

**The Renaissance and Shakespeare**  
**Dr. Payal Nagpal**  
**Department of English**  
**University of Delhi**

**Lecture - 12**  
**Lecture on Macbeth**

Hello, the next lecture in this MOOC on The Renaissance in Shakespeare is by Doctor Payal Nagpal from Janki Devi memorial college university of Delhi. This lecture will discuss Shakespeare's tragedy Macbeth which was written most probably around 1605. The lecture is divided into 3 parts. The first part discusses theaters in Shakespeare's time. The second part moves on to look at the social and historical and political context of the play. And the third part provides the detailed analysis of Macbeth, looking at aspects like the role of the witches, the significance of the women characters, and the setting of the play.

Hello viewers, today's lecture is on William Shakespeare's Macbeth. You are all familiar with the playwright William Shakespeare or the bard as he is popularly known. Today I will be talking to you about a very popular tragedy by the playwright called Macbeth. Some of you might have read it at the school level in the abridged form or you have tales of Shakespeare by Charles and Mary Lamb. But today we are going to look at the more complex nuances of a play widely read performed and adapted. Let me tell you about the 3 parts into which this lecture has been divided. The first part will acquaint you with theaters in Shakespeare's time. The second part will focus on the historical and political context of the play. The third part will be the detailed analysis of the play. And these 3 sections will be followed by a summing up of the chief points of the discussion.

Why do we need to understand the placement the construction of theater in Shakespeare's time? This is an important question that you must keep in mind. During Shakespeare's time and I am talking about the late 16 and approximately the first decade of the 17th century. Theaters, theater houses that is were placed in spaces outside the boundary of the city. These areas were called the liberties. And as you know the word liberty itself signifies freedom. Now what kind of freedom were these people seeking? If you look at it the theaters the audience that watched these plays they came from all walks

of society. They were the most ordinary to people who had aristocratic or royal connections.

So, women were also present as part of the audience. In this kind of a context to watch a play that also dealt with the bawdy as in *bawdy*, now that became very, very challenging and that is why you know that you know the growing influence of the puritans and you also have the presence of the church. So, it became very difficult for these performances to happen within the city. So, theaters were shifted outside the city into spaces that were called the liberties. I hope this idea is now clear. So, it is also interesting to mark, that a lot of these theaters were actually brothels that had been converted into theaters.

I will give you small example. For instance you have the rose theatre. The rose theatre was bought by Philip Henslowe. And it is believed and peter Thomson points us out that Philip Henslowe left the brothel intact and he used the yard for the theater. So, this in a sense tells us that there is a subversive or a challenging role that the theaters were performing, and they were in some way questioning what was happening within mainstream society within the city spaces. So, this challenging role or this subversive function can be assigned to performances in theatrical spaces. It is no surprise therefore, that theaters were constantly under a kind of scrutiny. Numerous tracts, pamphlets controlling and sensory performances were published around this time.

So, if you look at the social structure, if you look at the way the renaissance society imagined itself So, on the one hand you have the yardstick of morality which comes to you from the church, on the other hand you have a space that is very, very free So, to say it is open, and it is a space in which people interact in a way that they do not interact in the mainstream society. And for and again here you need to kind of go back to what I just said which is that if you look at it really speaking then this interaction between the different sexes, this interaction between you know people from the different rungs of the society was something that was in the years to come going to challenge the insularity of a particular social class.

So, in talking about a heterogeneous audience, in drawing your attention to the fact that spaces in which plays were performed had a role to perform; whatever be that role let me

share with you a quote from the act of common counsel for the regulation of theatrical performances in London. This was an act that was introduced in 1574, and was an attempt to censor performances. It sought for an erasure of anything that was considered to be what they called unfit or uncomely. These were the words that we used. I will just read out a little quote.

Henceforth no play comedy, tragedy, interlude, nor public show, shall be openly played or showed within the liberties of the city, wherein shall be uttered any word or example or doings of any unchastity, sedition and that no innkeeper tavern keeper nor other person whatsoever within the liberties of this city shall openly show or play, any play interlude comedy, tragedy, matter or show which shall not be first perused and allowed in such order and form, and by such persons as by the lord mayor and court of aldermen. There were many such treaties, pamphlets, and acts written to control performances in the Elizabethan and the Jacobean age.

I want you to now think and keep this at the back of your mind. The theaters as a result were frequently shut and one of the reasons you know the why theaters would be immediately shut down was the plague. You know that there were a series of outbreaks of plague in the late 16th century. And as a result of this theaters because you had this very, very intense interaction amongst people from different walks of the society. So, theaters would be the first to be shut down.

Let me now acquaint you with another term. This is called the kings men. Who were the king's men? In the late 16th century there were 2 group of performers. One was the admiral's men and the other were the lord chamberlains men. Now the admirals men performed in a theater called the rose theatre. And the lord chamberlains men performed in the space called the theatre that was the name of the space like the rose you have the theatre. Shakespeare was associated with the later. As the lease of the theatre expired in 1599, Shakespeare along with his friends started the globe theatre.

And you know that when we think about the renaissance period, we think about Shakespeare the first name that comes to our mind is the globe theatre. Now he was and I also want to share with you that Shakespeare was the partner in the globe theatre. In 1603 you had another very important political event that happens, what is that? King

James the 6th of Scotland became king James the first of England and Scotland. So, after queen Elizabeth, England and Scotland were united under the same king, and this was the Scottish king, King James.

After this the lord chamberlains men the troupe that Shakespeare was associated with was renamed the kings men by a royal patent, and the kings men became the official troupe of the monarchy. Do you think this had implications? I am sure it certainly did. It meant that the playwrights and the performances had to adhere to a kind of code that was already circumscribed. What do we mean by this? Because of this association where the kings men was going to be the official performing troupe for the monarchy, you have to keep in mind that the writing of plays and the performances would be something that had to be negotiated in a certain sense with the powers that be interestingly; it is during this period that Shakespeare writes some very important plays, specially the plays that we refer to as the tragedies.

For instance, othello was written somewhere around 1603 to 1604 king lear in 1605, to 1606 and Macbeth in 1606. They all belong to this period. The period that the period after which king James becomes the king of both England and Scotland. Anthony and Cleopatra Coriolanus, these are plays that were written a little later, but these are these 3 plays I just spoke about draw immediate attention. And you can see that these are tragedies and these are plays that are very, very closely related to issues matters that pertain to the king. And I must say that of course, a very brave act and how does the bard, how does the bard as playwright negotiate with his times to write these plays.

Do you think there was some connection between the writing of tragedies and the immediate historical context? I use the word negotiation. If you think that negotiation was there, then what is the nature of this negotiation? You know in the process of this lecture I am going to be putting up a lot of questions which I want you people to ponder over. Why was the playwright engaged in this form, the form of the tragedy? Do you think the play do you think the plays give us an insight into these issues? You must keep these questions in mind as we go along.

I would now like to move on to the second section and give you a brief overview of the historical and political context. The immediate context, what was happening there?

Macbeth as I just shared with you, was believed to have been written somewhere around 1606. This is 3 years after king James ascends to the English throne. Before we move on to an analysis of the play, let me draw your attention to the uneasy rise of James to the English throne. I have used the word uneasy because we know that the Elizabethan period is known for something called the Elizabethan order, the notion that the king is divinely ordained and that the king is the representative of god on earth. Now in this kind of a system and I must add that it is not as if during the Elizabethan period this did not come, this is it is I it is not as if during the Elizabethan period this was not put to question.

It was put to question even then. But there was something different happening in the first decades of the 17th century. So, there were factions supporting his claim that is the claim of king James. And there were others that contested it. Tracts were written in defense of either claim people who supported king James wrote pamphlets wrote books with supporting their claim, and the opposition did the same. This meant that the position of the king who was considered to be divinely ordained was now open to some sort of speculation. I will also draw your attention to the social context of the time. Now socially this was a world that was gradually becoming more and more mobile.

The strong hold of the aristocracy was affected by the sheer monetary power of people who engaged in trade. These people were gradually acquiring significance in society. These people wanted to acquire more and more. I have used the word acquire very, very deliberately twice. Because I want to draw your attention, I want to focus on the acquisitive nature of a new group that was coming up in society. In the late 16th century you have the establishment of the royal stock exchange; you also have you know by and large not just the English, but the European notion of travel to discover new lands. What they thought were new lands now this so called discovery and of course, you have to read between the lines and not accept the word discovery at it is face value. This was the perception of the west right.

So, they thought that they were discovering new lands, but what was more important and what is more important for us as readers and viewers of 21st century to understand that these people engaged in trade. Trade also meant that these people would acquire money.

I go back to the points that I just made, that in this period the late 16th and early 17th century people were acquiring more and more money and as a result these people had to be accommodated. So, to say, within the structure of power that existed in society, but was gradually losing its strength. In discussing the historical the social the political context to the play, I want to mention another very important event that happens in 1605.

Now, we know the play was written in 1606 and in 1605 something very, very important happens. This was the gunpowder plot, just one year before this play is written. The gunpowder plot was a failed rebellion. A rebellion none the less, it was a conspiracy planned by the Catholics to destroy the parliament by blowing it up with gunpowder. The plot was revealed and thereby prevented from being implemented. What were the implications? This meant that there was a faction of people extremely discontented with the new king.

This discontent translated into the gunpowder plot. Now King James as I mentioned takes over in 1603, but in 1600 we had also seen another rebellion against him and this was the Gowrie conspiracy. What are the points that I am trying to make here is that you can see that in the early years of the 17th century that there are these rebellions things that happened earlier also, but they acquire new meaning historically when they happen in the early years of the 17th century. So, the Gowrie conspiracy before King James takes over the throne of England and in 1605 the gunpowder plot. The gunpowder plot also introduced to us another term, which is equivocation. I want you to keep this in mind at the moment and in the discussion of the play, specially in the Porter scene I am going to be referring to the term equivocation again.

How then does Shakespeare deal with his times? Does he recreate a lot of this in his plays? Does it affect him? Well, we can only conjecture we can only look at the forces of history that were there, and we can only understand how they contest for spaces how they are in conflict with each other and thereby find representation in the works of his time. A very important question that this brings up for us is does the play have any connection with the issues of state and kingship. And state of course, I want to mention here that the word state has to be understood in its very, very nascent form of course, not in the way we look at it in the present day, but as something that is information, but is

represented through the king. So, I am going to use these 2 words together, state and king. So, you need to as I said you need to focus on some of these questions.

I will now move on to the third section, that is an analysis of the play. Having discussed theaters in Shakespeare's time the historical political and social context to the play, let us now take a close look at Macbeth. What is the locale or the setting of the play? The play is set in Scotland, not in England. King James was the king of Scotland, and then became the king of both England and Scotland. You must think about the play and the Scottish connections of King James. This also brings in a related question. How did the English people perceive the Scots?

This needs to be juxtaposed against Shakespeare's choice of Macbeth as a king, why Macbeth? Historically Macbeth was a king who ruled in the 11th century. During this period what was the system of succession? Was it primogeniture? Or was it hereditary succession? Or was there any other way? We need to therefore; think about why does the playwright chose a figure of power from the 11th century to discuss something that is happening or to recreate in literature something that is happening in the early years of the 17th century. There are these different sources on which Shakespeare relies and I will just list a few of these, of course the most obvious is Raphael Holinshed chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland. There are 2 other sources that I want to mention here. One is John Major's a history of greater Britain, and George Buchanan's the history of Scotland.

So, Shakespeare relies on these sources and he recreates in literature within the form within the genre of drama a play that he calls Macbeth. What are the important themes that we need to keep in mind while analyzing this play? And I will just list a few. For instance, you can keep in mind the whole relationship between state and violence. The second idea is that of Macbeth as king. How does he acquire the throne? Is it a methodology that is sustainable? Is Shakespeare presenting that or is he rejecting that? The witches; very, very important in the play. Lady Macbeth, the other another very important woman in this play lady Macduff and of course, very, very important interaction that happens towards the end of this play is that between Macduff and Malcolm.

The tone of the play is set by the witches. The play begins with the witches and their statement fair is foul and foul is fair. I mentioned to you a term that came along that became very, very popular during the gunpowder plot, it was equivocation. And what are we looking at here? Fair is foul and foul is fair. Which means that our standard perception of understanding the nuances of what is fair and what is foul will probably not be viable anymore. Because the fair is foul and vice versa. In this context equivocation and its use by the witches is very important. Before I discuss the relationship between the witches and the course of events in the play let us take a look at how the witches were perceived in the 16th and early 17th centuries, I am going to concentrate more here on King James' perception of the witches. Because remember that is the official statement in a sense.

So, on the one hand you had somebody called Reginald Scot who writes the discovery of witchcraft in 1584. And on the other hand you have King James' track called daemonologie written in 1597, where he is very critical of what Scot says in the discovery of witchcraft. I will just mention 2 quotations from you know one from each of these books. King James' daemonologie states, the witches are servants only and slaves to the devil, right; so, which means that the witches are looked at in connection with the devil. The second is a quotation from Reginald Scot's the discovery of witchcraft, and he says one sort of such as are said to be witches a women, which be commonly, old, lame, bleary eyed, pale, foul and full of wrinkles. Now these are 2 absolutely divergent views on people, slash women, slash creatures who are considered to be witches.

What do I mean? Where King James in daemonologie considers them and puts them within the framework of morality and considers them to be the slaves to the devil, Reginald Scot says that there is nothing of this sort and these are women who are old who are outcast. There is nobody to take care of them, and it is their diminutive conditions that presents them in a form that they seem like witches. So, these 2 different interpretations of witches from the same period also gives us the kind of discourse if I may use the word, or prevalent views on witches.

Shakespeare of course, presents them you know as women and a times you know this, this dimension is also blurred you know when it is said that who are these you know who



have the beard and so on and so forth. So, this clearly meant that in the later Elizabethan and the Jacobean age the dominant discourse looked at women as witches, even though this was contested by narratives such as those of Reginald Scot. Macbeth's witches and their construction they are of course, presented as very, very active women who have familiars and who are predicting the future and so on. But when we take a deeper look at the construction of these characters, this discourse regarding witches as women is automatically kind of brought into the purview.

So, making use of prevalent notions about witches, the play begins with an atmosphere that indicates turmoil. And I go back to the statement fair is foul and foul is going to be enacted. The witches hail Macbeth as thane of Glamis, thane of Cawdor, and one who shall be king hereafter. Macbeth displays bravery on the battlefield defeating the Norwegian forces and protecting Scotland. He is referred to in terms of laudatory epithets. He is Bellona's bridegroom, valor's minion, and in turn he is rewarded with the title of thane of Cawdor. He is referred to as brave Macbeth. The very soon the brave Macbeth will turn into something else totally.

There is going to be a kind of anarchic monstrosity that is going to be associated with him in the play. This title earlier belonged to that is the thane of Cawdor, belonged to a man who betrayed his country. Ross refers to him as the most disloyal traitor, but Macbeth has protected the state and has won the confidence of King Duncan. Having moved on from thane of Glamis to thane of Cawdor, will he have access to the title of the king? Will his bravery fetch him that title; because the title of the king is something that is passed on from one generation to the other. In this context again keeping mind the fact that historically speaking Macbeth belonged to the 11th century, a time period when this system might not happen then.

So, the play begins with a rebellion. And I have already pointed out the connections between the play and its historical context of the Gunpowder Plot. This then takes us on to a very important aspect, which is the nature and role of violence. There is a kind of violence that is exhibited on the battlefield. This violence leads to a sort of reward, but can we say then that this violence is accepted in some form? Macbeth clarifies that there is a kind of violence which is given the form of bravery and is therefore, accepted

by the king Duncan in this case, as long as it is used to protect the rights of the state and the king.

And so, Duncan appreciates Macbeth. This was certainly a part of the normative idea that the king is divinely ordained and therefore, must needs be protected. In this context Macbeth's brutal killing of the thane of Cawdor is the means of acquiring glory and an act that is praised by the state or king. The play also presents to us violence in another form, that of excess. What do I mean by this; unbridled violence whose only end is fulfillment of personal ambition. Now this is not acceptable, this is unacceptable to the state or king, as it acquires a threatening guise. In the course of events that follow Macbeth is seen as transforming from a brave soldier to an anarchic force that sets itself to destroying all that is there around it. Macbeth murders Duncan and acquires the crown, and in doing this as is mentioned by the others in the play he has destroyed the lords' anointed temple.

We know that the king was the supreme representative and the king had to be because of the whole notion of the fact that the king is the whole notion that the king is divinely ordained we have to keep this in mind. The children that is Malcolm and Donalbain leave the country Macbeth of course, becomes the king. Now Lady Macbeth partners with her husband in this brutality. In fact, she eggs him on, she eggs him on to go on and commit the murder. We need to deliberate upon Lady Macbeth's ambition. It is very easy you see to actually straightaway project it in terms of morality and you know understand the play in terms of the good and the bad, but one needs to read between the lines and see what else is really happening in the play.

Her desire to acquire the kingly scepter is possible only through her husband. You see there is no other way that Lady Macbeth can acquire power or the crown. She spurs him on to kill Duncan. And in doing this she rejects her socially assigned role that of femininity. A role that is to provide nurture. It is the sheer power of Lady Macbeth that has proved quite difficult for critics to deal with contend with or unravel right. A period and this was also you know the late I mean 16th century by and large was also the period that focused heavily on the writing of conduct literature. To counsel women on how to behave. And when I say how to behave I mean how to dress up how to deal with marriage, how to be given away in marriage so on and so forth.

For example let us take a look at the title of one of these books. Juan Luis Vives has written a book called the education of a Christian woman, right. Now education and Christian woman both the things they are in the title. So, you must think about the fact that in a society that spoke heavily about counseling women, counseling women on their conduct in this kind of a backdrop you have a character like Lady Macbeth. So, to look at her simply in terms of violence and ambition would actually not be adequate. You need to go a step further and ask this question how does Lady Macbeth fit into the larger problematic that is the social problematic. What is the politics of this kind of a character? So on the one hand you have Lady Macbeth who along with Macbeth can be seen within the structure of violence as excess that I just discussed, but on the other hand Lady Macbeth is also a character that needs to be looked at for rejecting the established moulds of femininity that were laid down for women in society.

I now want to introduce since we talked about excess and violence. So, there is a kind of brutality that is at work. You know killing of people and butchering them. So, what is the function of this brutality in the play? It raises the question of violence in its accepted form so called accepted form, and it raises questions about notions of bravery that allow a certain kind of violence to be seen as acceptable. If Macbeth's brutality questions it is an earlier more acceptable form then Lady Macbeth's powers denounced the mould of femininity that is socially circumscribed for her. Her desire to be unsexed, and turn her milk for brawn is a rejection of both femininity and motherhood. She rejects that and in doing so, at times critics have seen her as one with the witches.

I now move on to another very important aspect of the play and this is the porter scene. Critics have responded in various ways to the porter scene. But I would just like to raise a few questions about the porter scene and the issues that it brings up. Now in the 19th century we know the famous you know debate the whole notion that St. Coleridge of the romantic period dismissed the porter scene as the disgusting passage written for the mob by some other hand whereas Thomas de Quincey of course, sees it as a useful interpolation. How do we as 21st century readers respond to the porter scene? Let us take a look at the location of the porter scene.

It is technically act 2 scene 3, but it is immediately after the murder and just before the revelation of the horrific deed of the murder of Duncan. Now technically this will of course, give you know it indicates the passage of time allowing the actors change to discover the deed. At a more complex level the porter is talking about all sorts of mystiques. He talks about a farmer, who hoards grains and equivocator, who swears that invokes the scales right. This is true and the other thing is also true equivocation is something that I have already discussed with you. And English tailor who steals and some of all professions who go the primrose way. What is the primrose way? This is the easy way, right? Why does and the porter draws on characters that are ordinary. The porter is sending people into hell he is standing at the gateway to hell.

So, why does the playwright present to us a character at such a tense moment in the play? Of course, it gives us comic relief and I can straightaway think about 20th century playwright bertolt brecht who would really have appreciated this. But getting back to the play I leave it to you to think about these connections. Is he preempting? That this is now the road to hell? And henceforth Macbeth is only going to go further in terms of this structure of excess and violence, or is he also doing one more thing? Which is, is he drawing our attention? To the acquisitive nature of a new class of people, right? Who are these? These are ordinary people you have a farmer you have a tailor you have an equivocator, these are not people of the upper class. So, he draws our attention to the acquisitive nature of the new class of people. Does Macbeth represent the new forces? Does Macbeth represent forces that can be called acquisitive? And can these forces be realized in society, right?

So, these are some of the questions I am not stating here I am not stating the answers here. Because it is these questions that are more important. And it is this that we need to ask in the context of the play. I have already pointed out the value of the term equivocation in the play and if you actually look at the insertion in the 17th century you know by late 17th century by William Davenant. He adds 2 scenes to the play, but totally dilutes the whole structure of fair is foul, and foul is fair. So, this as I said is the language of equivocation and the porter is talking about the equivocator. This was a term associated with father Henry garnet who in the aftermath of the gunpowder plot refused to testify against the plotters, and eluded investigation. As friar bacon has pointed out

that equivocation was a very contentious term in 1606, and the porter reminds us of the same. The language of equivocation is something that has been used throughout in the play, specially in the context of the witches.

Macbeth's insecurities do not end here and of course, he moves on to murder Banquo. And of course, he hires murderers for the same. Here I want to focus on another very subtle difference that is suggested in the text, and this is specially important when we look at Lady Macbeth's character. Where in Duncan's murder Lady Macbeth is in equal partner in crime in the case of Banquo she is told to wait and watch and only applaud the deed. Macbeth has moved on and with this the scale of anarchic violence in the play has escalated it has increased.

The witches are brought in once again, and this time they bring with them the 3 apparitions. Now through these apparitions they predict the cause of events, and again these are veiled in the language of equivocation. So, Macbeth thinks that he cannot be defeated and the witches have already suggested the way in which this is going to happen. This is followed by a show of 8 kings and at the end of it you have Banquo. Now legend has it that Banquo was the ancestor of the Stuart line. This remains in keeping with the witches prediction that Macbeth will be king, but he will not beget kings this of course, historically speaking would have certainly appealed to the new king that is King James in the real time social context right. Which is why I familiarized you with the term kings men earlier.

Now, moving on to the multiplying nature of violence in the play, we can see another instance of blood and gore in the play. This is the brutal murder of Lady Macduff and her son, they are both butchered. Her questioning of this brutality is a very, very useful point of entry for us as readers. I will just read a few lines by Lady Macbeth I will just read a few lines by Lady Macduff. In act 4 scene 2 she says, "wisdom to leave his wife, to leave his babes, his mansion and his titles in a place he loves us not, he wants the natural touch. And a little later she refers to her husband Macduff as a traitor" she is critical of Macduff for having abandoned them. With her son she quits on the word father. She realizes in this world to do harm is laudable and to do good a folly. With their murder we realize that by the end of the play the women have either been killed or like lady

Macbeth they have committed suicide. The children too have either fled or have been killed Malcolm, donalbain and fleance are not there, they have left Scotland.

So, what we see is a barren terrain where the next generation is not there we see a barren terrain where women have no space. Through lady macduff we are compelled to think about the way in which macduff has acquired loyalty. This loyalty is at the cost of his wife and son. Which is why lady macduff is very critical of him and we are made to think about the disturbing consequences of loyalty of macduffs loyalty for his family. If the witches and lady Macbeth challenge the established order, then lady macduff too does the same from within the domestic sphere.

She rejects macduffs claims as he has abandoned them for the larger good of the nation. The ease with which women are subsumed within the idea of the defense of the nation or the larger good of the nation can be seen in the lines spoken by lady macduff. Of course, macduff is the loyal subject, one who proves his loyalty after sacrificing his wife and son. These are ideas that are there in the case of lady macduff both at the ostensible, surface level and at the deeper level. We have discussed the king and state at length in the context of violence. In the context of bravery we have another notion here that of loyalty and what it entails.

What then is the plays relationship to its own time period. This is the question that I raised at the beginning. Let us deliberate a little more on some of these issues. And here I would like to focus on the discussion between Malcolm and macduff to understand the deeper nuances of the play. Macduff urges Malcolm to claim the throne as the rightful heir. Malcolm, he is the eldest son So, he is going to be the next in line. Malcolm in putting Macbeths to test refuses on the ground that he suffers from 2 problems. One avarice and the other (Refer Time: 51:11). However, macduff they consider him to be suitable. But then, Malcolm claims that he lacks justice temperance and so on. At this macduff tells Malcolm that if he lacks what is called and please mark this; the king becoming graces, then he is surely not fit to govern. The nation is going to be miserable with the king like this. Macduffs momentarily rejection of Malcolm is significant.

So, as per the structure of hereditary succession, Malcolm is the rightful heir to the throne he is Duncan's son. However, macduffs response regarding the able monarch puts

the forces of hereditary succession in a new perspective. We first need to ask, in this accepted structure can Duncan's legitimate successor be rejected? Well Macduff's momentary response seems to say so. And Macduff says you are not fit to govern. So, 2 kingly models have been presented to us. One is that of succession, and the other is of acquisition of acquiring the throne through a structure of excess. Now I am going to string together the 2 aspects of this discussion.

So, when we look at Macbeth, Lady Macbeth coming in through the structure of the excess of anarchy violence we also have Malcolm whose claim comes from the fact that he is Duncan's son. And this very, very brief response that is given by Macduff is telling. It makes us think that there are these 2 structures and both have been rejected. In a changing world Shakespeare suggests, I must say that the play suggests that the state and the claims of the king must be based on a more humanitarian vision rather than either the model of succession or acquisition. This is also in keeping with the humanist vision of that period.

The failure of these new forces to be realized in the proper form, the failure of these new forces to gain a certain acceptance in society gives the tragic overtones to the play. And finally, I will just sum up some of the issues that we have dealt with in this play. We looked at the theaters in Shakespeare's time we discussed the historical and political context to the play. We looked at the whole notion of state it is formation and anarchy, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, the porter scene women and their relationship to the state or king rather the kingly order, who is the able king and finally, the ending of the play.

Thank you, I hope you enjoyed this lecture.