

lines referring to Cawdor are inconsistent with the references to Cawdor in Sc. 3.

Swinburne also believes the scene corrupt, but attributes the corruptness to bad editing.

No explanation of the reason why the *two* reports of the battle are given on the stage has been considered adequate.

2. Johnson, Daniel, and Rolfe simply state that Macbeth's references, in Sc. 3, to Cawdor are incongruous.

Furness' *Variorum* accepts the same view. *No hypothesis has been brought forward to explain these discrepancies: they stand as hopelessly incongruous in all the editions.* The Cambridge editors cut the knot by abandoning Sc. 2.

3. Daniel and others point out the fact that Ross tells utterly different stories in speaking to Duncan (Sc. 2), and in relating to Macbeth what he had said to Duncan (Sc. 3.)

No editor has offered any explanation of this fact.

According to the Folio of 1623, Angus heard Ross on both occasions. Modern editors have concluded that Angus does not enter with Ross in Sc. 2.

4. If Angus enters with Ross in Sc. 2, and also in Sc. 3, he must have heard the inconsistent stories of Ross.

If Angus does not enter in Sc. 2 the Folio is at fault.

5. Though Macbeth's references to Cawdor are said to be inexplicable, Banquo, who knew as much about Cawdor as we have reason to think Macbeth did, did not comment upon Macbeth's inconsistency.

6. Dowden considers Banquo innocent of complicity in the murder of Duncan, and says that though he was tempted with Macbeth, the evil thoughts which ruin Macbeth "work no evil" in the mind of Banquo: Flathe, however, holds that Banquo is corrupted as well as Macbeth, though differently.

7. Coleridge rejects the Porter-scene, the Cambridge editors follow suit: many hold the same opinion. Some editors consider it genuine.*

*Mr. Churton Collins defends the scene in a book just come to hand.