The Almeda plot strand and the text of Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlainethe Great, Part Two*

Erne, Lukas Christian

How to cite

ERNE, Lukas Christian. The Almeda plot strand and the text of Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlainethe Great, Part Two*. In: Notes and queries, 2022, vol. 69, n° 4, p. 287–291. doi: 10.1093/notesj/gjac119

This publication URL: https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:166365
Publication DOI: 10.1093/notesj/gjac119

While the three vernacular versions furthermore expand Holcot's Latin to signify a sensory experience of joy at the Resurrection by describing birds that would fill the wood with song, textual similarities between only Holcot and *CMB* indicate the latter's reliance on the former. The *CMB*-writer amplifies Holcot's 'fiunt gaudentes' [they are made joyful] by labelling the resurrected birds as 'lyuen in yis wood wid luuely song, mirth, and joy' [living in this wood with lovely song, mirth, and joy]. Both the *Temporale* and Mirk do not directly note joy, joyful feelings, or rejoicing, but instead describe actions that evoke sweetness: in the *Temporale*, the birds will 'fyll þis wode and all þe forest full of melodye and swete notes of þe birdes'; and Mirk renders the sweet sentiment most succinctly when the birds 'fyllyn þis wode wyth melody of swete song'. Mirk furthermore eliminates the description found in Holcot and *CMB* of the pilgrim who 'heard' nothing while 'looking about' and then 'saw' inanimate birds; instead Mirk translates *CMB*'s 'he stode still and listende if yat he might se any foulel syng bot none he herde ne saugh stirand' into 'alle was style and no burde steryng'. The sermonist of Harley 2247, in contrast, centers the Christian in the woods and amends that moment to 'so þis Cristen man cowed not se nor here eny birdes syng nor flying'. Particular only to Holcot and the *CMB*-scribe are descriptions that name an 'Englishman' (anglicus) instead of 'a Christian man from England' (the case for both Mirk and the *Temporale* sermonist) and 'ye fyfftene day' (domenica ad quindecimam [diem]). When combined with all of the aforementioned commonalities, these last two similarities specific to Holcot and *CMB* suggest that the *CMB*-writer was using the *Convertimini* as a source for the exemplum.

CMB's two close translations of Holcot's Latin, which are preserved neither by Mirk nor the scribe of Harley 2247, provide further evidence of the likelihood that the *CMB*-scribe was working from the Dominican's preaching manual. The first translation is of 'domenica in passione incipiunt mori et domenica ad quindecimam [diem], scilicet in die pasce, reviviscunctur', which *CMB* renders and expands as 'ye last sounday yat was yen come in ye Passiun of ye prophete als ye telle, and yen bigan alle yher foulthes to dye and sall yus lye alle fulle fourtene days and ye fyfftene day, yat ye calen Pasch day, yai sall rysen agayne to ye lyfe'. Whereas both Holcot and the *CMB*-writer note 'ye fyfftene day', Mirk and the Harley 2247 homilist instead name Palm Sunday. The second translation that *CMB* makes from Holcot is at the end of the example when describing the kindness of Christ's sacrifice. Holcot notes, 'Pro nulla enim creatura nisi pro solo homine passus est', which the *CMB*-writer interprets as 'for non oither creature ne non oither enchesun tholed Crist ded on ye rode bot for man one'. The Harley 2247 homilist and Mirk conclude their versions in progressively abbreviated fashion. They condense the comparison in *Convertimini* and *CMB* between animals without reason (animalia irrationabilia) that nevertheless are joyful at the news of Christ's resurrection and presumably reasonable man who demonstrates ingratitude despite Christ's sacrifice. Mirk and the homilist of Harley 2247 instead note that since even birds in particular—not animals more broadly—'haue mynde of Cristus passion', 'myche more' should man be able to reflect thereupon since Christ died for the sake of humankind.

Nicole D. Smith
University of North Texas, USA

https://doi.org/10.1093/notesj/gjac113

Advance Access publication 7 November, 2022

THE ALMEDA PLOT STRAND AND THE TEXT OF CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE'S *TAMBURLAINE THE GREAT, PART TWO*

Christopher Marlowe's two-part play *Tamburlaine the Great* was first printed in London in 1590. The octavo includes a prefatory address by the publisher Richard Jones, 'To the Gentlemen Readers: and others that take pleasure in reading Histories', which suggests that the printed text is an abridgement of the two-part play as it had been performed:

> I haue (purposely) omitted and left out some fond and friuolous Iestures, digressing (and in my poore opinion) far vnmeet for the matter, which I thought, might seeme more tedious vnto the wise, than any way els to be regarded, though (happly) they haue bene of some vaine cõceited fondlings greatly gaped at, what times they were shewed vpon the stage in their graced deformities: neuertheles now, to be mixtured in print with such matter of worth, it wuld prooue

> a great disgrace to so honorable & stately a historie (sigs. A2r-v)

What the prefatory address suggests is that *Tamburlaine* in its original state was longer and generically more mixed than the text that has come down to us, and contained material that Jones decided to omit, notably 'fond and friuolous Iestures', in modern spelling 'gestures', perhaps with a hint at 'jests' and the kind of 'clownage' (line 2) the play's Prologue denigrates. According to Jones, this material, 'digressing' from the main interest, may have been of interest to socially inferior 'vaine cõceited fondlings' at the playhouse but would be 'vnmeet' for his readers. Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* is now usually considered a tragedy, but it should be noted that when the play was entered to Richard Jones in the Stationers' Register on 14 August 1590, it was referred to as 'The twooe com*m*icall discourses of Tomberlein the Cithian shepparde'.[1] Like Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, the original text of *Tamburlaine* seems to have mixed serious matter with comedy, and like some of *Faustus*' critics, Jones preferred the play without the comedy.[2]

There are other good reasons for believing that Jones printed a truncated text. Unlike the printed texts of most professional late-sixteenth-century plays, the two parts of *Tamburlaine* are not continuous but divided into five acts each, and each act is divided into a few scenes. Yet some of the scene numbers are out of order. In Part 1, Act II Scene iii is followed by Act II Scene vi, and Act IV Scene iii is followed by Act IV Scene v. It is possible that Act II Scene vi and Act IV Scene v were misnumbered (they are the last scenes of their respective acts). Given Jones's prefatory address, it seems more likely, however, that Act II Scenes iv and v, and Act IV Scene iv were among the 'fond and friuolous' material Jones decided to omit.

The evidence from Part 2 is more complex. In Acts I and II, the numerical sequence is undisturbed, and in Acts IV and V, the gaps are not unlike those in Part 1: Act IV has three scenes, Act IV Scene i, Act IV Scene iii, and Act IV Scene iv, but Scene ii is missing. Act V also has three scenes, Act V Scene i, Act V Scene iv, and Act V Scene vi, with Scenes ii, iii, and v missing. In Act III, the order is more irregular: Act III Scene i, Act II Scene ii, Act III Scene i, Act III Scene v, and Act II Scene i. Even if we assume that 'Actus 2' in the second and the last scenes of the act are misprints for 'Actus 3', we are still left with the problems of the repetition of 'Actus 3 Scæna 1' and of another 'Scæne 1' at the end of the act. Although Jones's excision of material from the original text may well be partly responsible for the problems with the act and scene division, it cannot account for all of them.[3]

What the irregular act-and-scene division suggests is that the text of *Tamburlaine* was substantially interfered with, resulting in a seriously truncated text. Evidence for this can also be found in the dramatic text itself. In the process of removing 'fond and friuolous Iestures' and perhaps more generally interfering with the text and its scene order, Jones appears to have omitted the conclusion of one of the plot strands of Part 2, the plot strand involving Almeda. The wider implication of this is that *Tamburlaine*'s text is more severely damaged and fragmented than is usually assumed.

Almeda's first appearance in *The Second Part of Tamburlaine* occurs in Act I Scene ii. Callapine, son of Bajazeth, is kept prisoner by Tamburlaine, and Almeda serves as his keeper. In a wonderfully enticing speech, Callapine promises Almeda to make him a king and convinces his keeper to free and escape with him. Tamburlaine refers to Callapine's escape in Act III Scene ii, when he says he plans to 'hunt that coward, faint-heart, runaway,/With that accursèd traitor, Almeda,/Till fire and sword have found them at a bay' (III.ii.149–51), a plan that is echoed by Usumcasane, who says: 'I long to pierce his bowels with my sword/ That hath betrayed my gracious sovereign,/That cursed and damnèd traitor Almeda' (III.ii.152–4).[4] In Act III Scene ii, revenge on Almeda for his treasonous acts is thus first announced.

[1] Edward Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A.D.*, 5 vols. (London, 1875–94), II, 558.

[2] See Kirk Melnikoff, 'Jones's Pen and Marlowe's Socks: Richard Jones, Print Culture, and the Beginnings of English Dramatic Literature', *SP*, 102 (2005), 184–209.

[3] For the problems with *Tamburlaine*'s act and scene division, see also J. S. Cunningham, ed., *Tamburlaine*, The Revels Plays (Manchester, 1981), 86–7, Laurie Maguire, 'Marlovian Texts and Authorship', in *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Patrick Cheney (Cambridge, 2004), 43, and Claire M. L. Bourne, 'Making a Scene; or *Tamburlaine the Great* in Print', in *Christopher Marlowe, Theatrical Commerce, and the Book Trade*, ed. Kirk Melnikoff and Rosyln L. Knutson (Cambridge, 2018), 115–32.

[4] Quotations are from and line references are keyed to Cunningham, ed., *Tamburlaine*.

Callapine and Almeda are present on stage in the preceding scene, Act III Scene i, in which Callapine is crowned Emperor of Turkey and joins Orcanes, the King of Natolia, and the Kings of Trebizond, Soria, and Jerusalem, who are preparing to do battle against Tamburlaine. Towards the end of the scene, Callapine turns to Almeda—'this my friend/That freed me from the bondage of my foe' (III.i.69–70)—and affirms his determination 'To keep [his] promise and to make him [i.e. Almeda] king' (III.i.72), for which the King of Jerusalem invites him to 'choose some 'pointed time,/Performing all [his] promise to the full' (III. i.76–7). That time comes in Act III Scene v, when Tamburlaine, with his three sons and Usumcasane, meet Orcanes, Jerusalem, Trebizond, Soria, Callapine, and Almeda before the battle. During the leaders' mutual flyting, Tamburlaine's son Celebinus turns to his father and says: 'See, father, how Almeda the jailor looks upon us' (III.v.116). Tamburlaine addresses Almeda in a fit of rage:

> Villain, traitor, damnèd fugitive,
> I'll make thee wish the earth had swallowed thee!
> Seest thou not death within my wrathful looks?
> Go, villain, cast thee headlong from a rock,
> Or rip thy bowels and rend out thy heart
> T'appease my wrath, or else I'll torture thee,
> Searing thy hateful flesh with burning irons
> And drops of scalding lead, while all thy joints
> Be racked and beat asunder with the wheel:
> For if thou livest, not any element
> Shall shroud thee from the wrath of Tamburlaine. (III.v.117-27)

The first line of Tamburlaine's speech acknowledges Almeda's misdeeds: having freed Callapine and escaped with him, Almeda is a 'fugitive' and a 'traitor' to Tamburlaine. But the rest of the speech focuses not on what was but on what will be. And what will be is either Almeda's suicide or Tamburlaine's wrathful revenge. The speech projects actions into the future and thereby builds up suspense by making readers or spectators wonder whether and, if so, how Tamburlaine's revenge on Almeda will take place.

Tamburlaine's speech is followed by Callapine's crowning of Almeda (III.v.128–43). 'Well, in despite of thee he shall be king' (III. v.128), Callapine taunts Tamburlaine, before offering Almeda a crown. Almeda hesitates and incongruously addresses Tamburlaine, 'Good my lord, let me take it', prompting Callapine's exasperated response, 'Dost thou ask him leave? Here, take it'. Tamburlaine mockingly adds, 'Go to, sirrah, take your crown' (III.v.133–5). Once Almeda has accepted the crown, another mocking comment by Tamburlaine again turns our attention to his promised revenge: 'let him hang a bunch of keys on his standard', Tamburlaine says, 'to put him in remembrance he was a jailor, that, when I take him, I may knock out his brains with them' (III.v.139–41). In the very next speech, the King of Trebizond shouts, 'Away, let us to the field' (III. v.144), and one of the confrontations in the battle that Marlowe has made us anticipate is that between Tamburlaine and Almeda.

As if that were not enough, Tamburlaine, after Theridamas and Techelles have entered, turns to them and says, 'See ye this rout, and know ye this same king?', prompting Theridamas' reply, 'Ay, my lord, he was Callapine's keeper' (III.v.153–4). '[L]ook to him', Tamburlaine urges Theridamas, 'when we are fighting, lest he hides his crown as the foolish king of Persia did' (III.v.155–7), recalling the confrontation between Tamburlaine and the cowardly King Mycetes in Part 1, Act II Scene iv. In the course of Act III, Marlowe thus goes to considerable lengths to prepare us for the conclusion of the Almeda plot strand, building up suspense by means of Tamburlaine's repeated announcements.

This plot mechanism is familiar from elsewhere in *Tamburlaine*: In Part 1, the overcoming of Mycetes is announced in Act II Scene iii and brought about in Act II Scene iv, and a similar order of events can be observed in the overcoming of Cosroe (II.v to II.vii), Bajazath (III.iii), and the Soldan of Egypt and the King of Arabia (V.ii). In Part 2, similarly, Tamburlaine announces the cruel treatment of Orcanes, Jerusalem, Trebizond, and Soria in Act III Scene v, and we see him execute it after the battle (IV.i, IV.iii, V.i). When Tamburlaine has overheard Agydes' disloyalty to him, he sends him a dagger, and we witness Agydes stabbing himself (Part 1, III.ii). As for the virgins of Damascus, a messenger announces that once Tamburlaine's tents are black, 'Without

respect of sex, degree, or age,/He razeth all his foes with fire and sword' (Part 1, IV.i.62–63); and after the black tents have been pitched, the virgins plead in vain and are taken off stage to be killed (Part 1, V.ii). What all these plot strands have in common is that the violence planned by Tamburlaine is announced and infallibly carried out.

The only exception to this is the sequence of events involving Almeda, which is all the more striking as the play extensively dwells on Tamburlaine's determination to punish him. Yet after the build-up towards Tamburlaine's revenge in Act III Scene v, Almeda simply disappears from the play. Not only does he not reappear, but neither Tamburlaine nor any other character ever mentions him again. Contrary to Almeda, Callapine does reappear, although not until Act V Scene ii, and what happens to Almeda and Callapine in the great battle in Act IV is never clarified.

Almeda's puzzling disappearance from the play has attracted surprisingly little critical attention. The only point Helen Gardner makes about Almeda in her influential essay on *Tamburlaine the Great, Part Two*, is that the scene in which he is 'won over from [Tamburlaine] by the lure of money and glory, would be inconceivable in the first part'.[5] Clifford Leech similarly argues that the character fits the world of Part 2 as opposed Part 1, commenting that he is among the characters who 'can echo the aspirations after kingship and sensual splendor that are associated only with Tamburlaine in Part I'.[6] J. S. Cunningham comments that 'Mycetes finds a counterpart in Almeda, with his fussy ineffectuality, eventually crowned a mock-king', and that 'Callapine's tempting of Almeda from his responsibility to Tamburlaine contrasts with Tamburlaine's own winning of Theridamas from Mycetes'; but he is silent on Almeda's absence from the play after Act III.[7] Other critics have noticed Almeda's disappearance but make little of it. Jean MacIntyre comments that 'Unlike other allies [of Callapine], Almeda escapes capture, and we never hear of him again'.[8] William L. Godshalk points out that 'After Callapine's first defeat, Almeda disappears from the play'.[9] No scholar seems to have drawn attention to the puzzling discrepancy between the significant build-up towards Tamburlaine's revenge on Almeda up to the end of Act III, and the play's total silence on it in Acts IV and V.

The most interesting comment on Almeda is by J. B. Steane, who considered the character in the context of the play's humour:

> In Part 2 humour comes more kindly with the introduction of Almeda, Callapine's gaoler. The dialogue in his first scene (2, I. 3) unfreezes the officialdom of speech so far. Almeda is presumably a comedian's part: he sometimes speaks in prose, has a recognisable character and may well have been one of the clowns in the scenes 'omitted and left out' by Jones. Even here the comedy has its hard side, for Almeda is tempted to release Callapine by visions of Tamburlaine-like power which his prisoner puts before him. The effect of this appeal is not to cheapen the Tamburlaine-ideal, but to see Almeda as ludicrous for taking such a grandiose vision as a possibility.[10]

It is true that Almeda's ambitions are ludicrous, as Steane points out, but Tamburlaine's wrath at his treason is genuine and given ample scope in the play. This makes of Almeda a character who participates in both the play's serious and comic matter. Steane rightly pointed out that this made his part liable to abridgement by Jones. What Steane did not realize, however, is that Jones's cuts seem to have resulted in the elimination of the conclusion of a plot strand that the play has carefully prepared, namely Tamburlaine's revenge on 'that accursèd traitor, Almeda' (III.iii.150). As mentioned above, in Part 2, Act IV Scene i is followed by Act IV Scene iii and Act IV Scene iv, with Scene ii missing. Act IV Scene i shows Tamburlaine and his troops triumph over Orcanes, Jerusalem, Trebizond, and Soria, and otherwise deals with Tamburlaine's sons. Amyras and Celebinus unsuccessfully try to get their brother Calyphas to join the battle, who is stabbed to death by Tamburlaine as a result. The following scene, Act IV Scene iii in the early editions, renumbered Act IV Scene ii in modern editions, continues and concludes the plot sequence involving Olympia, who is wooed by Theridamas but tricks him into stabbing her. The original Act IV Scene ii thus

[5] 'The Second Part of *Tamburlaine the Great*', *Modern Language Review*, 37 (1942), 18–24, 20.
[6] 'The Structure of *Tamburlaine*', *The Tulane Drama Review*, 8 (1964), 32–46, 40.
[7] Cunningham, ed., *Tamburlaine*, 66.
[8] *Costumes and Scripts in the Elizabethan Theatres* (Edmonton, Alberta, 1992), 110.
[9] *The Marlovian World Picture* (The Hague, 1974), 156.
[10] *Marlowe: A Critical Study* (Cambridge, 1970), 108.

seems to have continued the dramatization of the battle in a more comic key, including Almeda's end, but was omitted by Jones in his attempt to leave out the play's 'fond and friuolous Iestures'. Jones thus appears to have done serious damage to the play by mutilating the end of a plot strand to which earlier parts of the play would have carefully led up.

LUKAS ERNE
University of Geneva, Switzerland

https://doi.org/10.1093/notesj/gjac119

Advance Access publication 17 November, 2022

MALLECHO OR MALLIGO? A CRUX IN *HAMLET* REVISITED

Hamlet's reaction to the dumbshow preceding the players' performance of *The Murder of Gonzago* features a textual crux that has perplexed readers for centuries. The witnesses read: 'This is myching Mallico, that meanes my chiefe' (Q1); 'Marry this munching *Mallico*, it meanes mischiefe' (Q2); 'Marry this is Miching *Malicho*, that meanes Mischeefe' (F).[1] In Q2 and F the second half of the sentence plausibly serves to explicate the first, while the Q1 version, though not impossible, is usually regarded as a corruption. The real difficulty lies in the first clause. Two clear variants are presented for the verb, whether formed from 'munch' or from the *lectio difficilior* 'mich' or 'mitch', meaning 'pilfer', 'conceal', 'lurk', 'skulk', vel sim.[2] But how to interpret 'Mal(l)ic(h)o'?

Thomas Hanmer first glossed this word as 'a wicked act, a piece of iniquity', after Spanish *malhecho*; Edmund Malone, thinking the same, emended the spelling to 'mallecho'.[3] The Hanmer-Malone interpretation, in one orthographical form or another, has since become widely adopted. John Dover Wilson suggested on this basis that Hamlet was castigating the players for 'prematurely disclosing the Mouse-trap'.[4] Yet some skepticism remains: Philip Edwards in the latest Cambridge edition goes so far as to call it an 'insoluble problem'.[5]

Several alternatives have been put forward. Malone noted in passing that '*Mallico* is printed in a distinct character, as a proper name', and some have speculated that the word represents a fictional or historical character: Richard Farmer saw a reference to Spenser's Malbecco, Alice Walker to Antipater's poisoner Malichus.[6] Jane Crawford, likening the Spanish etymology to more patently outlandish claims of derivation from Gaelic or Romani, asserted that 'Mallico' was instead a misreading of 'malice'.[7] None of these proposals, however, has met with much acceptance: Farmer's and Walker's readings come across as overly ingenious, and Crawford's contention that a simple word like 'malice' suffered such disfigurement across all three texts strikes most as improbable.[8] While I do not believe that any of these alternative conjectures deserves approbation, in my view they nevertheless emerge from some sound reasoning. The irregular practices of compositors aside, it is true that the witnesses accord in appearing to treat the word as a proper noun: it is capitalized in all three texts as well as italicized in Q2 and F (distinguishing it, in the latter case, from the similarly capitalized 'Miching' and 'Mischeefe'). At the same time the notion that Shakespeare borrowed the word from a common noun in Spanish, a language with which he is not known to have had any familiarity, should be regarded with inherent suspicion. It is in line with these observations that I shall propose here a novel interpretation of the crux.

[1] William Shakespeare, *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke* (London, 1603), sig. F3r; id., *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke* (London, 1604), sig. H1v; id., *Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies* (London, 1623), 267 (*Tragedies* pagination). In-text citations of Shakespeare's plays are to id., *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Critical Reference Edition*, 2 vols., eds. Gary Taylor, John Jowett, Terri Bourus, and Gabriel Egan (Oxford, 2017).

[2] See *OED* s.v. mitch, *v.*

[3] William Shakespeare, *Works*, vol. 6, ed. Thomas Hanmer (London, 1745), sig. Nn3r; id., *Plays and Poems*, vol. 9, ed. Edmund Malone (London, 1790), 309.

[4] *Ibid*., *Hamlet*, ed. John Dover Wilson (Cambridge, 1968), 201.

[5] *Ibid*., *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, ed. Philip Edwards, rev. Heather Hirschfield (Cambridge, 2019), 165.

[6] Malone, op. cit.; William Shakespeare, *Plays*, vol. 18, ed. Isaac Reed (London, 1803), 201; Alice Walker, '"Miching Malicho" and the Play Scene in *Hamlet*', *MLR*, xxxi (1936), 513–17.

[7] Jane Crawford, '*Hamlet*, III. ii. 146', *RES*, xviii (1967), 40–5. Cf. Charles Mackey, 'Celtic or Gaelic Words in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries', *Athenaeum*, 16 October 1875, 508–10, at 508; Robert Pierpoint, 'Shakespeariana', *N&Q*, xliv (1904), 344; Eric Honeywood Partridge, 'Some Romany Words', *TLS*, 26 December 1936, 1068.

[8] For an exception in support of Crawford see Barbara Everett, 'New Readings in *Hamlet* (And Some Principles of Emendation)', *RES*, xxxix (1988), 177–98, at 192–93.