity. Readers could be forgiven for thinking that this all sounds worryingly familiar. As a British academic who has previously lived and worked in Germany for several years, it would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the shadow cast by Brexit, over both this article and its author. If these plays teach us anything, it is that the nation state and the academic state are closely interlinked. Offering cautionary tales highly pertinent to today, *Friar Bacon* and *John of Bordeaux* offer us a vision of a world in which political strife and national rivalries are allowed to hinder the free exchange of academic knowledge and learning. With this stark warning in mind, it is all the more important that academics continue to forge collaborative research links between Britain and the rest of Europe. As academics and scholars, we must not let isolationist thinking cloud our understanding of the past, or our ambitions for the future.

---

[28] Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology* (1967), trans. by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976), pp. 144-5.