



*Research  
Opportunities  
in  
Medieval  
and  
Renaissance  
Drama*  
XLVIII 2009

## Charismatic Authority and Political Subversion in *John of Bordeaux*

Brian Walsh / Yale University

Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (ca. 1589) has garnered a modest but steady stream of critical notice over the past several decades, during which time many aspects of the play have been subjected to scrutiny. The same cannot be said of its uncertainly-authored sequel, dubbed for the sake of convenience *John of Bordeaux* (ca. 1590-1594).<sup>1</sup> This is due largely to the difficulties presented by the text of *John of Bordeaux* as we have it. It comes down to us only in a damaged, at times sloppy manuscript that was virtually unknown to scholars until 1936, when the Malone Society brought out a print edition edited by William Renwick. This edition has provoked some interest: in the play as a re-capitulation of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, in the transmission history of the manuscript and its relation to performance, and in speculations on the play's ending, which survives only in fragments.<sup>2</sup> There has not, however, been much enthusiasm for addressing the play's discernable content and the ways it might be intrinsically engaging. Perhaps the greatest thematic interpretation in the critical history of *John of Bordeaux* is the very title by which it is now known, first suggested by Renwick, who also proposed as an alternative *The Second Part of Friar Bacon*.

Despite the manifold corruptions of the manuscript, most of the speeches and plot points up until the mutilated ending are reasonably clear. The play provides enough intelligible and intriguing material here to inspire more interpretive approaches to *John of Bordeaux*. It offers a range of entry points for scholars interested in dramatic interventions in Elizabethan culture, including representations of Euro-Turkish conflict, the trope of sexual coercion by a tyrannical prince, necromancy and morality, and English relations to the

Hapsburg German states and princes to name a few.<sup>3</sup> This essay will draw attention to one potentially incendiary aspect of the play that touches on some of those issues: its representation of Friar Bacon's ability to subdue and control kingly figures. The threat Bacon presents to temporal dominion is made evident in Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, but it is eventually blunted by Bacon's own volitional submission to authority. In the sequel, his awesome, unqualified power is made central to the plot as it unfolds and, most importantly, to what we can make of the ending. I will argue here that *John of Bordeaux* thus suggests a more subversive attitude toward monarchical supremacy than its predecessor play. In *John of Bordeaux* Bacon's magic endows him with sufficient charismatic authority, based on a universal recognition of his preternatural facility in controlling the people and events around him, to surmount the regal figures he encounters and thus dim their own claims to privilege based on charisma. This suggests that an over-mighty subject endowed with such authority can, *ipso facto*, defeat and perhaps also de-legitimize temporal powers. Rather than attempting to conceal or soften the disruptive political implications of representing a subject equipped with formidable magical powers, *John of Bordeaux* enacts such implications.<sup>4</sup> Examining the play in these terms will expand our understanding of the stakes involved in representing magical versus political power in Elizabethan England. I hope also to demonstrate more generally that some compelling critical possibilities and opportunities emerge if we take *John of Bordeaux* seriously as a work that offers lively language, engaging characters, a coherent plot, and a surprisingly unorthodox political tenor.<sup>5</sup>

There are many deliberate echoes of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* in *John of Bordeaux*. One comes in the first scene, as Friar Bacon, in the German court of Emperor Frederick, apologizes to Frederick's champion John of Bordeaux for the poor hospitality he had received when he had been to Oxford: "I would yo[ur] English wellcom had bin more but friers dieat / must not revell it" (ll.58-60).<sup>6</sup> Greene's play does not depict John's actual visit to England, but these words recall a particular moment in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* when Bacon first reveals the meanness of his "dieat." There, after a spectacular conjuring contest in which he has baffled the German Vandermast and sent him back to Europe on a devil's back, Bacon offers a meal to the English King, German Emperor, and other dignitaries. Bacon's servant Miles enters "with a mess of pottage and broth."<sup>7</sup> Bacon announces: "Lordings, admire not if your cheer be this, / For we must keep our academic fare; / No riot where philosophy doth reign" (*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, 10.229-231).

The Emperor is outraged, first at Bacon, then, more pointedly, at his official host, the English King, Henry III:

Presumptuous friar! What, scoff'st thou at a king?  
 What dost thou taunt us with thy peasants' fare,  
 And give us cates fit for country swains?  
 Henry, proceeds this jest of thy consent,  
 To twit us with a pittance of such a price?  
 Tell me, and Frederick will not grieve thee long.

King Henry must protest his innocence:

By Henry's honor, and the royal faith,  
 The English monarch beareth to his friend,  
 I knew not of the friar's feeble fare,  
 Nor am I pleased he entertains you thus.

(10.234-243)

Bacon immediately diffuses the situation when he declares that the pottage was merely to show how little he and his fellows at Oxford eat. He then promises to deliver a magnificent feast for the court.

By invoking the matter of Bacon's paltry diet at the start of *John of Bordeaux*, the author builds continuity between the Bacons of the two plays, here in terms of the characters' abstemiousness. Further, he calls to mind this earlier scene in which Bacon had angered and flummoxed his king. King Henry's helplessness stands out in that scene. Bacon is clearly in control of the entire situation. The friar has orchestrated a practical joke on the assembled aristocratic and royal visitors that violates hierarchies of status. This is done fresh off of his amazing display of necromantic power, power that, presumably, he could turn on those assembled if he so wished; could he not, for instance, send the Emperor back to Germany on a devil's back as easily as he sent Vandermast? Or do as much to his own king? Henry's reaction to the Emperor's anger makes evident his impotence in this moment. He can only assure his guest he did not know about the joke, and that it does not "please" him. It is interesting to consider whether, in performance, Bacon's reassuring response comes immediately, or if there is even the slightest pause. A pause, even a small one, would maintain a moment of extreme tension, for Henry's inability to do more than express displeasure at Bacon reveals that Bacon is mightier than his king; that he is, practically speaking, not subject to the king's power. It is not until Bacon makes clear that he means to serve the guests a lavish feast that fits their eminence that we can be assured that he does not intend to challenge openly the king's authority by insisting on the jest. Bacon's momentary

disruption of hierarchy is papered over as he voluntarily puts himself at the service of his temporal betters.

This same dynamic plays out elsewhere in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. When Edward, the Prince of Wales, arrives in Oxford, he and his train of nobles are incognito, and he has disguised his fool Rafe as himself. A skirmish breaks out between the men and Bacon's servant Miles, and when Bacon arrives he charms the young gallants' swords, rendering them unable to draw. Bacon then demonstrates omniscience when he correctly identifies Edward and his friends, and, moreover, tells them what they have been up to prior to coming to Oxford:

Edward, King Henry's son and Prince of Wales,  
Thy fool disguised cannot conceal thyself.  
I know both Ermsby and the Sussex earl,  
Else Friar Bacon had but little skill.  
Thou comest in post from merry Fressingfield,  
Fast fancied to the Keeper's bonny lass,  
To crave some succor of the jolly friar.  
(5.70-76)

Warren surmises "The friar knoweth all," and Edward admits he is "amazed to hear this jolly friar / Tell even the very secrets of my thoughts" (81, 83-84). As with the panoptic ideal symbolized in the "Rainbow Portrait" of Queen Elizabeth—where her gown is embroidered with an array of eyes—Bacon is represented as all seeing. Edward is forced to admit both Bacon's power to disable him physically as well as his God-like perception.<sup>8</sup> Quickly, though, Bacon reveals that he is happy to assist Edward to monitor his love in Fressingfield. He offers his services to his Prince, to which Edward replies "I will quite thy pains" (107). The friar's power to overwhelm and supervise his royal better is displayed even more explicitly here. It is then transformed into a pledge of service, so that this time, with Edward's promise of reward, Bacon's submission advances a kind of stabilizing social contract for mutual benefit between prince and subject.

By the end of this play, Bacon abjures his impressive array of powers. He bases the decision on religious grounds:

Bacon must be damned  
For using devils to countervail his God.  
Yet, Bacon, cheer thee; drown not in despair!  
Sins have their salves; repentance can do much.  
(13.97-100)

It is uncertain whether *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* pre- or post-dates Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*.<sup>9</sup> Regardless, Bacon represents a clear alternative to the infamous recalcitrance of Faust. He looks at a crucial moment to the health of his soul so that the trajectory of Bacon's narrative becomes less about political service and more about theological diligence. The will and the ability to subvert temporal authority in the play is displaced more overtly onto the two clowns of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Miles and Rafe. Both are, to some degree, unrepentant subversives, as stage clowns tend to be. Rafe impersonates his master the Prince by wearing his clothes and "prince[ing] it out" (1.99); he also attacks a vintner and embarrasses Edward before his bride-to-be through his indelicate gossiping, and suffers no real reprisal, while Miles feels no remorse for his inability to obey Bacon's commands to watch over his prize project, the Brazen Head. When he is carted off to Hell, he goes gladly. These infractions against orthodoxy are ultimately minor, though. Bacon is potentially the most subversive figure of the play, wielding as he does the power to awe majesty. He even has designs on usurping the king's place as protector of the nation altogether in his dream to wall England in brass. Greene shields the audience from confronting the implications of this subversive power when Bacon abjures it; by framing Bacon's rejection of necromancy in terms of contrition and desire for salvation, Greene especially obscures the extent to which the friar's power threatens not merely his own soul, but the stability of the English state under the rule of the Plantagenet monarchs. The more sustained, unapologetic tweaking of authority we do get is channeled mainly through exercise of the clown's traditional, and here largely harmless, prerogative.

The failure of Bacon's Brazen Head project marks a limit to his power insofar as he is unable to stay awake to watch over the head at the crucial hour in which it becomes animate. The fact that his servant Miles is unwilling to obey, or even, in a fundamental sense, understand, his master is another limit. The play offers these qualifications to Bacon's abilities, but it is through his choice to remain a subservient subject to his king and his prince that Greene most obviously avoids representing the disruption of the monarch's authority. Bacon's final act of magic is a prophecy delivered to the court before the marriage of the Prince of Wales. It is calculated to flatter his king's family and to announce and praise in advance the rise of Queen Elizabeth, the reigning monarch at the moment of the play's performance. He also makes clear that while he can see a vision of the future up to the Tudors, it is not he who in any sense produces that future. The vision depicts that which will "grow from Edward and his queen," that is, from the marriage of Edward and Eleanor of Castile with which the play ends (16.42). The English

future set forth here arises from the nation's ruling houses—first Plantagenet and eventually Tudor—not its powerful subjects.<sup>10</sup> Bacon's volitional subservience to temporal authority, within the play to Prince Edward and King Henry and within the context of its production on stage to Elizabeth and her House, is consistent with Greene's main source, the anonymously-authored prose tract *The Famous History of Friar Bacon*. In this work, Bacon's magical abilities and unparalleled scientific knowledge aid the English king in his conquests, and also implicitly threaten the king's primacy by making the king dependent on a powerful subject. But the Bacon of this novella repeatedly assures the king that he remains a loyal servant, despite his vast powers. In return for his service, "hée [Bacon] desired nothing so much as his Maiestice[s] love."<sup>11</sup> *The Famous History of Friar Bacon* thus also emphasizes an orderly contract of reciprocal but still clearly hierarchical relations between an over-mighty subject and a king.

Kurt Tetzeli von Rosador, in an extremely insightful article on magic and political power on the early modern stage, offers a useful framework in which to understand this trajectory.<sup>12</sup> Von Rosador, drawing on the work of Max Weber, notes that Elizabethan monarchs and magicians both claim that their authority derives from "charismatic investiture." Such charismatic authority is noted by its "extraordinariness, its transcendental legitimation," and tends to be "absolutist in character, suffering no rival."<sup>13</sup> The magician thus implicitly impugns the power of kings. But such a hazardous conflict is rarely represented openly, especially on stage. As von Rosador shows, in works like Lyly's *Endimion* and Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, we see the magician's submission to monarchs. This is especially powerful in *Faust*, where, despite his own stated desire for temporal power, Faust nonetheless pledges subservience to the Duke of Vanholt and to the Emperor Charles V.<sup>14</sup> Von Rosador takes King James VI of Scotland's theorization of the relation between kingly and magical power in *Daemonologie* (1597) to be an exemplary statement that explains these servile tendencies. James takes up the question "what is their [necromancers'] power against the Magistrate?" He responds by noting that if a necromancer is apprehended by an ordinary person, his power remains the same. But if they are apprehended by a "lawfull Magistrate,"

upon the iust respectes of their guiltnesse in that craft, their power is then no greater then before that euer they medled with their master. For where God beginnes iustlie to strike by his lawfull Lieutennentes, it is not in the Deuilles power to defraude or bereaue him of the office, or effect of his powerfull and reuenging Scepter.<sup>15</sup>

Just as von Rosador shows Lyly and Marlowe do, Greene in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* observes this orthodox formulation that the magician's power withdraws in the presence of divinely authorized royal power.<sup>16</sup> The playwrights do more, however, than simply have the monarch prevail; along with the author of the prose work *The Famous History of Friar Bacon*, they insist on enacting the fealty of the magician, thus offering a clear demonstration of the ultimate triumph and superior status of the king's charismatic authority, an authority that "suffers no rival."

*John of Bordeaux* occupies the same cultural context as these other works, and more specifically it inherits from its predecessor play and the prose source they share the figure of Friar Bacon, who, in both, displays his awesome, unmatched puissance only to put his power at the disposal of the temporal authority of his king. Audiences of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* can delight in Bacon's amazing feats, but also see a demonstration of fealty enacted even by one who is preternaturally powerful. This amounts to an object lesson for Elizabethan playgoers that obedience to authority is not merely a matter of recognizing the monarch's superior force. It is about recognizing the proper limits of all subjects, no matter how mighty, before the mystical power of royalty. In the case of Greene's play, that royalty is English. *John of Bordeaux*, though, re-locates Bacon to the court of the German Emperor, as well as, briefly, to a battlefield in Europe where he encounters the Ottoman Emperor. Superficially, the foreign setting releases the author of the play to depict Bacon's ability to disrupt and subdue temporal authority to an even greater degree, and, of more significance, to allow Bacon to do so without ever renouncing his power or putting it at the service of those ruler figures. In other words, the always subversive potential of Bacon's power in previous representations of him in England is made actual in *John of Bordeaux* where he appears in Europe.

Whether the foreign setting ameliorates the corrosive political implications of such subversion is an open question, though. After all, as we have seen in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, the German Emperor, even while in England, angrily demands the deference of the "presumptuous friar" who offers him pottage for dinner. The national rivalry that surfaces in that play is restricted to Bungay's and Bacon's contest with their social equal, Vandermast. Greene ensures that Bacon is ultimately respectful of both his own king's, and the German king's, regal authority, implying a transnational logic of deference to monarchy at work. Bacon is the hero of *John of Bordeaux*, and simultaneously his behavior is repugnant to concepts of royal prerogative that are upheld anywhere. The edge of Bacon's defiance of monarchial power in *John of Bordeaux*, even though it is

played out on foreign soil, cuts against authority that is closer to home for English audiences.

Bacon initially finds a warm welcome in the court of the "Iermayn emperore" Frederick (*John of Bordeaux*, l. 39). The foreignness of the setting is emphasized, both through the frequent articulation of Bacon's exotic status as "Inglish," and through the repeated identification of the main location of the play as "hosburge" that is, "Hapsburg," a synonym for the lands of the Holy Roman Empire used also in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*.<sup>17</sup> The play shows a civil relationship between the Emperor and his foreign guest. Frederick is careful to extend hospitality to Bacon, and Bacon acknowledges the Emperor's "Curtecie" (l. 45). Bacon is overtly deferential, calling Frederick "yo[r] grase [grace]" and telling him that he does not deserve such treatment from an Emperor (ll. 41, 44). Bacon then quickly asks permission to accompany John of Bordeaux, the Emperor's great military leader, on his expedition against the Ottomans: "I have longe desired to se the turke / to witnes with my nies what I have read ill to / Revena [i.e. Ravenna] marchinge with yo[u]r troupes and se" (ll. 61-63). The play establishes Bacon's willingness to observe hierarchical protocol as long as it pleases him to do so.

Once he arrives at Ravenna, Bacon finds himself face to face with the Turkish "Emperor," Amerothe, and immediately assumes a very different posture. Amerothe demands to know his "degree." Bacon defiantly introduces himself: "Turk I can bridell all thy / pouer by art thus fo[r] my skill and now fo[r] my degree / I am Inglish Bacon" (ll. 149, 156-157). He proceeds to speak more audaciously to the Emperor:

I fo[r] to gratulat my princleie frend cam wandering  
Amewroth unto thy camp to have thy croune thy robe  
and semeter, which I will have mawger thy prowdist  
gard. [Before] I depart... from hence grudge  
not but yeld them me with out delaye,  
fo[r] Inglish Bacon will not hav a naye.

(ll. 170-175)

Amerothe threatens to kill Bacon with his "semeter" or scimitar when, through Bacon's magic, a spirit appearing as the Emperor's beloved son Selimus appears before them, being pursued by a soldier. The soldier is about to kill the boy, and the Emperor and his men are charmed and unable to move in his defense, a repetition of the moment in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* when Bacon likewise freezes up Prince Edward and his courtiers. At Bacon's command of "strike" the soldier raises his weapon and is close to killing Selimus.

It becomes clear that Bacon is in control of the soldier and the entire situation. Amerothe begs Bacon to intervene, first asking him to "in treat" or entreat for the boy's life, but then quickly amends his request in language that ascribes ultimate power to the English friar: "nay charge fo[r] thy command is donne" (l. 209).

Bacon agrees on condition that the Emperor render his crown, robes and weapon to Bacon's servant Perce. When he does, Bacon and Perce exit, apparently having broken the bargain, for Bacon sends the spirits that had taken the shapes of the soldier and Selimus away, he says, to hell. Perce leaves Amerothe with a final witty play on his master's name that serves as a mock to his religious observance of dietary restrictions: "I beleve you will love hogge flesh / the worse this seven yeer ye bin so hardlie handlid by Bacon" (ll. 222-223). That Perce can exit speaking such a sharp affront demonstrates Amerothe's complete humiliation and disempowerment at the hands of Bacon. The Emperor proclaims that the charm is undone and his "limes hav wanted libertie" again, but his men are still fearful: as one "lord" says, "whether shall we flie / this Cursed Bacon will haunt ous at the heeles" (ll. 224, 225-226). It is then revealed that Selimus is safe after all. The Emperor is so relieved, he proclaims Bacon is "a man in all his word" since the boy is indeed alive. Significantly, though, when Amerothe swears that he will retrieve his robes and other possessions, he does not intend to re-take them from the man who coerced them. Rather, he promises to go "doun to hosborge [Hapsburg] playnes and fech from fredrick my Croune" (ll. 251-252). Amerothe confines his challenge to Frederick. He now knows better than to imagine he could successfully confront Bacon.

Bacon's ability to subdue physically the Ottoman ruler and to force him to surrender the indices of his sovereignty shows the astounding extent of his powers. In the broadest sense this is an example of the political order being subverted: a lowly figure thwarts the will of a royal one. The fact that Amerothe is an Ottoman "other" might take some of the sting out of the representation of such a disruption of social hierarchy from the perspective of Elizabethan authorities who, it might be supposed, would have no issue with degrading an "infidel" monarch on stage. And yet, as Emily Bartels, Jonathan Burton, Matthew Dimmock and others have argued, the cultural status of the "turke" in sixteenth-century England was more complicated than is often assumed. Elizabeth had opened relations with the Ottomans in the first decades of her reign, and, as Burton argues, she even "emphasizes what sameness she can find—doctrinal and political—in Islam and Protestantism" in her correspondence with the Sultan.<sup>18</sup> While by the 1590s relations had become more complicated, and indeed we do see "Amurath" traduced in Shakespeare's *2 Henry IV*, Dimmock has seen in *John of Bordeaux* a

balanced portrait of the Turk.<sup>19</sup> He points in particular to a scene where the Muslim Emperor is reported to respect true nobleness and bravery more than the European, Christian Frederick does, a representation that "suggests the potential for a different kind of interaction between Christian and Ottoman," one that is not rigidly devoted to the demonizing of the "turkes."<sup>20</sup> So while the baffling of the Ottoman Emperor might have read only as the deserved comeuppance of a foreign heretic, it might also have registered to those with a more nuanced sense of "Anglo-Ottoman" relations as a shocking spectacle of an imperial power, lateral to the English monarch, humiliated by a socially lowly figure.

If Amerothe's vow to get his things back from Frederick shows he is clearly afraid to tangle with Bacon again, he is also technically correct in assuming the spoils will end up with the German Emperor. Bacon does, like a good guest who subjects himself to his host country's ruler, give the booty to Frederick. Frederick takes pleasure in the gifts, but he laments that he cannot see the action in Ravenna first hand. He recalls a moment from *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* when Bacon "didest breake...in a splene" the magic glass that would have allowed him to view distant locales. *John of Bordeaux* here draws attention to the crucial moment in its predecessor play when Bacon abjures magical power in order to rescue his soul from damnation, but trivializes the action somewhat by characterizing it as done "in a splene" rather than as a matter of conscience. Bacon in *John of Bordeaux* does not dispute the Emperor's characterization, and goes so far as to correct his assessment of Bacon's dependence on the object: "my lord though my glass be broke was Bacons conninge [cunning] tied with in a glass no." Bacon makes a new and amplified claim to power as he asserts that his necromantic might is somehow immanent to himself, not reliant upon external implements like a perishable piece of glass. He then promises to show Frederick "the warlicke stratagemes before revena walls," and with the king's somewhat bewildered consent—"but...how shall I fall in to a dreame having no mynd at all to slepe"—Bacon raises Morpheus as a soporific agent and exits to, as the stage direction reads (apparently speaking to the players themselves) "bring in the showes [of the battle at Ravenna] as you knowe" (ll. 424-447).

Frederick gives himself over completely to Bacon's enchantment, and Bacon in essence takes control of Frederick's sense of reality. The Emperor's trance serves as a major turning point of the plot, as it also allows Vandermast and the German Prince Ferdinand to manipulate him into believing that John of Bordeaux is disloyal. This happens when Vandermast creates a false messenger who interrupts the dream at a crucial moment to deliver a phony charge of Bordeaux's cowardice. Although Bacon and Vandermast are not

deliberately working in concert, the result of their separate enchantments is to usurp the Emperor's perception of the world. As a result of his distorted perspective on the loyal John of Bordeaux, he becomes a tyrant, unfairly persecuting both Bordeaux and his wife and children. This is of course the result desired by Ferdinand, who desires Bordeaux's wife Rossalin sexually, and who believes that she will yield to him under the duress of her husband's disgrace and the vulnerable position his fall creates for her. The power of magic thoroughly hoodwinks the Emperor.

Why Bacon, who both *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and *John of Bordeaux* repeatedly show to be more powerful than Vandermast, allows Frederick's misperception and subsequent tyranny to stand as long as he does is not clear. This may be due to some textual muddle of the manuscript that omits to account for Bacon's absence after the "showes" of Ravenna begin, or it may be a simple matter of a play, for the sake of dramatic convenience, sacrificing some of its own logic in order to maintain the tension and conflict as long as possible. In any case, it is not until several scenes later when the play nears its end that we see Bacon exert his powers to correct the situation: not through simply disabusing Frederick about Bordeaux's true devotion to him against the Turks, but through directly challenging the authority of the Emperor and his vile son Prince Ferdinand. Bacon's defiance begins when he is imprisoned for, along with Rossalin, allegedly seeking to kill the Emperor. Bacon pointedly reminds him that earthly monarchs are not the ultimate authorities: "well frederick you sopposeth but god supposeth all in him we tr[ust]" (l. 1046).<sup>21</sup> Frederick realizes that his own power is limited in relation to Bacon's, and he calls on Vandermast to act as a bulwark: "go vandermast tri all thy otmost skill antissipat [anticipate] his charm with thy foresight" (ll. 1052-1053). *John of Bordeaux* represents in this moment a world where the reigning monarch is forced to rely on the mediocre academician Vandermast to protect him against the potential "charms" of Bacon, revealing again Frederick's vulnerability.

But it is Bacon's action in busting out of prison that is his most aggressive usurpation of Frederick's authority. Bacon declares: "now Bacon...seet op the prison dors / and let the prisoners forth" (ll. 1172-1173). Not only does he defy Frederick's authority to imprison him, he overturns the Emperor's prerogative to detain and administer punishment to his own country's malefactors. He tells his servant Perce "com com perce shak of thy chaynes and go with me" and later directs him to "go yo[r] wayes and bed / all the prisoners shacke of ther chaynes and a fige fo[r] the hang man" (ll. 1204, 1211-1212). Perce then reiterates the command, this time directly addressing the inhabitants of the jail: "you ye velines and theves shake of yo[r]



chaynes" (1213-1214). A stage direction here reads "Enter all the presoners." This must have been an uncanny moment in the performance of the play; Elizabethan prisoners were often visible to denizens of the city, either through the window gratings of city jails or even as they were set out to beg on a short-term, supervised basis. Here, prisoners are represented as not merely visible, or out on restricted release, but as set free. This might have been an especially sensational spectacle in performance of *John of Bordeaux* at the Rose Theatre, which stood just a short walk from the Clink Prison in Elizabethan Southwark, where inmates, as they banged their chains and cups begging for sustenance, were often audible and visible to passers-by.<sup>22</sup> Bacon's cry of a "fig" for the hangman, the executioner who acts as the Emperor's agent of justice, amounts to an anarchic cry on behalf of those miserable creatures, probably so familiar to playgoers, against the prevailing social and political order. The spectacle of the prisoners entering would add an embodied complement to that cry, a parade of the defiant lawless assembled on stage, ready to illicitly re-enter the general population.

Perce introduces the inmates in words ostensibly directed at Bacon, but that seem equally directed at the playhouse audience: "now in[aster] hells broke lose hers such a crew as yo never se...the ar all theves this a Cutpurs and this a hors steler" (1215 s.d., ll. 1216-19). Confronted with this inglorious "crew" at the point of releasing them, Bacon admonishes them to stop their wrongdoing. He also gives them a kind of verbal passport to roam freely: "yf anie man / excammin ye say say English Bacon let you all goe free" (ll. 1222-1223). Bacon disperses the criminals back into the community from which they had been isolated by state power, and he specifically tells them, if questioned about their freedom, to broadcast that it was "English Bacon," a foreign subject, who has authorized their release. Bacon's audacity undermines Frederick's authority at its very roots: the power to criminalize and detain certain subjects for their attempts to disrupt the state. Such power is his claim to safeguard the community at large, an important aspect of any ruler's claim to a "charismatic investiture" of authority. If we take Bacon's admonishment to the criminals as having the efficacious power of some of his other actions, then we can intuit that he has reformed the prisoners through his words, another sign of how far his power outstrips that of the monarch, who could only detain and threaten them with the gallows. If we do not assume that at Bacon's command they cease illegality, then his act of releasing them is all the more disruptive and subversive, for it contaminates the community with the agents of chaos that the Emperor's laws had sought to contain. Either way, the action of setting the prisoners free demonstrates that Bacon's

charismatic authority in effect desiccates Frederick's, and perhaps even reveals it to be chimerical.

From here, we approach the fragmentary ending the manuscript of *John of Bordeaux* affords. The set-up for this partial final scene is more or less clear. The Emperor had set a date for a trial by combat to decide the fates of Bacon and Rossalin, the wife of John of Bordeaux. The trial by combat as a form itself depends on some sense that right will prevail by divine decree; the victor proves their charismatic investiture by virtue of winning. The play thus creates another explicit opportunity to pit, in mystical terms, the Emperor's putative transcendent power against Bacon's. After Bacon's escape from prison, Rossalin awaits judgment alone. Prince Ferdinand enters as the champion of the state and its accusations against Bacon and Rossalin. There is a call for Rossalin's champions to emerge, at which point her husband, her son Rossacler, and eventually Bacon himself enter as candidates. Bacon openly renounces Ferdinand for his lustful pursuit of the virtuous Rossalin, and promises to the Emperor that he will "aprove his son dith lie" about her treason (l. 1264). Bacon has by this time also disabled Vandermast, who wanders in muttering gibberish. Bacon then makes clear he is about to employ his magic, calling out "revenging heaven loyne you to my art" (l. 1310). It is at this point that the manuscript splinters. It is thus difficult to make absolute arguments about the closing scene of the play, but there is enough here to stimulate reasonable conjecture.

Waldo McNeir in 1951 essayed to reconstruct the ending based on the partial final manuscript leaf, and his suggestions are persuasive.<sup>23</sup> He shows that the final scene offers a resolution in which Bacon most likely uses his "art" to stymie the Emperor and his men, "perhaps by an exhibition of sword-charming" as occurred earlier in the play with the Ottomans.<sup>24</sup> Bacon demonstrates Ferdinand's guilt to the Emperor's satisfaction, for the fragments show him to say he is "greved" and that "I Lofte to see hi[m]" that is, to see his son. He instructs Bacon to "do with hi[m]," suggesting that he has given his son over to Bacon's power; in other words, after Bacon had already usurped Frederick's power to judge the guilty of his country when he set the prisoners free, the Emperor now explicitly abdicates to him that authority over his own son and heir, and thus the very future of his country (ll. 1328-1330). Bacon appears to be on the verge of killing Ferdinand, when the manuscript records a partial line in which the Emperor implores "ha Bacon save m" which McNeir suggests might read "save my son." Bacon clearly asks whether the Prince repents, the Prince appears to say he does, at which Bacon tells him "ries up." It is then clear that the Emperor agrees to fulfill any other demands of Bacon: "what er it be bacon sha," probably completed with "shall have." Bacon appears to



demand the reinstatement of John of Bordeaux, before the manuscript ends with words that sound like those that might close out a play by moving the characters offstage: "com this way" is visible among the final broken lines (ll. 1336-1352).

From what we can reconstruct from this final scene, then, Frederick, the Holy Roman Emperor, is reduced to a position of begging Bacon for the life of his son, just as Amerothe did before him. This symmetry adds force to the notion that Bacon's subversion of their powers might be read as thematically equivalent, despite the Ottoman's more obviously "other" status. Frederick's submission is also significant for it is on this note that the play appears to end. Based on the text as we have it, it appears that a conclusion is reached without any moment of volitional submission to power as we saw Bacon enact in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. If this is correct, the conclusion to *John of Bordeaux* is more radical in its political implications. Here, a mighty man of low social status can subdue and dominate monarchs, Christian and non-Christian, and be the *hero* of the play rather than a threatening force of disruption who must dilute his power through an expression of fealty.

Richard Levin has recently proposed an ingenious argument to the contrary.<sup>25</sup> He suggests that alterations made to *The Famous History of Friar Bacon*, the prose source for *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and *John of Bordeaux*, between its earliest extant editions and an edition published in 1683 reflect the probable complete ending for the latter play. He argues that the later edition of the *History* offers a dénouement to the Bacon-Ferdinand-Frederick story that might reflect the ending of the play as it was performed, or somehow otherwise known to the author of the *History*, in a fuller version than is preserved in the manuscript. Based on this theory, Levin believes that the play originally would have ended with a scene in which Bacon renounces his magical powers. To adapt Levin's analysis to the terms of my interests here, such a conclusion would have the effect of deflecting the lingering implications of an ending that leaves us with an unbounded, over-mighty subject.

Levin's argument is based both on his reading of such a renunciation scene in the 1683 *Famous History*, and on his sense that two-part Elizabethan plays tended to mirror each other in key respects, so that in this case, the sequel would follow the original in having Bacon abjure his magic.<sup>26</sup> While Levin may be on to something in terms of what a longer, authorial manuscript of the play might have looked like, or what a version of the play hypothetically performed in the mid- to late seventeenth century may have contained, there simply is nothing in the Elizabethan manuscript as we have it that would suggest this renunciation takes place. Indeed, when the seeds for such an act seem to be sown earlier on, they are

immediately quashed. While in jail, Bacon summons the demons at his command to help him break free and torment Vandermast. The demons at first seem poised to disappoint him, like those summoned by Joan of Arc late in *1 Henry VI*. The devil Astrow says "no Bacon no it goes not with the as twas wont / the hellish sperrite ar no mor at thy command...thow art ours both bodie and soull ho ho ho" (ll. 1140-1144). But Bacon quickly unleashes a Latin charm and Astrow is subdued to his will once more. In other words, the moment that should have chilled Bacon and pushed him toward repentance—the threat of demons dragging him off to Hell—barely glances off him as he overrides whatever power they thought they had over him. This scene celebrates Bacon's freedom from the need to repent. Without asserting his power here, he would not be able to produce the comic ending of the play. It thus sets up an ending without renunciation of magic or the devils that make it possible, for Bacon appears to rely on his magic up until the very end. In my view, there are no legible textual indications that he abjures his power.<sup>27</sup> Paul Dean has offered an argument that two-part plays are not necessarily mirror images of each other, and that often they offer first a comic and then a tragic trajectory. Through this lens, he reads *John of Bordeaux* as a "graver play" than its predecessor, and while he does not specifically deal with the renunciation or non-renunciation of magic, his sense of a tonal shift between the two plays accords with my own argument here that *John of Bordeaux* breaks in some key aspects from *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* rather than repeating them.<sup>28</sup>

In *John of Bordeaux*, we see represented two temporal rulers, both described as Emperors, and both ostensibly legitimate monarchs, brought to submission by a socially humble figure, Friar Bacon, who overawes them with his magic. This is very different from *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, where the use of magic, after its power is demonstrated in the charming of Prince Edward's sword, is never brought to bear upon higher temporal authorities. Shakespeare's *1* and *2 Henry VI* are two near-contemporary plays that depict characters using magic in ways that are politically disruptive to the order of the English state, and in both instances those characters pay a terrible penalty. Likewise, in *Endimion* and *Doctor Faustus* magus figures acknowledge the power of temporal authority. Bacon's volitional subservience to power in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, and his explicit renunciation of necromancy is thus in line with the political orthodoxy enacted in Shakespeare's early histories and even in Lyly's and Marlowe's plays. Recognizing this trend allows us to highlight the strangeness of how magic is used to challenge temporal authority in *John of Bordeaux*.

As I suggested earlier, this may be due to the foreign setting. The author of *John of Bordeaux* may have felt that by removing

Bacon to Europe, and allowing him to confront foreign monarchs rather than doing so at home, would not threaten the Elizabethan status quo—would, perhaps, even be a source of national pride: “English Bacon,” as the text frequently describes him, thwarts the Ottoman and the German monarchs.<sup>29</sup> Yet there are certain elements of the play that cut against the notion that the foreign setting would necessarily defang the radical ramifications of Bacon’s power from the perspective of Elizabethan authorities. For instance, in the case of his rebellion against Frederick, Bacon is confronting the crime of a Prince who seeks to rape a subject. Obviously resonant with the ancient story of Lucretia, this was a highly charged *topos* with implications for political radicalism in the sixteenth century. Ferdinand’s lust for Rossalin, the reason that he traduces the heroic Bordeaux, is explicitly connected with the lust of Tarquin in *John of Bordeaux*. When he confronts Frederick and Ferdinand at the end of the play, Bacon presents what appears to be a masque enacting the tale: a marginal note reads “Enter the show,” and a stage direction reads “Enter the show of Luces” (s.d. ca. l. 1267). Bacon then declares to Frederick:

as would thy son so tarquine di in rome  
Abuse chast luces with unlawfull lust,  
but heavenes that hate conspeiring trecherie  
revengd her death by martiall Collatine  
who banished tarquine forom the royalle croune  
and all his kinsfolke as exciells from rome  
(ll. 1267-1273)

Bacon smoothes over the sense of a concerted revolt against the Tarquins in his euphemistic expression that it was the “heavenes” that drove them from Rome. Yet he declares himself Rossalin’s champion and aligns himself with such forces, pointing not only to his god-like power, but also to its capacity to sweep monarchs from their thrones. In his pointed language of kings losing their crowns, and of the “kinsfolke” of the offending Prince being exiled from their kingdoms, he makes a clear analogy between the expulsion of the Tarquin clan from power and his own aims to defend Rossalin and punish Ferdinand and his family.

By invoking the instance of “Luces,” Bacon’s defiance of Frederick is tintured here with hues of republicanism. Stephanie Jed and others have written on the connection between rape and republicanism that emerges from the Lucretia story. As Oliver Arnold distills the matter, “The historiographical motive of the republican rape *topos* is to posit a relation between coercive political authority

authority, the kind of authority, regardless of where it reigns, that provokes its virtuous subjects to revolt. It is noteworthy also that when Frederick imprisons Bacon, he threatens to burn him at the stake, telling him that “burning faggeets shall inchaunt yo[u]r limes” (1033). This threat aligns Frederick with the infamous forces of Catholic repression from the Marian years made so well known by John Foxe and others. In doing so, the lines again frame Bacon as subject to a tyrannical ruler whose persecution justifies resistance. From what we can discern of the ending, Frederick still rules and Ferdinand still waits to inherit not because of their inherently righteous claim to power, but because it is the pleasure of Bacon to allow them to do so, after he has forced them to acknowledge his greater moral authority and physical prowess to control the world. If we return to James’s *Daemonologie* and its insistence that royal power wilts the magician’s power, we see how clearly that does not take place in this play. We are left with the sense that in *John of Bordeaux*, the magician’s triumph can expose the tyranny of temporal power, drain its charismatic authority, and de-legitimize it altogether, and, in perhaps the greatest exercise of power of all, still ultimately grant conditional license to it.

*John Of Bordeaux* does not, of course, directly espouse republicanism, nor should it be connected to explicit resistance theories of its era, such as those of George Buchanan. I do not want to overstate a case for the play as “revolutionary” text. While Frederick rules at Bacon’s pleasure, he does appear still to rule at the play’s end. The foundations of monarchy have been shaken, not uprooted. But it is clear that the play is willing to engage more politically radical notions of ruler-subject relations than its predecessor *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. There are many reasons that this might be so. One would be to suppose a different author than Greene, one more willing to test the bounds of subversive political representations on stage. Or, if Greene did author the sequel, the bolder tone may reflect his desire to press the implications of Bacon’s power further than he had before. Bacon renounces his awesome capabilities at the end of *Friar Bacon*. To bring him back for a second play in which he continues to exercise that power implicitly nullifies that renunciation. This very fact may have propelled Greene, or whoever wrote *John of Bordeaux*, to expand the ramifications of Bacon’s power in relation to temporal authority accordingly. We might be tempted to chalk the difference up to the foreign setting, but that cannot fully inoculate the play’s representation of the general challenge to authority, and in particular in the case of the misrule of Frederick and Ferdinand, of the moral imperative of powerful individuals openly to resist corrupt authority. This is a dangerous moment

as England in the late sixteenth century, that relies on theories of monarchical right and privilege, and that assumes that the charismatic authority of king- or queen-ship will "suffer no rival."

When in the play's first scene Bacon asks to join Bordeaux on his expedition, Bordeaux replies "Bacon content thow shalt have soulders fayer / but wellcom as it were unto a kinge" (65-66). The conventional formulation of Bordeaux's courtesy hints at a reality, for, while Bacon is no king himself, he does wield the kind of absolute power that kings covet. He is not reluctant to wield it against monarchs themselves in *John of Bordeaux*, and he never, as far as we can tell, renounces it or submits it to temporal authorities. Bacon exerts and amplifies his extraordinary power, his charismatic authority, to the point of drowning out that of his royal superiors. Richard Levin's argument that in a complete version of *John of Bordeaux* Bacon would have renounced his power is compelling because it pronounces symmetry between a prior play and its sequel. But the *lack* of that symmetry, especially on the issue of submission to authority, is one of the things that makes this play so intriguing. The most basic opposition between *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and its sequel is that the former enacts the volitional submission of an over-mighty subject to authority, while the latter enacts instead multiple instances of a socially-low figure overpowering temporal authority. Undoubtedly the more subversive energy that is put on display in the sequel would have made it more troubling to Elizabethan authorities than *Friar Bacon*, the penultimate speech of which extols the peace and prosperity of Elizabeth's reign. If nothing else, this difference in the trajectories of the plays may explain one of the most basic questions of all that surrounds *John of Bordeaux*: why it was never published.<sup>31</sup>

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> I (cautiously) think that Greene is the most probable primary author of *John of Bordeaux*, although the manuscript that we possess includes a speech in Henry Chettle's hand. For the purposes of this essay, I consider the case unresolved and the author(s) to be anonymous. See Grace Ioppolo, *Dramatists and Their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, and Heywood: Authorship, Authority, and the Playhouse* (New York: Routledge, 2005) 120-121 on Chettle's involvement, and Waldo F. McNeir, "Robert Greene and *John of Bordeaux*," *PMLA* 64 (1949): 781-801 for an argument for Greene as author.

<sup>2</sup> On the play's repetitive relationship to *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, see McNeir, "Robert Greene and *John of Bordeaux*," and Paul Dean, "Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay and *John of Bordeaux*: A Dramatic Disturbance," *English Language Notes* 18 (1981): 262-266; on textual studies of

the play and its relation to performance, see Harry R. Hoppe, "John of Bordeaux: a Bad Quarto That Never Reached Print," in *University of Missouri Studies* 21 (1946): 119-132, Laurie E. Maguire, "(Mis)Diagnosing Memorial Reconstruction in *John of Bordeaux*," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 11 (1999): 114-28 and Maguire, "John Holland and *John of Bordeaux*," *Notes and Queries* 33 (1986): 327-333; on the play's ending, see McNeir, "Reconstructing the Conclusion of *John of Bordeaux*," *PMLA* 66 (1951): 540-43 and Richard Levin, "Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, *John of Bordeaux*, and the 1683 Edition of *The History of Friar Bacon*," *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 40 (2001): 55-66.

<sup>3</sup> The play has recently attracted some notice for its representation of the Ottoman Emperor and other "foreigners"; see A.J. Hoenselaars, *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: A Study of Stage Characters and National Identity in English Renaissance Drama, 1558-1642* (Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1992) 31-32 and Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005) 185-189. In terms of its consideration of the morality of magic, Barbara Howard Traister, in *Heavenly Necromancers: The Magician in English Renaissance Drama* (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1984) offers a rare, noteworthy foray into more thematic criticism of *John of Bordeaux*, devoting four pages to consideration of its use of the magician figure (47-51).

<sup>4</sup> Traister provides an important precedent for my arguments here. In her excellent study of the magician on the English stage, she sees the Bacon of *John of Bordeaux* as a departure from most other characterizations of the necromancer precisely because in this play Bacon "is one of the few stage magicians who displays no sense of limitation" (Traister, *Heavenly Necromancers*, 50). Traister qualifies this thought by adding "except for the bounds of Christian faith." This may be so, but more work needs to be done on the status of Christianity in the play, an analysis that would perforce involve thinking through the complexity of the play's setting in the pre-Reformation past and Bacon's status as a Catholic Friar among Catholic Hapsburgs.

<sup>5</sup> Although her 1999 article cited above is mainly concerned with debunking Hoppe's thesis about the transmission of the text of *John of Bordeaux*, Maguire does make a brief pitch for recognizing the play's thematic coherence and its "linguistic care," 115.

<sup>6</sup> *John of Bordeaux, or The Second Part of Friar Bacon*, ed. William Lindsay Renwick (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1936). The play is cited from this edition throughout this essay according to through line numbers.

<sup>7</sup> Robert Greene, *The Honorable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, quoted from *English Renaissance Drama*, ed. David Bevington et al., (New York: W.W. Norton & Company 2002).

<sup>8</sup> On this point, see also Traister, *Heavenly Necromancers*, 71.

<sup>9</sup> Daniel Seltzer questions the traditional priority of *Faustus* in the introduction to his edition of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1963) ix; David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen have more

recently upheld the traditional view in *Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus: Texts A and B* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993) 1.

<sup>10</sup> Traister, *Heavenly Necromancers*, sees this as Bacon's "acceptance of the limits of magic's legitimate sphere of action," 75. David Bevington declares of Bacon that "though he can imprison Prince Edward's sword in its sheath, he never acts disloyally toward Edward and his father," in *Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1968) 223.

<sup>11</sup> *The famous historie of Fryer Bacon Containing the wonderfull things that he did in his life* (London, 1627) sig.Br.

<sup>12</sup> Kurt Tetzeli von Rosador, "The Power of Magic: From *Endimion* to *The Tempest*," *Shakespeare Survey* 43 (1991): 1-13.

<sup>13</sup> Von Rosador, "The Power of Magic," 2. Raphael Falco has more recently examined the concept of charismatic authority in relation to the Shakespearean stage in great detail in his study *Charismatic Authority in Early Modern English Tragedy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2000). Weber's seminal articulation of the concept, originally published in 1922 in *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, can be found in English translation in *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, ed. Talcott Parsons, trans. A.M. Henderson and Parsons (New York: Oxford UP, 1947) 358-362, where he writes: "The term 'charisma' will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities...on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader...it is very often thought of as resting on magical powers" (358-359).

<sup>14</sup> On *Endimion*, see "The Power of Magic," 4-5. For von Rosador's comments on Faust and the German Emperor and Duke, see 6-7.

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in Von Rosador, "The Power of Magic," 4.

<sup>16</sup> Although James's view demonizes magic absolutely, as Traister has shown, early modern discourses on magic, on and off the stage, were surprisingly ambivalent, evincing a reluctance to view "magic as exclusively bad." See *Heavenly Necromancers* 1-31, esp. 26.

<sup>17</sup> "English" appears early in the play at, for instance, ll. 30 and 41. "Hosburge" with various spellings can be found at ll. 29, 31, 46, 251, and elsewhere.

<sup>18</sup> Emily C. Bartels, *Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1993); Jonathan Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamburlaine*," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30 (2000): 125-156, esp. 136, and Dimmock, *New Turkes* 1-19 and *passim*.

<sup>19</sup> See *2 Henry IV*, Act 5, scene 2, 47-49.

<sup>20</sup> Dimmock, *New Turkes*, 188-189.

<sup>21</sup> In the manuscript the last word here is truncated and only "tr" is legible. I am suggesting "trust" as a reading for the full word.

<sup>22</sup> If Renwick and others are correct, the appearance of the name of the actor John Holland in the manuscript indicates that the Lord Strange's Men, to which Holland belonged, performed *John of Bordeaux*. They were

performing at the Rose in 1592 when Henslowe records the performance of a "Friar Bacon" play which Renwick, and later Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean, have argued refers to *John of Bordeaux* and not Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. See Renwick, *John of Bordeaux, or the Second Part of Friar Bacon*, viii, and McMillin and MacLean, *The Queen's Men and Their Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) 90. E.J. Burford, *In the Clink: The Story of England's Oldest Prison* (London: New English Library, 1977) notes that prisoners in the Clink could "beg through the [street-level window] gratings for food and alms from passers-by," 41. On prisoners actually released into the public space to beg for alms, see Christopher Harding, *Imprisonment in England and Wales: A Concise History* (Dover, NH: Croom Helm, 1985) 30.

<sup>23</sup> McNeir, "Reconstructing the Conclusion of *John of Bordeaux*," 540-543.

<sup>24</sup> McNeir, "Reconstructing the Conclusion of *John of Bordeaux*," 541.

<sup>25</sup> Richard Levin, "*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, John of Bordeaux*, and the 1683 Edition of *The History of Friar Bacon*," 55-66. Levin is explicit throughout his stimulating article that his conclusions are performative speculative; as of course are mine, or any drawn from the mutilated ending of the manuscript.

<sup>26</sup> Levin is following G.K. Hunter, who argues that many two-part plays from the era rely on what he calls "diptych-unity"; that is that they achieve unity through "a parallel presentation of incidents." See Hunter's "*Henry IV* and the Elizabethan Two-Part Play," in *R.E.S V* (1954): 236-248, esp. 247.

<sup>27</sup> On this, see also Traister, *Heavenly Necromancers*, 50.

<sup>28</sup> Dean, "*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and *John of Bordeaux*: A Dramatic Diptych" 262-266.

<sup>29</sup> G.K. Hunter hints at such a view in his brief remarks on the play in *English Drama 1586-1642: The Age of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997) 105.

<sup>30</sup> Stephanie Jed, *Chaste Thinking: The Rape of Lucretia and the Birth of Humanism* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1989); Oliver Arnold, *The Third Citizen: Shakespeare's Theater and the Early Modern House of Commons* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2007) 118. See also Barry Nass, "The Law and Politics of Treason in Shakespeare's *Lucrece*," *Shakespeare Yearbook* 7 (1996): 291-311, and Sasha Roberts, *Reading Shakespeare's Poems in Early Modern England* (New York: Palgrave, 2003) 126.

<sup>31</sup> Leeds Barroll has argued that Elizabethan authorities may have been more concerned with potential sedition in print than in performance. See his article "A New History for Shakespeare and His Time," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (1988): 441-464, esp. 452.