

## “Confusion Now Hath Made His Masterpiece”: (Re)Considering the Maddening of *Macbeth*

Seth Clark  
Idaho State University

---

Scholarship surrounding the tragedy of *Macbeth* has sought in various ways to explain Macbeth’s depravity and the character’s seemingly limitless potential for evil. While Macbeth attempts to justify his murder of Duncan, at a certain point in the play we realize that the protagonist is hopelessly beyond justification. Whether readers reach this point in act 2, scene 2, when Macbeth has just murdered the king and his two guards and cannot say “Amen,” or after act 4, scene 2, when Macbeth’s hired murderers kill Macduff’s wife and son, at some point readers must come to terms with the fact that the “brave Macbeth” who was “valor’s minion” (1.2.16, 19) in the first act tops “the legions / Of horrid hell . . . in evils” (4.3.55-56, 57) by act 5.<sup>1</sup> Yet the play is more complicated than an exposé of perverse ambition, and accomplishes more than “defin[ing] a particular kind of evil—the evil that results from a lust for power.”<sup>2</sup>

Macbeth is a complicated character, and while understanding his complexity does little to expunge his bloody deeds, closer study can identify in Macbeth a profound confusion which fuels his actions, his paranoia, and his eventual downfall. This essay takes into consideration several factors available in the text of the play that help to explain how once-noble Macbeth is led down this tragic path (after all, how could it be tragedy if Macbeth were completely evil?). I argue that the play takes great measures to ensure that readers are aware of Macbeth’s confusion and that this confusion stems both from the contradictions of those around him—he is the “butcher” who is “too full o’ the milk of human kindness” (5.8.69, 1.5.15)—and from his misunderstanding of his role as an active, and later inactive, military general. While Macbeth ultimately acts in ways that can best be described as evil, his

understanding of his position and his history of being rewarded for acts of violence may help readers understand Macbeth's personal justification for killing Duncan. Ultimately, however, it is Macbeth's inability to stop acting after he has become king that especially makes him into the play's monster.

Of course, it is not unique to this argument to see Macbeth as confused. More commonly, though, this confusion is seen as a sign of Macbeth's evil nature. In G. Wilson Knight's 1978 edition of *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearean Tragedy*, Knight argued that "*Macbeth* is Shakespeare's most profound and mature vision of evil,"<sup>23</sup> that practically everything from the darkened imagery, contradictory language, and night-fallen action contribute to the play's over-arching evil. A key point to Knight's argument is that the confusion and "doubt" of Macbeth's characters leads to this sense of evil. Part of the play's ubiquitous tone manifests in Ross's utterance, "We . . . do not know ourselves" (4.2.19). Knight added that "we, too, who read, are in doubt often . . . ; we are confronted by mystery, darkness, abnormality, hideousness: and therefore fear."<sup>24</sup> Knight drew heavily on the imagery of the play, at times even connecting the shrieks of birds to the psychology of the characters. Because much of the play's actions are dealt at night, for example, Knight suggested that readers also "grope in the stifling dark, and suffer from doubt and insecurity . . . of suffocating, conquering evil."<sup>25</sup> In this respect, Knight only elaborates on the position held by A.C. Bradley, whose 1904 lecture said of *Macbeth* that "all the later tragedies may be called tragedies of passion, but not all of them display these extreme forms of evil."<sup>26</sup> In a similar argument, Camille Wells Slight's argued that the imagery of specific scenes exposes readers to the signs of evil in the play. Particularly, she describes the dagger soliloquy of act 2, scene 1 as depicting "the growth of evil in the mind."<sup>27</sup> This becomes particularly apparent if we attach Knight's description of fear as a sort of evil to Slight's interpretation of the dagger scene, where Macbeth is noticeably unsettled by the vision, calling the dagger "a false creation, / Proceeding from the heat oppressed brain" (2.1.37-38).

It is difficult to see the dagger soliloquy as an expression entirely evil, though, if we also take into account Macbeth's confusion about the vision. Characteristic of the confused language throughout the play, Macbeth talks back and forth about the dagger, considering its meaning and then reminding himself of its insignificance:

Mine eyes are made the fools o' the other senses,  
 Or else worth all the rest. I see thee still,  
 And on thy blade and dudgeon gouts of blood,  
 Which was not so before. There's no such thing. (2.1.43-46)

Were Shakespeare attempting to show “profound and mature visions of evil” or “that consciousness of fear symbolized in actions of blood,” he might have handled this scene differently to do so more effectively.<sup>8</sup> If Macbeth were overcome by fear of the dagger, he might try to flee it, or, as when he sees the ghost of Banquo in act 3, scene 4, verbally accost the dagger in defense of his thoughts and actions. Rather, Macbeth’s soliloquy tries fruitlessly to understand the dagger, and through it his own mind. At once he realizes that his eyes “are made the fools” by this apparition, and yet he sees it and seeks to understand why it is now covered by “gouts of blood.” When the thoughts become overwhelming for Macbeth—perhaps he realizes the bloody nature of the murder he is considering, and perhaps the evil of killing Duncan has entered his mind—his thoughts abruptly change; he reminds himself that the dagger is a vision. “There’s no such thing.”

This behavior is a trend for Macbeth as he considers the murder of Duncan. Our first description of Macbeth details his prowess in battle, yet it appears as though the killing he performs in the subsequent action of the play requires a great deal of reasoning and emotional deliberation. In *Shakespeare and Violence*, R.A. Foakes argues that this deliberation results from Macbeth’s questions of manliness and valor and the relationship of those questions to acts of violence. While Macbeth is a figure deeply involved in violence, Foakes’s argument, that these acts are inspired by his insecurity or confusion about manliness, contribute further to the argument for reading Macbeth as a vision of evil. Foakes additionally relates this growing evil with the dagger vision, suggesting that the “alternation in Macbeth between moral horror at the thought of murder and fulfillment of an idea of manliness in carrying it out is focused in the double significance of his soliloquy and vision of a dagger.”<sup>9</sup> This double significance, Foakes argues, represents in the dagger both the violence of murder and the “manliness” of sexual conquest. Seeing the dagger as a sort of phallus, in this case, Foakes implies that the murder of Duncan is both literal murder and figurative penetration, further symbolic of “this point on [which] Macbeth alternates between a ‘manly readiness’ (2.3.133) to rid himself of those who stand in his way and a condition in which a ‘torture of the mind’ (3.2.21) unmans him.”<sup>10</sup> If Macbeth’s confusion symbolizes his evil nature,

this dichotomy in Macbeth’s mind—between swift, masculine action and hesitating on the consequences of that action—is his primary offense. The implication of the dagger as Macbeth’s tool for imposing his manliness, though, is unlikely, since our first introduction to Macbeth describes him “disdaining Fortune, with his brandished steel, / Which smoked with bloody execution” (1.2.17-18). If the play has shown us Macbeth’s imposition of his masculine self, it is in this description of act 1, when he “carvéd out a passage” through the rebel army and “unseamed” Macdonwald, all with a sword.

The dagger, rather, is not so much a sign of Macbeth’s masculinity, which we have already seen displayed through the description of the wounded sergeant, but an additional sign of Macbeth’s internal conflict. In “Macbeth’s Rites of Violence,” Derek Cohen observes that the use of a dagger is not necessarily emasculating, but a sign of cowardice. “Macbeth’s use of the dagger off the field of battle is remarkable and uncharacteristic,” Cohen argues, “for its sheer if inevitable cowardliness: he stabs three sleeping men to death.”<sup>11</sup> To consider the vision of the dagger—a floating symbol of cowardice—Macbeth must once again consider a contradiction: is he “brave Macbeth” from the battlefield, or the silent wielder of a “bare bodkin”?

Cohen essentially aligns himself with the arguments of Knight and Foakes, that the way Macbeth contemplates violence is seeded in an evil nature. Knight argues that this nature is visible in every aspect of the play, applying the environment and even the time of day of actions to Macbeth’s character. Foakes additionally suggests that the way Macbeth hesitates over action contributes to this evil character—that we see in his hesitation an internal struggle to prove manliness. Cohen’s article then connects these two in suggesting that Macbeth’s murders are the outward sign of internal corruption, that his “use of violence is the measure of his depravity.”<sup>12</sup> If the symbol of the dagger shows Macbeth’s evil nature, and the soliloquy surrounding the vision shows his “growth of evil,”<sup>13</sup> then Macbeth’s thoughts, actions, and words are unanimously evil.

This reasoning takes us full circle, then, and we are left, in a way, where we might have started with Knight and “the metaphysic of evil.” How can Macbeth be entirely evil? If the backdrop of the play, from the screech of birds to the confusion of the characters, are part of a sort of a magnum opus of evilness, how can we claim with any certainty that one character is more evil than the next? If thoughts themselves are evil, how can action be any more or less

evil? What does it matter if Macbeth flees from the dagger in terror or says, “Come, let me clutch thee?” (2.1.33). The play is a terrible and awesome exploration of evil, but it is also necessarily more complicated. Macbeth is given no introductory villain lines like Richard III, who is “determined to prove a villain” (1.1.30) or Iago who “hate[s] the Moor” (1.3.387). I do not mean to simplify these characters, but to illustrate Macbeth’s inability to be categorized: he is not a villain, but he is no longer a hero; he is determined to understand himself, but he is hopelessly confused about himself. I would add that this confusion comes from Macbeth’s training as a soldier: he is a skilled warrior, but must act only as a result of being given orders or instructions. When he seemingly begins to receive orders from authorities other than Duncan (the witches, his wife, and even the visions of his “heat-oppressed brain”), he becomes confused about whether he must follow these orders, whose orders he is obligated to follow, and whom the orders should ultimately benefit.

The play gives several obstacles to the Macbeth-as-evil interpretation, among them the use of contradictory language demonstrating Macbeth’s and others’ confusion throughout the play, the portrayal of Macbeth’s misconception of his role as a soldier, and the system of reward for violence he has experienced through that role. These obstacles are tangible elements present in the play, and while Macbeth’s actions become unjustifiable after the murder of Duncan, the struggle of Macbeth before and immediately after he kills the king require a multifaceted approach to understanding the play.

From the play’s opening, we are introduced to the obscure language that continues until its close. In the first scene, the nearly-nonsensical meeting of the three witches conveys almost no meaning to the reader—we can parse out that they will meet again “upon the heath” after a battle, “There to meet with Macbeth” (1.1.7, 8). All together they then declare, “Fair is foul, and foul is fair” (1.1.10); we could read this line as a sort of curse on the remainder of the play, which adopts similar language and an atmosphere of panicked confusion hereafter. Even Macbeth, first appearing amid a thundering storm, claims not to have seen before “so foul and fair a day,” mirroring the language of the witches. If foul *is* fair, Macbeth is already a voice of redundancy, calling the day “foul and fair” in his first line. The witches perpetuate this contradictory language in their prophesy, telling Banquo he is “lesser than Macbeth, and greater” and “not so happy, yet much happier” (1.2.66-67). It is perhaps Macbeth’s most lucid line that

cries, “Stay, you imperfect speakers!” (1.2.71). In a way, the witches are an active force of confusion. Whereas the dagger passively floats and bleeds, the witches hurl confusion into the play with their paradoxical language and half-formed prophesies.

This ambiguity is further compounded when we consider the play as viewed in performance. In *The Masks of Macbeth*, Marvin Rosenberg introduces Macbeth as a play in which nothing is as it seems and argues that this effect is layered during performance. When we first meet Duncan, for example, we do not know who has just walked on the stage. “What bloody man is that?” (1.2.5) the scene begins. “Is the bloody man Macbeth?” Rosenberg asks; “The speaker turns out to be a king: is he Macbeth?”<sup>14</sup> In performance, the ambiguity of the text is projected, and audiences are not only disoriented by contradicting language, but by new information and not enough information at the same time. The audience sees the action, but is not given enough information to understand it. Similarly, Macbeth is given these whispers of prophecy, but not enough detail to determine how he should act as a result.

Already affected by the witches’ language by scene 3, Macbeth tries to reason through the encounter: “This supernatural soliciting / Cannot be ill, cannot be good” (1.3.130-31). It is apparent that Macbeth must wrestle with this new information, but it is unclear that either argument—good or ill—will emerge victorious. When Macbeth argues with himself, it seems fated that he will always lose. His conviction about killing Duncan is sincere and powerful, and yet his reason is consistently thwarted by moments of contradiction that nullify his arguments. He finishes his first consideration of the murder realizing that his “thought, whose murder yet is fantastical, / Shakes so my single state of man that function / Is smothered in surmise, and nothing is / But what is not” (1.3.139-42). These repeated poetic and philosophical claims propel Macbeth into the moral relativism that allows him to kill Duncan. The first half of the thought might lead Macbeth to abandon the murder, since it upsets and “shakes” him so; yet the second reveals what Rosenberg calls “the psychic bewilderment of this fearless warrior,”<sup>15</sup> where the world seems turned upside down, the impossible seems possible, and the bounds of reality seem to be bending: “Nothing is / But what is not.”

Beleaguered by the witches’ curse, or else by his own inner turmoil, Macbeth arrives at the dagger scene with a conscience divided between the physical and fantastic, the perceivable and prophetic. His vision of the dagger, as he suggests, is “a dagger of the mind,” the subject of his anxieties. In an article applying forms

of criminal psychology to *Macbeth*, Kevin Curran says that the dagger symbolizes, in a way, the liminal space between the extremes Macbeth considers. “To interrogate the line between innocence and guilt, Shakespeare seems to tell us, is also to interrogate the line between mind and matter, subject and object, conceiving and doing, being and feeling.”<sup>16</sup> The dagger bridges the gap between thought and action, and Macbeth uses the vision to question whether action or thought determines innocence or guilt. A major factor for Macbeth in rationalizing his action is separating it from thought—he seems to decide here that too much thinking has more to do with guilt than action. As he watches the dagger begin to drip with blood, he stops his thoughts: “There’s no such thing” as the floating dagger, he says, only “the bloody business which informs / Thus to [his] eyes” (2.1.46, 47-48). Were he to perform the action without thinking on the deed (as he did, perhaps, in the battle with Macdonwald), he would be free from guilt, or, as Curran argues, from “feeling guilty” for killing Duncan. Macbeth hastens to commit the act, since “words to the heat of deeds too cold breath gives,” (2.1.60), and the soldier whose “brandished steel . . . smoked with bloody execution” (1.2.18) cannot allow his deeds to be cooled by the reason which only brings contradiction and confusion.

That Macbeth shows an unwillingness toward reason, or at least deference toward action, likely originates with his role as a successful, career soldier. It might be argued that Macbeth’s guilt does not originate with his “vaulting ambition” (1.7.27), but rather in over-stepping his role as a soldier. By considering killing his own targets, for the benefit of Macbeth rather than the benefit of Scotland and Duncan, Macbeth falls into a space *between* valor and depravity, the soldier and the assassin, where an internal conflict rises over understanding how killing can be both honorable, even rewarded, or deplorable and punished. In an article which highlights these dualities throughout the play, Unhae Langis argues that Macbeth’s error is not ambition but “ignobly substitut[ing] honor for virtue,” further suggesting that “Macbeth’s actions illustrate contrasting examples of praiseworthy and censurable ambition.”<sup>17</sup> While Macbeth is right in describing his ambition as “vaulting,” it has been a noble ambition, fighting under Duncan’s command. We are given an example of this “virtuous ambition” when we hear of Macbeth’s valiant exploits in the battle which earns him the title of Cawdor.<sup>18</sup> He makes an error, though, when he allows himself to equate the honor of kingship with the virtue of obedience and service. The battle against the rebels gives us a

clear representation of Macbeth’s honorable soldierliness before he encounters the witches—Duncan ostensibly ordered Macbeth to attack, and, based on the account of the sergeant, he appears to have done so heroically. He is then rewarded as such a hero for his show of “bloody execution.”

As a good—even heroic—soldier, then, Macbeth must have grown accustomed to acting under orders. But the play takes place between battles for Macbeth, as the battle against Macdonwald has already been won when the play begins. As a result, Macbeth walks onto the stage as an idle soldier in this play, unable to act and awaiting orders. When the witches tell Macbeth he will be king, he questions how it might happen (since “the Thane of Cawdor lives”); his conflict is twofold: can he act? and can he do it guiltlessly?

Lady Macbeth gives him the order to act, to take the crown, and Macbeth ultimately obeys this command. Lady Macbeth gives him the clear directives he needs to perform again. Foakes argues that Macbeth has grown accustomed to making “images of death” on the battlefield (1.3.98) and that it is actually the new “challenge” of killing Duncan that overcomes his moral reservations against killing his king.<sup>19</sup> Macbeth himself seems to contradict this argument, though, with his wish that “if chance will have [him] king, why, chance may / crown” him (1.3.142-43). Macbeth is not driven by the challenge of killing Duncan—a feat which, physically, he accomplishes easily—but rather by the combination of satisfying noble ambition, fulfilling the prophesy, and following orders. He begins to believe that he must become king, by fated prophesy and by the order of Lady Macbeth, and he wishes it could be done quickly and be over with: “If it were done when ‘tis done, then ‘twere well / It were done quickly” (1.7.1-2).

While he grapples with whether it is criminal to consider killing Duncan or criminal to actually kill him (as in the dagger scene), Lady Macbeth calls into question his manhood and his ability to act. When she makes the murder into a question of success or failure for Macbeth, he is able to react as a good soldier should: with an assessment and affirmation of his ability to complete assignments. Lady Macbeth’s statements of absolutes, such as, “When you durst do it, then you were a man” and “Screw your courage to the sticking place, / And we’ll not fail” (1.7.49, 60-61), invigorate Macbeth’s sense of action. They remove the ambiguity from the actions that have been tormenting him, and narrow them down to simpler equations: killing Duncan, Macbeth will prove a man; with enough courage (an attribute in which we



know Macbeth is not lacking), he will not fail. Her affirmations function as orders to Macbeth's soldierly impulses and clear away the contradictions hindering him from action.

In addition to following orders, Macbeth has also been conditioned to receive reward for his martial prowess. When Ross delivers the news that Macbeth has been given Cawdor, Macbeth's excitement grows not out of his surprise at being rewarded, but at the fulfillment of the witches' prophecy. The reward itself makes perfect sense to him once he learns of the former Cawdor's fate. In *If It Were Done: Macbeth and Tragic Action*, James Calderwood ties this system of reward directly to the murder of Duncan. As killing earns him promotions, Calderwood observes, "so death defines Macbeth and enlarges him. He stands over dead men on the battlefield, he is singled out by the Witches immediately afterward for prophetic glory, he is honored by the king with thaneship. And all for killing. Why should he doubt that death will make him King of Scotland?"<sup>20</sup> Throughout the first act of the play, we see Macbeth honored by his friend, his peers, a soldier under his command, and even his king, all for his efficient and bloody killing. Foakes adds that part of Macbeth's confusion may be that he fails to understand the difference between types of killing until after he has killed Duncan; the play "brings out the discordances between open violence in battle and secret violence in murder."<sup>21</sup> Foakes suggests symptoms of post-traumatic stress in the general, who has partially lost his ability to feel emotionally and can no longer distinguish between settings in which killing is "appropriate" or not.<sup>22</sup> In this light, Macbeth is no less guilty for the murder of Duncan; he still killed the king, but his character in doing so becomes something much different from the current discussion defining just how purely evil is Macbeth. Understanding Macbeth's murder of Duncan involves considering his perception of murder and how that perception relates to his experience of being rewarded for killing.

Despite his profound confusion throughout the play, his misunderstanding of his role as a soldier and his altered perception of killing and murder, Macbeth ultimately abandons his reservations about killing, and we lose sight of the once noble general who has somehow metamorphosed into a paranoid tyrant-butcher. After Macbeth becomes king, it is as though he realizes the depths of his depravity and there are no more boundaries which cannot be crossed. He becomes a character difficult to feel sympathy for, both for his enemies in the play and his audience.

Arguably Macbeth’s problem at this point is his inability to stop killing. Again, we might consider ambition, but he has nothing to gain from killing after he takes Duncan’s throne. His killing is a means of holding onto the crown, but, as Cleanth Brooks phrases it, it is as though he attempts to “conquer the future,”<sup>23</sup> with the next threat to be removed constantly in mind. The contemplative, conflicted Macbeth of act 1 is replaced in act 4 with a new Macbeth who acknowledges that his hands will now do the business of the impulses of his heart: “From this moment / The very firstlings of my heart shall be / The firstlings of my hand. And even now / To crown thoughts with acts, be it thought and done” (4.1.146–49). He will no longer consider consequences, but “crown thoughts with” action, to just think and do those things necessary to keep the crown. He instigates the deaths of Banquo and Macduff’s wife and son. By the play’s final scene he deserves neither Cawdor nor Glamis, but only the remaining title of “butcher.”

Whether it changes how we perceive Macbeth as a character to reconsider his motives and his struggles before he kills Duncan will depend largely on the reader. In Macbeth’s final scene, we are reminded he is a soldier, as he seems to break free of the fog of his confusion for a few brief lines. As we witness his impending demise and sudden death, “there is disillusion and despair, and the elemental struggle of the splendid warrior trained to live until killed.”<sup>24</sup> Shakespeare makes clear that Macbeth is not *only* a butcher, and his conscience brings scholars back to reconsider and question the play. Perhaps Macbeth can be understood as a conflicted human being, one who struggles in turn with his ability to cope with his military experience, his interpretation of the witches, and his failing reasoning. We cannot deny that what he becomes is evident in evil actions, but maybe Macbeth really was once “too full o’ the milk of human kindness.” Calderwood notes that we must remember the Macbeth of the play’s beginning in order to better understand the implications of its end. As Malcolm invites his lords to meet him at Scone, we should be reminded that “between the king’s loyal defenders and Scone lie a good many wild and witch-ridden heaths.”<sup>25</sup> The play ends much as it began, and implies that if good soldiers like Macbeth can be changed to butchers, the cycle of violence may very well continue long after his death.

Finally, it is of note to suggest some implications of this way of viewing Macbeth for early modern audiences. Benjamin Parris, in “‘The Body Is with the King, but the King Is Not with the Body’: Sovereign Sleep in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*,” compiles several

statements, especially those of James I, in which the king explains his two bodies: the physical and political. “In *A Paterne for a Kings Inauguration*, James I of England advises his son Charles that the king must be ‘a great watchman and shepheard . . . and his eye must neuer slumber nor sleepe for the care of his flocke, euer remembering . . . his office, beeing duely executed.’”<sup>26</sup> Of course, the “sleepe” to which James I refers is figurative; as Kantorowicz described in *The King’s Two Bodies*, it is the sleep not of the physical body, but of the political and spiritual body, the “sleep” of a negligent ruler.<sup>27</sup> Parris argues that Shakespeare experiments with this dual nature of the king when he allows good kings to be murdered in their sleep. Both King Hamlet and Duncan are seen as kings who are executing their duties sufficiently, and yet they are killed during the sleep of their physical bodies. In both cases, the supernatural world is upset by the imbalance caused by this perverse violence; the Ghost of Hamlet rises from the grave to exact revenge, and Macbeth almost immediately hears the voice crying out that “Macbeth does murder sleep” and “Macbeth shall sleep no more” (2.2.34, 41).

Macbeth, who “murdered sleep,” is punished essentially for his lack of judgment, for killing Duncan—a good king—in his physical sleep. The implication might be that deposing a “sleeping” body politic or removing a negligent or tyrant king could potentially be honorable, but killing the physical body of the king as he sleeps is never honorable, especially in the case of a good king. It is a secret act of vile murder, and Macbeth, having “murdered sleep,” is no longer able to sleep after he kills Duncan. Macbeth himself becomes an ineffective king (sleeping politically), who also cannot sleep physically. Duncan was not sleeping politically—he was not a negligent king—and the play seems to punish Macbeth both for taking advantage of the physical body of the king and for killing a good king. The play, which James I likely watched, would have served as a warning to those taking advantage of the king’s mortal vulnerability. Perhaps Shakespeare had been aware of James’s “Speech to Parliament” of 1605, which describes the difficulties of kings, “being in the higher places like high trees” and therefore “most subject to the daily tempests of innumerable dangers.”<sup>28</sup> James, who had recently suffered an assassination attempt, decries the vulnerable state of the king’s physical body. Alongside *Hamlet*, the murder of the sleeping king in Macbeth functions as a sympathetic argument to that of James’s speech and a warning to would-be villains of the horrors awaiting those who would attack their sovereigns.

### Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, ed. Burton Raffel (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005). All *Macbeth* citations come from this work.
2. L.C. Knights, “Macbeth,” in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Macbeth: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Terrence Hawkes (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977). 87.
3. G. Wilson Knight, *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearean Tragedy*, 4th ed. (London: Methuen, 1978), 140.
4. *Ibid.*, 146.
5. *Ibid.*, 144, 140.
6. A.C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth*, 2nd ed. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1981), 83.
7. Camille Wells Slight, *The Casuistical Tradition in Shakespeare, Donne, Herbert, and Milton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 111.
8. Knight, *The Wheel of Fire*, 140, 158.
9. R.A. Foakes, *Shakespeare & Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 152.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Derek Cohen, “Macbeth’s Rites of Violence,” *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* 23 (2011): 57.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Slight, *The Casuistical Tradition*, 111.
14. Marvin Rosenberg, *The Masks of Macbeth* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978), 36.
15. *Ibid.*, 137.
16. Kevin Curran, “Feeling Criminal in Macbeth,” *Criticism* 54, no. 3 (2012): 398.
17. Unhae Langis, “Shakespeare and Prudential Psychology: Ambition and Akrasia in Macbeth,” *Shakespeare Studies* 40 (2012): 46-47.
18. *Ibid.*, 46.
19. Foakes, *Shakespeare & Violence*, 151.
20. James L. Calderwood, *If It Were Done: Macbeth and Tragic Action* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), 79.
21. Foakes, *Shakespeare & Violence*, 151.
22. *Ibid.*, 156.
23. Cleanth Brooks, “The Naked Babe and the Cloak of Manliness,” in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Macbeth: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Terrence Hawkes (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977): 47.
24. Rosenberg, *The Masks of Macbeth*, 676.
25. Calderwood, *If It Were Done*, 114.
26. Benjamin Parris, “‘The Body Is with the King, but the King Is Not with the Body’: Sovereign Sleep in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*,” *Shakespeare Studies* 40 (2012): 101.
27. Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).
28. Quoted in Parris, “The Body is with the King,” 114.