

The Tragic Vision of *Macbeth*

by Masahiko Omura

i

In the former thesis¹⁾, we looked for the ground of sympathy with Macbeth in his ambition and found it in his acute consciousness of how the traditional pattern of belief can be violated. The present paper deals with his fall and its impact on our sympathy with Macbeth. Does his fall strike us as a tragic end or a poetic justice? We try to find the answer to this question in the light of the discussion in the preceding paper.

Malcolm compares Macbeth with Satan, apologizing to Macduff for suspecting that he is also a spy in spite of his appearance of virtue:

But I shall crave your pardon:
That which you are my thoughts cannot transpose;
Angels are bright still though the brightest fell.
Though all things foul would wear the brows of grace,
Yet grace must still look so. (IV, III, 20–24)

As Irving Ribner says, “the destruction of Macbeth reflects the fall of Satan and the play is full of analogies to make this parallel clear.”²⁾ “Pattern analysis” is right when it asserts that the whole of the play is constructed on the pattern of morality plays such as *The Creation and the Fall of Lucifer*.

If Macbeth falls like Satan, then we could not regard the play as a tragedy. Whatever sympathy Macbeth might elicit from us, we would certainly be alienated from him by God. Then, *Macbeth* would at best be “a morality play written in terms of tragedy”, as Willard Farnham says.³⁾

We know that not only Macbeth but also Faustus and Richard as well are depicted against the background of order by which we should judge them. As is mentioned in the former thesis, “the Orthodox Man”, the ordinary educated Elizabethan looked on his world as manifesting the order which God had brought into being. Order, the disposition of all things in a fixed pattern, was the keynote of all things both in heaven and on earth.⁴⁾

Needless to say, *Macbeth* is written in terms of this traditional view of world-order. Theodore Spencer says that in *Macbeth* this hierarchic notion of

the world is more fully used than in any other tragedy.⁵⁾ In fact, Macbeth himself weighs his murder of the king with this view in mind.

What is more important is that we can see there those who stand for Order and have the effect of focusing attention on Macbeth. Duncan, for example, represents Order, a benevolent aspect of *Nature*. Macduff and Malcolm serve similar symbolic functions. Ribner says, “Macduff is a force of divine retribution generated by Macbeth’s own course of evil. Malcolm is Shakespeare’s portrait of the ideal king, and his chief function is to present restitution of Order in the state which will succeed the tyranny of Macbeth.”⁶⁾

(“Character study” complains that Duncan is portrayed flat and is lacking in individuality, and that the dialogue between Macduff and Malcolm in Act IV, scene iii, is long-drawn-out and dull.⁷⁾ But, as “pattern analysis” asserts, they are not from the first shaped by the demands of psychological verisimilitude.)

Thus Macbeth’s fall is depicted in a striking contrast not only with the divine order but also with the characters who represent and defend it. It is true that Macbeth is not destroyed directly by God like Satan, but Malcolm and Macduff are without doubt God’s ministers. Are we alienated from Macbeth by them in the end? The seeming fall of Macbeth is by no means a tragedy. We shall look more closely at Macbeth’s end in comparison with Faustus’ and Richard’s.

ii

Faustus sold his soul to Lucifer and he has already enjoyed twenty four years’ life of “voluptuousness” (I, iii, 92) in return. Faustus must then fall into Hell according to his contract with Lucifer. Faustus, as Good Angel says, “did love the world” (V, ii, 109). His sin has grown into his nature, so that his repentance is too late. What is remarkable at this stage is, however, that in the face of his doom, which Lucifer will bring him at any moment, Faustus develops from a flat character into a round one. As Philip Henderson notes, the conversation between Faustus and the scholars about the hideousness of his sin (V, ii, 26–94) truly moves us, and it creates a deep impression that just before falling into the eternal abyss of Hell with fearful loneliness,

Faustus begins to gain tender humanity.¹⁾

Just when Faustus is going to Hell, his cries appeal so powerfully that we could almost forget that he is a dramatic character-invented. When Faustus cries,

The devil come, and Faustus must be damned.

And see where God stretcheth out his arm,

And bends his ireful brows.

Mountains and hills, come come, and fall on me,

And hide me from the heavy wrath of God. (V, ii, 154–164)

and implores,

O, no end is limited to damned souls.

Why wert thou not a creature wanting soul?

Or why is this immortal that thou hast? (V, ii, 181–183)

we stare at him with awe, setting aside the framework of good and evil in the drama.

But when Faustus goes on to beg, “My God, my God, look not so fierce on me” (V, iii, 197), we realize that God is standing in anger before us as well as before Faustus. It is a proof of Faustus’ greatness that he utters the existential question, “Why wert thou not a creature wanting soul?” in the manner of Job, but the same greatness brings home to us that the root cause of his fall is his deadly sin of pride. We are alienated from him by God, and come to look upon *Faustus* as a morality play written in terms of tragedy. This impression is confirmed by the epilogue of the chorus which explains that Faustus is an Icarus flying high into the sky.

As to the situation in the ending part, *Richard III* and *Macbeth* do not differ much from *Faustus*. For both Richard and Macbeth are respectively destroyed by Richmond and Malcolm, who are God’s ministers commissioned to restore the divine order. When Richmond, at the end of the drama, plays the part of the chorus, he calls Richard “bloody dog” (V, v, 2), and pronounces that he is one of “the traitors/That reduce these bloody days, ----- make poor England weep in the streams of blood” (V, v, 35–36). In the same way, Malcolm at the end of the play judges Macbeth as “dead butcher”, and Lady Macbeth as “fiend-like queen” (V, vi, 118). Here we see that Richard

and Macbeth are shown as rebels against God as Faustus was. *Richard III* and *Macbeth* have the same framework of morality as does *Faustus*.

The similarity between *Richard III* and *Macbeth* has long been pointed out because of their morality-play structure. As Thomas Whately summarizes, “both Macbeth and Richard are soldiers, both usurpers; both attain the throne by the same means, by treason and murder; and both lose it too in the same manner, in the battle field against the person claiming it as lawful heir.”²⁾ And F.M. Smith, in explaining their similar structures, calls our attention to the social background in which Shakespeare wrote these two plays. “In *Richard III*, one of the first plays he wrote during Elizabeth’s reign, Shakespeare for Elizabeth’s sake glorifies Richmond, the founder of the Tudor line, at the same time, blackening the character of Richmond’s foe; in *Macbeth*, one of the first plays he wrote during the reign of James I, for James’ sake he glorifies Banquo, the founder of the Stuart line, blackening the character of Banquo’s foe.”³⁾ In short, the two plays have the theme of the realization of Providence in history.

We should not be too hasty in pointing out the similarities between the two plays, but it would be noteworthy that they both lack the scene of reconciliation which tragedy usually needs to produce “purgation”. Shakespeare’s typical tragedies, *Hamlet*, *Othello* and *Lear*, all end with their heroes’ confession of their sins. Each of the tragic heroes, on the verge of death, makes his peace with those he has wronged without knowing it, and settles his account with the living, thus producing a reconciliation scene. In a striking contrast to these three plays, both Richard and Macbeth are killed in the battle field without any friends or followers who weep over their death. In the case of Macbeth, his head is severed and put on the tip of a spear as a trophy of the battle.

Men can be reconciled to each other only when they follow their conscience, only through God. Richard and Macbeth, however, do what they themselves recognize as mortal sin to satisfy their ambition. As Lily B. Campbell comments, Richard and Macbeth have alienated their souls from God, so that they cannot confess nor be reconciled to God or man.⁴⁾

Would that mean, then, that both the plays fundamentally remain within the framework of a morality play? G.B. Harrison says, “Macbeth does not at the end leave us with any sense of utter purgation, and such pity as we feel is

not for Macbeth but for his victims. ----- *Macbeth*, therefore, is not so much a tragedy, but rather a loosely constructed chronicle play, with a villain as hero, on the pattern of *Richard III*, to which it has certain resemblances.”⁵⁾ We may, however, perceive a significant difference of self-knowledge between Faustus, Richard, and Macbeth when they are at last faced with utter spiritual ruin. We shall consider Richard’s case in the following section to see the difference.

iii

In the last section we considered the final parts of *Richard III* and *Macbeth*, and saw that the falls of Richard and Macbeth are shown as the natural result of their rebellion against God. But what is their own view of the matter?

Faustus goes to Hell, seeing God in anger and recognizing the enormity of his sin, and in a sense the same happens to the hero of *Richard III*. After Richard gained the ultimate object - - the crown, a subtle difference grows increasingly apparent in his mood and conduct. His “golden dew of sleep” (IV, i, 83) is filled with “timorous dreams” (IV, iii, 84), and he gradually loses “that alacrity of spirits” (V, iii, 73) and “cheer of mind” (V, iii, 74) which he was wont to have. And in proportion to this, Richard’s direct address - - which is the usual style of his soliloquy - - decreases, and the intimate relation between Richard and the audience vanishes, reducing him to a stale character on the stage.

Richard now camps in Bosworth Field to fight against the attack of Richmond, but his sleep in the tent is troubled by a nightmare. As soon as he is startled out of sleep, he begins to question himself in the manner of a rather primitive question-and-answer catechism:

Give me another horse! Bind up my wounds!
 Have mercy, Jesu! - - Soft! I did but dream.
 O coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me!

 What do I fear? Myself? -----

 Alack, I love myself. Wherefore? For any good

That I myself have done unto myself?
 O no! Alas, I rather hate myself
 For hateful deed committed by myself.
 I am a villain. -----

 My conscience hath a thousand several tongues,
 And every tongue brings in a several tale,
 And every tale condemns me for a villain.

I shall despair. There is no creature loves me;
 And if I die, no soul will pity me.
 Nay, wherefore should they, since that I myself
 Find in myself no pity to myself? (V, iii, 178–204)

Conscience overwhelms Richard, and for the individual this means the end. In the Elizabethan age, as W.H. Toppen points out, conscience was taken to be “of a divine nature, ----- a thing placed by God in the midst between him and man as an arbitrator to give sentence and to pronounce either with man or against man unto God.”¹⁾ Richard now recognizes that his real enemy is the King of kings and that Richmond is his minister.

This soliloquy which depicts the collapse of Richard’s intellectual confidence is probably the climactic scene of the play. Yet the victory is clearly on the side of his conscience which one-sidedly tears him to pieces. The reality of God alienates us from Richard. Or rather his conscience destroys him and erases the object of our sympathy from our sight. As E.A.J. Honigmann says, “Richard, like Faustus, fights a losing battle with his God, but Shakespeare could not allow his doomed hero to appeal so powerfully to the audience.”²⁾

Richard seeks for Richmond, God’s instrument, crying out as follows, and is finally killed by him:

Slave, I have set my life upon a cast,
 And I will stand the hazard of the die.
 I think there be six Richmonds in the field;
 Five have I slain today instead of him.
 A horse! A horse! My kingdom for a horse! (V, iv, 9–13)

Richard here appears to be swallowed up in the prevailing ritual tone of the

play which signifies God's order and providence.

Indeed Richard does not see God directly like Faustus, but his conscience breaks him to pieces and disables him from assuming the grandeur of a truly tragic hero. In fact this conscience may be considered as evidence for the righteousness of Richmond's choric epilogue. We find an agreement between Richard's final self-knowledge and Richmond's judgement on him. *Richard III*, then, should be classified as a chronicle play, whose moral sense is synonymous with a morality play, and its hero may, as is generally admitted, be a scourge of God, whose evil course is a necessary element in a larger merciful divine scheme.³⁾

At the end of the play Faustus sees God angered, but Richard doesn't. Richard gets crushed under the weight of his conscience which acknowledges the reality of God. Macbeth, on the other hand, neither sees nor acknowledges his existence. We know that Macbeth's starting point was to circumvent God, to outwit conscience. It is true that Macbeth suffers from the furies of his conscience even after the king's assassination, but he never recognizes his imaginative fears as the voice of conscience, and he goes so far as to numb his conscience, as J. Dover Wilson says, by "injecting it with doses of crime."⁴⁾ The following soliloquy would make this point amply clear:

I have almost forgot the taste of fears.
The time has been my senses would have cooled
To hear a night-shriek, and my fell of hair
Would at a dismal treatise rouse and stir
As life were in't. I have supped full with horrors:
Direness, familiar to my slaughterous thoughts,
Cannot once start me. (V, v, 9-15)

It is notable that not once does Shakespeare use the word, "conscience" in *Macbeth*. The fall of Macbeth forms a striking contrast to that of Lady Macbeth, who goes mad and kills herself through "compunctuous visitings of nature" (I, v, 43), the only exact equivalent for "conscience" in the play. "Conscience" has no place in Macbeth's fall, or rather Macbeth leaps over the obstacle which tripped up Richard, and falls into ruin.

What, then, is Macbeth's fall? What sort of self-knowledge will he have when he spiritually collapses? We shall trace his fall with the conclusion of

the former thesis in mind.

iv

Macbeth's imaginative fears originated in the realization that he was free to kill even the king, in other words, in the realization that he was free as mind from anything objectified. But Macbeth self-denyingly overcame his fears and murdered King Duncan, because he believed that the freedom of mind from the objectified world was the only dependable reality. The freedom or the obligation to obey God's law seemed vague and unreliable to Macbeth.

Apart from his mind, however, Macbeth has a body. As body, Macbeth is not free from *nature* and belongs to the objectified world. Because Macbeth killed and objectified the Other, he must now admit the possibility that somebody else could kill and objectify him. He becomes aware that others are as well entitled to freedom of mind from the objectified world. They are in fact free to kill Macbeth. He must know that the freedom to kill is the freedom to be killed. The tables are gradually turned on Macbeth.

After the coronation, Macbeth soliloquizes as follows:

To be thus is nothing;
But to be safely thus! - - Our fears in Banquo
Stick deep; and in his royalty of nature
Reigns that which would be feared. 'Tis much he dares,
And to that dauntless temper of his mind
He hath a wisdom that doth guide his valour
To act in safety. - - - - -

- - - - - He chid the sisters
When first they put the name of king upon me,
And bade them speak to him. Then, prophet-like,
They hailed him father to a line of kings.
Upon my head they placed a fruitless crown
And put a barren sceptre in my grip,
Thence to be wrenched with an unlineal hand,
No son of mine succeeding. If it be so,
For Banquo's issue have I filed my mind,

For them the gracious Duncan have I murdered,

To make them kings, the seeds of Banquo kings! (III, i, 47–69)

Now that Macbeth is a king, he realizes that all of the prophecies about him have come true. The prophecy about Banquo now weighs heavily on Macbeth's mind. Banquo might realize the prophecy for himself. Macbeth, who used the freedom to kill anybody, must now permit the same thing to Banquo. He cannot help admitting that "he hath a wisdom that doth guide his valour/To act in safety."

Macbeth must receive the freedom to be killed. He begins to fear the image of himself being stabbed:

But let the frame of things disjoint, both the worlds suffer
 Ere we will eat our meal in fear, and sleep
 In the affliction of these terrible dreams
 That shake us nightly; better be with the dead
 Whom we, to gain our peace, have sent to peace,
 Than on the torture of the mind to lie
 In restless ecstasy. (III, ii, 16–22)

Because Macbeth did what he himself recognized to be villainous to satisfy his desire, he is no longer a dweller of the realm of God. Although he succeeded in usurping the throne, he might be removed from it at any moment. As long as Banquo and his offspring are alive, Macbeth cannot enjoy being a king.

Banquo and Fleance are "assailable". Macbeth decides to resort again to the freedom to kill anybody, the freedom of mind from anything objectified:

Macbeth. O, full of scorpions is my mind, dear wife!
 Thou know'st that Banquo and his Fleance lives.
 Lady M. But in them nature's copy's not eterne.
 Macbeth. There's comfort yet! They are assailable.
 Then be thou jocund. Ere the bat hath flown
 His cloistered flight, -----
 -----, there shall be done
 A deed of dreadful note. (III, ii, 36–44)

When Macbeth murdered King Duncan, he had to separate the actions of his hands and feet from himself. As king, he can now employ assassins. They are

literally Macbeth's separated hands and feet to proceed with his evil deeds. As his objective wording, "there shall be done/A deed of dreadful note" shows, he is now free from the foul business not only as mind but also as body.

Although the murderers succeed in killing Banquo, they fail to catch Fleance, and he flees to Ireland. Fears come down on Macbeth again:

Then comes my fit again. I had else been perfect,
Whole as the marble, founded as the rock,
As broad and general as the casing air,
But now I am cabined, cribbed, confined, bound in
To saucy doubts and fears. - - But Banquo's safe? (III, iv, 20-24)

Macbeth was free as mind from anything objectified, and the objectified world assured him that he was free to kill anybody. As body, however, Macbeth is bound to *nature*, and the same objectified world assures him of the freedom to be killed as well. The world which Macbeth believed could protect as a fortress gradually turns into a prison.

Fleance "Hath nature that in time venom breed,/No teeth for the present" (III, iv, 29-30). Macbeth thinks that he is safe for the time being, and goes back to the banquet. Banquo's ghost, however, appears on the throne as if Banquo claimed it as "father to a line of kings", and frightens Macbeth. As Willard Farnham says, "his conscience obtains supernatural support for the work which it does through his imagination."¹⁾ Macbeth cannot look Banquo in the face and quibbles, totally terrified:

Thou canst not say I did it; never shake
Thy gory locks at me. (III, iv, 49-50)

And what frightens Macbeth more is the fact that the dead, whom he supposed to be buried under the objectified world, rise again. He is much confused and wonders:

Blood hath been shed ere now, i'the olden time,
Ere humane statute purged the gentle weal;
Ay, and since too, murders have been performed
Too terrible for the ear. The times has been
That, when the brains were out, the man would die,
And there an end. But now they rise again
With twenty mortal murders on their crowns,
And push us from our stools. This is more strange

Than such a murder is. (III, iv, 74–82)

But when Banquo's ghost makes its second appearance, Macbeth vituperates against it and challenges its reality:

Avaunt, and quit my sight! Let the earth hide thee!
 Thy bones are marrowless, thy blood is cold.
 Thou hast no speculation in those eyes
 Which thou dost glare with.

 What man dare, I dare.

----- Hence, horrible shadow!
 Unreal mockery, hence! (III, iv, 92–106)

The ghost is thus objectified and returned to where it should be by Macbeth's bidding, and it cannot make him obey his conscience.

Since Macbeth obstinately hardens himself against his conscience, he cannot look straight at the people who observe God's law and dwell in His realm. Gradually they begin to seem to Macbeth to be the agents who would realize Banquo's prophecy, or rather a second or a third Macbeth who would commit regicide. The following dialogue reveals his state of mind clearly:

Macbeth. How sayst thou, that Macduff denies his person
 At our great bidding?

Lady M. Did you send to him, sir?

Macbeth. I hear it by the way. But I will send.

There's not a one of them, but in his house
 I keep a servant fee'd. I will tomorrow - -
 And betimes I will - - to the Weird Sisters.

More shall they speak; -----
 ----- For mine own good
 All causes shall give way. -----

Strange things I have in head, that will to hand;
 Which must be acted ere they may be scanned.

(III, iv, 127–139)

Macbeth must perish whatever bars the road to peace. He is determined to kill and wipe out those who raise suspicions in his mind as if he would separate his "strange things" from himself with a complete objectivity. Gradually,

Macbeth is becoming a practical man of action, a man whose words advance directly to deeds.

When Macbeth swears, "What man dare, I dare", he is no longer the same Macbeth that could say, "I dare do all that may become a man:/Who dares do more is none" (I, vii, 47-48). Macbeth now forms the following judgement on himself without any hesitation:

Come, we'll to sleep. My strange and self-abuse
Is the initiate fear that wants hard use.
We are yet but young in deed. (III, iv, 141-143)

The predominance of the I in the relation between an I and an It over the I in the relation between an I and a Thou is now firmly established in him. Such determination and judgement are getting firmer and firmer after he meets the witches to ask further about his future.

But Macbeth cannot actually kill all the people on earth, or in G.K. Hunter's words, he cannot "bring his world into conformity with the man that Macbeth has become."²⁾ The fact that he can be killed never goes out of his mind, and it gradually brings home to Macbeth another fact that man is to die some time. This world has changed into a prison, and it seems to him as if the world were ringing his death knell. Macbeth is aged rapidly by his deep consciousness of the seed of death in his own life:

I have lived long enough: my way of life
Is fallen into the sere, the yellow leaf;
And that which should accompany old age,
As honour, love, obedience, troops of friends,
I must not look to have; but, in their stead,
Curses, not loud, but deep, mouth-honour, breath
Which the poor heart would fain deny and dare not. - -
(V, iii, 22-28)

As Malcolm says, "Macbeth/Is ripe for shaking" (IV, iii, 236-237).

Thus far Macbeth has been killing suspicious men one by one. Yet he neither feels relieved nor enjoys the companionship of friends. His disobedience to conscience is blocking the road which links Macbeth with others. What is worse, the absolute possibility of his death now strips Macbeth of all his glory.

When Macbeth hears the news of Lady Macbeth's death, he begins to

speak about the vanity of life without any affection for her:

She should have died hereafter.
 There would have been a time for such a word - -
 Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow,
 Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
 To the last syllable of recorded time;
 And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
 The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
 Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
 That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
 And then is heard no more. It is a tale
 Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
 Signifying nothing. (V, v, 17-28)

What Macbeth believed to be Archimedes' immovable point was not the freedom to follow God, but the freedom of mind from the objectified world. He is not, however, allowed to live the eternal now, and his life is full of irrevocable "yesterdays", which he is to escape and hopeless "tomorrows", which mean merely another step towards death. He cannot but conclude that "life's but a walking shadow - - - -."

Macbeth was woken up to ambition by the witches and kept on stepping forward with their assurance. The course of life that he took, however, leads him to a nightmare and raises life's dark void before his eyes. When the medieval contempt of the world said much about the imperfection of the world, its spirit originated in the obedience to God which makes this present moment eternal.³⁾ But Macbeth has turned his back on God, so that he can neither live the eternal now nor hold the imperfection of the world in contempt. Thus Macbeth's self-knowledge is what Marlowe's Mephistophilis says on his view of the world, namely, "where we are is hell" (I, v, 125).

v

We have followed the course of Macbeth's fall and seen that his final self-knowledge is that we are "walking shadows". How should we evaluate this?

What is significant here is the way Macbeth gives the "Tomorrow" speech. For it is not a speculative soliloquy, but rather something like a poem. As

L.A. Janus says, instead of the usual technique of introspective soliloquy, “Shakespeare adapts a form closely resembling lyric verse.”¹⁾ Here Macbeth does not hold life’s emptiness at a distance outside himself as Faustus saw God in anger. Nor is he broken to pieces by the emptiness as Richard was by conscience. Just as the Thane of Cawdor became one with conscience and “confessed his treasons” (I, iv, 6), so Macbeth becomes one with the emptiness with courageous honesty and delivers his “Tomorrow” speech.

It is our usual practice to fear death and objectify the dark void of life to escape from it. We cannot but admire Macbeth for his courageous honesty to the dark void. Macbeth, at one with the void, is elevated to the absolute supremacy of death and is purified. When his “Tomorrow” speech brings home to us how absolute our possibility of death is, our sympathy with Macbeth and his ambition is transformed into admiration for his courageous honesty.

We have recognized that *Macbeth* has no reconciliation scene, but we may say that this transformation in a sense signifies such a reconciliation. We are all to die some time, and death never discriminates between Macbeth and us. All men are absolutely equal before the law of death. When Macbeth says “our” in his speech, whether we sympathize with him or not, we are compelled to interpret the speech as his proposal of reconciliation in the field of death, where we are all equal. We should not overlook play images such as “poor player”, “stage”, for they are serving as a bridge between the audience and Macbeth on the stage.²⁾

The proposal which harmonizes the audience and Macbeth is a different kind of reconciliation from what we see in *Hamlet*, *Othello* and *Lear*. But when Macbeth says to Macduff before their fight,

Of all men else I have avoided thee.
But get thee back; my soul is too charged
With blood of thine already. (V, vi, 43–45)

could we not say that he is proposing reconciliation to Macduff as well? It may not be very much amiss to say that in Macbeth the indiscriminateness of death comes to bear resemblance to that of God’s love.

The serene insight into the dark void in life hallows Macbeth. He goes beyond good and evil and becomes a tragic hero. Even though Macbeth is at

last killed by Macduff, and Malcolm pronounces that he is a “dead butcher”, we could not take his judgement to be literally true. Macbeth has already alienated us from the living. Admiration for his courageous honesty is living in our gloomy thought of death. Hence we may say that *Macbeth* is a spiritual tragedy of an ambitious man, written in terms of a morality play.

NOTES

i

- 1) Masahiko Omura, "The Problem of Sympathy in *Macbeth*", *Hitotsu-bashi Journal of Social Sciences* 73 (1986), pp. 81-97.
- 2) Irving Ribner, *Patterns in Shakespearian Tragedy* (Methuen, 1957), p. 155. cf. Paul N. Siegel, *Shakespearean Tragedy and Elizabethan Compromise* (New York Univ. Press, 1957), p. 145.
- 3) Willard Farnham, *Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier* (Univ. of California Press, 1950), p. 79.
- 4) The idea of the great chain of being is fully considered by Arthur O. Lovejoy in his *The Great Chain of Being* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1936).
- 5) Theodore Spencer, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man* (Macmillan, 1951), p. 154.
- 6) Ribner, *Patterns*, p. 160.
- 7) Kenneth Muir, ed. *Macbeth* (Methuen, 1979), pp. lxiii-lxv.

ii

- 1) Philip Henderson, *Christopher Marlowe* (The British Council, 1956), Chapter 2. "Doctor Faustus".
- 2) Thomas Whately, "Remarks on Some of the Characters of Shakespeare", *World Classics*, ed. D.N. Smith, (Oxford, 1916), pp. 125-126. cf. William Hazlitt, *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* (Dent, 1969), pp. 186-194.
- 3) F.M. Smith, "The Relation of Macbeth to Richard the Third", *P.M.L.A.* (1945), p. 1016. cf. R.L. Anderson, "The Pattern of Behaviour Culminating in Macbeth", *S.E.L.* (1963), pp. 151-173.
- 4) Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes* (Methuen, 1978), Appendix B, pp. 274-280.
- 5) G.B. Harrison, *Shakespeare's Tragedies* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951), p. 190.

iii

- 1) W.H. Toppen, *Conscience in Shakespeare's Macbeth* (Groningen, 1962), p.2.
- 2) E.A.J. Honigmann, ed. *Richard III* (Penguin Books, 1980), p. 39.
- 3) cf. E.M.W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (Chatto & Windus, 1980), pp. 198-214. Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Histories* (Methuen,

1970), pp. 306–334.

- 4) J. Dover Wilson, *Six Tragedies of Shakespeare* (Eihosha, 1963), p. 32.

iv

- 1) Farnham, *Frontier*, p. 108.
- 2) G.K. Hunter, ed. *Macbeth* (Penguin Books, 1980), p. 17.
- 3) The relation of the medieval contempt of the world to the Elizabethan tragedies is fully considered by Willard Farnham in his *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy* (Basil Blackwell, 1956).

v

- 1) L.A. Janus, *The Telling Word: The Soliloquy in Hamlet, Othello, and Macbeth*, Univ. of Maryland, Ph.D., 1972 (University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company), p. 148.

- 2) For a fuller treatment of Shakespeare's play images see Anne Righter, *Shakespeare and the idea of the play* (Penguin Books, 1961).

(The texts used in this thesis are, *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays*, ed. J.B. Steane, (Penguin Books, 1969), *Richard III*, ed. E.A.J. Honigmann, (Penguin Books, 1980), and *Macbeth*, ed. G.K. Hunter, (Penguin Books, 1980).