Abstract: Malcolm, like James VI and I, occupies a unique position between Scotland and England. His dual roles as king and exile grant him a novel view of the nature of his homeland. Malcolm also serves as a vehicle for cultural influence from England upon Scotland, as is mostly clearly illustrated by his often overlooked relationship with Macduff. This illustration of cultural difference occurs on three interrelated planes: politics, gender, and morality. The critique of Scottish society and its subsequent loss of integrity bolsters England’s own esteem, especially given the way its king, Edward the Confessor, is characterized in the play. In fact, the manner in which the English are portrayed in the play plays a crucial role in the definition of both cultures, and the systematic privileging of the English over the Scottish. Malcolm’s replacement of and improvement upon Macbeth represents a parallel relationship between the Scottish and British cultures. This relationship, instead of being detrimental to James I, works to his advantage as he attempts to fortify his position on the English throne and occasion the “Reuniting of these two mightie, famous, and ancient Kingdomes of England and Scotland, under one Imperiall Crowne.”
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On March 24, 1603, the day after the death of Elizabeth I, the document *A Proclamation, declaring the undoubted Right of our Soveraigne Lord King JAMES, to the Crowne of the Realmes of England, Fraunce, and Ireland*, pronounced the following assertion to the English people:

The Imperiall Crowne of these Realmes aforesaid are now absolutely, wholly, and solely come to the High and Mightie Prince, James the sixt King of Scotland, who is lineally and lawfully descended from the body of Margaret . . . by Law, by Lineall succession and undoubted Right is now become the onely Soveraigne Lord and King of these Imperiall Crownes. (Kinney 21-22)

The “undoubted Right” by which James VI of Scotland lays claim to the throne of England is founded in the system of “Lineall succession,” or primogeniture. A year and a half later, the newly crowned King of England publicly delivered a statement delineating one of his primary goals as king, “A Proclamation concerning the Kings Majesties Stile, of King of Great Britaine, &c.” Notably referring to himself as the King of Great Britain, James’s ambition drives him in an imperialistic and consolidating direction: “Namely the blessed Union, or rather Reuniting of these two mightie, famous, and ancient Kingdomes of England and Scotland, under one Imperiall Crowne” (Kinney 24). James’s heritage, his character, and the nature of both his claim to the throne and his goals upon achieving it vaulted Scotland and its newly privileged relationship to England into the public consciousness. As James began to broaden the definition of England and Britain to include Scotland, the tale of a long-dead tyrant in a backwater country gained unprecedented importance in England. Shakespeare had undoubtedly encountered the story of *Macbeth* while voraciously reading Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* for his English history plays, but it only became culturally relevant upon the advent of James I, whose broader definition of England brought it into contact
and conflict with other countries, principally Scotland. In light of this cultural exchange England was forced to define and redefine itself in relation to its neighbors; *Macbeth*, a play about Scottish history and Scottish kings, serves to render and reinforce English identity. The interplay between Scottish and English culture in the play serves as a form of cultural imperialism—English society is privileged over the barbarous and monstrous Scottish figures in the play. The central figure of this cultural exchange is Malcolm, who serves as a conduit and filter of English influence on Scotland. Malcolm, who flees Scotland for England only to return and conquer his homeland, operates as an agent for cultural influence on Scotland, an influence which operates in three principal avenues—political paradigms, masculine identity, and social values.

Malcolm’s claim to the throne of Scotland parallels James’s claim to the English throne, the crown is Malcolm’s by “the due of birth.”¹ According to the system of “Lineall succession,” Macbeth has unlawfully usurped the crown from Malcolm, whose claim is through his blood relation to his father. This system of inheritance is not deeply ingrained into Scottish culture, however. Malcolm’s father, Duncan, established the system of primogeniture as one of his final regal acts, replacing the extant system of tanistry, and effectively taking the crown away from right under Macbeth’s nose. Tanistry was a system “whereby the succession to an estate or dignity was conferred by election upon the ‘eldest and worthiest’ among the surviving kinsmen of the deceased lord” (*OED*). As cousin to Duncan (I. ii. 24) and as “Valour’s minion” (I. ii. 19), Macbeth satisfies both requirements of the ancient system and legitimately expects to be appointed his successor.

Duncan alters everything when he declares, “We will establish our estate upon / Our eldest, Malcolm” (I. iv. 38). By switching the inheritance paradigm from tanistry to primogeniture and naming Malcolm as his first successor, Duncan effectively terminates any aspirations Macbeth has toward the throne. Holinshed offers a detailed explanation of Macbeth’s reaction:

Mackbeth sore troubled herewith, for he saw by this means his hope sore hindered (where, by the old lawes of the realme, the ordinance was, that if he that was next of bloud unto him should be admitted) he began to take counsell how he might usurpe the kingdome by force, having a just quarell so to doo (as he tooke the matter) for that Duncane did what in him laye to defraud him of all maner of title and claim, which he might in time to come, pretend unto the crowne. (Bullough 496)

Granted, a significant portion of Macbeth’s indignation is a result of his personal and generous interpretation of the facts, but his ambition toward the throne, so inappropriate and destructive under the new system, was not unwarranted under the Scottish “old lawes of the realme.” Although the historical date at which the system of primogeniture diffused into Scotland is difficult to ascertain exactly, the system migrated northward from England and established itself firmly in Scotland, overcoming some resistance, by the 12th century (Britannica Online).

Historically as well as in the play, Malcolm brought from the south other English influences which pervaded Scotland. His first regal act upon assuming the throne at the conclusion of the play is to rename all of his Scottish allies according the English fashion:

We shall not spend a large expense of time,  
Before we reckon with your several loves,  
And make us even with you. My Thanes and kinsmen,  
Henceforth be Earls; the first that ever Scotland  
In such an honor nam’d. (V. ix. 26-30)
Malcolm quickly seeks to settle his debt to his Thanes by magnanimously bestowing upon them “such an honor.” Holinshed confirms that this is the first known reference to earls in Scottish history: “There were the first earles that have been heard of amongst the Scotishmen, (as their histories doo make mention)” (Bullough 506). Implicit in the honor he confers upon them is the value statement that the English system, or at the very least its terminology, is somehow superior to the extant Scottish system. By this reasoning, to be anglicized is to be elevated.

Other historical facts attest to Malcolm’s esteem for England and his cultural influence upon his homeland. For example, the progression of his two wives leads to provocative speculation regarding his personal values. His first wife, Ingibjorg, the daughter of an earl of Orkney of Norse descent, was succeeded by Margaret, who was from a Saxon royal house of England (Britannica Online). Malcolm and Margaret are credited for the infusion of a number of new developments into Scottish culture. One significant way in which this may have occurred was with the introduction of new popular pastimes to Scotland, what are now know Highland Games and Highland Dancing. As legend holds, the Scottish institution was introduced by Malcolm himself (Jarvie 6-7). Another significant change which the historical Malcolm Canmore implemented was to move the very location of the royal court from Perth to the Southern region of Dunfermline (Jarvie 18). England undoubtedly influenced Scotland more strongly over the shorter distance. As Holinshed’s translation of Hector Boece’s description of Scotland shows, these changes deeply affected the Scottish people:

In processe of time . . . and cheeflie about the daies of Malcolme Canmore, our manner began greatlie to change and alter. [Through contact with the English the Scots began] through our dailie trades and conversation with them, to learne also their maners, and therewithall their
language . . . Thereby shortlie after it came also to passe, that the temperance and virtue of our ancestors grew to be judged worthie of small estimation amongst us. (Bullough 507)

Boece recognizes Malcolm’s affect upon Scottish culture, pointing out the linguistic influence in particular, and the degree to which the Scots valued it. The manner in which Malcolm came to power and his accomplishments upon reaching the throne altered the political and cultural fabric of Scotland for all time.

Another manner in which Malcolm differs from and exerts influence on his peers in the play is the way he defines and contradicts the accepted definition of masculinity in the play. Gender and masculinity are not discrete, isolated elements; a culture’s definition of masculinity includes clear emotional, personal, sexual, and familial expectations and responsibilities. Therefore, the scrutiny of a culture’s definition of gender serves as a window to that culture’s general attitudes; gender study expands into ethnic study. In Early Modern England, the web of emotion, gender, and ethnicity was just beginning to take shape, and an instrumental work in its development was Thomas Wright’s *The Passions of the Mind in General*, first published in 1601 and then revised in 1604. Wright undertook a systematic investigation of the human mind written in the English language focusing on the English people. Wright, relying heavily the work of Thomas Aquinas, found that two major factors influenced the psychological makeup of an individual: gender and nationality. He writes, “there are certain general causes which move our souls to sundry passions” (Wright 117); as he displays the differences between young and old men and women, he reveals that age and gender are first among them. Nationality also plays a role, however. In his preface and elsewhere, he suggests that the passions vary among the citizens of different countries and climes; location profoundly
impacts emotion (Wright 84). In fact, Wright would address the qualities of each nation individually, were they not so vastly different that they exceeded the confines of his work:

I might discourse over Flemings, Frenchmen, Italians, Polans, Germans, Scottishmen, Irishmen, Welshmen, and Englishmen, explicating their national inclinations, good or bad; but every one of these exacteth a whole Chapter, and perhaps some of them, more proud then wise, would be offended with the truth. (Wright 121-122)

Each citizen is subject to the “national inclinations” of his or her country; one’s emotional life is intimately linked with one’s civic and political affiliations.

Wright’s treatise was widely read in London, and there is significant circumstantial evidence that Shakespeare himself was directly aware of Wright’s ideas. First, the production of their texts were strikingly similar. The Roman font in which The Passions was printed matches exactly the font used to print at least five of Shakespeare’s quartos, and Valentine Sims, who published The Passions, is suspected of publishing and distributing Shakespeare’s earlier quartos (Stiebel 7). Furthermore, the two men both shared an admiration for Henry Wriothesley, the Earl of Southampton. In 1593 and again in 1594, Shakespeare dedicated the poems “Venus and Adonis” and then “The Rape of Lucrece” to “the right honourable Henry Wriothesley” (Norton Shakespeare 607, 641). In 1604, Wright dedicated his work to the very same “Right Honourable” patron (Wright 79). This accretion of evidence suggests that Shakespeare may have read Wright’s work, and Wright’s widespread influence on the London intellectual class attests to the fact that Early Modern English culture established a connection between emotion, gender, and ethnicity.
Macbeth and Lady Macbeth establish the baseline definition of masculinity in the play: to be male is to be, in the words of the second apparition, “bloody, bold, and resolute” (IV. i. 79). The archetype of manhood which Lady Macbeth uses to goad her husband is that of a cold-blooded, decisive, and cruel murderer similar to the individuals Macbeth himself hires to carry out Banquo’s murder. As Lady Macbeth says, “When you durst do it, then you were a man” (I. vii. 49); a true man commits decisive action, often of a bloody or distasteful nature. This definition of what it means to be masculine is the driving paradigm of the play, and much of Macbeth’s anxiety in the first few acts of the play concerns not only his conscience, but also his failure to live up to the ideal established by his wife and his culture. Malcolm—and to a lesser degree, Macduff—establish a paradigm contrary to the one to which Macbeth ascribes. There are a number of characters in the play who never kill anyone, but in most cases it is not for a lack of trying. What distinguishes Malcolm is that he never wants to kill anyone. He seems to be above actual participation in any of the bloodshed; Macduff acts in his stead.

Macduff’s experience with Malcolm, however, tempers his bloodthirstiness and allows him to transcend Macbeth’s model. Whereas Macbeth attempts to slaughter everything in his path, at the end of the play, the vengeful Macduff, haunted by his murdered wife and children, refuses to kill anyone besides Macbeth himself:

If thou be’st slain, and with no stroke of mine,  
My wife and children’s ghosts will haunt me still. 
I cannot strike at wretched Kernes, whose arms 
Are hir’d to bear their staves. 

(V. vii. 15-18)

Macbeth’s hired mercenaries do not deserve Macduff’s fury; he reserves it for one alone.

---

2 See Asp, Kimbrough, and Pearlman for the articulation and consequences of this widely accepted definition of manhood and manliness in the play.
Macbeth, by ordering the murder of Macduff’s family, induces Macduff’s tremendous grief and fury, which ultimately translate into the desire to wreak vengeance upon the person responsible. Malcolm influences the transformation process in a significant way, however. Macduff discovers the fate of his family while in Malcolm’s company in England, where they hope to establish a liberating army with English assistance. When Macduff fled Scotland, he did not take the time to say farewell to his family, which strikes Malcolm as peculiar:

Why in that rawness left you wife and child
(Those precious motives, those strong knots of love),
Without leave-taking?

(IV. iii. 26-28)

Malcolm’s query is far more gentle than Lady Macduff’s condemnation of her husband’s behavior in the previous scene: “the flight / So runs against all reason” (IV. ii. 13-14). Macduff’s unexplained flight leads Lady Macduff to the following conclusion: “He loves us not: / He wants the natural touch” (IV. ii. 8-9). Even a wren, she says, will defend its nest from a threat, but her husband flees. Fatherhood, in the natural world, requires that the father stands by his family, but Macduff fails his family, and is thereby denounced as unnatural. Lady Macduff’s interpretation seems to be supported by Holinshed, although Holinshed introduces a political element to his flight: “Makduffe, to avoid perill of life, purposed with himselfe to passe into England, to procure Malcolm Cammore to claime the crowne of Scotland” (Bullough 500). This unnatural decision appeared to be within the bounds of the responsibilities of a Scottish man, however. As a powerful man who cared about his country, he needed to depart for England to prepare to liberate Scotland from Macbeth, so he decided to privilege his country over his defenseless family. The consequences of his decision are devastating, however, and Macduff’s discovery, which
Shakespeare delays until he can be with Malcolm when he finds out, generates in him the fury to slaughter Macbeth.

Malcolm plays an instrumental role in channeling Macduff’s fury into action. Malcolm first encourages Macduff, upon receipt of the terrible news, to “Give sorrow words; the grief, that does not speak, / Whispers the o’er-fraught heart, and bids it break” (IV. iii. 209-210). He encourages Macduff to express his feelings, for stifled emotion will erode him from within. Malcolm’s sensitive suggestion falls on deaf ears, for although Macduff says he must “feel it as a man” (IV. iii. 221), he refuses to express himself as Malcolm suggests, to “play the woman with mine eyes, / And braggart with my tongue” (IV. iii. 230-231). Instead, Macduff quells his emotions and turns, fittingly, to action, which Malcolm has chosen as his second mode of advice: “Let’s make med’cines of our great revenge, / To cure this deadly grief” (IV. iii. 214-215). When Macduff accepts Malcolm’s advice, Malcolm replies, “This tune goes manly” (IV. iii. 235). As a killer and a stoic, Macduff fulfills the qualifications of what it means to be a Scottish man, and Malcolm sends him off to the battlefield with a morsel of verbal reinforcement as a coach might send a lineman into a football game. And like any true coach, Malcolm remains on the sidelines to watch the action unfold.

In one of the few essays directly addressing the relationship between Malcolm and Macduff, E. Pearlman tries to resolve Malcolm’s lack of participation in battle by suggesting that Malcolm and Macduff represents two “complementary” parts to a single successor figure; each part serves a specific purpose (8). Macduff carries out the slaying of Macbeth while Malcolm avoids all involvement in the physical doing of the deed. Pearlman argues, “Macduff replicates Macbeth’s violence, while Malcolm transcends it”
Like the statement, “Macduff is a proper foil for Macbeth, but represents no improvement nor advance; Malcolm brings promise of a new and restored world” (9), this is a perceptive, but overly simple, reading of the situation. Malcolm is indeed the successor to the throne, but he has no competition; Macduff holds no pretensions to it whatsoever. Macduff earns our sympathy by means of the nobility and integrity for which Malcolm commends him, but he is little more than an instrument which Malcolm wields. Macduff knows his place; he is the champion for his country, but he is not its ruler, rather it is Malcolm who is “the truest issue of [Scotland’s] throne” (IV. iii. 106). Macduff is well within his right to depose the tyrannical Macbeth, but he must pass the crown on to its rightful heir, at least according to the system of primogeniture. Under the system of tanistry Macduff may have aspired to the throne, but in the current system, which Macduff accepts, Malcolm is the one true successor.

Malcolm’s claim to the throne is through his blood-line, but to be truly Scotland’s liberator and rightful ruler, he must also deserve the throne on the basis of his superior virtue. If Malcolm also achieves the throne through merit, then he can truly save his people, and he will also satisfy the demands of tanistry. It is of utmost importance that Malcolm represent admirable qualities, even if many of them are inherently English. Malcolm promises a new and improved world, not a restored one, and Macduff’s transformation illustrates that improvement. Macduff reflects Malcolm’s positive influence—and represents an improvement over Macbeth’s senseless violence—by sparing the lives of any obstacles he encounters in his single-minded pursuit of his enemy. Malcolm has spurred him on to pursue Macbeth alone, and the surviving Kernes can credit their lives to Malcolm and Macduff’s discussion on virtue.
Macduff sought Malcolm out to gather a liberating army which would depose Macbeth and establish, or so he hopes, Malcolm in his rightful place as king of Scotland. Shakespeare adopts the ensuing scene, in which they discuss the nature of tyranny and just authority, directly from Holinshed’s historical account. Notably, however, in Holinshed’s version of the narrative, this conversation takes place over ten years after Macbeth took power; in Shakespeare’s account, it takes place within a matter of weeks. Holinshed’s intervening ten years were characterized by “good peace and tranquillitie” (Bullough 497) under Macbeth’s just rule. Shakespeare undoubtedly excised these years for the sake of dramatic efficiency, but another consequence is the demonization of Macbeth. According to Shakespeare, the kingdom was content under Duncan’s rule (a claim Holinshed does not make). and Macbeth condemned it to misery, which conveniently sets the stage for its prodigal liberator.

Malcolm tells Macduff that the person to save Scotland must possess the “king-becoming graces,” as he defines them:

As Justice, Verity, Temp’rance, Stableness, Bounty, Perseverance, Mercy, Lowliness, Devotion, Patience, Courage, Fortitude.

(IV. iii. 91-94)

At first, Malcolm professes to embody none of these virtues. Rather, in both Holinshed’s and Shakespeare’s renditions, Malcolm claims to be the epitome of two of the most insidious and destructive of sins, especially when found in a ruler: lechery and avarice. Surprisingly, this does not seem to deter Macduff significantly. To Malcolm’s self-professed boundless voluptuousness, he replies, “We have willing dames enough” (IV. iii. 73), and to his claims of avarice he contends, “Scotland hath foisons to fill up your will” (IV. iii. 88). By allowing Malcolm to indulge himself Scotland’s bounty, Macduff
seems to suggest that these sins are permissible in a king, a suggestion Malcolm’s more refined tastes find unacceptable. Macduff’s allowance of a degenerate to assume Scotland’s crown appears to be absolutely incomprehensible; one would think Macduff would be better suited to ruling the country.

Macduff grants Malcolm his indulgences with the understanding that they are his only faults; these two sins are “portable, / With other graces weigh’d” (IV. iii. 89-90). He implies that personal qualities carry either a positive or negative valence, and Macduff implies that they can cancel each other out; a bevy of virtues will outweigh a handful of foibles. This process transforms Malcolm into an acceptable candidate for king, especially when he is compared to the unredeemable Macbeth, who is “smacking of every sin / That has a name” (IV. iii. 59-60). This doctrine of relativity among rulers may seem unusual, but it is widely accepted; Malcolm uses this tool to carry out his test on Macduff:

black Macbeth
    Will seem as pure as snow; and the poor State
    Esteem him as a lamb, being compar’d
    With my confineless harms.

(IV. iii. 52-55)

Since Macduff cannot fathom anything blacker than Macbeth, Malcolm can push very far before Macduff will see him as anything but a shade of gray. As a matter of fact, Malcolm himself is a pure as the snow, and when he reveals his ruse to Macduff he depicts himself as absolutely free of fault and qualified to be the perfect ruler: “here abjure / The taints and blames I laid upon myself, / For strangers to my nature” (IV. iii. 123-125). He possesses a just nature which destines him to be a good ruler. The manner
in which he portrays himself reveals his values and further illustrates his definition of a just ruler:

I am yet
Unknown to woman; never was forsworn;
Scarcely have coveted what was mine own;
At no time broke my faith: would not betray
The Devil to his fellow; and delight
No less in truth, than life: my first false speaking
Was this upon myself.

(IV. iii. 125-131)

There are three qualities which make Malcolm deserve to be the king of Scotland; he is chaste, he is not covetous, and the only lie he has ever told was the one with which he slandered himself. These qualities oppose Macbeth’s, and his unadulterated goodness makes Macbeth seem even more evil by comparison.

Relativity illuminates the play on an even larger scale. Shakespeare omits the ten years of just rule which Holinshed grants him in order to make Macbeth seem blacker and more unappealing, making anything else more desirable in comparison. Malcolm benefits when contrasted with Macbeth’s truly fathomless evil. Furthermore, the English also benefit from a comparison with their sinful and barbaric neighbors to the North.

The portrayal of the English by the Scottish and relative to the Scottish is essential to this reading of the play. Everything the Scottish are can be viewed in relation to the English, and any act of acculturation carries with it a value judgment. The anglicization of the Scottish through Malcolm can be a sanctified event so long as the Scottish are viewed in a negative light but the English are viewed in a positive one. Moreover, a positive view of England among the Scottish should fortify positive opinion of the England at home.
The first direct reference to the English in the play occurs in the Porter’s speech in Act II, scene iii. One of his imaginary arrivals at the gate is “an English tailor come hither for stealing out of a French hose” (II. iii. 13-14). The English are associated with tailors, a trade that requires some skill and refinement. This refinement may be related to Malcolm’s avoidance of any direct combat; the English seem to use their minds, and they use their hands for delicate tasks. The tailor does end up in hell, however, as the consequence of a French fashion faux pas. Kermode, in his footnote, suggests that the tailor and his peer end up in hell because they were “caught out by overreaching themselves” (Kermode 59). The English, it seems, may be guilty of excess and ambition, but not in the way the Scottish are. Macbeth, near the end of the play, condemns his subjects and the English in a single phrase: “Then fly, false Thanes, / And mingle with English epicures” (V. iii. 7-8). Macbeth correctly deems his Thanes to be false, they do indeed betray him; soon they will no longer even be known as Thanes. Two meanings of the word “epicure” can illuminate Macbeth’s opinion of the English. The first is, “One who gives himself up to sensual pleasure, esp. to eating; a glutton, sybarite” (OED). The Oxford English Dictionary actually cites this very line as an example of this definition applied in literature, which could terminate any further discussion, but a second definition reveals a more complicated situation: “One who cultivates a refined taste for the pleasures of the table; one who is choice and dainty in eating and drinking” (OED). The English possess a notable appreciation for pleasing food and drink, but the degree to which they enjoy it, and what one should think of that appreciation, remains to be seen. Although Macbeth criticizes the English for their affinity for food, it is preferable to the Scottish thirst for blood which Macbeth represents. Coupled with the English tailor, the
English epicure establishes a Scottish vision of the English as a refined, civilized people who may have a tendency to take things too far, a fault with which Macbeth should be very familiar.

Two English-born characters appear on stage: the liberating English general Siward and his enthusiastic son, Young Siward. Shakespeare adopted these characters and their role in the play from Holinshed, but not from his Scotland chronicles. Rather, Shakespeare interpolates this story from Book VIII of Holinshed’s *The Chronicles of England*. Young Siward is the first person to attempt to kill Macbeth during the siege on his castle. Macbeth dispatches him quickly with the pithy remark, “Thou wast born of woman” (V. vii. 11). When Rosse, yet again the bearer of bad tidings, tells Siward of his son’s death, Siward deliberately asks whether he received his mortal wounds on the front or the back of his body. Rosse tells him that he was wounded on the front, and that “like a man he died” (V. ix. 9). Siward, as Holinshed tells it, “greatlie rejoised thereat, to heare that he died so manfullie” (Bullough 507). The English general celebrates his son’s heroic demise in the line of duty; his young son did not back away from his challenge, even though it killed him. Young Siward’s death had meaning; he died as part of an ultimately successful venture to overcome a tyrant. Furthermore, his father introduces a new system of values by deeming him “God’s soldier” (V. ix. 13). The battle was part of a crusade against Macbeth, who, especially near the end of the play, is characterized in demonic terms by Malcolm, Macduff, and Young Siward. Pearlman’s description of *Macbeth* as “a pagan tale onto which Shakespeare has grafted Christian myth” (6) excessively privileges Shakespeare’s role in dramatizing Holinshed’s tale, for most of the material to which Pearlman refers—Malcolm’s virtues, Duncan’s murder, King
Edward—was already included in the *Chronicles*. The English and Anglicized figures do carry with them Christian values. Malcolm maintains a faith in angels (IV. iii. 22), but so does the Thane of Lenox, who prays for an angel to bring “a swift blessing” (III. vi. 47) in the person of Malcolm to deliver them. Malcolm, in a gesture of sensitivity unique to him, offers to mourn personally for Young Siward: “He’s worth more sorrow, / And that I’ll spend for him” (V. ix. 16-17). Siward, known as the oldest and best soldier in Christendom (IV. iii. 192), replies: “He’s worth no more; / They say he parted well and paid his score: / And so, God be with him!” (V. ix. 17-19). Malcolm, in a gesture similar to his treatment of Macduff regarding the loss of his family, believes that the young fallen soldier merits a greater degree of grief, but his father disagrees with him. Malcolm’s silence suggests his consent, most likely because he accepts that Young Siward’s loss was for a righteous reason. He died according to a novel definition of valor; because he died bravely and for a just purpose, his loss should be celebrated.

The most important representation of an English person is that of its king, Saint Edward the Confessor. Although he never actually appears on stage, he plays a crucial role in the relationship between Scotland and England. It is to Edward whom Malcolm and Macduff go to seek the power to liberate Scotland from its tyrant; he is called upon to set things right. Young Siward died while serving God, but he also died while serving Edward. When referring to Edward, even in Scotland, the characters use the adjectives “pious” (III. vi. 27), “holy” (III. vi. 30), and “good” (IV. iii. 147), in direct contrast with the words used to describe Macbeth. Edward is further described as acting “with such grace” (III. vi. 27) and “full of grace” (IV. iii. 159). The word “grace” is used in every discussion of just and right rule; recall Malcolm’s phrase “king-becoming graces” when
he indirectly describes the qualities of the ideal king to Macduff. When Malcolm himself becomes king of Scotland, he says that he will perform his regal acts “by the grace of Grace” (V. ix. 38). The word carries with it a religious tone, and although granting excessive weight to capitalization is a risky enterprise, Malcolm certainly regards the second “grace” as a figure or agent of some sort; he very well could have said, as other kings have, “by the grace of God.” This agent is of divine origin, and it is the source of authority for all of the English kings, including the anglicized one, Malcolm.

Shakespeare includes a description of Edward, adopted from Holinshed’s *Chronicles of England*, which endows him with powers of divine origin. The Doctor describes the nature of Edward’s healing touch: “Such sanctity hath Heaven given his hand, they presently amend” (IV. iii. 144-145). Malcolm describes this “miraculous work” (IV. iii. 147) to Macduff:

> How he solicits Heaven,  
> Himself best knows; but strangely-visited people,  
> All swoln and ulcerous, pitiful to the eye,  
> The mere despair of surgery, he cures.

(IV. iii. 149-152)

In addition to this power to heal, the king of England possesses, according to Malcolm, “a heavenly gift of prophecy” (IV. iii. 157). The nature of his divine powers are in direct counterpoint to those of Macbeth, who can bring only harm, and whose dark prophecies are delivered by the witches. The English king is a holy healer, whereas the Scottish king is a strictly evil and demonic tyrant deposed by a virgin prince who receives his power from the English king and operates “by the grace of Grace.” Malcolm represents an improvement over Macbeth through religious influence; Malcolm was centuries early to be Anglican, but he does liberate Scotland by means of his anglicized religious beliefs.
In his account, Malcolm hints that audiences would have been aware of the healing touch which Edward possessed:

and ‘tis spoken,
To the succeeding royalty he leaves
The healing benediction.

(IV. iii. 154-156)

As Holinshed tells it, Edward “left that vertue as it were a portion of inheritance unto his successors the kings of this realme” (Bullough 508). The healing touch is a form of royal inheritance which Edward grants to his descendants, undoubtedly through the system of primogeniture. Edward is established as a model ruler; Malcolm learns what a king should be from spending time in his court, and he applies that knowledge as soon as he takes the throne. Naming the Thanes Earls, then, becomes an effort to make his court more ideal, and more like Edward’s. Edward establishes a precedent which Malcolm is to follow, but its influence is even more far-reaching. Edward instructs another Scottish king whose influence straddles two countries: James VI. Centuries later, James, in an effort to establish his legitimacy on the throne, deliberately adopted Edward as his predecessor. Edward, the canonized king, is perhaps the only one who has any legitimate claim to James’s theory of the divine right of kings as illustrated in his Basilikon Doron (McDonald 305). In this light, that he was invested in 1604 with Edward’s robe and crown and that he performed the Royal Touch—even though he didn’t believe in it—acquire new importance (Kinney 49). James claimed his authority not only through a mythical blood relation to Banquo, but also through a symbolic connection to Edward which he deliberately and publicly created. Furthermore, Malcolm’s purity and suitability for the throne give the Scottish kings greater authority at home and abroad, especially if their instruction took place in England, and that English influence began to
permeate the country centuries ago. If the Scottish are more English than they first appear, and James can claim a heritage in Edward through both England and Scotland, then James’s ambition to unite the two crowns may be justified.

James I found himself the very unenviable position of trying to unite two countries under to reign, and he sought legitimacy by means of a number of different avenues. His effort to define his authority reflects a fundamental effort on the part of England as a whole to articulate its political and cultural identity. James I’s history as the king of Scotland, and his role as a cultural ambassador, brought Scotland to the fore and forced England to compare itself to its Northern neighbor. The comparison was a favorable one; barbarity, degeneracy, and depravity characterize Scotland and its ruler, and its only hope for peace is a prince who learned how to be a king from his stay in England. By appropriating and applying English values in Scotland, Malcolm privileges his adopted country over his own. The anglicization which Malcolm instigates establishes England as a model, and considers the qualities of the English to be morally and politically superior to those native to his country. This cultural migration works to James I’s advantage; by proving English influence in Scotland, he can establish himself more firmly as an English king of Scottish heritage. The arrangement glorifies England and its heritage, particularly over Scotland’s, but that too is to his political advantage. Cultural relativism also insidiously exalts English society; the worse the Scottish look, the better the English feel, especially if it was their society which politically and culturally liberated it from a tyrant’s oppression. Malcolm, like James I, bridged the gap between both cultures; the liminal figures served as vehicles of cultural influence. In this rendition of the relationship, which undoubtedly reflects both a great deal of national
pride and a limited vision of the real situation, the English culture dominates the Scottish
culture entirely. This imbalance attests to the superiority of the English as portrayed in
the texts of the time. Furthermore, the Scottish king benefits from inheriting English
influence through his Scottish heritage. Illustrating the now ancient anglicization of
Scotland actually assuages the perception of the Scottish as aliens, and it supports James
I’s claim that he is not different after all, and that he is fully qualified to fulfill his new
role. The rendition also privileges James I and his newly adopted country, for when
compared to black Macbeth, the English people have no choice but to esteem their king
and their country as a lamb.
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