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ABSTRACT

This article examines the portrayal of Macbeth and Malcolm Canmore as illegitimately born men in Andrew of Wyntoun’s Orygynale Cronikyl. Portraying two kings of Scots as illegitimate sons was an unusual choice and was one that had textual and narrative implications. Wyntoun increased the role and political agency of Macduff of Fife in the narrative to create an eleventh-century precedent that explained the political career of Robert Stewart, Duke of Albany and Earl of Fife and Menteith, as a regent for three Scottish kings. In order to make sense of Macbeth and Malcolm’s portrayals, it is crucial to differentiate between different types of illegitimacy in early fifteenth-century Scotland, as well as identify how each type of illegitimacy impacted issues of good kingship and magnate-noble relations in the text. Although illegitimacy did not outright prevent Malcolm and Macbeth from becoming kings, it did explain Macbeth’s descent into tyranny and Malcolm Canmore’s political impotence. In both cases, the intervention of Macduff of Fife as a kingmaking figure and as representative of the community of the realm of Scotland guaranteed the proper functioning of governance in a manner similar to how Albany served as regent in Scotland at the time.
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Introduction

In 2016, Rhiannon Purdie published one of the few studies of the “Macbeth narrative” found in Andrew of Wyntoun’s *Orygynale Cronikyl* (1406 x 24), the earliest extant full history of Scotland written in the vernacular.1 Spanning an impressive 30,000 lines and written in octosyllabic meter, the *Orygynale Cronikyl* remains influential in shaping the narrative of eleventh-century Scottish historical events while paradoxically being understudied as a historical source. Remarkably, the unusual narrative of eleventh-century Scottish events presented in the *Cronikyl*, Purdie was, as many scholars, puzzled by the chronicler’s depiction of Malcolm III Canmore (r. 1058–1093) as an illegitimate son of King Duncan and the miller of Forteviot’s daughter (*Cronikyl*, VI: 17).2 Malcolm’s predecessor, Macbeth (r. 1040–1057/8) was also portrayed in the narrative as an illegitimate son of King Duncan’s sister and the devil himself disguised as a handsome knight (*Cronikyl*, VI: 18). The predominance of illegitimate-born monarchs is striking considering the implications a bastard birth might have on noblemen’s ability to inherit property or kingdoms. But as Purdie observed, Wyntoun’s decision to attribute an illegitimate birth to these kings reflects fifteenth-century politics, where some of the predominant noblemen in Scotland—including Robert Stewart, duke of Albany and earl of Fife and Menteith—demonstrated that an illegitimate birth was not an impediment to acquiring political support and power.3 By

---

1 Andrew of Wyntoun, *The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun Printed on Parallel Pages from the Cottonian and Wemyss Mss., with the Variants of the Other Texts*, ed. F. J. Amours, Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh: Printed for the Society by W. Blackwood and sons, 1903). Citations from this edition will be included in the text as *Cronikyl*, with the manuscript they come from (either Wemyss or Cotton manuscripts) when appropriate.
3 Purdie, “Rhetoric and the Re-Shaping of History,” 58; Emily Wingfield, “‘Qwhen Alexander Our Kynge Was Dede’: Kingship and Good
interrelating the fortunes and stories of Macbeth and Malcolm Canmore, Purdie argued, Wyntoun reimagined the eleventh-century Scottish past to promote the Canmore dynasty to a fifteenth-century audience. The *Orygynale Cronikyl*’s portrayal of Malcolm Canmore and Macbeth testifies to how engrained the image of the often-called ‘Canmore dynasty’ as forefathers of a more modern Scottish kingdom was in the late-medieval Scottish psyche.

While Wyntoun’s “reimagining” of the mid-eleventh century does highlight the importance of Malcolm’s reign as the foundation of a modernized Scottish kingdom, the young prince’s illegitimacy in the text does raise some important questions that remain unanswered, as Purdie observed. Portraying Malcolm Canmore as illegitimate did little to enhance the prince’s political agency, which, contrary to what the reader would have expected, was substantially diminished throughout the narrative. Seen as a founding dynasty, Malcolm’s illegitimacy also threatened the legitimacy of his descendants and, by association, of their successors, the Stewarts, who had only come to royal power in Scotland in the late fourteenth century.

---


5 Purdie, “Rhetoric and the Reshaping of History,” 52.
century. Even more puzzling was Wyntoun’s continuous exaltation of Malcolm’s virtues as a man and prince despite his illegitimacy, contrasting sharply with his condemnation of Macbeth’s tyrannical reign. Wyntoun’s version of the Macbeth narrative also deviated from the earliest extant version found in the Chronica gentis Scotorum (c. 1360s x 80s), formerly attributed to John of Fordun. The differences between the versions of this narrative in the Cronikyl and Chronica might be explained by the local character of Wyntoun’s sources and political interests. Therefore, to understand why Wyntoun portrayed Malcolm and Macbeth as illegitimate-born kings, this article examines how local, Fife-centric contemporary politics influenced the portrayal of the Macbeth narrative in the Orygynale Cronikyl. Instead of seeing the Orygynale Cronikyl’s Macbeth narrative as a reiteration of the politics of dynasty creation and kingly power, as Purdie has argued, this article suggests instead that Wyntoun’s reimagining of Malcolm Canmore and Macbeth as kings of illegitimate birth served the purpose of enhancing the political power of the “community of the realm” of Scotland in the narrative, as represented by the figure of Macduff of Fife.

Macduff’s political agency is not only rooted in contemporary ideas of royal-magnate relations in Scotland but also reflects the political importance of Robert Stewart (1340–1420) as earl of Fife and Menteith, Duke of Albany, and later, Governor of Scotland. Politically intrepid and highly ambitious, Albany had a prodigious political career that, for a large portion of his adult life, saw him at

---

7 John of Fordun, Johannis de Fordun Chronica gentis Scotorum, ed. W. F. Skene (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1871). This edition will be cited in the text when necessary as “Chronica.”


the helm of the Stewart dynasty as regent for three Stewart kings: his father, Robert II (r. 1371–90), his brother Robert III (r. 1390–1406), and his nephew James I (r. 1424–37) during his imprisonment in England. Wyntoun’s positive appraisal of Albany’s leadership in the Cronikyl suggests his far-reaching political influence and popularity among nobles and clergy alike. This is especially evident in the fact that the Orygynale Cronikyl was commissioned by Sir John Wemyss of Leuchars and Kincaldrum, lord Reres, constable of St Andrews Castle, and a retainer of Albany in the early fifteenth century. By demonstrating that Malcolm’s and Macbeth’s illegitimacy served the purpose of turning Macduff into the more central character of the narrative, Wyntoun highlighted how the main precondition to becoming king of Scots in the narrative was to have Macduff’s political support—a reflection of the magnitude of Albany’s control over Scotland’s affairs. In fact, Wyntoun’s political awareness and knowledge, influenced by his relationship with his patron, Sir John Wemyss, impacted his authorial and editorial decisions as he composed and revised the Cronikyl.

How is Wyntoun’s illegitimate rendition of Scottish kings in the Cronikyl connected to Albany, and how exactly does it affect the narrative’s reduction of princely agency? First, it is necessary to draw a distinction between types of illegitimacy as defined by canon law and within a Scottish context. These distinctions influenced the depictions of Malcolm and Macbeth as different types of monarchs. Canon law was first used to regulate marriage during the Gregorian reforms, but it was not until the late twelfth and, perhaps, the early thirteenth century that the Church presented a cohesive definition of what illegitimacy meant. Furthermore, canon law was initially concerned with regulating sexual unions, not with dictating dynastic rules of inheritance. Sinful conception guaranteed that offspring would inherit the sins of their parents, a discourse that made its way into later medieval tracts, such as the Glanvill (1187 x 89) in England.

11 Boardman, The Early Stewart Kings, 144–5.
or, in Scotland, the *Regiam Majestatem* (early 14th c.). An important distinction to make here is between two main types of illegitimate offspring which, according to Susan Marshall, in late medieval Scotland included: natural children, who were born into a long-standing secular marriage or relationship, and spurious children, who were born out of a short-lived sexual liaison. Since the belief children inherited the sins of their parents was persistent in medieval canon law, a child born out of wedlock was seen as a potential immoral adult depending on the sinfulness of the parents’ union at the time of conception. Based on the relationship between illegitimacy and sinfulness, Wyntoun carefully crafted the illegitimacies of Macbeth and Malcolm in ways that suited the political interests of his Fife-based audience, showing the influence of contemporary canonical ideas and political awareness on authorial intent.

---

13 The *Regiam Majestatem* incorporates the *Glanvill*, the *Summa super rubricus decretalium* of Godofredus de Treno, and other early medieval Scottish laws, and was compiled during the reign of Robert I as legal propaganda during the early tenure of his kingship. See Alice Taylor, *The Shape of the State of Medieval Scotland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 124–17, for a brief discussion of the development of the *Regiam Majestatem*.


15 Marshall, “Illegitimacy,” 17–8; McDougall, *Royal Bastards*, 18, 23–4, and 27–8. McDougall explains that in ancient Roman texts, *spurius* implied that the child was born out of adultery or incest, and thus excluded from legitimization and inheritance. Meanwhile, Justinian decreed that *naturalis* was the child born out of parents who could potentially marry at some point. Isidore of Seville differentiated between the *nothus*, the child of a low-status woman, and the *spurius*, the child of a woman of noble birth. During the high Middle Ages, these definitions shifted often depending on the author or canonist using each term.

Modifying the portrayals of Malcolm and Macbeth as illegitimate not only impacted both characters’ roles in the Cronikyl, but also permitted Wyntoun to reinterpret and increase Macduff’s political agency in the narrative. As explained previously, the earliest surviving version of the Macbeth narrative is found in the Chronica gentis Scotorum; however, the most recent editor of the Cronikyl, F. J. Amours, and Dauvit Broun have both argued that Wyntoun did not base his text on the Chronica, but possibly on the Chronica’s earlier source. Nonetheless, because the Chronica’s sources no longer survive, the only feasible way to understand Wyntoun’s reinterpretation of Macduff’s role is to compare his version of events to the version contained in the Chronica gentis Scotorum, a comparison that can be found in Appendix A. The appendix shows that Wyntoun made changes to specific events in the plot to increase Macduff’s political agency and importance in the Cronikyl. Overall, both Wyntoun and Fordun follow the basic structure of the Macbeth narrative with some key exceptions. In the Chronica, Malcolm and his brother Donald Bane are the sons of King Duncan and a cousin of Siward, earl of Northumbria, and Duncan later placed Malcolm in charge of Cumbria during his reign (Chronica, IV: 44). In the Cronikyl, Malcolm’s mother was the miller of Forteviot’s daughter, and Malcolm had two other legitimate half-brothers; furthermore, Malcolm himself had no political role in the kingdom during or after Duncan’s death until he was crowned king (Cronikyl, VI: Ch. 117). Macbeth’s conception story also differs between the chronicles: in the Chronica, Macbeth was descended from a family of conspirators
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against the kings of Scots (IV: 45), while the *Cronikyl* portrayed Macbeth as King Duncan’s nephew, the son of the king’s sister and the devil (VI: 118). Furthermore, Wyntoun stressed how the devil kept in contact with the woman after their sexual encounter; in fact, it was the devil who prophesied to Duncan’s sister that Macbeth would rise in the kingdom (VI: 118). After Macbeth usurped the throne, Malcolm and Donald Bane stayed in Scotland for a couple of years before fleeing, according to Fordun’s *Chronica* (IV: 45). However, according Wyntoun’s *Cronikyl* (VI: 118), Malcolm and his brothers left the kingdom for England. In both accounts Malcolm was sought out by Macduff of Fife to return to the kingdom (*Chronica*, V: 1; *Cronikyl*, VI: 118); however, Macduff’s role is more limited in the *Chronica*. In comparison, Macduff exhibits greater agency in influencing the kingdom’s politics in the *Cronikyl*.

**Conceiving Malcolm Canmore and Macbeth in the Orygynale Cronikyl**

Wyntoun’s understanding of contemporary ideas of illegitimacy is most apparent in the subtle yet important editorial changes made to the story of Malcolm Canmore’s “get” or conception in the three different recensions of the *Orygynale Cronikyl*: the Wemyss, the Royal, and the Cotton manuscripts.\(^1\) One of the most complex aspects of studying the *Cronikyl* is that the surviving manuscripts represent three recensions, yet all extant manuscripts postdate the

---

\(^1\) The *Orygynale Cronikyl* survives in nine manuscripts that postdate the dates of composition. They are: Wemyss MS (ca. 1500 x 1550), Royal MS 17 D XX (c. 1475 x 1499), Cotton MS Nero D XI (1450 x 1499), Lansdowne MS (c. 1500s), St Andrews MS (ca. 1500 x 1550), Advocates’ Library 19.2.3 (First Edinburgh MS, ca. 1480), Advocates’ Library 19.2.4 (Second Edinburgh MS, 1550 x 1599), Harleian MS (ca. 1600s), and Auchinleck MS (end of fifteenth century). For an analysis of the surviving manuscripts, see Amours, “Introduction,” *Cronikyl*, xlvii–lxvii. Amours also cited information from David Laing “Appendix II: Notices of the Various Known Manuscripts of the Cronikyl,” in Wyntoun, *Cronykil*, v. III, xvi–xxxv. For an analysis of the St Andrews MS, which combines the Wemyss and Cotton recensions, see W. A. Craigie, “The St. Andrew MS. of Wyntoun’s Chronicle,” *Anglia* 20 (1898): 363–80.
composition dates for the text. William Craigie established that the Wemyss manuscript (c. 1500 x 1550) represents the earliest recension of the Cronikyl, and the Royal (c. 1475 x 1499) and Cotton (1450 x 1499) manuscripts represent the second and third recensions, respectively. F. J. Amours, the editor of the edition of the Orygynal Cronikyl used for this study, suggests that the recensions were created more or less simultaneously by Wyntoun himself during the regency of the Duke of Albany, and thus they represent an excellent example of the editorial processes used to adapt each recension as appropriate to the author’s aims and concerns.19 The Wemyss manuscript is the most distinctive out of the recensions, while the Royal manuscript contains a brief account of the death of David, duke of Rothesay, heir to the Scottish crown and the Duke of Albany’s nephew, along with a laudatory passage on Albany. Some manuscripts include an eulogy of Albany (“Resembyll he couth a mychty King,” [Cronikyl, ed. Laing, IX: 26, l. 2786]) that show that the last revisions to the Cronikyl occurred between September 1420, the date of Albany’s death, and before 1424, the year of James I’s return to Scotland.20 Although the passages concerning the Macbeth/Malcolm Canmore/Macduff narrative differ considerably between the first and following two recensions, there are barely any changes to the text made between the Royal and Cotton manuscripts. Therefore, based on the lack of textual differences, and on the multiple errors and unexplained editorial changes present in David Laing’s edition of the Royal manuscript,21 the analysis put forward here will focus solely on the versions in the Wemyss and Cotton manuscripts.

Using the notions of illegitimacy and an understanding of the text’s recensions, it is possible to better contextualize the portrayal of Malcolm Canmore within the Orygynale Cronikyl, particularly as it pertains to the literary implications it has for the narrative’s development. In the passage below, taken from the Wemyss

20 See W. A. Craigie, “Wyntoun’s ‘Original Chronicle,’” The Scottish Review; Edinburgh 30, no. 59 (July 1, 1897): 3–24, at 51, for the date of composition of Chapter 26; and Amours, “Introduction,” Cronikyl, xxx, for the composition dates of the Royal MS.
21 Broun, Irish Identity, 97, fn. 51.
manuscript, King Duncan was hunting one day with his noblemen and decided to part from their company, a recurring theme in chivalric romances, to stay the night with the miller of Forteviot. Wyntoun explains that,

This myllare had a dochter faire
That maid to Þe king Þat nycht repaire
And till hir fadir displiesit it nocht
To be relevit Þar thrhou he thocht
Off Þe king baith he and scho
His will Þe better wes Þar to
Sa scho baire him a presand
That scho wist wes till him plesand
And he resauit it curtasly
Hir and hir presand thankfully
And chesit Þare Þat faire woman
To be fra Þin his luffit lemmman (Cronikyl [Wemyss], VI: 116, ll. 1653–1664).

Lemman is the Scots word for lover or sweetheart but it is specifically used by Wyntoun here to describe a mistress or concubine. Both the Wemyss and Cotton manuscripts use lemmman to describe the miller’s daughter, although the narrative later explains that Malcolm was conceived of this first sexual encounter. After using the word lemmman in this passage, the Wemyss manuscript does not use this word to refer to the miller’s daughter again in the Cronikyl, opting instead to call her “woman”:

Thus quhen Þis king Duncane wes deid
This woman wes rycht will of reid
Bot scho a baitwart efter Þat

---

22 Purdie, “Rhetoric and the re-shaping of history,” 51.
23 “Lemman (2.),” Dictionary of the Scottish Language (DSL), https://dsl.ac.uk/entry/dost/lemm. According to the DSL, one of the meanings of “lemman” is “An unlawful lover or paramour; (a woman’s) gallant; (a man’s) light-of-love, mistress, or concubine.” As an example of this specific meaning, the DSL quotes the aforementioned passage from Wyntoun.
Till hir spousit husband gat (*Cronikyl* [Wemyss], VI: 118, ll. 1691–4).

What is implied in this passage is that King Duncan’s relationship with the miller’s daughter was one that was sexual in nature and little else, since she is later described as a “woman” that eventually married a boatman. Although King Duncan granted the woman lands “in heritage” (presumably for her maintenance and Malcolm’s), there is no indication in the account that he maintained a romantic relationship with the woman after conceiving Malcolm. The lack of a romantic, long-standing relationship between King Duncan and the miller of Forteviot’s daughter would effectively make Malcolm a spurious son conceived out of an uncommitted—and therefore more sinful—sexual relationship. This passage was amended in the Cotton manuscript, which represents the third recension of the *Orygynale Cronikyl*. This recension refers to the miller’s daughter as *lemman* consistently throughout the narrative, particularly in this passage: “Thus bis kynge Duncan dede / His *lemman* was wil of gud red” (*Cronikyl* [Cotton], VI: 18, ll. 1651–2). By subtly changing the terminology used to describe Malcolm’s mother, the *Orygynale Cronikyl* corrected its earlier statement that the relationship between Duncan and the miller’s daughter was merely a casual sexual encounter, and instead conveyed the idea of the relationship as a longstanding, if extramarital, relationship. Wyntoun’s version of the story of Malcolm’s “get” in the Cotton manuscript portrays Malcolm’s mother as King Duncan’s long-standing mistress, which meant Malcolm was a natural-born son of King Duncan and could be legitimized if necessary. The consistency of the term used to refer to Malcolm Canmore’s mother in the Cotton manuscript demonstrates how the author revised and corrected the account to construct Malcolm as a young prince whose conception allowed for later legitimization and, as a consequence, accession as king of Scots.

The change Wyntoun made to the third recension provides evidence of how specific political events influenced editorial choices in the *Cronikyl*, showing the relationships between textual content, authorial and editorial decisions, and political influence. Correcting the references to Malcolm Canmore’s mother in the *Cronikyl* was no doubt inspired by the uncanonical marriage between the future Robert II of Scotland (r. 1371–1390), a grandson of Robert Bruce,
and Elizabeth Mure in 1336. All children born of this union—John, earl of Carrick (later Robert III); Robert, earl of Fife and Menteith; Walter, lord of Fife; and Alexander, earl of Buchan (known as the Wolf of Badenoch)—were illegitimate according to canon law. As Susan Marshall has demonstrated, Scottish nobility would contract secular marriage and cohabit before requesting for a papal dispensation for their marriage, a process that was lengthy and expensive to pursue. Robert’s situation was not unusual, especially during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, as Alexander Grant has shown, when the number of illegitimate-born men of royal and noble descent occupying important positions in Scotland was considerable. Scottish nobles, in contrast with their English and continental counterparts, were more successful at producing direct male heirs, and the fact that many of them were conceived illegitimately, yet still acquired political positions, implies that illegitimacy itself was not an insurmountable hindrance to securing inheritance and power in this period.

But the Stewart’s position as grandson to Robert Bruce and one-time heir presumptive to the Scottish throne made his predicament more concerning as his young uncle, David II (r. 1336–1371), sought to replace him as heir in case he was unable to procreate a son. Friction between David II and Robert Stewart was exacerbated when, in November 1363, David negotiated the designation of

28 Boardman, The Early Stewart Kings, 19–21.
Edward III as heir presumptive of the kingdom in the eventuality that the king could not produce legitimate male issue—a proposal that was rejected by the Scottish parliament but that was not without support in Scotland. David also attempted to name John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and Edward III of England’s son, as heir to the Scottish crown, a proposal designed to bypass Robert and his sons as heirs. According to Stephen Boardman, David II’s proposal was an incentive for Robert Stewart to seek papal recognition of his marriage and a retroactive legitimization of his sons. On 22 November 1349, Pope Clement VI gave Robert a dispensation to marry Mure in a canonical ceremony, making their sons legitimate. Eventually, Robert Stewart would succeed to the throne of Scotland as the first king of the Stewart dynasty, despite David II’s attempts to curtail his succession and despite the pushback of David II’s allies, particularly William, earl of Douglas.

In contrast to the picture of Malcolm, Wyntoun’s portrayal of Macbeth’s character and reign is less than favourable. The Oryginale Cronikyl states that “[…] as we fynd in his [Macbeth’s] storyis / That he wes gottin on selcouth [strange] wiss”; Macbeth was conceived by King Duncan’s sister through her sexual liaison with a handsome knight, who revealed himself to be the Devil in disguise (Cronikyl [Wemyss], VI: 118, l. 1957). Learning about the identity of her suitor did not stop the noblewoman from communicating with him afterwards: the Devil gave her a jewel that he used to communicate to her and even prophesied that Macbeth would rise to power (Cronikyl [Wemyss], VI: 118, l. 1987–1993). As a man conceived by incubus, Macbeth carried the sins of his parents, confirming…

29 Ibid., 19.  
30 Ibid., 20–1.  
31 Ibid., 8 and 20.  
32 Men who built their fortunes on their relationship with David II, such as Sir Robert Erskine, George Dunbar, earl of March, and John Dunbar, lord of Fife, among others, saw their power in Scotland threatened by the coronation of Robert Stewart as king of Scots. Many of them obtained safe-conduits to England from Edward III as they sought to escape from a Stewart-controlled Scotland. See Boardman, The Early Stewart Kings, 25; 39–40.
religious notions that the manner of conception determined the character and morality of a man.\textsuperscript{33}

Portraying a king as descended from the devil and, in the case of Macbeth, as the product of an incubus is a rather uncommon claim in late medieval chronicles but there are several precedents for this practice originating from Scotland. The mid-fifteenth century \textit{Scottis Originale} depicts Henry II of England as descended from the devil, thus making the king a tyrant:

\begin{quote}
Suppos Þai [the English] be werray fals, and Þar caus quhy: \textit{Par king is cummyn downe lyne be lyne fra Pe Devill}, as Þar awne cronkle callit Policornica propotis and beris witness […] the quhilk emprize was weddit with Þe Erll of Angeos, and he gat apen hir \textit{pis Henry Pe Tyrand, the quhilk was second fra Pe Devill carnate}, as Þar awne ald writ beris witness.\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

The author of the \textit{Scottis Originale} deployed genealogy against the legitimacy of the king of England’s claims over Scotland, a way in which the chronicle presented the “uninterrupted independence and freedom of the Scots” against England.\textsuperscript{35} Another source, a short sonnet titled \textit{Ane anser to ane Ingliss railer praysing his awin genealogy}, countered claims of English sovereignty over Scotland by claiming that the mythological Brutus, from whom the English claimed their ancestry, was descended from the devil himself.\textsuperscript{36} Although these examples of Scottish literary and historical sources postdate the \textit{Orygynale Cronikyl} by several decades (having been composed between 1460 and 1490), these Scottish authors did not hesitate to assign a devilish origin to the English kings who were


perceived as infringing upon Scotland’s longstanding sovereignty and independence. It was more common to see portrayals of illegitimate-born kings in medieval romances; examples of these include romances on Alexander the Great and King Arthur. Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *De gestis Britonum* famously depicted Arthur as illegitimate, and this trend is also seen in Scottish chronicles like the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*, Walter Bower’s *Scotichronicon*, and Hector Boece’s *Scotorum Historia*. Likewise, medieval romances about Alexander the Great, many of them derived from the French *L’Roman de Alexandre*, portrayed the young king as the illegitimate son of Olympias and Nectahebus, an Egyptian priest disguised as the god Ammon. Sir Gilbert Hay’s *The Buik of Alexander the Conquerour* has particular interest in Alexander’s illegitimacy, so it is most likely that Wyntoun’s portrayal of Macbeth as the son of the devil was inspired by romances popular at the time he was writing.  

Evidently, the portrayal of a Scottish king as the product of incubus is not reflective of antagonistic Anglo-Scottish relations in the *Cronikyl*. Rather, Wyntoun signals the perils of having a ruler who was conceived in a spurious manner as a threat to the freedoms of nobility in a given kingdom. As Purdie has noted, Macbeth’s rule is comparable to that of William the Conqueror, called William the Bastard in the *Cronikyl* because he was also of illegitimate origin, conceived by a high-status father and a low-birth mother. According to twelfth-century uses of the French-originated term *bastardus*, William would have been treated as part of his father’s family and had legal claims to property. Wyntoun’s initial

---

description of William as a king of “lauchfull and be lele lynnage” ([Wemyss], VI: 120, l. 2520) indicates that he understood *bastardus* to have this specific meaning. But William’s reputation in the *Cronikyl* is one of a traitor to the English nobility; like Macbeth in Scotland, William Bastard mistreated English nobles after usurping the kingdom and after an initial period of effective rule.⁴⁰ In the first recension of the *Cronikyl*, William came from Normandy after King Harold, “Off Denmark’s be nacioun/Off traytouris generacioun,” and usurped the English throne ([Wemyss], VI: 120, ll. 2505–6). The English accepted William as their king until he lost his mind and, with “outrageous extorcionys,” stole the lands and riches of the English barons ([Cotton], VII: 3, l. 254). Thus, William’s and Macbeth’s spurious origins were not, at least for the purposes of Wyntoun’s narrative, as detrimental to their reign initially; soon enough, however, the sinful manner of their conception was revealed in their abuse of the nobility and their tyranny. Taking his information from the thirteenth-century *Chronicle of Melrose* or a derivative,⁴¹ Wyntoun echoed the idea that Macbeth was, initially, a competent and charitable ruler, although such qualities were not to last for long (VI: 118, ll. 1935–6). Both William’s and Macbeth’s characters would eventually reflect the sins of their parents. Like William’s descent into tyranny, the earliest symptom of Macbeth’s descent into tyrannical rule was his mistreatment of Scotland’s nobility, in particular the way he mistreated Scotland’s premier noble, Macduff of Fife.

Macbeth’s downfall began with his desire to build “a haus of fenss” in Dunsinane that he constructed by gathering materials and oxen from Fife and Angus. Some of the oxen belonged to Macduff of Fife, and when they failed in the field, Macbeth was quick to scold his nobleman:

Than spak makbeth dispersitously
And said to be thayne angrely
As he were writing in his will
Me think, he said, it were nocht ill

⁴¹ Amours, “Introduction,” *Cronikyl*, 1, Section 7.
To put Þ in awne nek in zöne ȝoke
For Þi stottis to draw zöne stok
To Þov and all Þin were wraith
A blasé I set nocht by zow baith (Cronikyl [Wemyss], VI: 118, ll. 2157-2163).

This threat prompted Macduff to escape to England to Edward the Confessor’s court, where he found Malcolm and his brothers. King Edward received him, “and quhen he [Macduff] had salust Þe king/ He tald Þe causs of his cummyng/And Þe king herd him soberly/ And ansered him full gudly” (Cronikyl, VI: 118, ll. 2133–6). Macduff negotiates Malcolm’s return to Scotland with King Edward, who agreed to provide military support for the endeavour, whereas in the Chronica, it is Malcolm who requests military help from King Edward (Chronica, V: 7). This passage is based on the version found in Book IV, chapter 46 of the Chronica gentis Scotorum, but the motivation behind Macbeth’s insult is different in that version. In the Chronica, Macduff was already working against Macbeth to help Malcolm return to Scotland, and it was Macduff’s machinations which prompted Macbeth’s threat to Macduff: “[…] and then he added plainly that he should stoop his neck under the yoke, as that of an ox in a wain; and he swore it should be so before long” (Chronica, IV: 46). Wyntoun’s expansion of the conflict between Macbeth and Macduff served to exculpate the latter from betraying the monarch, instead focusing on how the monarch slighted his nobleman by taking his oxen to construct a castle for himself and later threatening the nobleman for the oxen’s failures. It also highlights how Macduff’s decision to substitute Macbeth as a king was the result of Macbeth’s abuses against his person, suggesting Macduff’s right to combat tyranny by supporting a candidate to the throne who not only had the legal right to inherit the kingdom but who also built positive and collaborative relationships with his nobility.

The conflict between Macbeth and Macduff of Fife in the Cronikyl benefits from contextualizing the contents of the text, as well as Wyntoun’s changes to the narrative, with the events that marked Scottish politics in the first few years of the fifteenth century. Macbeth’s threatening behaviour against Macduff is reminiscent of one of the most difficult episodes of Albany’s political career: the death of David, duke of Rothesay and heir to the throne, in 1402.
under Albany’s custody. As heir to the throne and lieutenant of the kingdom, Rothesay had been given the power and authority of a king in January 1399 without having to respond to Robert III, an indication of the loss of the political community’s confidence in the king’s abilities to govern Scotland effectively. Albany, as well as other leading magnates like Archibald, third earl of Douglas, supported Rothesay’s lieutenancy. However, Rothesay’s political dealings and attitude grew increasingly defiant of political counsel. As a result, Rothesay was imprisoned by Albany and Archibald, fourth earl of Douglas, after his increasingly despotic behaviour threatened to verge on the tyrannical. In 1397, the young Rothesay initially agreed to but later rejected a marriage to Elizabeth Dunbar, daughter of the earl of March. This rejection prompted the earl of March to align himself with Henry IV of England on an invasion of Edinburgh in 1400. Albany blamed Dunbar’s defection and the English invasion on Rothesay and refused to provide his nephew with military support to defend the city. Rothesay’s relationship with Albany and the rest of the Scottish parliament continued to deteriorate as Rothesay, who was initially praised for his handling of the daily affairs of the kingdom, increasingly ignored his uncle’s counsel as he attempted to govern as if he was already king.

---

42 For the reputation of Rothesay before his death in 1402, see Devlin, “Whatever the world admires in a prince,” 82–91; and Boardman, The Early Stewart Kings, 223–54. For his reputation post mortem, see Steve Boardman, “A Saintly Sinner? The ‘martyrdom’ of David, Duke of Rothesay,” in The Cult of Saints and the Virgin Mary in Medieval Scotland (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), 87–104.

43 Devlin, “Whatever the world admires in a prince,” 84; Boardman, The Early Stewart Kings, 206, 223–25.


45 Devlin, “Whatever the world admires in a prince,” 86–7; Boardman, The Early Stewart Kings, 235.
Orygynale Cronikyl, who was constable of the castle at the time. After he was transferred to Falkland Castle in 1402, Rothesay died under mysterious circumstances, either due to illness or possibly starvation. Rumours seem to have circulated among Scotland’s magnates that the duke’s death was the result of foul play, and perhaps this was the reason why the parliament exonerated Albany and Douglas of any involvement in Rothesay’s death on 16 May 1402. Additionally, parliament decided to reinstate Albany as guardian of the kingdom in 1403.

Whether Albany intentionally killed Rothesay or not has been contested in recent historiography, but what it clear is that Albany’s portrayal in contemporary histories, such as Wyntoun’s Cronikyl and later, Walter Bower’s Scotichronicon, lauded the governor’s life and career. At the same time, contradictory portrayals of Rothesay emerged, some accusing him of tyranny while others praised his career. Shayna Devlin has recently argued that Albany’s role as regent, and particularly his imprisonment of Rothesay, was influenced by an understanding of regency as a component of corporate monarchy that sought to remediate the lack of an able king since Robert III was deemed unfit to rule by his own parliament. When Rothesay exceeded the limits of his office, his uncle’s response might have been a “check” on the young prince’s power rather than an attempt to usurp royal authority. As earl of Fife and Menteith and uncle to the kingdom’s regent, Albany’s role in keeping royal power and authority in check seems a likely and

47 Devlin, “Whatever the world admires in a prince,” 87–8; Boardman, The Early Stewart Kings, 244–5.
51 Devlin, “Whatever the world admires in a prince,” 89. For a different view on Albany’s motivations, see Boardman, The Early Stewart Kings, 244.
relevant inspiration for Macduff’s actions against Macbeth in the *Cronikyl*, especially when Sir John Wemyss witnessed these events himself.

**Macduff the “Kingmaker” and Fife-centric Politics in the *Cronikyl***

The influence of Albany’s political actions and daily governance of the kingdom is the likely inspiration for the way Wyntoun ascribed a kingmaking role to Macduff in the *Cronikyl*. According to Wyntoun, Macduff first asked Malcolm’s two legitimate brothers whether one of them would become king, “Bot schortly ðe lauchfull brePer twa / Forsuke to pass for gret peril” (*Cronikyl*, VI: 118, ll. 275–6). While these two lines remain unconvincing as a motive behind Malcolm’s eventual coronation, they establish the reason why Macduff chose Malcolm, Duncan’s illegitimate son, to become king: he was left without another viable option. The passage in the Wemyss manuscript states that,

Than Makduf counsalit rycht thraly  
Malcome the thrid broPer [brother] ðaim by  
Set he wes nocht of lauchfull bed  
As ze before ðis has hed red  
To pass with him sen ðai forsuke  
To follow ðar rycht and vndertuke  
That he suld mak him of Scotland king (*Cronikyl*, VI: 118, ll. 2157–2163 [my emphasis]).

The idea of Macduff as a kingmaker is noticeably absent from the text of the *Chronica gentis Scotorum*. The specific phrasing of this passage should not be attributed to Wyntoun, however. A passage in Latin containing similar phrasing is found in Walter Bower’s *Scotichronicon* (c. 1440s), evidence that Bower and Wyntoun were consulting the same Latin source independently at St Andrews some twenty years apart: 52

---

52 Dauvit Broun, “A New Look at Gesta Annalia Attributed to John of Fordun,” in *Church, Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Early*
In triumphant progress you will approach your father’s kingdom.
You will gain the crown of the kingdom by right, I promise.
All rights are due to you, not to him (Scotichronicon Vol. 3, V: 6, 14–17).

Both Bower’s and Wyntoun’s passages focus on two important and interconnected ideas: the hereditary right of Malcolm to the Scottish throne and Macduff’s role in enforcing this right. The traditional notion of the earls of Fife as inauguration officers of the kings of Scots and as having received special privileges from Malcolm III himself has been perpetuated in Scottish historiography, most notably in John Bannerman’s 1993 study of the Macduffs of Fife. Relying on the information about Macduff contained in the Cronikyl and the Scotichronicon, Bannerman considered both chronicles to be based on contemporary accounts of eleventh-century historical events. An example of this is that A. D. M. Forte, in his analysis of the Law of Clan Macduff, relies on Bannerman’s assessment that this law was possibly implemented during the reign of Malcolm III. Yet the earliest example provided by Forte to support this assessment is a charter from David II of Scotland to Walther Ramsey of Colluthie dated to 1358. Likewise, Robert Stewart, the future Duke of Albany, was explicitly called the “head of the law of Clan Macduff”


in legislation by Robert II’s parliament in November 1384. The anonymous source from which Wyntoun and Bower take their information on Macduff of Fife, specifically but not exclusively in the passages cited above, should not be so readily accepted as evidence of an eleventh-century origin to the role ascribed to the earls of Fife during late medieval Scotland.

Rather, the portrayal of Macduff as a kingmaker is unique to the *Orygynale Cronykyl*: it relies on the concept of contractual monarchy that was developed in Scotland during the fourteenth century in order to aggrandize Macduff’s political role in the kingdom. Macduff’s role as a kingmaker is justified by Malcolm’s illegitimacy, turning the traditionally ascribed role of the earls of Fife as heads of the king’s enthronement ceremony into one of choosing the Scottish monarch themselves. However, and as explained earlier, the explicit allusion to Macduff as a kingmaker is exclusive to the Wemyss manuscript: the third recension, represented by the Cotton manuscript, words this passage differently:

Malcolm, Þe thride, to say schortly,
Makduff counsalit richt thraly,
Set he was noucht of lauchful bede,
As in Þis buk zhe [ye] haf herde rede;
Makduff hym tretit neuirÞeles
To be of stark hart and stoutnes,

---

56 For example, the account of the inauguration of Alexander III had the earls of Fife and Strathearn enthrone the young Alexander, while Robert Bruce had two inauguration ceremonies, in one of which he was enthroned directly by Isabella (Macduff) Comyn, countess of Buchan in representation of her nephew, the underaged earl of Fife, Duncan IV. Neither case represents evidence that, apart from the role in the inauguration ceremony of the king of Scots, the Macduff earls of Fife had a role in choosing the king themselves. See Dauvit Broun, *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain from the Picts to Alexander III* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 176–82; G. W. S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1988), 151–2.
And namly to tak on hande
To bere Þe crowne Þan of Scotlande;
And bad hym Þar of haf na dreide;
For kynge he sulde be made in deide (Cronikyl [Cotton], VI: 18, ll. 2105–14).

Here, Wyntoun expanded the passage to include the reasons why Macduff chooses Malcolm Canmore as heir presumptive over his brothers, highlighting Malcolm’s “stark hart and stoutnes” as personal qualities that merited Malcolm the crown and stressed his martial prowess and bravery in battle. Placing this addition before the next passage, the “advice to princes” passage where Malcolm invents three vices to test Macduff’s loyalty, contextualizes the said passage more carefully, suggesting to the reader beforehand that Malcolm’s vices were a ruse and that he had all the characteristics necessary for good kingship. Instead of concentrating the power of making kings on Macduff alone, Wyntoun emphasizes the thane’s role in selecting a candidate that would be presentable, and indeed, electable, to the kingship by the community of the realm. Contemporary political theory highlighted the nobility’s role and duty to regulate royal power, a role that Macduff of Fife in the Cronikyl and the Duke of Albany in early fifteenth-century Scotland performed admirably.

It is worth clarifying that Albany’s initial illegitimacy mattered little to Wyntoun’s portrayal of Macduff of Fife. The parallels that Wyntoun draws between Albany and Macduff are based on Albany’s political role as earl of Fife and regent, not on his illegitimate birth. This is especially apparent in two important events. First, Albany was designated earl of Fife in March 1371 upon the accession of


Robert II to the throne. Isabella, countess of Fife and Albany’s sister-in-law, recognized him as heir to the earldom. Furthermore, the council records from November 1384 show that Albany was not only earl of Fife, but also controlled Fife as “head of the law of Clan MacDuff,” a designation that shows Albany as heir of both the earldom and the clan historically associated with the Macduffs. As John Bannerman has argued, both roles were not always held by the same individual; Albany’s position as both earl and clan chief made him a distant, legal heir to the quasi-historical Macduff of Fife even when, as a Stewart, he was not a direct descendant of the Macduffs.

Another of Macduff’s roles in the Cronikyl had a contemporary precedent: the return of Malcolm Canmore to Scotland from England. Albany sought to negotiate the return of James I to Scotland, and in May 1412 and April 1413, Sir John Wemyss was one of the men given safe conducts to England for this purpose. Although James did not return to Scotland on that occasion, Wemyss was again given safe passage to England on December 13, 1423 to

59 Such action was based on two entails, one dated from 1360–2 by Isabella and her then-husband, Walter Stewart, Albany’s elder brother, and a second one from 1315 between Duncan, earl of Fife, and Robert I. See Boardman, The Early Stewarts, 50–2.
60 Bannerman, “Macduff of Fife.”
61 “Rymer’s Foedera with Syllabus: May 1412 | British History Online,” accessed January 14, 2018, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol8/pp733-745, at “Pro quibusdam de Scotia,” (May 15 1412); and “Rymer’s Foedera with Syllabus: April 1413 | British History Online,” accessed January 14, 2018, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rymer-foedera/vol9/pp2-6, at “De Tractando super Liberratione Regis Scotiae.” In 1412, the Scotsmen given passage to England were: Walter, bishop of Brechin; William, lord Graham; Alexander Ogilvy, earl of Angus; Master Robert de Lany; and Sir John Wemyss. In 1413, the bishop of Brechin, William lord Graham, Alexander Ogilvy, and Sir John Wemyss returned to England for the liberation of James I, but the following men were also given safe conduct: David Benigne, abbot of Melrose; William Douglas of Drumlagrig; John Sinclair; Robert Erskine; Patrick Dunbar; Alexander Haliburton; James Douglas, brother of the Earl of Douglas; John, lord of Montgomery; and William Wallace.
meet with James at Durham.\textsuperscript{62} Other knights of the Wemyss family had similar roles in previous centuries, most notably Sir David Wemyss, Sir John’s uncle, who was one of the knights that helped negotiate David II’s ransom in 1346 after the Battle of Neville’s Cross, and another Sir David Wemyss, who was one of the knights assigned as ward of Margaret, Maid of Norway (d. 1290) upon her arrival to Scotland.\textsuperscript{63} Wemyss’s own family history was embedded with examples of their political involvement in negotiating ransoms and returns of kings of Scots to Scotland, and no doubt Wyntoun capitalized on his reader’s interest here. But Malcolm Canmore’s predicament as an exile in the English court also mirrors James I’s own political impotence. Despite being king of Scots, James lacked political power in his own kingdom as the Scots were able to negotiate the release of his cousin Murdoch, Albany’s son, before his release. James was closely monitored by Henry IV and Henry V from the time he was captured in 1406. Indeed, Henry V required James to issue letters to the Scottish nobles asking them to join him and the English in fighting against France and its Scottish allies, but the Scots refused to serve the king while he was in English hands.\textsuperscript{64} Despite his position, James’s situation as a political prisoner rendered him incapable of wielding any authority over the country he was supposed to rule, a situation that bore strong similarities with how Malcolm Canmore was portrayed in the \textit{Cronikyl}.

Thus, Malcolm’s success in gathering political support for his return to Scotland depended almost exclusively on Macduff of Fife’s agency. The illegitimacy of Malcolm and Macbeth in the \textit{Orygynale Cronikyl} allowed Wyntoun to invent an eleventh-century precedent that would explain the heightened political role wielded by the Duke of Albany in the early fifteenth century. Macduff is transformed from

\textsuperscript{64} Hunt, “First Duke of Albany,” 31–2; Michael Brown, \textit{James I} (Glasgow: Tuckwell, 2000), 18.
a leading Scottish noble with a more limited role in the *Chronica gentis Scottorum* into a kingmaker who, with his influence and authority, was responsible for selecting the most apt candidate to occupy the Scottish throne. The emphasis on Malcolm’s and Macbeth’s illegitimacy served to turn Macduff into the more central character of the narrative, allowing Wyntoun to highlight how the main precondition to becoming king of Scots was to have Macduff’s political support. The importance of Macduff in the narrative was inspired by the importance that Albany had in Scotland as earl of Fife during Wyntoun’s lifetime. Wyntoun’s editorial changes to the Macbeth narrative reveal not only the far-reaching influence Albany had on Scottish politics and history, but also the enduring legacy of this particular story as the point in time where the modernized kingdom of the Scots was born.
Appendix A: Differences in the events of the Macbeth narrative between *Chronica gentis Scotorum* and the *Orygynale Cronikyl*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Chronica gentis Scotorum</em>, attributed to John of Fordun (1380s)</th>
<th><em>Orygynale Cronikyl</em>, by Andrew of Wyntoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duncan had Malcolm and Donald from the cousin of Earl Siward (IV: 44)</td>
<td>Duncan had Malcolm from the miller’s daughter, but had other two legitimate sons (VI: 117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm was put in charge of Cumbria (IV: 44)</td>
<td><em>no mention of what happened to Malcolm after Duncan had him</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan had Malcolm while he was king for a short time (IV: 44)</td>
<td>Duncan had Malcolm young. (VI: 117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth came from a family of royal conspirators (IV: 45)</td>
<td>Macbeth was the son of Duncan’s sister and the devil, and later he killed his uncle. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth reigned 17 years (IV: 45)</td>
<td>Macbeth reigned for 17 years. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td>Macbeth dreams of three Weird Sisters whose prophecies led him to murder Duncan. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td>Macbeth married his uncle’s wife, which is a sin. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td>Macbeth went to Rome and was most charitable. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td>Conception of Macbeth: Macbeth’s mother slept with a handsome man that was the devil in disguise. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The devil gave her a ring and told her his son would rise in the world. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth sought to kill Malcolm and Donald (IV: 45)</td>
<td>Duncan’s two sons fled and were banished to England. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm and Donald remained in Scotland for two years, then Malcolm fled to Cumbria and Donald to the Isles (IV: 45)</td>
<td>Malcolm was also banished, and he fled to Edward’s court. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm sought advice from Siward and went to King Edward for advice and protection (IV: 45, 46)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward was kind to Malcolm because he was recently an exile, like Malcolm was (IV: 45)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many in Scotland clamoured for Malcolm’s return (IV: 46)</td>
<td>No one was clamouring for Malcolm’s return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth punished those who sided with Malcolm (IV: 46)</td>
<td>Macbeth worked on making a “haus of fenss” in Dunsinane: he drew materials and oxen from Fife and Angus for his house. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff worked to advance Malcolm’s cause before being sent to Macbeth (IV: 46)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff was denounced to Macbeth (IV: 46)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth menaces Macduff to place his neck under the yoke (IV: 46)</td>
<td>Macbeth menaces to place Macduff’s neck on a yoke after his oxen failed in the field. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff replied “with a certain shrewd softness of his words” (IV: 46)</td>
<td>Macduff does not reply. Decided to flee from the court to the water of Erne without Macbeth’s consent. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff went on a small vessel to England. (IV: 46)</td>
<td>Macduff went on a small vessel in England and Macbeth pursued him. Macduff’s wife reprimands Macbeth. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff was received by Malcolm in England. (IV: 46)</td>
<td>Macduff was received by King Edward in England. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff was dispossessed and exiled. (IV: 46)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobles were shocked by Macbeth’s treatment of Macduff. (IV: 46)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm comes to the court of King Edward during the first year of Edward’s reign (IV: 47)</td>
<td>Malcolm had been exiled in the English court all along. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff holds an audience with Malcolm. Most nobles pledged allegiance to Macduff and Malcolm. (V: 1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm’s first fault: lust. (V: 1, 2)</td>
<td>Malcolm’s first fault: lust. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff replies: he can have all the women he wants, except noble’s daughters and wives (V: 3)</td>
<td>Same, but less specific. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malcolm’s second fault:</strong> thievery (V: 4)</td>
<td>Malcolm’s second fault: thievery. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff’s replies this is not a valid excuse to reject the throne. (V: 4)</td>
<td>Macduff’s replies that he can have all the riches in Scotland. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm’s third vice: falsehood. Macduff’s response is to retire in sorrow (V: 5)</td>
<td>Malcolm’s third vice: falsehood. Macduff’s response is to retire in sorrow. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm tells Macduff he was only testing his loyalty (V: 6)</td>
<td>Malcolm tells Macduff he was testing his loyalty. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm sends Macduff to Scotland with a secret message (V: 7)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm seeks help from King Edward: English nobles (V: 7)</td>
<td>Malcolm and Macduff seek help from King Edward (Wemyss MS, VI: 118); Macduff and Malcolm “hand in hand” to King Edward for help (other MSS; VI: 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only took Earl Siward (V: 7)</td>
<td>King Edward ordered Earl Siward to help Malcolm: This is Siward’s only mention in the narrative. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People divided between Macbeth and Macduff (V: 7)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm increases his army and follows Macbeth north to Lumphanan. (V: 7)</td>
<td>Malcolm and Siward to Birnam Wood: men hold branches from the wood and bring them to Dunsinane Hill. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm kills Macbeth on 5 Dec 1056. (V: 7)</td>
<td>Macduff’s knight kills Macbeth: he reveals he was not born of a woman. (VI: 118)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Chronica* criticizes Malmesbury for saying Siward killed Macbeth. (V: 7) | N/A
---|---
Macduff asks Malcolm for three guarantees for the earls of Fife. (VI: 119) |