Pearson Edexcel Level 1/Level 2 GCSE (9–1)

English Literature

Paper 1: Shakespeare and Post-1914 Literature

Tuesday 22 May 2018 – Morning
Time: 1 hour 45 minutes

Paper Reference
1ET0/01

Questions and Extracts Booklet

Turn over ▶

P52360A

©2018 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1/1/1

P 5 2 3 6 0 A

Pearson

stemup.co.uk

BLANK PAGE

stemup.co.uk

Answer the question on ONE text from Section A and ONE text from Section B.

The extracts for use with Section A are in this question paper.

SECTION A – Shakespeare	**Page**
1(a) and **1(b)** – *Macbeth*	4
2(a) and **2(b)** – *The Tempest*	6
3(a) and **3(b)** – *Romeo and Juliet*	8
4(a) and **4(b)** – *Much Ado About Nothing*	10
5(a) and **5(b)** – *Twelfth Night*	12
6(a) and **6(b)** – *The Merchant of Venice*	14

SECTION B – Post-1914 Literature	**Page**
EITHER	
British Play	
7 OR 8 – *An Inspector Calls*: J B Priestley	16
9 OR 10 – *Hobson's Choice*: Harold Brighouse	17
11 OR 12 – *Blood Brothers*: Willy Russell	18
13 OR 14 – *Journey's End*: R C Sherriff	19
OR	
British Novel	
15 OR 16 – *Animal Farm*: George Orwell	20
17 OR 18 – *Lord of the Flies*: William Golding	21
19 OR 20 – *Anita and Me*: Meera Syal	22
21 OR 22 – *The Woman in Black*: Susan Hill	23

stemup.co.uk

SECTION A: Shakespeare

Answer the question on ONE text from this section.

You should spend about 55 minutes on this section.

You should divide your time equally between parts (a) and (b) of the question.

***Macbeth* – from Act 5 Scene 1, lines 28 to 57**

In this extract, Lady Macbeth is sleepwalking.

LADY MACBETH
Yet here's a spot.

DOCTOR
Hark! She speaks. I will set down what comes from her,
to satisfy my remembrance the more strongly.

LADY MACBETH
Out, damned spot! Out, I say! – One, two. Why, then
'tis time to do it. – Hell is murky. – Fie, my lord, fie! – a
soldier, and afeard? – What need we fear who knows it,
when none can call our power to account? – Yet who
would have thought the old man to have had so much
blood in him?

DOCTOR
Do you mark that?

LADY MACBETH
The Thane of Fife had a wife: where is she now? –
What, will these hands ne'er be clean? – No more
o' that, my lord, no more o' that: you mar all with this
starting.

DOCTOR
Go to, go to: you have known what you should not.

GENTLEWOMAN
She has spoke what she should not, I am sure of
that. Heaven knows what she has known.

LADY MACBETH
Here's the smell of the blood still! All the perfumes of
Arabia will not sweeten this little hand. O! Oh, oh –

DOCTOR
What a sigh is there! The heart is sorely charged.

GENTLEWOMAN
I would not have such a heart in my bosom for
the dignity of the whole body.

DOCTOR
Well, well, well –

stemup.co.uk

GENTLEWOMAN
Pray God it be, sir.

DOCTOR
This disease is beyond my practice. Yet I have known
those which have walked in their sleep, who have died
holily in their beds.

LADY MACBETH
Wash your hands, put on your night-gown. Look
not so pale. – I tell you yet again, Banquo's buried: he
cannot come out on's grave.

1 (a) Explore how Shakespeare presents the character of Lady Macbeth in this extract.

Refer closely to the extract in your answer.

(20)

(b) In this extract, Lady Macbeth shows her guilt over the murder of Duncan.

Explain the importance of guilt **elsewhere** in the play.

In your answer, you **must** consider:

- how guilt is shown
- the reasons for the guilt within the play.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(20)

(Total for Question 1 = 40 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***The Tempest* – from Act 3 Scene 1, lines 42 to 73**

In this extract, Ferdinand is talking to Miranda.

FERDINAND

For several virtues
Have I liked several women – never any
With so full soul, but some defect in her
Did quarrel with the noblest grace she owed,
And put it to the foil. But you – o you,
So perfect and so peerless – are created
Of every creature's best!

MIRANDA

I do not know
One of my sex – no woman's face remember,
Save, from my glass, mine own. Nor have I seen
More that I may call men than you, good friend,
And my dear father. How features are abroad,
I am skilless of – but, by my modesty,
The jewel in my dower, I would not wish
Any companion in the world but you –
Nor can imagination form a shape,
Besides yourself, to like of. But I prattle
Something too wildly, and my father's precepts
I therein do forget.

FERDINAND

I am, in my condition,
A prince, Miranda: I do think, a King –
I would not so! – and would no more endure
This wooden slavery than to suffer
The flesh-fly blow my mouth. Hear my soul speak:
The very instant that I saw you, did
My heart fly to your service – there resides,
To make me slave to it – and for your sake
Am I this patient log-man.

MIRANDA

Do you love me?

FERDINAND

O heaven, O earth, bear witness to this sound
And crown what I profess with kind event,
If I speak true! If hollowly, invert
What best is boded me to mischief! I,
Beyond all limit of what else i'the world,
Do love, prize, honour you.

stemup.co.uk

2 (a) Explore how Shakespeare presents the character of Ferdinand in this extract.

Refer closely to the extract in your answer.

(20)

(b) In this extract, Ferdinand declares his love for Miranda.

Explain the importance of love **elsewhere** in the play.

In your answer, you **must** consider:

- the different types of love in the play
- how love is shown.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(20)

(Total for Question 2 = 40 marks)

***Romeo and Juliet* – from Act 1 Scene 5, lines 60 to 88**

In this extract, Tybalt is complaining about Romeo being at the Capulet party.

CAPULET
Why, how now, kinsman! Wherefore storm you so?

TYBALT
Uncle, this is a Montague, our foe! –
A villain that is hither come in spite,
To scorn at our solemnity this night.

CAPULET
Young Romeo is it?

TYBALT
'Tis he, that villain Romeo.

CAPULET
Content thee, gentle coz, let him alone.
'A bears him like a portly gentleman –
And to say truth, Verona brags of him
To be a virtuous and well-governed youth.
I would not, for the wealth of all this town,
Here in my house do him disparagement.
Therefore be patient, take no note of him.
It is my will, the which if thou respect,
Show a fair presence and put off these frowns,
An ill-beseeming semblance for a feast.

TYBALT
It fits when such a villain is a guest.
I'll not endure him!

CAPULET
He shall be endured.
What, goodman boy? I say he shall! Go to!
Am I the master here, or you? Go to!
You'll not endure him! God shall mend my soul,
You'll make a mutiny among my guests!
You will set cock-a-hoop! You'll be the man!

TYBALT
Why, uncle, 'tis a shame.

CAPULET
Go to, go to!
You are a saucy boy! Is't so indeed?
This trick may chance to scathe you. – I know what.
You must contrary *me*! Marry, 'tis time –
(*To dancers nearby*) Well said, my hearts! – You are
a princox! Go!
Be quiet, or – **(*To the Servants*)** More light, more light,
for shame! –
I'll make you quiet! – **(*To dancers*)** What! – Cheerly
my hearts!

stemup.co.uk

3 (a) Explore how Shakespeare presents the character of Lord Capulet in this extract.

Refer closely to the extract in your answer.

(20)

(b) In this extract, Lord Capulet demonstrates his power as head of the Capulet family.

Explain the importance of power **elsewhere** in the play.

In your answer, you **must** consider:

- how power is presented
- the effects power has within the play.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(20)

(Total for Question 3 = 40 marks)

***Much Ado About Nothing* – from Act 3 Scene 1, lines 59–91**

In this extract, Hero and Ursula are discussing Beatrice.

HERO
Why, you speak truth. I never yet saw man,
How wise, how noble, young, how rarely featured,
But she would spell him backward. If fair-faced,
She would swear the gentleman should be her sister;
If black, why, Nature, drawing of an antic,
Made a foul blot; if tall, a lance ill-headed;
If low, an agate very vilely cut;
If speaking, why, a vane blown with all the winds;
If silent, why, a block movèd with none.
So turns she every man the wrong side out,
And never gives to truth and virtue that
Which simpleness and merit purchaseth.

URSULA
Sure, sure, such carping is not commendable.

HERO
No; not to be so odd and from all fashions,
As Beatrice is, cannot be commendable.
But who dare tell her so? If I should speak,
She would mock me into air. O, she would laugh me
Out of myself, press me to death with wit!
Therefore let Benedick, like covered fire,
Consume away in sighs, waste inwardly.
It were a better death than die with mocks,
Which is as bad as die with tickling.

URSULA
Yet tell her of it: hear what she will say.

HERO
No: rather I will go to Benedick
And counsel him to fight against his passion.
And, truly, I'll devise some honest slanders
To stain my cousin with. One doth not know
How much an ill word may empoison liking.

URSULA
O, do not do your cousin such a wrong!
She cannot be so much without true judgement –
Having so swift and excellent a wit
As she is prized to have – as to refuse
So rare a gentleman as Signior Benedick.

stemup.co.uk

4 (a) Explore how Shakespeare presents Hero's feelings about Beatrice in this extract.

Refer closely to the extract in your answer.

(20)

(b) In this extract, Hero comments on Beatrice's behaviour as a woman.

Explain the presentation of women **elsewhere** in the play.

In your answer, you **must** consider:

- how women are presented
- the effects the presentation of women have within the play.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(20)

(Total for Question 4 = 40 marks)

***Twelfth Night* – from Act 3 Scene 4, lines 24 to 54**

In this extract, Malvolio is referring to the letter that he believes Olivia wrote to him.

OLIVIA
Why, how dost thou, man? What is the matter with thee?

MALVOLIO
Not black in my mind, though yellow in my legs. It did come to his hands, and commands shall be executed; I think we do know the sweet Roman hand.

OLIVIA
Wilt thou go to bed, Malvolio?

MALVOLIO
To bed! ay, sweetheart, and I'll come to thee.

OLIVIA
God comfort thee! Why dost thou smile so, and kiss thy hand so oft?

MARIA
How do you, Malvolio?

MALVOLIO
At your request! Yes; nightingales answer daws.

MARIA
Why appear you with this ridiculous boldness before my lady?

MALVOLIO
"Be not afraid of greatness"; 't was well writ.

OLIVIA
What meanest thou by that, Malvolio?

MALVOLIO
"Some are born great," –

OLIVIA
Ha!

MALVOLIO
"Some achieve greatness," –

OLIVIA
What sayest thou?

MALVOLIO
"And some have greatness thrust upon them."

OLIVIA
Heaven restore thee!

stemup.co.uk

MALVOLIO
"Remember who commended thy yellow stockings" –

OLIVIA
Thy yellow stockings!

MALVOLIO
"And wished to see thee cross-gartered."

OLIVIA
Cross-gartered!

MALVOLIO
"Go to, thou art made, if thou desirest to be so;" –

OLIVIA
Am I made?

MALVOLIO
"If not, let me see thee a servant still."

OLIVIA
Why, this is very midsummer madness.

5 (a) Explore how Shakespeare presents Olivia's reactions to Malvolio in this extract.

Refer closely to the extract in your answer.

(20)

(b) In this extract, Olivia believes Malvolio has gone mad.

Explain the importance of madness **elsewhere** in the play.

In your answer, you **must** consider:

- how madness is presented
- the effects madness has within the play.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(20)

(Total for Question 5 = 40 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***The Merchant of Venice* – from Act 5 Scene 1, lines 142–169**

In this extract, Nerissa and Gratiano are arguing in front of Portia.

GRATIANO
(*To Nerissa*) By yonder moon I swear you do me
Wrong!
In faith, I gave it to the judge's clerk –
Would he were gelt that had it for my part,
Since you do take it, love, so much at heart.

PORTIA
A quarrel, ho – already! What's the matter?

GRATIANO
About a hoop of gold, a paltry ring
That she did give me, whose posy was
For all the world like cutler's poetry
Upon a knife: 'Love me, and leave me not.'

NERISSA
What talk you of the posy or the value?
You swore to me when I did give it you
That you would wear it till your hour of death,
And that it should lie with you in your grave.
Though not for me, yet for your vehement oaths
You should have been respective and have kept it.
Gave it a judge's clerk! No, God's my judge,
The clerk will ne'er wear his hair on's face that had it!

GRATIANO
He will, and if he live to be a man.

NERISSA
Ay, if a *woman* live to be a man.

GRATIANO
Now, by this hand, I gave it to a youth! –
A kind of boy, a little scrubbèd boy
No higher than thyself, the judge's clerk –
A prating boy that begged it as a fee.
I could not for my heart deny it him.

PORTIA
You were to blame, I must be plain with you,
To part so slightly with your wife's first gift,
A thing stuck on with oaths upon your finger,
And so riveted with faith unto your flesh.

stemup.co.uk

6 (a) Explore how Shakespeare presents the relationship between Nerissa and Gratiano in this extract.

Refer closely to the extract in your answer.

(20)

(b) In this extract, Gratiano has been deceived by Nerissa and Portia.

Explain the importance of deception **elsewhere** in the play.

In your answer, you **must** consider:

- why deception is important
- the effects deception has within the play.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(20)

(Total for Question 6 = 40 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 40 MARKS

stemup.co.uk

SECTION B: Post-1914 Literature – British Play OR British Novel

Answer ONE question from this section, on EITHER a British Play OR a British Novel.

You should spend about 50 minutes on this section.

BRITISH PLAY

***An Inspector Calls*: J B Priestley**

Your response will be marked for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation.

EITHER

7 **Eric:** *Well, she hadn't a job – and didn't feel like trying again for one – and she had no money left…*

Explore the significance of money in *An Inspector Calls*.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 7 = 40 marks)

OR

8 **Birling:** *I speak as a hard-headed business man, who has to take risks and knows what he's about…*

In what ways is Mr Arthur Birling important throughout the play?

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 8 = 40 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***Hobson's Choice*: Harold Brighouse**

Your response will be marked for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation.

EITHER

9 Maggie: *He's not so well, Alice. The doctor says one of us must come and live here to look after him.*

How is responsibility important in *Hobson's Choice*?

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 9 = 40 marks)

OR

10 Vickey: *Yes. But we've got to be careful, Alice. She mustn't have things too much her way.*

Explain the significance of Alice and Vickey in the play.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 10 = 40 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***Blood Brothers*: Willy Russell**

Your response will be marked for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation.

EITHER

11 Mrs Lyons: *They shall be raised apart and never, ever told what was once the truth.*

How does the character of Mrs Lyons develop throughout the play?

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 11 = 40 marks)

OR

12 Mickey: *Eddie's my best friend, Mam. He lives up by the park…*

What is the significance of friendship in *Blood Brothers*?

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 12 = 40 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***Journey's End*: R C Sherriff**

Your response will be marked for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation.

EITHER

13 Osborne [*slowly mixing a drink*]: *I wonder what it is they put in the water.*

Hardy: *Some sort of disinfectant, I suppose.*

Explore how life in the trenches is presented in the play.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 13 = 40 marks)

OR

14 Osborne: *You must remember he's commanded this company for a long time – through all sorts of rotten times. It's – it's a big strain on a man.*

Explain how Stanhope is important in *Journey's End*.

You **must** refer to the context of the play in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 14 = 40 marks)

stemup.co.uk

BRITISH NOVEL

Animal Farm: George Orwell

Your response will be marked for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation.

EITHER

15 *Immediately the dogs bounded forward, seized four of the pigs by the ear and dragged them, squealing with pain and terror, to Napoleon's feet.*

Explain the significance of violence in the novel.

You **must** refer to the context of the novel in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 15 = 40 marks)

OR

16 *Snowball was a more vivacious pig than Napoleon, quicker in speech and more inventive, but was not considered to have the same depth of character.*

How is Snowball important in *Animal Farm*?

You **must** refer to the context of the novel in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 16 = 40 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***Lord of the Flies*: William Golding**

Your response will be marked for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation.

EITHER

17 *I'll give the conch to the next person to speak. He can hold it when he's speaking.* **(Ralph)**

In what ways is control significant in the novel?

You **must** refer to the context of the novel in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 17 = 40 marks)

OR

18 *Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!*

How is the beast important in *Lord of the Flies*?

You **must** refer to the context of the novel in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 18 = 40 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***Anita and Me*: Meera Syal**

Your response will be marked for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation.

EITHER

19 *This was always one of my favourites, this image of my parents as epic, glamorous figures, touched by romantic tragedy.*

Explore the significance of Meena's parents in the novel.

You **must** refer to the context of the novel in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 19 = 40 marks)

OR

20 *My best friend in all the world really did have a boyfriend and had never told me. My best friend was sharing me with someone else.*

How is friendship important in *Anita and Me*?

You **must** refer to the context of the novel in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 20 = 40 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***The Woman in Black*: Susan Hill**

Your response will be marked for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation.

EITHER

21 *I was growing impatient of the half-hints and dark mutterings made by grown men at the mention of Mrs Drablow.*

In what ways is mystery created in *The Woman in Black*?

You **must** refer to the context of the novel in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 21 = 40 marks)

OR

22 *Isobel was only twenty-four years old but already the mother of three young sons, and set fair to produce more.*

How are mothers presented within the novel?

You **must** refer to the context of the novel in your answer.

(includes 8 marks for the range of appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures, and accurate use of spelling and punctuation)

(Total for Question 22 = 40 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 40 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 80 MARKS

stemup.co.uk

BLANK PAGE

Sources:

Macbeth, Shakespeare, Pearson Education Ltd Longman School
The Tempest, Shakespeare, Pearson Education Ltd Longman School
Romeo and Juliet, Shakespeare, Pearson Education Ltd Longman School
Much Ado About Nothing, Shakespeare, Penguin Education Ltd
Twelfth Night, Shakespeare, Penguin Longman School
The Merchant of Venice, Shakespeare, Pearson Education Ltd Longman School
An Inspector Calls, J B Priestley, Pearson Education Ltd Heinemann
Hobson's Choice, Harold Brighouse, Samuel French Ltd
Blood Brothers, Willy Russell, Methuen Drama, 2001
Journey's End, R C Sheriff, Penguin Classics, 2000
Animal Farm, George Orwell, Heinemann, 1972
Lord of the Flies, William Golding, Faber and Faber Edition, 2012
Anita and Me, Anita Syal, Harper Perennial, 2004
The Woman in Black, Susan Hill, Vintage, 1998

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.

stemup.co.uk

Write your name here

Surname	Other names

Pearson Edexcel
Level 1/Level 2 GCSE (9–1)

Centre Number | | | | | |

Candidate Number | | | | |

English Literature

Paper 1: Shakespeare and Post-1914 Literature

Tuesday 22 May 2018 – Morning
Time: 1 hour 45 minutes

Paper Reference
1ET0/01

You must have:
Questions and Extracts Booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer the question on **one** text from Section A and **one** text from Section B.
- You should spend about 55 minutes on Section A.
- You should spend about 50 minutes on Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided
  – there may be more space than you need.

Information

- This is a closed book exam.
- The total mark for this paper is 80.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets
  – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.
- The marks available for the accuracy of your writing are clearly indicated.

Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ▶

P52360A

©2018 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1/1/1

P 5 2 3 6 0 A 0 1 2 0

Pearson

stemup.co.uk

SECTION A: Shakespeare

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: **Question 1** ☒ **Question 2** ☒ **Question 3** ☒

Question 4 ☒ **Question 5** ☒ **Question 6** ☒

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 40 MARKS

stemup.co.uk

SECTION B: Post-1914 Literature

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number:

Question 7 ☒	**Question 8** ☒	**Question 9** ☒
Question 10 ☒	**Question 11** ☒	**Question 12** ☒
Question 13 ☒	**Question 14** ☒	**Question 15** ☒
Question 16 ☒	**Question 17** ☒	**Question 18** ☒
Question 19 ☒	**Question 20** ☒	**Question 21** ☒
Question 22 ☒		

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 40 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 80 MARKS

stemup.co.uk

BLANK PAGE

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

BLANK PAGE

stemup.co.uk

BLANK PAGE

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Surname	StemUp Model Solution
Answer booklet	Write the question number in the left-hand margin at the start of each answer.

Question number

1a

In this extract Shakespeare presents Lady Macbeth as a woman whose mind has been broken by the very crimes she once commanded. The controlled, persuasive speaker of the early acts has vanished, and in her place is a fractured voice that relives the past in disordered fragments, so that the sleepwalking scene becomes a kind of involuntary confession.

The form of the scene is central to this. For the first time Lady Macbeth speaks in prose rather than verse, and the loss of the iambic rhythm mirrors the loss of her self-control. Her speech is broken by dashes and short exclamations: "Out, damned spot! Out, I say!" The repetition of the imperative "Out" is painfully ironic, because she is still giving orders, yet now they are addressed to a stain that will not obey her. The "spot" is invisible to the Doctor and Gentlewoman, which suggests that the blood exists only in her conscience. Shakespeare turns her obsessive hand washing into a physical symbol of a guilt that no action can remove.

The structure of her lines is equally revealing. She leaps between moments without logical connection: the counting of "One, two" seems to recall the bell before Duncan's murder, then she suddenly scolds Macbeth, "a soldier, and afeard?", echoing the taunts she used to manipulate him in Act 1. This collage of memories shows that she is trapped in the night of the murder, replaying it endlessly. Her rhetorical question "What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to account?" is spoken with apparent confidence, but in her sleep it sounds hollow, because the audience can see that her own mind is calling her to account. The horrified, almost childlike line "who would have thought the old man to have

Question number

had so much blood in him?" exposes how far reality has exceeded what she imagined.

Shakespeare also shows that her guilt has spread beyond Duncan. The jingling rhyme of "The Thane of Fife had a wife: where is she now?" sounds like a nursery rhyme, which makes her awareness of Lady Macduff's murder even more disturbing, and her final line, "Banquo's buried: he cannot come out on's grave", suggests that she knows about crimes she did not plan. The lexical field of death, "Hell", "blood", "grave", "buried", reveals a woman who now sees damnation where she once saw only a crown.

Sensory imagery deepens her torment. "Here's the smell of the blood still!" moves her guilt from sight to smell, and the hyperbole of "All the perfumes of Arabia" contrasts exotic luxury with "this little hand". The diminutive "little" is striking: the woman who called on spirits to "unsex" her now seems small and fragile. Her wordless sighs, "O! Oh, oh", show that language itself is failing her.

Finally, the onstage watchers shape our response. The Doctor's metaphor "The heart is sorely charged" and his admission that "This disease is beyond my practice" frame her suffering as spiritual rather than medical, while the Gentlewoman's pity invites the audience to feel sympathy as well as judgement. Shakespeare therefore presents Lady Macbeth as both a guilty criminal and a tragic victim of her own ambition.

1b

Guilt is important in Macbeth because it is the force that punishes the Macbeths long before Macduff's sword does. Shakespeare shows guilt as the natural response of a human conscience to crimes against God and the natural order, and by

Question number

tracing how it grows in Macbeth and destroys Lady Macbeth, he suggests that no one can escape the moral consequences of evil.

Guilt is shown even before the first murder. In the dagger soliloquy Macbeth sees a dagger leading him towards Duncan's chamber, later covered in "gouts of blood". The hallucination suggests that his conscience is already projecting the crime into the world around him, and his uncertainty about whether it is "a dagger of the mind" shows a man divided against himself. The reason for this guilt is clear: Duncan is his king, his kinsman and his guest. To a Jacobean audience who believed in the Divine Right of Kings, regicide was not simply murder but a sin against God, and James I, the play's royal patron, had himself survived the Gunpowder Plot in 1605. Macbeth's guilt is therefore the correct, almost instinctive, response to an unthinkable crime.

Immediately after the murder, guilt is shown through his inability to pray. He cannot say "Amen" when the grooms pray, which suggests that he has cut himself off from God's grace. He believes he heard a voice cry "Sleep no more", and sleeplessness becomes a recurring symbol of a guilty mind throughout the play. Blood imagery is equally important: he looks at his "hangman's hands" and fears that not even the ocean could wash them clean, a hyperbole that contrasts sharply with Lady Macbeth's dismissive claim that "a little water" will clear them. Shakespeare uses this contrast to set up a powerful irony, since by Act 5 it is she who is obsessed with washing.

As the play develops, Macbeth's guilt turns into paranoia rather than repentance. After arranging Banquo's murder, he sees Banquo's ghost sitting in his place at the banquet. The ghost is silent, yet its presence publicly exposes Macbeth's crime in front of his thanes. Elizabethan and Jacobean audiences widely believed that

Question number

ghosts could return to accuse the guilty, so the scene would have seemed both terrifying and just. Interestingly, Macbeth responds to guilt not by stopping but by killing more, claiming that he is so far "in blood" that returning would be as hard as going on. Guilt here becomes a trap that drives him deeper into tyranny.

Lady Macbeth's guilt is shown more slowly but more completely. Having suppressed her conscience in Act I, she cannot control it in sleep, and her death, reported as probable suicide, suggests that guilt can be fatal. Shakespeare may be suggesting that conscience is part of human nature, and that trying to destroy it destroys the self.

At the end, Macbeth's admission to Macduff that his soul is "charged" with the blood of Macduff's family shows that a trace of guilt survives even in the tyrant. Through guilt, Shakespeare reassures his audience that the moral order is restored from within as well as without.

2a

In this extract Shakespeare presents Ferdinand as a passionate, idealistic lover whose royal status is transformed by his devotion to Miranda. He moves from courtly flattery to a solemn vow, and the language he uses shows a prince willingly turning himself into a servant for love.

Ferdinand begins by presenting himself as a man of experience. The repetition of "several" in "For several virtues / Have I liked several women" suggests a varied history at court, and the measured verse sounds like a careful courtier weighing evidence. Yet the conjunction "but" introduces a flaw in every woman he has known, so that his past becomes a contrast that makes Miranda unique. The broken line in which "But you" is interrupted and restarted as "o you" is a striking

Question number

shift: the interjection and the repeated pronoun suggest that his composure collapses when he turns to her. The alliteration of "perfect" and "peerless" and the superlative claim that she is made "Of every creature's best" are hyperbolic, in the tradition of Petrarchan love poetry, and they present Ferdinand as someone who idealises Miranda almost as a work of art.

His second speech reveals a tension between status and service. The hesitant syntax of "I am, in my condition, / A prince, Miranda: I do think, a King" shows him remembering, painfully, that he believes his father drowned. The interruption "I would not so!" is an exclamation of grief which reveals a tender, loyal son as well as a lover. Shakespeare then sets his royal identity against his present labour. The metaphor "wooden slavery" and the disgusting image of letting "The flesh-fly blow my mouth" show how degrading carrying logs would normally be for a prince, so his acceptance of it measures the strength of his feeling. The paradox that his heart flew "to your service" and makes him "slave to it" reverses the usual order of power: love has made the prince the servant.

The self-mocking phrase "this patient log-man" adds a note of humour and humility. Ferdinand can laugh at his own situation, which makes him more likeable and suggests that his love is sincere rather than merely rhetorical.

The climax is shaped by Miranda's direct question, "Do you love me?" Its simple monosyllables contrast with Ferdinand's elaborate answer. He calls on "heaven" and "earth" to "bear witness", turning his declaration into a sacred oath, and he even invites misfortune if he speaks "hollowly". This conditional structure shows how seriously he treats his word. The triplet "love, prize, honour" builds from emotion to value to respect, and the phrase "Beyond all limit" suggests a love that cannot be measured. Placing the verbs at the very end of his speech gives them a final,

Question number

emphatic weight.

Overall, Shakespeare presents Ferdinand as noble, romantic and sincere, but also slightly extravagant in his language. His willingness to labour and his formal vow suggest that he deserves Miranda, preparing the audience for a union that will heal the divisions of the play.

2b

Love is important in The Tempest because it is the force that finally turns Prospero's plot of revenge into a story of reconciliation. Shakespeare presents several kinds of love, romantic, paternal, the love between master and servant, and love of place and knowledge, and he shows that love can be both controlling and healing.

Paternal love drives the whole play. In Act I Scene 2 Prospero tells Miranda that everything he has done has been "in care of thee", and he later calls her "a third of mine own life". His storm, his magic and his manipulation of the shipwrecked lords are all designed to restore her to her rightful place. Yet this love is also possessive. He watches the lovers secretly and deliberately makes Ferdinand's courtship difficult fearing that "too light winning" would make Ferdinand value her less. In Jacobean society a father had the right to arrange his daughter's marriage, and Prospero's control would have seemed natural to an original audience, but a modern audience may find his surveillance uncomfortable. Alonso's love for Ferdinand mirrors Prospero's. Believing his son drowned, he is overwhelmed by grief and wishes he could lie "mudded" in the ooze beside him. Shakespeare uses this suffering to show that even a guilty king who helped to depose Prospero is capable of deep love, which makes his eventual repentance believable.

Question number

Romantic love between Ferdinand and Miranda begins as wonder and attraction. Miranda, who has seen no young man before, thinks Ferdinand a "spirit", while Ferdinand's first concern is whether she is a "maid". His question reflects the importance placed on female chastity and virginity before marriage in Jacobean England, and Prospero's stern warnings about honouring her before the wedding reinforce this. Love here is shown through service: Ferdinand carries logs willingly, and Miranda offers to carry them for him, which suggests a relationship of mutual sacrifice. Their marriage also has a political function, uniting Milan and Naples and resolving the old conflict, so love becomes a means of restoring order.

The relationship between Prospero and Ariel offers a more complicated form of love. Prospero calls Ariel "my delicate Ariel" and values the spirit's advice, and when Ariel says that, were he human, his feelings would become tender towards the suffering lords, Prospero is moved to choose virtue over vengeance. Love, in the form of compassion, is therefore the turning point of the play. However, Ariel's repeated requests for freedom remind us that this affection exists within servitude.

Caliban's love is directed towards the island itself. In his speech about the island's "sounds and sweet airs", his lyrical verse reveals a sensitivity that contrasts with the curses he hurls at Prospero. Written at a time of European colonisation of the "New World", the play allows Caliban's love of his home to raise questions about the dispossession of native peoples.

Finally, Prospero's love of his books cost him his dukedom, since he neglected government for study. By breaking his staff and drowning his book, he gives up one love for a wiser one, suggesting that Shakespeare sees human love, rather than power or magic, as the true source of harmony.

Question number

3a

In this extract Shakespeare presents Lord Capulet as a genial host whose good humour depends entirely on being obeyed. At first he appears tolerant and reasonable, even generous towards his enemy's son, but when Tybalt challenges him his temper erupts, revealing a proud patriarch for whom authority matters more than either peace or kinship.

Capulet opens with apparent concern. The question "Wherefore storm you so?" and the affectionate term "kinsman" suggest that he wants to calm his nephew, while the metaphor "storm" hints at Tybalt's violent nature. His response to Romeo is surprisingly generous. The soothing imperatives "Content thee, gentle coz, let him alone" sound gentle, and he even praises Romeo as "virtuous and well-governed", reporting that "Verona brags of him". Shakespeare makes Capulet's tolerance seem sincere, but it is also about reputation: he would not "for the wealth of all this town" disgrace his own house. The hyperbole shows how much he values the image of a gracious host.

However, his language also reveals the foundations of his power. The phrase "It is my will" is a blunt assertion of authority, and the conditional "which if thou respect" makes obedience a test of loyalty. The rhyming couplet "Show a fair presence and put off these frowns, / An ill-beseeming semblance for a feast" sounds polished and controlled, as if Capulet is concerned above all with appearances.

The turning point comes when Tybalt refuses: "I'll not endure him!" Capulet's reply turns Tybalt's own verb against him, "He shall be endured", and the modal "shall" is uncompromising. From here his speech becomes fragmented. Short exclamations and imperatives, "Go to!", "Be quiet", and the rhetorical question "Am I the master here, or you?" show his anger rising rapidly. The question is not really a question

Question number

at all; it reasserts the hierarchy of the household. Significantly, his terms for Tybalt shift from "kinsman" and "gentle coz" to "goodman boy", "saucy boy" and "princox". These belittling labels strip Tybalt of adult status and remind him that, within this house, only Capulet is a man of authority. The sarcastic mimicry of "You'll be the man!" mocks Tybalt's ambition to act independently.

Shakespeare's stagecraft makes the scene both comic and unsettling. Capulet's tirade is repeatedly interrupted by asides to the dancers and servants, "Well said, my hearts!" and "More light, more light". The rapid switching between fury and cheerful hospitality shows a man performing joviality in public while threatening in private, and the broken lines and dashes mirror his divided attention. The threat "This trick may chance to scathe you" and the unfinished "Be quiet, or" leave the consequences ominously unspoken.

Overall, Capulet is presented as a powerful, volatile patriarch. His insistence on obedience here foreshadows his later explosion at Juliet, and Tybalt's humiliation plants a resentment that will explode in violence. Ironically, Capulet's attempt to keep peace through dominance helps to create the conflict that destroys his family.

3b

Power is important in Romeo and Juliet because almost every tragic event results from a struggle between different kinds of authority: the civic power of the Prince, the patriarchal power of fathers, the spiritual power of the Church, and the overwhelming power of love and fate. Shakespeare suggests that when these forces pull against each other, the young are crushed between them.

From the Prologue, the power of the feud is presented as an inherited force. The

Question number

"ancient grudge" breaks out into "new mutiny", showing that the hatred has a momentum of its own which neither family seems able to control. The opening brawl, begun by servants biting their thumbs, shows how this power reaches down through the whole social hierarchy. Prince Escalus represents the legal power that should restrain it. His declaration that the families' lives "shall pay the forfeit of the peace" is a formal, absolute threat. To an Elizabethan audience, civil brawls were a real danger to social order, and Elizabeth's government feared disorder among powerful families, so the Prince embodies the authority of the state. Yet his power proves limited: after Mercutio's death he banishes rather than executes Romeo, and by the final scene he must admit that he too has lost kinsmen. Shakespeare may be showing that law alone cannot overcome private hatred.

The most direct form of power in the play is patriarchal. Early on, Capulet seems a considerate father who tells Paris to wait and win Juliet's heart. However, after Tybalt's death he arranges her marriage himself and fixes the day for Thursday, telling Paris that he thinks Juliet will be ruled by him in all respects. When she refuses, his power turns brutal. He calls her a "disobedient wretch" and threatens to throw her out to die in the streets. In Elizabethan England a daughter was legally her father's property until marriage, and marriages among wealthy families were often arranged for status, so Capulet's rage reflects real expectations. Shakespeare, however, exposes the cruelty of this system, since it forces Juliet into the desperate plan that leads to her death. Lady Capulet's refusal to help and the Nurse's advice to marry Paris show that the women around Juliet are also powerless before him.

Against this, Shakespeare sets the power of love. Romeo and Juliet's love defies family, name and law. Juliet's wish that Romeo would "deny thy father and refuse thy name" shows love challenging the power of identity itself. Yet the Prologue's

Question number

description of them as "star-crossed lovers" suggests that a still greater power, fate, governs their lives, and Romeo's cry "I defy you, stars!" is tragically futile.

Friar Laurence attempts to use the spiritual power of the Church to reconcile the families, hoping the marriage will "turn your households' rancour to pure love". His power, though, depends on secrecy, and when his letter fails to reach Romeo his plans collapse. Ultimately the deaths of the lovers achieve what no authority could, as Capulet and Montague are reconciled. Shakespeare suggests that the abuse of power has a terrible cost, and that peace comes only through sacrifice.

4a

In this extract Hero presents Beatrice as proud, scornful and impossible to please, but because the conversation is staged for Beatrice to overhear, Shakespeare makes Hero's feelings deliberately double. On the surface she sounds critical and even exasperated; beneath this performance lies affection and a playful determination to change her cousin.

Hero's first speech is built as an extended catalogue of Beatrice's faults. The claim that "I never yet saw man" whom Beatrice could not criticise uses an absolute, exaggerated negative, and the metaphor that she would "spell him backward" suggests that she reverses every virtue into a fault. Shakespeare then uses a structure of parallel conditional clauses: "If fair-faced", "If black", "if tall", "If low", "If speaking", "If silent". The relentless anaphora creates a list in which every possible type of man is rejected, and the antithesis between opposites shows that Beatrice's mockery has no logic except contempt. The comic images, a "lance ill-headed", "an agate very vilely cut", "a vane blown with all the winds", are themselves witty, so Hero ironically imitates Beatrice's style while condemning it. This suggests an affectionate knowledge of her cousin rather than real hostility.

Question number

The concluding lines of this speech moves from comedy to moral judgement. The image that she "turns every man the wrong side out" presents Beatrice as someone who distorts the truth, and the abstract nouns "truth and virtue", "simpleness and merit", show Hero claiming that Beatrice denies men the respect they deserve. Hero's feeling here sounds like disapproval of a woman who refuses the conventional role.

When Ursula agrees that such "carping" is not commendable, Hero replies with a firm "No" and the double negative "not to be so odd and from all fashions". Calling Beatrice "odd" suggests that she stands outside social expectation. Yet Hero then shifts to apparent fear. The rhetorical question "But who dare tell her so?" and the hyperbole that Beatrice would "mock me into air" and "press me to death with wit" present Beatrice's tongue as a weapon. The phrase "press me to death" alludes to a real form of torture, and its exaggeration is comic, showing Hero relishing the performance.

Hero's plan to "devise some honest slanders" is an oxymoron that captures the game: the slanders are false, but the intention is kind. Her claim that "an ill word may empoison liking" is dramatically ironic, because it foreshadows the far more serious slander that will later be used against Hero herself. The image of Benedick, "like covered fire", consuming away in sighs is meant for Beatrice's ears, encouraging pity and love.

Ursula's protests, "O, do not do your cousin such a wrong!", allow the two women to praise Beatrice's "swift and excellent" wit indirectly. Overall, Shakespeare presents Hero's feelings as a careful mixture of criticism and love: her exaggerated attack on Beatrice's pride is designed to make Beatrice see herself, and to open

Question number

her heart to Benedick.

4b Shakespeare presents women in Much Ado About Nothing as living within a society in which their value depends on male judgement, particularly on reputation and chastity. Through the contrast between the quiet Hero and the outspoken Beatrice, and through the near tragedy of Hero's shaming, he exposes how fragile a woman's position was, while also allowing female wit to challenge male power.

Hero is presented, for most of the play, as the ideal Renaissance daughter: modest, obedient and largely silent. In the opening scenes she barely speaks while the men discuss her, and Claudio's anxious check on whether Leonato has a son, and therefore whether Hero will inherit, reveals that she is seen as a prize as much as a person. When Don Pedro is wrongly expected to propose, Leonato tells her what to say, and Beatrice teases that it is a cousin's duty to curtsy and say "Father, as it please you". This passivity reflects the Elizabethan expectation that a father arranged his daughter's marriage, often for status.

The effect of this presentation becomes devastating at the wedding in Act 4. Deceived by Don John and Borachio, Claudio publicly rejects Hero, calling her a "rotten orange" and comparing her to Diana and then to Venus. The metaphor reduces her to something that looks fair but is corrupt inside. Most shockingly, Leonato believes the accusation instantly and wishes she were dead. In Messina a woman's honour rested entirely on her virginity, while a man's rested on his deeds and status, so the mere accusation of unchastity destroys Hero's worth. Shakespeare shows how easily men believe the worst of women, and Hero's "death" and later "resurrection" expose the injustice of a system in which her innocence is irrelevant until men accept it.

Question number

Beatrice, by contrast, refuses to be silent. Her "merry war" with Benedick shows that she can match any man with her wit, and she mocks the idea of marriage, claiming she would rather hear her dog bark at a crow than a man swear he loves her. Benedick's insults and the other characters' warnings that she will never get a husband with such a shrewd tongue suggest that men find such a woman threatening. Yet when Hero is shamed, Beatrice's anger reveals the limits of female power. Her cry "O that I were a man!" shows that, however brilliant her words, she cannot take action herself and must ask Benedick to "Kill Claudio". Shakespeare presents her frustration sympathetically, inviting the audience to question a society that gives women voice but not power.

Margaret offers a further contrast. As a gentlewoman of lower class, she enjoys bawdy jokes and has a lover, Borachio, and she unknowingly allows herself to be used in the deception of Claudio. Her role suggests that female freedom of behaviour is dangerous in such a society, because it can be turned against other women.

The play ends in marriages, which restore order, but the presentation of women leaves an uneasy feeling. Hero is accepted back by the man who humiliated her, while Beatrice is silenced, at least comically, by Benedick's kiss. Shakespeare may be celebrating love, but he also reveals how unequal the world of Messina is for women.

Sa

In this extract Shakespeare presents Olivia's reactions to Malvolio as a growing mixture of bewilderment, concern and alarm. Because the audience knows that Maria forged the letter, every one of Olivia's innocent questions creates dramatic

Question number

irony, and her confusion becomes the engine of the scene's comedy.

Olivia begins with genuine concern. Her question "Why, how dost thou, man? What is the matter with thee?" is simple and direct, and the familiar "thou" suggests the authority of a mistress speaking to a servant she believes is unwell. Malvolio's riddling reply about being "Not black in my mind, though yellow in my legs" makes no sense to her, and so her next suggestion, "Wilt thou go to bed, Malvolio?", is a practical remedy for apparent illness. Shakespeare exploits the ambiguity of this line. Olivia means rest, but Malvolio hears a sexual invitation, replying "ay, sweetheart, and I'll come to thee." The shocking familiarity of "sweetheart" from a steward to a countess breaks every rule of the hierarchy between them, and Olivia's response, "God comfort thee!", shows that she now fears for his sanity.

As the scene develops, her questions focus on his strange physical behaviour: "Why dost thou smile so, and kiss thy hand so oft?" The stage directions implied here would allow an actor to perform exaggerated grinning and gestures, and Olivia's question draws the audience's attention to how ridiculous he looks. Her reactions effectively narrate the comedy for the audience.

The structure of the central section is particularly effective. Malvolio quotes the letter line by line, "Some are born great", "Some achieve greatness", and Olivia interrupts each phrase with short, puzzled exclamations and questions: "Ha!", "What sayest thou?" This stichomythic pattern creates a comic rhythm, with Malvolio growing more confident while Olivia grows more baffled. Her repetition of his own words, "Thy yellow stockings!" and "Cross-gartered!", is especially funny because she echoes them in disbelief. The exclamation marks suggest rising astonishment, and the repetition shows that she cannot connect these words to anything she knows. The audience, who remember that Olivia detests yellow and

Question number

hates cross-gartering, enjoy the gap between her horror and his belief that she adores the sight.

Olivia's religious exclamations, "God comfort thee!" and "Heaven restore thee!", show that she begins to interpret his behaviour as a spiritual affliction, perhaps even possession, which was a common belief about madness at the time. Her brief question "Am I made?" picks up his phrase with incredulity, almost as if she is checking whether she has heard correctly.

The extract ends with her declarative judgement: "Why, this is very midsummer madness." The phrase links his behaviour to the heat and festivity of midsummer, a time associated with folly and lunacy, and it gives a name to what the audience has watched. Ironically, Olivia, who is herself infatuated with Cesario, diagnoses madness in someone else. Shakespeare therefore uses her reactions both to heighten the comedy of Malvolio's humiliation and to prepare for the darker treatment he will receive when he is confined as a madman.

Sb

Madness is important in Twelfth Night because it is the word the characters reach for whenever disguise, desire or deception throws Illyria into confusion. Shakespeare presents madness in many forms, from the festive folly of the title to the passionate "madness" of love and the cruel accusation used against Malvolio, and he uses it both to create comedy and to raise unsettling questions about who is truly sane.

The title itself suggests madness as celebration. Twelfth Night was the last night of the Christmas festivities, a time of revelry, misrule and role reversal when servants could mock masters and ordinary order was turned upside down. Sir Toby

Question number

and Sir Andrew's drunken singing late at night captures this spirit, and when Malvolio interrupts, he asks whether they are "mad" to make such noise at that hour. Here, madness is the disorder that festivity brings. Feste reinforces the link between drink and madness when Olivia asks what a drunken man is like, and he replies that he is like a madman and a drowned man. Shakespeare suggests that a little madness is natural and even joyful, but that it can quickly become excessive.

Love is also presented as a kind of madness. Orsino's opening speech, with its longing for an "excess" of music, shows a man intoxicated by his own feelings. Olivia falls instantly for Cesario and wonders how she could catch "the plague" so quickly, and when she compares her own state with Malvolio's she admits that she is as mad as he, if sad and merry madness are equal. This parallel is significant: the countess and the steward are both lovesick, but only the servant is punished. Shakespeare invites the audience to notice that madness is defined by status as much as by behaviour.

The most important effect of madness is the treatment of Malvolio. After the letter trick, Maria, Toby and Fabian declare him mad and have him "bound" in a dark room, which was a common treatment for lunatics in Elizabethan England, where madness was often thought to be caused by possession by evil spirits. Feste, disguised as the curate Sir Topas, pretends to exorcise the devil from him and insists that the darkness is light. Malvolio's repeated, dignified protest that he is "not mad" makes the joke turn cruel, and many audiences come to pity him. His final threat to be revenged "on the whole pack" of them shows that madness used as a weapon leaves lasting damage.

Finally, the confusion caused by Viola's disguise makes sane characters appear mad. Sebastian, greeted by strangers and embraced by Olivia, asks whether he is mad or

Question number

whether the whole world is, and Antonio, accusing "Cesario" of betrayal, seems to the officers to be raving. Mistaken identity, the central device of the comedy, therefore produces a world where reason seems to have collapsed. When the twins finally appear together, Orsino describes the sight as a "natural perspective", and the restoration of identity ends the madness.

Overall, Shakespeare uses madness to drive the comedy, but he also shows that in a world of disguise it is often impossible to tell the mad from the sane, and that labelling someone mad can be a form of power.

6a

In this extract Shakespeare presents the relationship between Nerissa and Gratiano as a comic lovers' quarrel in which the balance of power has shifted firmly to the wife. Because the audience knows that Nerissa herself was the "judge's clerk", the argument is built on dramatic irony: Gratiano is genuinely flustered, while Nerissa is acting, enjoying her husband's discomfort in order to test and teach him.

The quarrel begins in the middle, with Gratiano already on the defensive. His oath "By yonder moon I swear you do me / Wrong!" is exaggerated, and the moon, a traditional symbol of inconstancy, ironically undermines his claim to be faithful. The crude wish that the clerk were "gelt" is comic and coarse, revealing the bawdy humour that characterises Gratiano throughout, yet the rhyme of "part" with "heart" also shows him trying to soothe her by acknowledging that she takes it "so much at heart". Portia's interjection, "A quarrel, ho", followed by the exclamation "already!", frames them as newlyweds who have barely been married before arguing, and the exclamation adds to the comic tone.

Gratiano then makes his position worse by belittling the ring. Calling it "a paltry

Question number

ring" and comparing its posy to "cutler's poetry / Upon a knife" are dismissive images that reduce a love token to a cheap, mass-produced object. The inscription, "Love me, and leave me not", is ironic, because it is exactly what Nerissa accuses him of failing to do. His tactlessness suggests that he values the ring only for its material worth, while she insists on its meaning.

Nerissa's reply is sharp and controlled. Her question "What talk you of the posy or the value?" brushes aside both his excuses, and the repeated second person pronouns, "You swore to me", "you would wear it", sound accusatory. She reminds him of his oath to wear it "till your hour of death" and that it should "lie with you in your grave", language of permanence which elevates the ring to a symbol of the marriage vow itself. The phrase "vehement oaths" emphasises that broken promises, not lost jewellery, are the real issue. Her disbelieving exclamation "Gave it a judge's clerk!" and her mocking claim that the clerk will never grow a beard turn the argument into teasing.

The stichomythic exchange that follows, "He will, and if he live to be a man" answered by "Ay, if a woman live to be a man", is one of the wittiest moments. Nerissa's reply is a private joke for the audience, since the clerk was in fact a woman disguised as a man. She is playing with her husband, and the quick exchange shows that she is his equal, or superior, in wit.

Gratiano's final, flustered description of "a little scrubbèd boy / No higher than thyself" is again comically ironic, because he is describing Nerissa to her face. Portia then takes Nerissa's side, using the imagery of something "riveted with faith unto your flesh" to stress that the ring should be part of him. Together, the women control the scene. Shakespeare presents a relationship that is affectionate but playful, in which Nerissa uses deception to assert her power and to remind

Question number

Gratiano of the seriousness of his vows.

6b

Deception is important in The Merchant of Venice because it shapes almost every relationship in the play, from courtship and friendship to commerce and law. Shakespeare shows that deception can be cruel and self-serving, but also that it can be used cleverly to rescue, test and reveal the truth, particularly by characters who otherwise lack power.

Deception begins with Bassanio's courtship. Having already wasted his own fortune, he borrows money from Antonio so that he can travel to Belmont looking like a wealthy suitor worthy of Portia. Although he later confesses to her that all his wealth "ran in my veins", his initial show of wealth is a kind of disguise. In Elizabethan society, marriage among the upper classes was closely tied to money and status, so Bassanio's deception reflects how love and finance were intertwined, and it sets in motion the bond that endangers Antonio.

The bond itself is built on deception. Shylock claims that he wishes to be friends with Antonio and to forget the insults he has suffered, calling the pound of flesh a "merry sport". His friendly words hide a deep hatred, revealed earlier in his aside that he would "feed fat the ancient grudge" against Antonio. For an Elizabethan audience, who were taught to regard Jews with prejudice and who associated moneylending with sin, this deception might have confirmed stereotypes. A modern audience, however, may see it as a response to years of abuse, since Antonio has spat on him and called him "dog". Shakespeare's presentation therefore allows the audience to see deception as a weapon of the persecuted as well as of the villain.

Deception is also used for comedy. Lancelot Gobbo tricks his blind father into

Question number

believing that his son is dead before revealing himself. The scene is cruel but comic, and it mirrors the larger theme of mistaken identity and the testing of loyalty. Jessica deceives Shylock too, escaping from his house disguised as a boy and taking his money and jewels to marry Lorenzo. Her deception allows her to escape her father's control, but its effect on Shylock, who laments both his daughter and his ducats, deepens his bitterness and his desire for revenge.

The most significant deception is Portia's disguise as Balthazar, a young doctor of law, with Nerissa as her clerk. In a society where women could not practise law, disguise is the only way Portia can act in the public world of Venice. Her deception is morally justified because it saves Antonio's life. By insisting that Shylock may take flesh but not "one drop of Christian blood", she defeats him with the very literalness he relied upon. The effect is a dramatic reversal, though the harshness of Shylock's punishment and forced conversion may trouble a modern audience.

Finally, Portia and Nerissa use their disguises to test their husbands by demanding the rings. This deception turns the end of the play into a comic examination of loyalty and of the vows men make to women. Shakespeare suggests that deception is not simply wrong: in the hands of the clever and the powerless, it can expose hypocrisy and restore justice.

7 In An Inspector Calls, money is far more than a sign of comfort: it is the hidden force that decides who is listened to, who is protected and who is thrown away. Priestley, writing in 1945 but setting the play in 1912, uses money to expose the selfishness of a capitalist society in which a small, wealthy class lives at the expense of the many. Eric's words about Eva, that she had "no money left", sum up the tragedy: in this world, to be without money is to be without choices, and

Question number

eventually without a life.

From the opening stage directions, Priestley makes wealth visible. The Birlings' dining room is "substantial and heavily comfortable", and the family are in evening dress, drinking port and champagne, with cigars on offer. This display is deliberately smug. The celebration is not simply for Sheila's engagement but for a business alliance: Birling hopes that Crofts and Birlings will one day work together for "lower costs and higher prices". The marriage is therefore partly a financial merger, reflecting the way middle and upper-class families of the Edwardian period used marriage to protect and increase their wealth and status. Even Gerald's gift of a ring is a token of money as much as love. Priestley invites his 1945 audience, many of whom had endured the poverty of the 1930s, to see how hollow this comfortable world is.

Money is most brutal in Birling's treatment of Eva. When the workers at his factory asked for a rise from about twenty-two and six to twenty-five shillings a week, he refused and sacked the "ring-leaders". To Birling this was simply sound business: he argues that it is his "duty to keep labour costs down". The small sum involved makes his choice seem petty and shocking; a few shillings mattered nothing to him but everything to Eva. In 1912 there was no welfare state, no unemployment benefit and very little protection for workers, so losing a job could push a young working-class woman towards destitution. Priestley, a socialist who had campaigned for a fairer post-war Britain, uses this moment to show how capitalism treats people as costs rather than human beings. Sheila's protest that "these girls aren't cheap labour" voices the playwright's own view and marks the beginning of the younger generation's change.

The power of money is also shown through Sheila's account at Milwards. As the

Question number

daughter of a wealthy customer, she is able to have Eva dismissed simply out of jealousy and bad temper. Money gives Sheila an influence that Eva, who depends on her wage, cannot resist. Priestley suggests that spending power is a form of social power: the shop manager obeys the rich customer, not the honest worker. Sheila's later shame, when she admits she used her position unfairly, shows that she begins to understand how money corrupts relationships between classes.

Gerald's relationship with Daisy Renton presents money in a more ambiguous light. He rescues her from the Palace bar, installs her in his friend's rooms and gives her money to live on. On one level this seems generous, yet it also reveals a deep inequality. Gerald's wealth allows him to keep a young woman as a mistress and then end the affair when it suits him, sending her away with a little money. This reflects the double standards of a male-dominated society in which wealthy men could buy companionship while poor women had few respectable ways to support themselves. Priestley seems to suggest that even kindness, when it depends on money, is a kind of control.

Mrs Birling's role makes the cruelty of wealth even clearer. As a prominent member of the Brumley Women's Charity Organisation, she has power over who receives financial help, yet she refuses Eva because the girl used the name "Mrs Birling", which she found impertinent. Her scornful remark, "As if a girl of that sort would ever refuse money!", reveals her assumption that the poor are greedy and dishonest. Ironically, Eva had refused stolen money from Eric, showing more integrity than the wealthy family. Charity here is not compassion but a way for the rich to judge and control the poor, which echoes the humiliating means-tested relief that many in Priestley's audience remembered from the Depression.

Eric's theft of around fifty pounds from his father's office completes the pattern.

Question number

Money that Birling values so highly is quietly stolen by his own son, and Birling's reaction is to talk of covering it up rather than of the dead girl. Indeed, when the Inspector presses him, Birling says he would give "thousands" to put things right. This offer is deeply ironic: thousands are now available, yet he refused a few shillings when they could have saved Eva. Money cannot buy back a life, and Birling's belief that it can exposes the moral emptiness of his class.

Ultimately, Priestley uses money to support the Inspector's final message that "we are responsible for each other". The Inspector's warning of "fire and blood and anguish" would have reminded the 1945 audience of two world wars, and his vision of "millions and millions" of Eva and John Smiths turns one girl's poverty into a symbol of an entire class. By showing how money divides the Birlings from Eva, Priestley argues that a society built on profit is unjust and must change, a message that matched the mood of the Labour victory and the coming welfare state. Money in the play, then, is significant because it exposes the choices of the powerful: it is not the lack of money that kills Eva, but the refusal of those who have it to share it.

8 Mr Arthur Birling is important throughout An Inspector Calls because he embodies everything Priestley wanted his audience to reject. Proud, self-satisfied and devoted to profit, he is both the head of the family and the starting point of the chain of events that leads to Eva Smith's death. Writing in 1945 but setting the play in 1912, Priestley turns Birling into a symbol of the selfish capitalist attitudes that he believed had led Britain into poverty and war, so that by the end the audience sees not just a foolish man but a whole outlook that must be left behind.

Question number

From the start, Priestley presents Birling as a man obsessed with status. The stage directions describe him as a "heavy-looking, rather portentous man" in his middle fifties, and note that his wife is his "social superior". This detail suggests that Birling is a self-made man whose new money still feels insecure beside the older wealth of the Crofts. He tells Gerald that he hopes Crofts and Birlings will one day combine for "lower costs and higher prices", which shows that he sees his daughter's engagement partly as a business merger. In the Edwardian period, marriages among the wealthy were often a way to protect and increase a family's position, and Birling's hints about a possible knighthood ("Just a knighthood, of course") reveal how desperately he wants to rise further. Priestley makes him a little ridiculous, but also dangerous, because his love of status leaves little room for compassion.

Birling is also important as a vehicle for dramatic irony. In his speeches in Act One he describes himself as a "hard-headed, practical man of business" and confidently dismisses the idea of war, insisting that the Titanic is "unsinkable, absolutely unsinkable". The 1945 audience knew that the Titanic sank in 1912 and that two world wars followed. By making Birling wrong about everything the audience can check, Priestley undermines the rest of his views. When he lectures the young men that a man must "look after himself and his own", and mocks the idea of "community and all that nonsense", the audience is primed to distrust him. In this way Birling's early confidence sets up the whole moral argument of the play, and the Inspector's arrival, signalled by the sharp ring of the doorbell, interrupts him at the very moment he is preaching selfishness.

Birling is the first person the Inspector questions, and this structural choice matters. In 1910, Eva worked in his factory and joined a strike for a rise to twenty-five shillings a week. Birling refused and sacked her as a ring-leader,

Question number

explaining that it was his "duty to keep labour costs down". His lack of guilt is striking: he insists he cannot accept responsibility, because if he did he would be responsible for everything that happened to everyone. Without welfare support in 1912, losing a job left a working-class woman very vulnerable, so Birling's action pushes Eva into a downward spiral that others continue. Priestley, a committed socialist, presents Birling as the face of employers who saw workers as "cheap labour", the very phrase that Sheila rejects when she reminds him that the girls are people.

Throughout the Inspector's investigation, Birling's main concern is his reputation rather than the dead girl. He tries to intimidate Goole by mentioning that he was Lord Mayor, that he is a magistrate and that he plays golf with the Chief Constable. When the truth about Eric emerges, he worries about a "public scandal" and the effect on his knighthood. Even his offer to give "thousands" to put things right shows that he thinks money can repair anything. The Inspector's quiet rebuke, "Public men, Mr Birling, have responsibilities as well as privileges", highlights the gap between Birling's power and his sense of duty. Priestley uses this contrast to argue that those with the most influence in society have the greatest obligation to others.

Birling's importance becomes clearest at the end, when he refuses to change. Once Gerald suggests that Goole may not have been a real inspector, Birling is triumphant. He mocks Sheila and Eric as "the famous younger generation who know it all". His relief is entirely selfish: the possibility that no girl died matters to him only because it means no scandal. This sharply divides the family into generations. Sheila and Eric accept their guilt and seem capable of change, whereas Birling and his wife remain fixed in their attitudes. Priestley, writing at the end of the Second World War as Britain moved towards the Labour landslide

Question number

and the welfare state, seems to suggest that hope lies with the young, who can learn from the mistakes of their elders.

The final telephone call, announcing that a girl has died and an inspector is on his way, exposes Birling's complacency once more. The family is left staring at one another in guilty silence as the curtain falls, unable to escape the consequences he has denied all evening. In this sense, Birling is important throughout the play because he is its moral target. His pomposity provides comedy, his false predictions create irony, and his refusal to learn makes the Inspector's warning about "fire and blood and anguish" urgent. Priestley uses him to show that a society run by men like Arthur Birling is unjust and unsafe, and that the audience must choose a different path.

9 Responsibility lies at the heart of Hobson's Choice, because Brighouse builds his comedy around a simple reversal: the man who should be responsible for his family and business neglects both, while the daughter he undervalues quietly carries them. Set in Salford in 1880 but written in 1915, when the campaign for women's rights was gathering force, the play asks who truly deserves authority. By the end, responsibility has passed from Hobson to Maggie and Willie, and Brighouse suggests that power should belong to those who take responsibility, not those who simply inherit it through gender or position.

At the start of the play, Hobson holds every traditional form of authority. He is a widower, the owner of a prosperous boot shop and the head of a household of three unmarried daughters. In Victorian society the father was expected to be the master of the home and to provide for his children, including arranging suitable marriages. Hobson insists on his rights loudly, telling his daughters that he is

Question number

talking and they are listening, and complaining that they have become "uppish". Yet Brighouse makes clear that he fails in his duties. He spends long hours drinking at the Moonraker with his friends, leaving the shop to Maggie, and he refuses to give Alice and Vickey settlements so that they can marry, because he does not want the expense. His sense of responsibility is purely selfish: he values his daughters as unpaid labour rather than as people with futures of their own.

Maggie, by contrast, has already taken on the responsibilities her father ignores. As the eldest daughter, she runs the shop, handles customers and keeps the business profitable. In many ways she has stepped into the role of her dead mother, managing the household and keeping her father's routine in order. Hobson dismisses her as past marrying age at thirty, assuming she will remain useful to him for ever. Brighouse uses this to criticise a society that relied on women's work while denying them recognition or reward. Maggie's decision to marry Willie Mossop, the skilled but timid boot hand, is an act of independence, but it is also deeply responsible: she recognises his talent and plans a future in which both of them can prosper.

Indeed, Maggie takes responsibility for Willie himself. When she proposes, she argues that her "brains" and his "hands" would make a working partnership, a businesslike phrase that shows she sees marriage as a shared enterprise. She breaks off his engagement to Ada Figgins, finds premises in a cellar in Oldfield Road and uses Mrs Hepworth's patronage to launch the business. Above all, she educates him, making him practise his handwriting on a slate and encouraging him to speak with confidence. This reflects late Victorian ideas of self-improvement, through which working-class men could rise by effort and learning. Maggie's responsibility here is generous rather than controlling, since her aim is to make Willie his own master.

Question number

Maggie also takes responsibility for her sisters, a duty that should have been Hobson's. When their father trespasses into Beenstock's cellar after a drinking session, she persuades Albert Prosser, Alice's suitor and a solicitor, to bring an action for damages. The settlement provides the money Alice and Vickey need to marry Albert and Fred Beenstock. Brighouse creates comedy from the way the irresponsible father is made to pay, through his own drunkenness, for the marriages he refused to fund. At the same time, Maggie's cleverness shows that a woman could manage legal and financial affairs as skilfully as any man, a pointed idea in 1915, when women were still denied the vote.

The final act completes the reversal. Hobson is now seriously ill from his drinking, and Dr MacFarlane tells him that one of his daughters must look after him. Brighouse links this collapse to the wider problem of heavy drinking in Victorian industrial towns, where alcohol damaged health, families and businesses. Alice and Vickey, now married and respectable, refuse to take on the burden, revealing that they have learned their father's selfishness. Only Maggie and Willie accept the responsibility, but on their own terms. Willie, transformed from the nervous boot hand of Act One, speaks with authority and insists that the business become "Mossop and Hobson", with his own name first. Hobson's choice is now no choice at all: he must accept their conditions or be left alone. The title, which refers to a choice with only one option, takes on its full ironic meaning at this point.

This ending suggests that responsibility, not birth or gender, earns respect. Willie becomes the head of the business because he has worked for it, while Maggie remains its guiding force, showing a more equal partnership than the traditional Victorian household. Some might feel that Willie's new authority hints at a return to male dominance, yet Brighouse makes clear that Maggie has created and

Question number

approved this change, proud of the man she has shaped. In this way responsibility becomes the measure by which every character is judged. Hobson is punished for neglecting it, Alice and Vickey are exposed for avoiding it, and Maggie and Willie are rewarded for embracing it. Brighouse, writing for an audience living through rapid social change, presents a hopeful vision in which hard work, intelligence and shared responsibility matter more than the old hierarchy of class and gender.

10 At first glance Alice and Vickey seem to be minor characters in Hobson's Choice, two pretty, vain younger sisters who exist mainly to be married off. Yet Brighouse gives them real significance. They act as foils to Maggie, highlighting her intelligence and independence; they provide much of the play's comedy of snobbery; and they reflect the narrow expectations placed on middle-class women in late Victorian England. Vickey's warning to Alice that Maggie "mustn't have things too much her way" captures their role perfectly: they depend on their elder sister, yet resent her power, and through them Brighouse explores the conventional femininity that Maggie rejects.

In Act One, Alice and Vickey are presented as typical young women of their class, concerned with appearances and romance rather than the business that supports them. While Maggie deals capably with customers, her sisters are more interested in their clothes and their suitors, Albert Prosser and Fred Beenstock. Hobson treats all three daughters as subordinates, insisting that he is talking and they are listening, and he lectures them about being too forward. In 1880, the setting of the play, a father was regarded as master of the household and women had very limited legal or financial independence. Alice and Vickey accept this order without question; their only hope of escape is marriage, which depends on a settlement from their father. Their passivity contrasts sharply with Maggie, who takes her

Question number

future into her own hands.

Their reaction to Maggie's engagement to Willie Mossop is especially significant, because it exposes the class prejudice of the time. To them, Willie is only a boot hand, a lowly employee, and they are horrified that their sister should marry beneath her. Alice worries that the match will damage her own chances with Albert, arguing that what Maggie does affects them too. Their snobbery reflects the sharp divide between the respectable shop-owning middle class and the working class in Victorian Salford, where status depended heavily on appearances. Brighouse, writing in 1915, invites his audience to laugh at this attitude, since Willie proves far more talented and decent than the young men the sisters consider suitable.

The wedding scenes reinforce this contrast. Vickey is reluctant to attend because she feels it would mean approving the marriage, and both sisters are shocked when Maggie uses a cheap brass ring from the shop rather than a gold one. Alice declares she would rather remain single than be married in that way, while Vickey would only marry if she could start properly. For them, marriage is about outward show and social standing. For Maggie, it is a practical partnership based on mutual benefit. Brighouse uses the sisters to question which kind of marriage is more valuable. Ironically, Alice and Vickey can only marry because of Maggie's ingenuity in using Hobson's trespass into Beenstock's cellar to obtain the money for their settlements. Their romantic dreams depend entirely on her hard-headed planning.

The sisters are also significant in showing how dependent conventional women had become on Maggie. Once she leaves, the shop begins to decline, and the household falls into disorder. Alice and Vickey lack both the skill and the will to replace her. Even after their marriages, they still look to Maggie for guidance and rely on her

Question number

to manage family crises. This dependence makes Vickey's remark about not letting Maggie have things "too much her way" seem ungrateful and slightly comic. Brighouse suggests that the conventional role expected of middle-class women left them ill-equipped for responsibility, whereas Maggie's practical experience in the shop has given her a strength that her sisters lack.

Their significance becomes clearest in the final act. When Dr MacFarlane insists that one of the daughters must live with Hobson to care for him, Alice and Vickey both refuse. Alice now enjoys the status of a solicitor's wife, and Vickey has her own husband and home to think of; neither wants the inconvenience of an ailing, drunken father. They are more interested in how much money Hobson has than in his welfare, revealing a selfishness that mirrors his own. Their refusal leaves the responsibility to Maggie and Willie, who are able to set their own terms and take control of the business. Structurally, then, the sisters help to bring about the play's resolution: their unwillingness to help completes Hobson's downfall and Maggie's triumph.

Brighouse wrote Hobson's Choice at a time when the suffragette movement was challenging traditional ideas about women's roles, and Alice and Vickey can be seen as representatives of the old model of womanhood. They conform to society's expectation that a woman's main goal is a respectable marriage, and they judge others by class and appearance. However, they are not simply villains. They are products of their upbringing and of a father who never taught them responsibility. Brighouse treats them with gentle satire rather than harsh condemnation, using their vanity and snobbery to create humour while making a serious point.

Ultimately, Alice and Vickey are significant because they show, by contrast, what makes Maggie exceptional. Where they are dependent, she is independent; where

Question number

they value status, she values ability; where they avoid responsibility, she embraces it. Through these two sisters, Brighouse highlights the limitations of conventional femininity and celebrates a new kind of woman who could succeed through intelligence and work rather than through inherited position.

11 In Blood Brothers, Mrs Lyons develops from a lonely, apparently respectable middle-class woman into a paranoid and vengeful figure who helps to bring about the tragedy. Her line in the extract, that the twins "shall be raised apart and never, ever told", shows her at the height of her control, yet the secret she creates gradually destroys her. Russell uses her development to explore how wealth and privilege fail to bring happiness, and how the class divisions of modern Britain damage people on both sides.

At the start of the play, Mrs Lyons seems almost sympathetic. She lives in a large house, employs Mrs Johnstone as a cleaner and has every material comfort, but her husband is often away on business and she is unable to have children. She tells Mrs Johnstone that she had wanted to adopt, and her longing for a child gives her a vulnerability that the audience can recognise. However, Russell quickly shows a calculating side. When she learns that Mrs Johnstone is expecting twins and cannot afford them, she sees an opportunity. She persuades the desperate mother to give her one baby, presenting the arrangement as a kindness: the child would have every advantage and could be seen every day. Mrs Lyons exploits Mrs Johnstone's poverty, which in the 1960s Liverpool setting reflects the gulf between a comfortable middle class and working-class families struggling with debt and large households. Her wealth gives her power, and she uses it to take what she wants.

Question number

Her manipulation becomes more sinister when she makes Mrs Johnstone swear on the Bible. Knowing that Mrs Johnstone is superstitious, she invents the warning that if the twins ever learn they were one of a pair, "they both immediately die". This is a crucial moment in her development. Mrs Lyons, who seems educated and rational, deliberately uses superstition as a weapon against a less educated woman. Russell may be suggesting that the middle class exploits the fears and ignorance of the poor to protect its own interests. Once she has the baby, her attitude changes completely; she becomes cold, pays Mrs Johnstone off and dismisses her from the house, telling her it would be better if she left. The friendly employer is revealed as someone who sees Mrs Johnstone only as a means to an end.

As Edward grows up, Mrs Lyons becomes an anxious, overprotective mother. She is terrified that Edward will discover the truth, and her fear grows whenever he mentions Mickey. When she discovers the boys have become friends, she reacts with hysteria. She forbids Edward to see Mickey and slaps him after he swears at her, a shocking moment that shows how fragile her self-control has become. Her superstition also grows. Earlier she mocked Mrs Johnstone's alarm about new shoes on the table, but now she cannot escape the fear she invented. Russell uses this irony to suggest that the lie has trapped its creator.

To keep the boys apart, Mrs Lyons persuades her husband to move the family to the countryside, claiming that it is for her health. Mr Lyons, a distant figure who is preoccupied with his business, agrees without understanding. This moment highlights the isolation of her life: she cannot share her secret with anyone, not even her husband. When Mrs Johnstone is rehoused by the council and moves nearby, Mrs Lyons becomes convinced that she is being followed, saying that wherever she goes Mrs Johnstone will be "just behind" her. Her paranoia reaches its peak when she offers Mrs Johnstone money to move away and, when this is

Question number

refused, attacks her with a knife and calls her a "witch". The respectable woman of Act One has become unstable and violent. Russell presents her decline as a form of punishment: the wealth that seemed to promise security cannot protect her from guilt and fear.

At the end of the play, Mrs Lyons becomes actively vindictive. When she learns that Edward is having an affair with Linda, she deliberately takes Mickey to see them together. Mickey, already broken by unemployment, prison and depression, is pushed towards the final confrontation. Mrs Lyons, who once wanted to protect Edward by keeping him away from Mickey, now uses Mickey to strike at Mrs Johnstone, and in doing so contributes to the deaths of both her son and his twin. Her development has come full circle: the secret she created to keep the boys apart is exposed at the moment of their death, fulfilling the superstition she invented.

Russell, writing in the early 1980s, when unemployment and inequality were rising sharply in cities such as Liverpool, uses Mrs Lyons to show the destructive effects of materialism. She has a fine house, money and an education, yet she is lonely and increasingly unhappy. Her desire to possess a child, almost as though he were another object she could buy, leads to suffering for everyone. The Narrator's question at the end, whether we should blame superstition or "what we, the English, have come to know as class", invites the audience to see Mrs Lyons not just as a villain but as a product of a divided society. Her development shows that the privileged class, too, can be poisoned by inequality, and that a society built on such division harms everyone within it.

12 Friendship in Blood Brothers is significant because it is the one bond that seems

Question number

able to cross the class divide, and its slow destruction carries the tragedy of the play. Mickey's innocent claim that Eddie is his "best friend" captures the pure, instinctive affection of childhood, before money, education and opportunity drive the twins apart. Russell, writing in the early 1980s against a background of mass unemployment in Liverpool, uses the rise and fall of this friendship to argue that class, not personality, shapes people's lives, and that an unequal society can turn even the closest friends into enemies.

When Mickey and Edward first meet at the age of seven, they are drawn together immediately. Mickey is "nearly eight", streetwise and full of energy; Edward is polite, well spoken and lonely. The comedy of their first scene comes from the difference in their language and manners, yet neither child judges the other. Edward freely offers Mickey sweets, and is fascinated when Mickey teaches him a swear word. When they discover they share the same birthday, they decide to become blood brothers, cutting their hands and promising that they will always defend each other. Russell suggests that children are naturally open and generous, untouched by the prejudices of adults. Their friendship is a reminder that the differences between them are not natural but created by their upbringing. The dramatic irony is painful, because the audience knows that they truly are brothers.

The friendship is significant, too, because it gives each boy something his own world lacks. Edward, raised in a middle-class home with a nervous, controlling mother, enjoys Mickey's daring and the freedom of the street. Mickey admires Edward's confidence and the ease with which he seems to have everything. Their friendship expands to include Linda, who joins in their games and is often bolder than either boy, defending Mickey and leading them into mischief such as throwing stones at windows. The trio's play in the street, with toy guns and playground chants, seems carefree, although Russell's repeated imagery of guns

Question number

quietly foreshadows the violence to come.

Yet the adults try to destroy this friendship from the start. Both mothers are terrified that the boys will discover the truth about their birth. Mrs Johnstone tells Edward never to come round again, while Mrs Lyons forbids him to see Mickey, slaps him when he swears at her and finally persuades her husband to move the family to the country. This shows how adult fear and secrecy interfere with natural friendship. In a wider sense, the mothers represent the social forces that keep the classes apart. The superstition that the twins will die if they learn the truth reflects the Narrator's suggestion that something larger and more sinister is at work.

Fate seems to bring the friends back together when the Johnstones are rehoused in the same area, and in their teenage years the friendship is briefly renewed. Edward, now at a private boarding school, and Mickey, at a struggling comprehensive, are reunited at fourteen and immediately pick up where they left off. Edward even encourages Mickey to tell Linda how he feels about her. This suggests that friendship can survive separation. However, the different education they receive sets them on completely different paths. Edward goes to university, while Mickey leaves school for a job in a factory, gets married young and soon faces redundancy. In the 1980s, the decline of manufacturing in cities such as Liverpool left many working-class men without work, and Russell clearly draws on this context to show how economic hardship damages relationships.

When Edward returns home from university, the friendship collapses. Edward is cheerful and carefree, offering Mickey money and wanting to go drinking, while Mickey, unemployed and anxious, feels humiliated. Mickey tells Edward that he has had to grow up, whereas Edward never needed to because he had money and

Question number

security. This moment is central to the play's message: it is not their characters that have changed, but their circumstances. Edward's privilege blinds him to Mickey's suffering, and Mickey's pride stops him accepting help. Russell shows that inequality breeds resentment, making genuine friendship between the classes almost impossible.

The final destruction of the friendship comes through Linda. After Mickey is sent to prison for his part in a robbery, he becomes dependent on antidepressants, and Linda turns to Edward, now a councillor, for help with a house and a job. Their affair, revealed to Mickey by Mrs Lyons, is the final betrayal. Mickey confronts Edward with a gun, his anger bursting out in the words "Friends! I could kill you". His bitter question, "We were friends, weren't we?", shows how deeply he still values what they once shared. When Mrs Johnstone reveals that they are twins, Mickey's cry "I could have been him!" exposes the real tragedy: their lives were decided by an accident of upbringing, not by who they truly were. Both brothers die, and the blood pact of childhood becomes a grim reality.

Ultimately, friendship in Blood Brothers matters because it represents what society could be if class divisions did not exist. The childhood friendship between Mickey and Edward shows that people from different backgrounds can connect naturally, yet Russell suggests that money, education and opportunity eventually poison even the strongest bond. The Narrator's closing question about whether to blame superstition or "what we, the English, have come to know as class" leaves the audience in no doubt. The breakdown of the friendship is a condemnation of a society that divides people from birth and denies so many the chance of a fair life.

Question number

13

Sherriff presents life in the trenches as a strange mixture of monotony, squalor and constant, unspoken fear, in which ordinary domestic routines become a fragile shield against death. Osborne's casual question about what "they put in the water" captures this perfectly: the men talk about disinfectant, food and earwigs, but beneath the small talk lies the knowledge that thousands of Germans are waiting across No Man's Land. Writing in 1928, a decade after the Armistice, Sherriff drew on his own service as an infantry officer to show an audience of veterans and bereaved families what the war had really been like, not the heroic myth of recruiting posters but the cramped, tense waiting that filled most of a soldier's life.

From the opening, Sherriff establishes the trenches as a claustrophobic, makeshift home. The whole play takes place in a single dugout, lit by candles, with steps leading up into the darkness of the front line, so the audience shares the officers' sense of being trapped underground. Hardy and Osborne's conversation about the chlorinated water, the damp and the insects shows that discomfort has become so normal that it is discussed calmly, almost comically. The rats, earwigs, mud and lice suggest a harsh and squalid environment, and the fact that the men must sleep, eat and plan attacks in the same tiny space emphasises how little privacy or comfort they have. Sherriff wanted his audience to recognise these details, and many of the original spectators would have lived them.

Perhaps the most striking feature of trench life in the play is boredom mixed with dread. The front line is described as having "not a sound or a soul", yet the silence is threatening because the men know an enemy attack is coming. Sherriff sets the play over a few days in March 1918, leading up to the real German spring offensive of the 21st, so the audience knows with dramatic irony that the waiting will end in catastrophe. To survive this tension, each officer finds his own form of escape.

Question number

Trotter draws a chart of circles and crosses one off every hour, turning time into a simple game, and he talks endlessly about his garden and his food. Osborne reads "Alice in Wonderland", a book about a nonsensical world where nothing follows normal rules, which seems a fitting choice for life in a war that makes little sense. Hardy sings and jokes. These coping strategies are presented sympathetically: Sherriff suggests they are not trivial but necessary for sanity.

Humour is another way of enduring the trenches. Mason, the cook, is a source of gentle comedy, describing a dubious cutlet that "smells like liver" and worrying over missing pepper and the wrong tinned fruit. Food matters enormously because it is one of the few pleasures left, and the officers' banter about rations reflects the real poverty of army supplies. Yet the humour is always shadowed by death. When Osborne and Raleigh wait to lead the raid, they talk about the New Forest, rugby and Roman roads, deliberately avoiding the subject of what is about to happen. This restraint reflects the public-school code of the officer class, in which fear could not be openly admitted, and Sherriff makes the audience feel the strain behind the polite conversation.

For some characters, the pressure of trench life becomes unbearable. Stanhope, the company commander, has been at the front for three years and survives by drinking heavily; Hardy says he is "Drinking like a fish". Hibbert claims to suffer from neuralgia and tries to be sent home, and his confrontation with Stanhope in Act 2 reveals that both men are terrified. Through these characters Sherriff explores what was then called shell shock, a condition that in 1918 was often treated as cowardice. By showing that even the bravest officer is near breaking point, Sherriff challenges the idea that fear is shameful and invites his audience to sympathise with men who had suffered silently.

Question number

Sherriff also presents trench life as a place where different classes are forced together. The officers are mainly public-school men like Stanhope and Raleigh, while Trotter has risen from the ranks and speaks with a working-class accent, and Mason serves them as a servant would in a large house. The hierarchy of the Edwardian class system survives even underground: Stanhope is angry when Raleigh eats with the men rather than the officers. However, the question "shall we get on together?" suggests that, in these conditions, cooperation matters more than status. Comradeship is presented as one of the only positive aspects of trench life, especially through Osborne, whom the others call "Uncle", and whose death after the raid leaves a gap no one can fill.

Finally, Sherriff shows how trench life is controlled by distant authority. The raid is ordered from above in daylight, and after it the Colonel is more interested in the prisoner's information than in the men who have died. The bitter contrast between the celebratory dinner and Osborne's empty place exposes the waste of life that many people in the 1920s had come to resent. The play ends with the German attack, Raleigh dying in the dugout, and the dugout itself collapsing as shells fall. The destruction of the officers' home is a powerful symbol: the small rituals that made trench life bearable cannot protect them in the end.

Overall, Sherriff presents life in the trenches as a test of endurance rather than a theatre of glory. By focusing on routine, humour, fear and friendship in one confined space, he gives his audience an honest and deeply human portrait of the men who lived and died there.

14 Stanhope is the dramatic and emotional centre of Journey's End. Sherriff uses him to show how the war could take the finest product of the Edwardian public school

Question number

and slowly wear him down, so that he becomes at once a model officer and a deeply damaged young man. Osborne's defence of him, that commanding the company through "rotten times" is "a big strain on a man", tells the audience before Stanhope even appears that his importance lies in the gap between his heroic reputation and the strain he is under.

Sherriff builds Stanhope up through other characters' talk before he enters, which makes him important structurally. Hardy's comment that he is "Drinking like a fish" immediately complicates the image of the war hero, while Osborne insists he is the best company commander in the battalion. The audience therefore meets him as a puzzle. He is only twenty-one, yet he has been at the front for three years and has won the Military Cross. When he does appear, his neat uniform and brushed hair, set against the dark shadows under his eyes, visually capture this contradiction: he maintains the discipline expected of an officer, but his body betrays exhaustion. He is also obsessed with order, complaining about the filthy state in which Hardy's company has left the trench, which suggests that keeping standards high is a way of keeping control of himself.

Stanhope is important as a representative of the officer class. He was captain of rugby at school, and Raleigh, a younger boy from the same school, has idolised him as a hero. In the years before 1914, public schools trained boys in leadership, loyalty and self-control, and many went straight from the sports field to command men in France. Many of Sherriff's first audiences in 1928 would have recognised this type. Stanhope inspires loyalty: Osborne, Trotter and even Mason respect him. Yet Sherriff suggests that the qualities the public schools cultivated, particularly the need never to show fear, are exactly what is destroying him. His drinking is the only way he can keep up the performance; he admits to Osborne that without whisky he could not face going up into the line.

Question number

His relationship with Raleigh drives much of the plot. Stanhope is engaged to Raleigh's sister, Madge, and his reaction to Raleigh's arrival is fear rather than welcome, because he dreads Raleigh writing home about the man he has become. The tender way he speaks about Madge reveals a caring, vulnerable side and shows how the war has separated him from the person he was. His decision to censor Raleigh's letter is one of the play's most dramatic moments. He forces Raleigh to hand it over in an act of bullying, only for Osborne to read aloud that Raleigh praises him warmly. Stanhope's silence shows his shame, and the audience sees how paranoia has distorted his judgement.

Sherriff also uses Stanhope to explore fear and what was then called shell shock. In his confrontation with Hibbert, who claims neuralgia in order to escape, Stanhope threatens to shoot him rather than let him desert. This exposes the harsh military code under which real soldiers were executed for cowardice. Yet the scene changes direction when Stanhope confesses that he feels the same terror. By admitting his fear, he becomes more humane, and he persuades Hibbert to stay by appealing to their shared duty to the other men. Sherriff seems to suggest that true courage is not the absence of fear but the decision to carry on in spite of it, a message that challenged older ideas of masculine heroism.

Osborne's role is vital to understanding Stanhope. Stanhope calls him "Uncle" and relies on him for emotional support, even allowing Osborne to put him to bed when he is drunk. Their bond reflects the close relationships formed in the trenches, where friendship was often the only comfort. This makes Osborne's death in the raid devastating. Stanhope's bitter response to the Colonel's satisfaction with the raid shows his anger at commanders behind the lines who treat men as numbers. At the dinner that follows, his loud forced cheerfulness looks heartless, and when

Question number

Raleigh accuses him of not caring, Stanhope explodes that he drinks to forget. This outburst reveals that his apparent coldness is the result of grief he cannot express.

The final scene shows Stanhope at his most human. When Raleigh is fatally wounded, Stanhope has him carried down into the dugout, against usual practice, and comforts him gently, fetching a blanket and a candle and calling him by his first name. The hierarchy and the resentment disappear and he becomes almost a brother or parent. Then, as the bombardment intensifies, he must go back up the steps to lead his men. Sherriff leaves him walking into the German attack of March 1918, which the audience knows will be overwhelming, so his duty becomes both admirable and tragic.

Stanhope is important, then, because he embodies the play's central ideas. Through him Sherriff shows the cost of the war on a generation of young officers: their courage, their loyalty and their breakdown. He is neither simply a hero nor a failure, but a young man doing his duty while being destroyed by it, and in this Sherriff offered post-war audiences an honest tribute to men like those he had served alongside.

15 In Animal Farm, violence is the force that both creates and destroys the revolution. Orwell shows that the animals' rebellion begins as a justified response to human cruelty, but that violence soon becomes Napoleon's main tool of power, until the farm is ruled by a terror worse than anything Jones imposed. The extract, in which the dogs drag four pigs "squealing with pain and terror" to Napoleon's feet, marks the moment this transformation becomes undeniable. Writing in 1943 to 1944, when Stalin was Britain's ally, Orwell used violence to expose how the Russian Revolution had betrayed its own ideals.

Question number

At the start of the novel, violence belongs to the humans. Jones and his men keep the animals under control with "cruel whips", and Old Major's speech reminds the animals that every one of them will meet the "cruel knife" in the end. Violence here is a sign of exploitation, and Orwell invites the reader to see the animals' anger as natural. This reflects the condition of Russian peasants and workers under the Tsar, whose poverty and suffering made revolution seem inevitable. When the Rebellion comes, it is spontaneous: starving and beaten, the animals "flung themselves upon their tormentors" and drive the men out. The word "tormentors" justifies the uprising, and Orwell presents this first act of violence as liberating, almost joyful.

However, Orwell immediately begins to complicate this. In the Battle of the Cowshed the animals, led by Snowball, defend the farm in a violent ambush, and the men are "gored, kicked, bitten, trampled". The list of brutal verbs is energetic and triumphant, yet it also shows that the animals have learned to use the humans' methods. Boxer, believing he has killed a stable lad, is distressed and says he has no wish to take life, "not even human life", while Snowball replies that "The only good human being is a dead one". This contrast is significant. Boxer represents the decent instincts of ordinary working people, while Snowball shows how revolutionary leaders could justify bloodshed as necessary. The Battle of the Cowshed mirrors the Russian Civil War, when the new Soviet state fought off foreign and counter-revolutionary forces, and Orwell suggests that the habit of violence was formed in these early struggles.

The turning point comes with Snowball's expulsion. Napoleon has secretly raised nine puppies, and they return as dogs "fierce-looking as wolves" who chase Snowball off the farm. From this moment violence is no longer aimed at enemies

Question number

outside but at the animals themselves. The dogs function like Stalin's secret police, the NKVD, standing beside Napoleon and growling at anyone who questions him. Orwell shows that the threat of violence can be as powerful as violence itself: when four young pigs protest at the abolition of the Sunday Meetings, the dogs' growls silence them, and it is these same four pigs who are later dragged forward in the extract. Squealer's speeches always come with the dogs in the background, so that persuasion and intimidation work together.

The extract describes the most horrifying moment of the novel, the forced confessions and executions. The pigs, hens and sheep confess to crimes involving Snowball and are killed one after another, until there is "a pile of corpses" at Napoleon's feet. The flat, almost reporting style makes the scene even more chilling, as though such killings have become procedure. This directly parallels Stalin's purges and show trials of the 1930s, in which old Bolsheviks confessed to absurd crimes before being executed. Orwell had seen this kind of political terror at first hand in the Spanish Civil War, when Soviet-backed communists hunted down members of the militia he had fought with, and his anger at the way the British left ignored it lies behind this scene. The hens' rebellion against having their eggs taken, crushed by starvation until nine hens die, also echoes the brutal collectivisation of Soviet agriculture.

Orwell makes the animals' response just as significant as the violence. Clover looks down on the farm and reflects that these scenes of terror and slaughter were not what they had hoped for when they rebelled. Her inability to put her feelings into words shows how fear has silenced the working class. The Sixth Commandment is quietly changed so that no animal shall kill another "without cause", and the added words reveal how propaganda makes violence legitimate. Orwell suggests that a regime built on fear depends on rewriting the rules so that its cruelty appears

Question number

lawful.

Violence also appears in the Battle of the Windmill, a "savage, bitter battle" in which Frederick's men blow up the windmill and many animals are wounded. This represents the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, and although the animals win, the victory is hollow, celebrated with ceremonies while the farm lies in ruins. The final act of violence is Boxer's death. Sent to the knacker's when he can no longer work, he is betrayed by the very leaders he served. This is perhaps the cruellest violence in the book because it is hidden, and because it shows that Napoleon has become exactly like Jones, using animals' bodies for profit.

Overall, violence is significant because it charts the corruption of the revolution. It begins as resistance to tyranny, becomes a tool for defending the farm, and ends as the means by which a new tyrant terrorises his own people. Through this progression, Orwell warns his readers that a revolution which relies on violence and fear will inevitably betray those it claims to free.

16 Snowball is important in Animal Farm because he represents the energy and idealism of the early revolution, and because his fate reveals how that idealism was crushed. Orwell introduces him as "more vivacious" than Napoleon, "quicker in speech and more inventive", yet lacking the same "depth of character". The phrase is ironic: Napoleon's "depth" turns out to be secrecy and cunning, while Snowball's lively openness makes him vulnerable. As a figure based on Leon Trotsky, Snowball allows Orwell to explore the power struggle that followed the Russian Revolution, and, even after he has gone, he remains vital to the novel as the enemy Napoleon invents to justify his tyranny.

Question number

In the early chapters, Snowball is the revolution's thinker and organiser. Together with Napoleon and Squealer, he develops Old Major's teachings into the system of Animalism, and he is the one best at writing, painting the Seven Commandments on the barn wall. He later reduces them to the single maxim "Four legs good, two legs bad" so that even the less intelligent animals can understand. This shows his genuine wish to include everyone, but Orwell is also hinting at something dangerous: simple slogans can replace thought, and the sheep later bleat the maxim to drown out debate. Snowball also sets up committees, such as the Egg Production Committee for the hens and the Clean Tails League for the cows, and runs reading and writing classes. The comedy of these schemes, including the attempt to re-educate wild rats and rabbits, suggests that Snowball's enthusiasm is sometimes unrealistic, much as Trotsky's vision of a worldwide revolution was criticised as impractical.

Snowball's bravery is shown most clearly in the Battle of the Cowshed. He has studied Julius Caesar's campaigns in a book found in the farmhouse, and he plans the ambush skilfully. He leads the charge himself and is wounded by Jones's gun, yet keeps fighting. He is awarded "Animal Hero, First Class" along with Boxer. This mirrors Trotsky's real role as founder and commander of the Red Army during the Russian Civil War. Notably, Napoleon is absent from the battle, which makes the later rewriting of events even more shocking.

The rivalry between the two pigs drives the middle of the novel. At the meetings, Snowball wins the animals over with brilliant speeches, while Napoleon canvasses support quietly between meetings, particularly among the sheep. Their debates over the windmill and the defence of the farm echo the real conflict between Trotsky and Stalin. Snowball's plan for the windmill, which he claims will light the stalls and reduce the working week, represents modernisation and a better future, and

Question number

his followers' slogan "Vote for Snowball and the three-day week" sums up his promise of comfort. Napoleon's response, urinating over the plans, is a crude dismissal that reveals his contempt. Orwell uses the windmill debate to show that Snowball relies on persuasion, Napoleon on power.

Snowball's expulsion is the key turning point of the novel. Just as he is about to win the vote, Napoleon releases nine huge dogs, which chase Snowball off the farm; he escapes only by slipping through a hole in the hedge. This sudden violence parallels Stalin's removal of Trotsky, who was expelled from the Communist Party in 1927 and exiled from the Soviet Union in 1929. From this moment democracy on the farm ends: Napoleon abolishes the Sunday debates and announces that decisions will be made by a committee of pigs.

Arguably, Snowball is even more important after he has left. Napoleon turns him into a scapegoat, blaming him for everything that goes wrong. When the windmill collapses in a storm, Napoleon declares that Snowball has destroyed it, and later the animals are told that Snowball creeps in at night to steal corn and break eggs. Squealer goes further and rewrites history, claiming that Snowball was in league with Jones from the start and fought openly on the humans' side at the Battle of the Cowshed. The animals' confused memories show how propaganda can overpower truth. This reflects Stalin's campaign to remove Trotsky from official history, erasing him from photographs and accusing his supporters of treason in the show trials. When animals confess to plotting with Snowball and are executed, Orwell shows how a shadowy enemy can justify terror. The real Trotsky was murdered by a Soviet agent in Mexico in 1940, and Snowball's invisibility in the second half of the novel reflects how he lives on only as a myth.

However, Orwell does not present Snowball as a perfect alternative to Napoleon. He

Question number

agrees with the other pigs that the milk and windfall apples should be reserved for the pigs, and his remark after the battle that "The only good human being is a dead one" shows a willingness to justify violence. Orwell, a democratic socialist who had seen Soviet-backed repression in the Spanish Civil War, was suspicious of all revolutionary leaders who placed themselves above ordinary workers. This suggests that the revolution might have been corrupted even under Snowball, though perhaps less brutally.

Overall, Snowball is important because he embodies the hopes of the revolution, exposes Napoleon's ruthlessness through their rivalry, and becomes the scapegoat on which a totalitarian state is built. Through him, Orwell shows that in a dictatorship the truth about the past is as easily destroyed as the people who remember it.

17 In Lord of the Flies, control is significant because the whole novel traces what happens when the controls of adult society are removed. Golding shows the boys trying to rebuild order through Ralph's rules and the conch, but this democratic control is gradually overpowered by Jack's control through fear, violence and ritual. Ralph's promise that he will give the conch to whoever speaks next represents a fragile, civilised kind of control based on agreement, and its eventual destruction suggests Golding's pessimistic view that civilisation is only a thin layer over human savagery.

At the beginning, the boys instinctively look for control. Without adults, they hold an assembly and vote for a chief, and Ralph is chosen partly because he holds the conch. The shell becomes the symbol of authority and order: whoever holds it may speak, and everyone else must listen. Ralph uses this control responsibly,

Question number

organising shelters, establishing rules about toilets and drinking water, and insisting that "We must make a fire" for rescue. His leadership reflects the parliamentary democracy of post-war Britain, which Golding's first readers in 1954 would have seen as the foundation of their society. Piggy, with his intelligence and his reliance on rules, supports this control, though he lacks the physical presence to enforce it.

Jack represents a very different kind of control. He first appears marching the choir in uniform and ordering them to "Stand still!", which shows that his authority comes from hierarchy and obedience rather than consent. He is furious that Ralph is elected and says that he ought to be chief. At first he still accepts civilised values, declaring that they must have rules because "We're English", and the irony of this line is sharp, since Golding's novel questions the belief that the British were naturally more civilised than others. This belief was common at the time, and Golding directly challenges R. M. Ballantyne's Victorian adventure story The Coral Island, in which English boys bring order to a savage island.

Golding shows control gradually shifting from the conch to the hunt. After Jack's first kill, the hunters chant and dance, and the thrill of violence gives Jack a power over the boys that votes cannot match. The painted face is especially significant: behind his mask Jack is "liberated from shame and self-consciousness", so the mask removes the inner controls of conscience as well as the outer controls of society. At the assembly in Chapter 5, Ralph pleads that the rules are the only thing they have, but Jack's cry of "Bollocks to the rules!" shows his open rejection of democratic order. Golding, who had taught boys at a school in Salisbury, believed from experience that without supervision children could quickly become cruel, and the collapse of the assemblies reflects this.

Question number

Jack also controls the boys through fear of the beast. By claiming that only his hunters can protect them, he exploits the littluns' terror and turns it into loyalty. This mirrors the way authoritarian leaders of the twentieth century, such as Hitler, whose regime Golding had fought against as a naval officer in the Second World War, used fear of an enemy to justify absolute power. Once Jack forms his own tribe at Castle Rock, he rules as a dictator: he has Wilfred tied up and beaten for no stated reason, and the boys accept it. Control is no longer about the group's welfare but about Jack's pleasure in power.

Roger shows a darker side of control. Early in the novel he throws stones at Henry but deliberately misses, because the old taboos of parents, school and police still restrain his arm. Golding presents this invisible control as the last remnant of civilisation. As the novel progresses, these restraints disappear entirely, and Roger is the one who releases the boulder that kills Piggy. At that moment the conch "exploded into a thousand white fragments", a violent image that marks the final death of democratic control. Piggy's broken glasses, earlier stolen by Jack's tribe, have already shown that the tools of reason and science are now controlled by the savages.

By the end, the only control left is the hunt. Ralph is chased across the island and the forest is set on fire, so the boys are destroying the very environment they need to survive. Golding then introduces the naval officer, who suddenly restores adult control. His comment that they should have put up "a better show" and his reference to The Coral Island are deeply ironic, because he is himself part of a war that mirrors the boys' violence on a larger scale. Written during the early Cold War, when nuclear destruction seemed possible, the ending suggests that adult control is no more reliable than the boys'.

Question number

Overall, control is central to Golding's message. Through the contrast between Ralph's democratic control and Jack's tyranny, he suggests that order depends on fragile agreements, and that once fear and violence take over, civilisation can be destroyed with terrifying speed. Ralph's tears for "the end of innocence" show that the loss of control is also a loss of the belief that humans are naturally good.

18 The beast is arguably the most important symbol in Lord of the Flies, because it shows how fear grows when it is not understood, and because Golding uses it to suggest that the real monster is inside human beings rather than in the jungle. The chant "Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!" is chilling because, when the boys finally believe they have caught the beast, they are actually killing Simon, the one boy who knows the truth. Through the beast, Golding, writing in 1954 after the horrors of the Second World War, explores how ordinary people can be driven by fear into savagery.

The beast first appears as a child's nightmare. At an early assembly, a small boy with a birthmark claims to have seen a "snake-thing" in the woods at night. The older boys laugh, and Ralph insists there is no beast, but the fear quickly spreads, especially in the dark. Golding shows that the beast grows from the boys' imaginations: the littluns suffer bad dreams, and their terror is never properly addressed by the leaders. Piggy's rational view that there is nothing to fear if things are understood scientifically represents the confidence of the modern world in reason. Golding, who had seen supposedly civilised nations commit atrocities during the war, seems to suggest that this confidence was misplaced.

As the novel develops, the beast becomes a political tool. Jack realises that he can use the boys' fear to strengthen his own position. He claims that his hunters will

Question number

track it down and protect everyone, making himself appear essential, and he mocks Ralph for being afraid. The more frightened the boys become, the more they turn to Jack's violence and away from Ralph's rules. This reflects the way authoritarian governments, like the Nazi regime Golding had fought against, used fear of an enemy to justify their control. When Jack forms his own tribe, he encourages belief in the beast even though he probably suspects it is not real, because a frightened group is easier to rule.

The beast seems to become physical when a dead parachutist lands on the mountain. Sam and Eric see the shape in the dark and flee, and later Jack, Ralph and Roger climb up and see what looks like a creature lifting its head. The dead airman, a casualty of the adult war raging beyond the island, is a powerful symbol: the boys' "beast" is literally a victim of human conflict. Golding's chapter titles, "Beast from Water" and "Beast from Air", show how the boys look for the monster everywhere except within themselves. Their mistake reflects a wider failure in the twentieth century to recognise that the cruelty of war came from ordinary people rather than from some external evil.

Simon is the only character who understands the beast's true nature. At the assembly he suggests "maybe it's only us", but he cannot express himself clearly and the others laugh. His encounter with the Lord of the Flies, the pig's head left on a stick as a gift for the beast, is the novel's central moment. The head tells him that it is foolish to think the beast is something that can be hunted and killed, and declares "I'm part of you". This confirms Golding's view that evil lies within every human being. The image of a severed head swarming with flies also links to the name Beelzebub, the devil in Christian tradition, so the beast takes on a religious dimension as a symbol of original sin.

Question number

The tragedy is that this truth is destroyed by the boys' fear. Simon climbs the mountain, discovers that the beast is only a dead man, and frees the body from its tangled lines. When he stumbles down to tell the others, they are dancing in a storm, chanting the words of the extract, and they mistake him for the beast. Golding describes the killing with horrifying physical detail, and the fact that even Ralph and Piggy join in suggests that no one is immune to the beast within. The repetition of the chant, adapted from the earlier hunting chant about the pig, shows how violence has moved from animals to humans. Afterwards Jack claims that the beast came in disguise, turning a murder into a story that strengthens his power.

By the end of the novel, the boys have turned the beast into a kind of god, leaving it offerings and organising their lives around it. The final hunt for Ralph shows that they have become the beast themselves, hunting a human being with sharpened sticks and setting the island on fire. The arrival of the naval officer seems to bring rescue, but Golding's irony is clear: the adults are also caught up in a war, and the cruiser offshore represents the same violence on a global scale. In the context of the early Cold War, when many feared nuclear destruction, this ending suggests that the beast threatens all of humanity. Ralph weeps for "the darkness of man's heart", which finally names what the beast has been all along.

Overall, the beast is important because it drives the plot, reveals the characters' differences, and carries Golding's central message. It begins as an imagined monster, becomes a weapon in Jack's hands, and is finally revealed as the savagery inside the boys. Golding uses it to warn his readers that the greatest danger to civilisation is not a creature outside us, but our own capacity for evil.

Question number

19

Meena's parents are significant because they are the fixed point against which everything else in the novel is measured. Syal presents Mr and Mrs Kumar as both heroic and vulnerable: they are, in Meena's words, "epic, glamorous figures, touched by romantic tragedy", yet they are also first-generation Punjabi immigrants trying to raise a daughter in a white, working-class mining village in the late 1960s. Through them Syal explores the cost of migration, the gap between generations and, ultimately, what it means for Meena to find out who she is.

The quotation in the question reveals as much about Meena as about her parents. She is a self-confessed fabricator who opens the novel by admitting that she learned early on to make up her own stories, and here she turns her parents' past into a kind of film, with "romantic tragedy" suggesting the melodrama of the Bollywood songs her father sings. This mythologising matters because it shows that the Kumars carry a lost world with them. Their history includes the violence of Partition in 1947, when millions of Punjabis were uprooted, so the "tragedy" is not only romantic but real. Syal, writing in 1996 as the daughter of Punjabi migrants herself, seems to suggest that children of the diaspora inherit stories rather than places, and that Meena's love of her parents' legend is a way of holding on to an India she has never seen.

Mr Kumar in particular is presented as a figure of almost cosmic authority in Meena's eyes. She believes "he could hold the planets in the palm of his hand", a hyperbole that captures a young child's worship of her father. Yet Syal undercuts this grandeur by showing him as gentle, principled and often quietly hurt. When he sings at the mehfils, the gatherings of Aunties and Uncles in the Kumar house, he becomes the romantic hero of Meena's imagination, and his songs move the adults to tears because they express homesickness that cannot be spoken in English. The generous hospitality of these evenings shows how important the extended Indian

Question number

community is to the Kumars, recreating the warmth of home in a cold, unfamiliar country. Importantly, Papa is also the parent who understands Meena best; he responds to her lies and misbehaviour with disappointment rather than rage, teaching her the moral standards he expects, which makes his disapproval far more powerful than any punishment.

Mrs Kumar is a more complicated presence. She is a teacher, educated and dignified, and the Tollington women regard her with a mixture of admiration and curiosity, which reflects how unusual an Indian professional woman would have seemed in a small Midlands village at this time. Yet her relationship with Meena is often strained. Her exasperated question, "Why do you do this, Meena?", shows a mother who cannot understand a daughter who steals sweets, lies and longs for fish fingers instead of her mother's cooking. Syal uses this friction to dramatise the generation gap common in immigrant families: Meena is drawn to the English culture around her, while her mother is anxious to preserve Punjabi values. The Kumars' garden, full of herbs for their Indian meals rather than "blazing rhododendrons and grinning gnomes", becomes a symbol of this quiet determination to keep their heritage alive, though Meena at first sees it only as proof that her family is different.

The birth of Sunil shifts the balance of the family and reveals the strain Mrs Kumar has been under. Without the network of women who would have supported a new mother in India, she struggles to cope, and Meena resentfully realises that her mother will no longer be hers alone. Here Syal exposes the isolation of migrant women, who often lost the extended family structures that sustained them. The arrival of Nanima solves this practically, but it also changes Meena, who through her grandmother begins to value the Punjabi language and the family stories that she had previously found embarrassing. In this way the parents' struggle indirectly

Question number

becomes the means of Meena's growth.

The Kumars are also significant because of the sacrifices they make for their daughter's future. They have come to England so that Meena can have a good education, and their ambition is focused on getting her into the "posh girls' grammar school". Meena feels the pressure of these expectations, especially with a mother who is a teacher, and her friendship with Anita can be read partly as a rebellion against them. However, Syal shows the parents enduring racism with restraint for her sake: the Kumars face hostility as the village changes and Sam Lowbridge's gang becomes openly aggressive towards "outsiders", yet they hold on to their dignity. This reflects the experience of many South Asian families in the era of Enoch Powell's 1968 "Rivers of Blood" speech, who were made to feel unwelcome but stayed to give their children opportunities.

By the end of the novel, when Meena passes the eleven-plus and the family prepares to leave Tollington, she has learned to see her parents more truthfully. They are no longer only the "epic" figures of her imagination, but ordinary people whose courage lay in small, daily acts of endurance. I think this is the real significance of Mr and Mrs Kumar: they represent the roots Meena tries to escape and then returns to, and through them Syal suggests that a secure identity comes not from choosing between two cultures but from understanding the love and sacrifice that brought you into both.

20 Friendship is central to Anita and Me because it is the means by which Meena grows up. Syal presents friendship as something Meena desperately craves, misunderstands and finally learns to judge for herself. Her intense attachment to Anita Rutter dominates the novel, but it is set against other, quieter relationships

Question number

with Nanima and Robert, and by the end Syal suggests that true friendship depends on loyalty and acceptance rather than glamour or power.

From the start, Meena's longing for Anita's friendship is bound up with her desire to belong in Tollington. Anita is older, confident and the self-appointed leader of the village girls, and for a nine-year-old Indian girl in a white working-class community in the late 1960s, being chosen by her feels like being accepted by England itself. Meena wants to become one of the "Tollington wenches", and the dialect word captures the tough, local identity she envies and feels shut out of. Syal suggests that Meena's admiration of Anita is partly a rebellion against her own background: by copying Anita's swearing, cheek and disregard for rules, Meena distances herself from her parents' Punjabi values and from the Aunties and Uncles whose world she finds embarrassing. In this sense friendship becomes a way of trying on a different identity.

However, Syal makes clear that Anita's version of friendship is about control. She always forms a pair with one of her followers and leaves another trailing behind, introducing them proprietorially with "These am me mates, Sherrie and Sally", where the Black Country dialect and possessive phrasing make friends sound like belongings. Meena, three years younger, is ideal for Anita precisely because she will follow. Syal's first-person retrospective narration allows the adult Meena to expose what the child cannot see; we sense the imbalance long before young Meena does. The fortune teller at the fair, who questions whether Anita really is Meena's friend with a pointed "is she?", acts almost like a prophetic voice, planting doubt in both Meena and the reader.

The quotation in the question marks a turning point. Meena's discovery that Anita has a boyfriend and "had never told me" exposes the one-sidedness of the

Question number

relationship. The superlative "best friend in all the world" sounds childlike and absolute, and the repetition of "my best friend" in the next sentence emphasises how much of Meena's identity is invested in Anita. The idea that her friend was "sharing me with someone else" is revealing: Meena imagines friendship as exclusive possession, mirroring the way Anita treats people. Anita's relationships draw her steadily closer to Sam Lowbridge, and this matters because it ties friendship to the growing racism in the village. Sam's outburst at the spring fete, blaming outsiders for the decline of Tollington, shows the resentment of a community facing unemployment and change, echoing the hostility stirred up in Britain after Enoch Powell's 1968 speech. When Sam insists his remarks were not aimed at Meena, Syal shows how racism hides behind personal friendliness, and Anita's alliance with him reveals where her loyalties really lie.

The violence that follows forces Meena to see her friends clearly. Sam's gang turns to violence against Asian people in the area, and Anita's closeness to him shows that her charm cannot be separated from the prejudice around her. Meena's devastation, "I saw everything crumble around me", uses the imagery of collapse to suggest that the whole fragile world she had built around Anita is falling apart. Syal widens this into a general lesson about growing up: Meena learns that "those you called friends could suddenly become tormentors". The antithesis of "friends" and "tormentors" captures the disillusionment of adolescence, but also the specific vulnerability of a young girl of colour whose acceptance can be withdrawn at any moment.

Against Anita, Syal sets two very different friendships. Nanima, who arrives from India after Sunil's birth, becomes a friend as well as a grandmother. Although she speaks little English, she teaches Meena Punjabi and tells her stories of India, and the warmth of their bond shows that friendship can be built on shared heritage

Question number

rather than imitation. Through Nanima, Meena begins to value the culture she once rejected, which reflects the importance of extended family in many South Asian households. Later, in hospital after her accident, Meena meets Robert, a boy who is gentle, funny and treats her as an equal. Their friendship is based on honesty and mutual understanding, the opposite of Anita's manipulation. Robert's death is painful, but Syal presents it as part of Meena's maturing: having experienced real friendship, she can recognise the falseness of her relationship with Anita and finally break away.

By the end of the novel, Meena chooses honesty and her own integrity over Anita's approval, and as the family prepares to leave Tollington for grammar school and a new life, she is able to let her childhood friendship go. I think Syal presents friendship as important not because it lasts, but because it teaches Meena who she is. Her loyalty shifts from a girl who offered her a borrowed identity to the people, and the heritage, who accepted her as she already was.

21

Mystery is the engine of The Woman in Black. Susan Hill creates it not by hiding the ghost but by withholding explanation: characters refuse to speak, settings conceal and reveal, and the narrator himself delays telling us what he knows. Writing in 1983 as a conscious imitation of the Victorian and Edwardian ghost story, Hill uses the conventions of the Gothic genre to make the reader share Arthur Kipps' frustrated, and eventually terrified, desire to understand.

The frame narrative creates mystery before the story proper has begun. The older Kipps sits with his family on Christmas Eve at Monkfish House while his stepchildren tell ghost stories, and when they ask him for one he leaves the room in distress. This is a traditional Victorian setting for a ghost story, echoing

Question number

Dickens, yet Hill subverts the cosy ritual: the reader realises that Kipps has a real story too painful to tell aloud, and that he will write it down instead. The retrospective first-person narration means he knows the ending all along, and his hints that the events still haunt him create suspense from the first chapter. We read on to discover what could have so damaged a calm, rational man.

The people of Crythin Gifford are central to Hill's methods. At first Kipps' impressions of the town are "distinctly favourable": farmers greet each other on market day and the Gifford Arms provides warmth and a good meal. This ordinary, comfortable surface makes the silences that follow more unsettling. Whenever Mrs Drablow or Eel Marsh House is mentioned, conversation stops. The quotation in the question captures Kipps' irritation at "the half-hints and dark mutterings made by grown men". The phrase "grown men" is telling: Kipps, a young London solicitor confident in reason and progress, expects adult men to behave rationally, and their fear seems to him childish superstition. Yet the reader, recognising the genre, interprets their reluctance as a warning. Hill exploits this dramatic irony, so the mystery lies partly in the gap between what Kipps dismisses and what we suspect. Mr Jerome, with his "somewhat shuttered expression", embodies this secrecy; the metaphor of shutters suggests a house closed against intruders, a mind locked around a painful truth which we later learn is connected to the death of his own child. Samuel Daily, too, speaks in guarded terms, and the repeated pattern of characters falling silent becomes "the now familiar mystery", as if the secret is woven into the community itself.

Setting intensifies the mystery. Eel Marsh House can only be reached by the Nine Lives Causeway, which disappears when the tide comes in, and this isolation is typical of the Gothic, where remote houses cut characters off from help and from ordinary reality. Interestingly, Kipps is first attracted to the place, seeing it as a

Question number

modest house and liking the lonely spot. Hill makes the setting ambiguous: its beauty draws him in, but its mists, its graveyard and the "burial ground" behind the house gradually transform it into somewhere "gaunt" and threatening. The sea fret that rolls in suddenly blinds Kipps, and the marsh itself, shifting and treacherous, becomes a symbol of a truth that cannot be grasped.

The woman in black herself is the most powerful source of mystery because she is so physically present. At Mrs Drablow's funeral Kipps assumes she is a mourner suffering from a "wasting disease"; she is "dressed in deepest black", which in the period would have been the expected dress of mourning, so her appearance seems natural. Only gradually does Hill reveal that she is not alive, and even then the woman never speaks. Her silence and her expression of desperate malevolence make her more frightening than an explained threat. The children's reactions at the school, and the way the villagers refuse to name her, deepen the sense that everyone except Kipps knows something terrible.

Hill also uses sound and structure to keep the reader uncertain. On the causeway, in the fog, Kipps hears a pony and trap sinking into the marsh and a child crying, but he sees nothing. Later, the locked nursery door, the rhythmic bumping of the rocking chair and the sudden appearance of the room in disarray create mysteries that are only partly solved. Each answer opens another question, a technique typical of the episodic, suspenseful structure of Victorian sensation fiction.

The documents Mrs Drablow kept, her "letters, receipts, legal documents, notebooks", provide the eventual explanation, and Hill uses them like a detective's evidence. Through the letters Kipps pieces together the story of Jennet Humfrye, forced to give up her illegitimate son Nathaniel to her sister, and of the boy's drowning on the marshes. This reflects the harsh moral codes of the period, in

Question number

which illegitimacy brought shame and women had little power to keep their children. Yet solving the mystery does not end it. Kipps learns that whenever the woman is seen, a child dies, and Hill withholds the final blow until the last pages, when Joseph is killed and Stella fatally injured.

I think Hill's greatest achievement is that the central mystery, why such a spirit exists and whether it can ever be stopped, remains unresolved. Kipps' rational, modern outlook offers no defence against a force rooted in grief and revenge, and his terse ending, "Enough", suggests that some mysteries can be survived but never fully explained.

22 In The Woman in Black, Susan Hill presents motherhood as the emotional heart of the novel and the source of its horror. The ghost is a mother whose love has been twisted into hatred, and around her Hill places other mothers, contented, grieving or bereaved, so that the reader is constantly invited to compare them. Through these contrasts Hill explores how a society's rules about women and children can destroy the very bond it claims to honour.

The novel opens with a mother who seems the picture of domestic happiness. Isobel, Kipps' stepdaughter, is described in the quotation as "only twenty-four years old but already the mother of three young sons, and set fair to produce more". The phrase "set fair" is usually applied to the weather, and its calm, settled tone suggests a life of uncomplicated contentment. Kipps admires her placid, homely nature; although his wife Esme wishes Isobel were a little "less staid", Kipps does not. The Christmas Eve frame, with its family gathered round the fire, shows motherhood at its most secure: children are safe, plentiful and surrounded by love. Yet Hill places this scene at the start of a ghost story for a reason. The easy

Question number

fertility of Isobel, who seems almost to take her sons for granted, sharpens our awareness of what Jennet Humfrye was denied, and the cosy setting is shadowed by the narrator's knowledge of how fragile such happiness can be.

Jennet is the novel's most important mother, and Hill makes her both terrifying and pitiable. Through the letters Kipps finds at Eel Marsh House, we learn that she gave birth to a son, Nathaniel, outside marriage, and was forced by her family to give him up to her married sister, Alice Drablow. In the late Victorian and Edwardian period, an unmarried mother brought disgrace on her family, and Jennet's lack of choice reflects how little power women had over their own lives and bodies. Hill lets Jennet speak in her own voice in these letters, and the effect is to shift the reader's sympathy. Her cry, "I think my heart will break", is simple and direct, the language of grief rather than of a villain. We realise that the spectre who has frightened Kipps was once a young woman whose child was taken away from her by respectable society.

Alice Drablow, as Nathaniel's adoptive mother, offers a different version of motherhood, one shaped by propriety. At first reluctant to allow Jennet any contact, she eventually permits visits but insists that Jennet should "never see the boy alone". The command suggests Alice's fear that Jennet might reclaim him, and perhaps her own anxiety about her position as a mother who did not give birth to the child. The nursery at Eel Marsh House suggests that Nathaniel was deeply loved: it is carefully furnished, full of toys, paints and books, with the bed neatly made and clothes still in the wardrobe, preserved for decades after his death. Hill presents this room as a shrine to lost childhood, and its preservation hints at the lasting grief of both mothers, even if Jennet could never forgive her sister.

The death of Nathaniel, drowned on the marshes when the pony and trap carrying

Question number

him was lost in the fog, turns Jennet's love into its opposite. She is "filled with hatred", and after her own death from a wasting disease she returns to haunt Eel Marsh House and the town. Her madness has warped maternal instinct into a desire to inflict on other mothers the pain she suffered, so that whenever she is seen, a child dies. Hill's presentation of the ghost is therefore deeply ironic: the figure most associated with motherhood becomes its destroyer. The fact that she never speaks in the main narrative, only staring with an expression of desperate malevolence, makes her a symbol of silenced female suffering that has turned into revenge. In a small, isolated village community, where superstition still had a powerful hold, the townspeople's terror of her is understandable; their silence about her is partly guilt, and partly the fear of every parent who has lost a child.

Hill also shows the effect of Jennet's revenge on other families. Mr Jerome's guarded manner is connected to the loss of his own child, and the sense of shared mourning in Crythin Gifford suggests a community defined by bereaved mothers and fathers. Most devastating of all is Kipps' first wife, Stella, who becomes a mother herself. Her happiness with their baby son Joseph is presented tenderly, making the novel's final pages all the more brutal. When Kipps sees the woman in black in the park, the pony and trap carrying Stella and Joseph crashes; Joseph is killed and Stella dies some months later. Structurally, Hill has prepared us for this from the opening, yet it still shocks, because it shows that Jennet's grief cannot be confined to the past or to the marsh.

Ultimately, Hill presents mothers as figures of love who are vulnerable to loss, and she uses the Gothic genre to explore what happens when that love is denied. The contrast between the serene Isobel and the vengeful Jennet is not simply one of good and evil. I think Hill suggests that Jennet was made into a monster by a society that judged her harshly, and that the real horror of the novel lies in a

Question number

cruelty that passes, like a curse, from one mother to the next.