Pearson Edexcel International GCSE

Thursday 16 January 2020

Morning (Time: 1 hour 30 minutes) | Paper Reference **4ET1/02**

English Literature

Paper 2: Modern Drama and Literary Heritage Texts

Question Booklet

Do not return this Question Booklet with your Answer Booklet.
Clean copies of your set texts may be taken into the examination.

Turn over ▶

P62919A

©2020 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1



Pearson

stemup.co.uk

BLANK PAGE

stemup.co.uk

Answer TWO questions:

Answer ONE question from Section A and ONE question from Section B.

SECTION A: Modern Drama	**Page**
A View from the Bridge, Arthur Miller	4
An Inspector Calls, J B Priestley	4
The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time, Mark Haddon (adapted by Simon Stephens)	5
Kindertransport, Diane Samuels	5
Death and the King's Horseman, Wole Soyinka	6
SECTION B: Literary Heritage Texts	
Romeo and Juliet, William Shakespeare	7
Macbeth, William Shakespeare	7
The Merchant of Venice, William Shakespeare	8
Pride and Prejudice, Jane Austen	8
Great Expectations, Charles Dickens	9
The Scarlet Letter, Nathaniel Hawthorne	9

stemup.co.uk

SECTION A: Modern Drama

Answer ONE question on ONE text from this section.

You should spend 45 minutes on your chosen question.

***A View from the Bridge,* Arthur Miller**

EITHER

1 Explore the importance of honour in *A View from the Bridge*.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 How does Miller present the relationship between Catherine and Eddie in the play?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)

***An Inspector Calls,* J B Priestley**

EITHER

3 'Sheila and Eva/Daisy are similar in age, but very different in situation.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 Explore Priestley's presentation of the theme of power in *An Inspector Calls*.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time,* Mark Haddon**
(adapted by Simon Stephens)

EITHER

5 How far is Christopher presented as a victim in this play?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 5 = 30 marks)

OR

6 Explore the theme of conflict in *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time*.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 6 = 30 marks)

***Kindertransport,* Diane Samuels**

EITHER

7 'Lil and Helga are both important in Eva's life.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 7 = 30 marks)

OR

8 How does Samuels present the theme of love in *Kindertransport*?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 8 = 30 marks)

***Death and the King's Horseman,* Wole Soyinka**

EITHER

9 'Much of the conflict in the play comes from a clash of cultures.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 9 = 30 marks)

OR

10 Explore the presentation of Iyaloja and the women from the market in *Death and the King's Horseman*.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer.

(Total for Question 10 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS

stemup.co.uk

SECTION B: Literary Heritage Texts

Answer ONE question on ONE text from this section.

You should spend 45 minutes on your chosen question.

***Romeo and Juliet,* William Shakespeare**

EITHER

11 Explore the importance of the Nurse in this play.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the play.

(Total for Question 11 = 30 marks)

OR

12 How does Shakespeare present the theme of power in *Romeo and Juliet*?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the play.

(Total for Question 12 = 30 marks)

***Macbeth,* William Shakespeare**

EITHER

13 Explore the theme of madness throughout *Macbeth*.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the play.

(Total for Question 13 = 30 marks)

OR

14 How does Shakespeare present Macbeth's relationship with the Witches in the play?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the play.

(Total for Question 14 = 30 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***The Merchant of Venice*, William Shakespeare**

EITHER

15 Explore the theme of loyalty in *The Merchant of Venice*.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the play.

(Total for Question 15 = 30 marks)

OR

16 'Shylock causes his own downfall.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the play.

(Total for Question 16 = 30 marks)

***Pride and Prejudice*, Jane Austen**

EITHER

17 How does Austen present the characters of Mr and Mrs Bennet in *Pride and Prejudice*?

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the novel.

(Total for Question 17 = 30 marks)

OR

18 Explore the theme of reputation in the novel.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the novel.

(Total for Question 18 = 30 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***Great Expectations*, Charles Dickens**

EITHER

19 Explore the theme of violence in *Great Expectations*.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the novel.

(Total for Question 19 = 30 marks)

OR

20 Explore the importance of Pip's friends in the novel.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the novel.

(Total for Question 20 = 30 marks)

***The Scarlet Letter,* Nathaniel Hawthorne**

EITHER

21 Explore Hawthorne's presentation of Hester in *The Scarlet Letter*.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the novel.

(Total for Question 21 = 30 marks)

OR

22 Discuss the importance of revenge in the novel.

You must consider language, form and structure in your answer and refer to the context of the novel.

(Total for Question 22 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 30 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 60 MARKS

stemup.co.uk

BLANK PAGE

stemup.co.uk

BLANK PAGE

stemup.co.uk

BLANK PAGE

stemup.co.uk

Please check the examination details below before entering your candidate information

Candidate surname	Other names

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE

Centre Number | | | | | |

Candidate Number | | | | |

Thursday 16 January 2020

Morning (Time: 1 hour 30 minutes) | Paper Reference **4ET1/02**

English Literature

Paper 2: Modern Drama and Literary Heritage Texts

You must have:
Question 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 **ONE** question from each section.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided
  – *there may be more space than you need.*

Information

- The total mark for this paper is 60.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets
  – *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*
- Copies of the *Pearson Edexcel International GCSE English Anthology* may **not** be brought into the examination.
- Dictionaries may **not** be used in this examination.
- Clean copies of your set texts may be taken into the examination.

Advice

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

Turn over ▶

P62919A

©2020 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1

P 6 2 9 1 9 A 0 1 1 6

Pearson

stemup.co.uk

SECTION A: Modern Drama

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** ☒
Question 7 ☒	**Question 8** ☒	**Question 9** ☒
Question 10 ☒		

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

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS

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

SECTION B: Literary Heritage Texts

Chosen question number: **Question 11** ☒ **Question 12** ☒ **Question 13** ☒

Question 14 ☒ **Question 15** ☒ **Question 16** ☒

Question 17 ☒ **Question 18** ☒ **Question 19** ☒

Question 20 ☒ **Question 21** ☒ **Question 22** ☒

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 = 30 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 60 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

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

Question number

1

Honour in A View from the Bridge is not simply one theme among many: it is the code by which the whole community of Red Hook lives, and the measure by which Eddie Carbone is finally judged and destroyed. Miller presents honour as something deeply admirable, a form of loyalty and self-respect that protects the vulnerable, yet also as rigid and unforgiving, a code that leaves no room for weakness or for the law. The tragedy lies in the fact that Eddie believes in this code completely and still breaks it.

Miller establishes the code of honour early through the anecdote of Vinny Bolzano, the boy who "snitched to the Immigration" about his uncle. The story is told casually in the kitchen, almost as gossip, but its placement in Act One is structurally significant: it works as a warning and a piece of foreshadowing. The punishment is brutal, with Vinny's family turning on him in the street, and yet the detail that "The whole neighbourhood was crying" suggests that honour is a communal value, enforced by everyone and grieved by everyone when it is betrayed. Eddie tells the story to impress the seriousness of loyalty upon Catherine, which makes it intensely ironic in retrospect: he is describing, in advance, the fate he will bring upon himself.

At this point Eddie seems to embody honour. Sheltering Marco and Rodolfo is, for him, a duty and a privilege: "It's an honour, B. I mean it." The short, emphatic sentences and the direct address to Beatrice convey sincerity, and the audience is encouraged to see him as a generous, principled man. Marco matches this with his own formal courtesy on arrival, promising "when you say we go, we go." His dignified, almost ceremonial speech presents honour as reciprocal respect between

Question number

host and guest. Miller therefore builds up a world in which honour seems secure, so that its collapse will feel all the more devastating.

Alfieri, the lawyer and chorus figure, stands between two systems of justice. He understands that the law of America and the code of Sicily are not the same, and he warns Eddie that if he informs he "won't have a friend in the world". Alfieri's role as narrator is crucial here: he speaks directly to the audience with the detached tone of someone who already knows the ending, so his warnings carry a sense of inevitability. The dramatic form of Greek tragedy, which Miller deliberately echoes through Alfieri's choric speeches, makes Eddie's loss of honour feel fated rather than accidental.

The turning point comes when Eddie, consumed by jealousy over Catherine and Rodolfo, makes the telephone call to the Immigration Bureau. Miller stages this simply, with Eddie in a phone booth, and the starkness of the moment emphasises its enormity: a single private act that breaks the most public of codes. From here, honour becomes Eddie's obsession rather than his principle. After Marco spits in his face and accuses him in front of the neighbourhood, Eddie's language becomes increasingly desperate. His insistence that "Marco's got my name" shows that honour has shrunk, for him, into reputation. The repetition of his demand for his "name" in the final scene suggests a man clinging to the appearance of honour precisely because he has lost the substance of it.

Marco, by contrast, represents honour in its most uncompromising form. When Alfieri tells him that "To promise not to kill is not dishonourable", Marco cannot accept that a promise to the law outweighs the wrong done to his family. His reply, "All the law is not in a book", is short and weighty, and its simplicity gives it a quiet authority. Yet Miller does not simply endorse Marco. He breaks his word

Question number

to Alfieri, so the play suggests that a strict code of honour can itself lead to violence and broken promises. It is perhaps significant that Marco, the man of honour, is the one who kills.

The ending offers an ambiguous judgement. Eddie dies by his own knife, turned against him, in front of the community whose respect he wanted back, which gives the death a terrible symmetry. Alfieri's closing speech admits that he mourns Eddie, though the hesitation before the word "alarm" shows how uneasy that mourning is, and he admires that Eddie "allowed himself to be wholly known". Miller seems to suggest that there is something heroic in Eddie's refusal to "settle for half", even as that refusal destroys him. Honour, then, is presented as both the noblest and the most dangerous force in the play: it binds the community together, but when pride and passion become entangled with it, it leaves no path except tragedy.

2 Miller presents the relationship between Catherine and Eddie as the emotional centre of the play and the source of its tragedy. On the surface it is a loving bond between an uncle and the niece he has raised as a daughter, but Miller gradually reveals a possessive, unspoken desire on Eddie's side that he can neither admit nor control. Catherine's innocence and her growing wish for independence collide with Eddie's need to keep her as she was, and the relationship moves from tenderness to suspicion, betrayal and, finally, a kind of broken reconciliation.

In the opening scene Miller presents the relationship as affectionate and playful, yet already uneasy. Catherine is seventeen, eager to please, and clearly adores Eddie, while he calls her by the pet name "Katie", a diminutive that keeps her a child. However, his comments about her appearance reveal something more

Question number

troubling. When he criticises her for "walking wavy", the alliteration draws attention to her body and her movement, suggesting that Eddie notices her in a way that is not entirely paternal. His objection to her new skirt and her shoes appears protective, but the intensity of his disapproval hints at jealousy of the men who might see her. Catherine, by contrast, does not seem to recognise this; her innocence makes her vulnerable and the audience uncomfortable.

The news of Catherine's job as a stenographer becomes the first real test. For Catherine the job represents adulthood and freedom, and her excitement is breathless and eager. For Eddie it is a threat, and he resists until Beatrice persuades him. Miller uses Beatrice here as a quiet counterweight, encouraging Catherine to grow up and recognising, more clearly than Catherine does, what lies behind Eddie's reluctance. Small domestic moments also carry symbolic weight. When Catherine lights Eddie's cigar, the stage directions suggest an unusual pleasure on his part, and the image of the flame may symbolise a desire he cannot express. Through these subtle gestures Miller lets the audience sense the truth long before any character names it.

The arrival of Rodolfo transforms the relationship. As Catherine is drawn to his lightness, singing and charm, Eddie's face is described as "puffed with trouble", a vivid image that externalises his inner turmoil. He cannot say that he wants Catherine for himself, so instead he attacks Rodolfo indirectly, claiming that he only wants her for his papers and insisting to Alfieri that "The guy ain't right". Alfieri sees through this and tells him: "You did your job, now it's her life; wish her luck and let her go." The plain, balanced phrasing makes the advice sound obvious and reasonable, which emphasises how far Eddie has moved from reason. It is Beatrice, though, who finally names the truth: "You want somethin' else, Eddie, and you can never have her!" The exclamation and the stark word "never"

Question number

make this one of the most explosive moments in the play, exposing what Eddie himself refuses to acknowledge.

The relationship reaches crisis when a drunken Eddie returns home, finds Catherine with Rodolfo, and kisses her. This shocking act shatters the boundaries of the family and forces Catherine to see Eddie differently. Her later declaration that she is "not gonna be a baby any more" suggests that she is finally breaking free from the role Eddie has imposed upon her. Structurally, this moment closes the distance between what the audience has suspected and what is now undeniable, and it propels Eddie towards the phone call that will destroy him.

After Eddie informs on Marco and Rodolfo, Catherine's love turns to fury. She calls him "a rat", an animal image that connects him to the vermin of the community's moral code and shows how completely he has fallen in her eyes. The contrast with the adoring girl of the opening scene is stark and painful. Yet Miller does not let the relationship end in hatred alone. As Eddie dies, Catherine pleads, "Eddie, I never meant to do nothing bad to you." Her taking of blame is deeply ambiguous: it may show genuine love surviving everything, or the lingering hold Eddie had over her, so that even now she feels responsible for his feelings.

Ultimately, Miller structures the play so that this relationship generates its central tension and drives Eddie's tragic downfall. It is significant that Eddie dies in Beatrice's arms, not Catherine's, perhaps suggesting that he turns back, too late, to the love that was rightfully his. Through Catherine and Eddie, Miller explores how love that cannot be acknowledged becomes possessive and destructive, and how the effort to stop someone growing up can destroy the very bond it is meant to protect.

Question number

3

I largely agree with the statement. Priestley deliberately makes Sheila and Eva/Daisy mirror images of one another: two young women of similar age, both pretty, both with their lives ahead of them, separated almost entirely by money and class. Yet the play also suggests a deeper similarity, since both are, in different ways, at the mercy of the men and the older generation around them. The contrast in their situations is what drives the play's moral argument, while the hints of likeness make Eva's fate more troubling.

Priestley introduces Sheila through a stage direction that captures her privilege: "a pretty girl in her early twenties, very pleased with life and rather excited." The adjectives present someone sheltered and carefree, whose excitement centres on her engagement and her ring. Her childish name for her mother and her teasing of Eric reinforce this sense of comfort. Everything about her situation is secure: she has a family, a fiancé from a titled family and a house where the lighting is initially "pink and intimate". By contrast, Eva never appears on stage at all. The audience builds a picture of her only through the reports of others and the photograph the Inspector shows to one character at a time. This dramatic choice is itself a comment on her situation: she has no voice in the Birlings' world and exists only in the stories they tell about her.

What we learn of Eva's situation is a sequence of losses. She is an orphan from the country who comes to Brumley to work, with no family to support her. Mr Birling sacks her for leading the strike, dismissing her because "She had a lot to say", and the casual phrase reveals how little her voice is valued. Each later scene adds another blow, from losing her job at Milwards, to being cast off by Gerald, to being refused help by Mrs Birling's committee, until the Inspector's report of her suicide by swallowing disinfectant. The episodic structure, with each character's confession following the last, makes her situation seem a downward spiral in which

Question number

she has no power at all.

The two women's lives intersect directly at Milwards, and this is where Priestley shows the gulf most sharply. Sheila tries on a dress that suits Eva better and, when she sees the shop girl smile, has her dismissed. Sheila admits that Eva was "the right type for it, just as I was the wrong type", and this telling confession suggests that, in looks and youth, the two are similar or even that Eva has the advantage. Yet Sheila's situation gives her the power to destroy a stranger's livelihood with a single complaint, while Eva has none. The fact that Sheila acted out of jealousy shows that the difference between them is not one of worth but of circumstance.

Gerald provides a further structural link. The summer when, as Sheila notes, Gerald "never came near" her is the summer he spent with Daisy Renton. Gerald describes Daisy warmly, with her "soft brown hair and big dark eyes", and he seems genuinely to have cared for her. However, there was never any question of marriage: it is to Sheila, the woman of his own class, that he returns. Priestley uses this parallel to show that both women are, in a sense, objects in Gerald's life, but only Sheila's class makes her a suitable wife. This is perhaps where the similarity between them is most evident, and most uncomfortable.

The biggest difference, though, lies in what each woman can become. Sheila responds to the Inspector with genuine remorse. She says she "felt rotten at the time" and vows she will never do it again to anybody, and she grows in moral authority, warning her parents and challenging Gerald. Her line "It frightens me the way you talk" in the final act shows her separating herself from her parents' complacency. She has the security and the time to learn and change. Eva, on the other hand, is given no second chance. Priestley's structure makes this contrast

Question number

painfully clear: the same evening that brings Sheila moral awakening has already brought Eva death.

The Inspector's final speech broadens the contrast into a universal one, insisting that there are "millions and millions and millions of Eva Smiths and John Smiths". The repetition turns Eva from an individual into a symbol of everyone whose situation leaves them powerless. Sheila, meanwhile, represents the possibility of change among the privileged. Overall, then, the statement is accurate: Sheila and Eva are similar in age and perhaps in character, but Priestley uses the gulf between their situations to expose how much a young woman's fate depends not on who she is, but on where she was born.

4 Priestley presents power in An Inspector Calls as something unevenly distributed through class, wealth, age and gender, and frequently abused by those who hold it. The Birlings and Gerald enjoy power they have done nothing to earn, while Eva Smith has almost none. Yet Priestley introduces a different kind of power in Inspector Goole: a moral authority that does not depend on status and that exposes the hollowness of everyone else's. The play ultimately asks the audience to question who deserves power and how it ought to be used.

Mr Birling is the clearest embodiment of economic and social power. He describes himself as a "hard-headed practical man of business", and his speeches in Act One are long and confident, revealing a man used to being listened to. His philosophy that a man must "look after himself and his own" shows that he regards power as a private possession rather than a responsibility. When his workers attempt to use the only power they have, collective strike action, he crushes it, and of Eva he says simply that "She had a lot to say", dismissing her as if a working girl's voice

Question number

were an offence. Priestley makes Birling's power seem impressive at first, but the dramatic irony of his confident predictions about the Titanic and the impossibility of war undermines him, suggesting that his authority rests on foolishness.

Birling also tries to use his status as a weapon against the Inspector. He reminds Goole that he was Lord Mayor and that "I'm still on the Bench", hoping that his connections will intimidate him. The tactic fails completely, and Priestley uses this to show that social power is useless against moral truth. At the same time, Birling's own position in the social hierarchy is less secure than he thinks. His anxious remark that the port is "the same port your father gets" reveals his eagerness to impress Gerald, whose parents are Lord and Lady Croft.

Mrs Birling's power comes from her social superiority and her role on the Brumley Women's Charity Organisation. She uses this position to refuse help to Eva, offended that the girl called herself "Mrs Birling". Her cold insistence to the Inspector that "You have no power to make me change my mind" is deeply ironic, because she is right in a narrow sense, and yet her refusal to change is exactly what condemns her in the audience's eyes. Her correction of her husband, "Arthur, you're not supposed to say such things", hints that she holds a quiet social power within the marriage too, as she is his social superior.

The younger characters reveal that power is not only held by older men. Sheila's single complaint at Milwards is enough to cost Eva her job, which shows how casually privilege can destroy. Gerald uses his wealth to rescue Eva from Alderman Meggarty, but also to keep her as his mistress and then end the affair when it suits him. Eric, perhaps the least powerful of the family, still abuses what power he has over Eva. Through this structure of successive confessions, Priestley shows that every member of the family has wielded power over the same powerless young

Question number

woman.

Against all this stands the Inspector. His power does not come from rank or wealth; the stage direction that he creates "an impression of massiveness, solidity and purposefulness" makes him physically dominate the room, and his "disconcerting habit of looking hard at the person he addresses" unsettles each character in turn. He controls the pace of the play, showing the photograph to one person at a time and deciding who is questioned next, and when the family descend into squabbling, the stage directions have him take charge "massively". The change of lighting from "pink and intimate" to "brighter and harder" when he arrives suggests that his presence strips away comfortable illusions. His almost omniscient knowledge of Eva's life gives him an uncanny authority.

Sheila grows in power as she absorbs his message. By the final act she is challenging her parents directly, accusing her mother of having "hardened her heart" and given Eva "the final push". Her authority now comes from understanding rather than status, which is exactly the kind of power the Inspector represents.

Priestley's final structural twist reasserts the Inspector's power even after his departure. The older Birlings and Gerald try to dismiss him as a hoax and return to normal, but the closing telephone call announcing that a girl has died on her way to the Infirmary snatches control back from them. The Inspector's warning of "fire and blood and anguish" if people refuse to learn hangs over the ending. Priestley therefore presents conventional power as fragile and morally bankrupt, and suggests that the only power worth having is the power to accept responsibility for others.

Question number	
5	Christopher is presented as a victim to a significant extent: of others' misunderstanding, of his parents' deceptions and failures, and of a world that is too loud and crowded for him to bear. However, Stephens' adaptation is careful not to let him be defined by this. The play's form, in which Christopher's own book is staged and his voice shapes the story, presents him as a hero and an investigator as much as a victim, so the answer to "how far" is that he is a victim of circumstance but never only a victim. From the opening tableau, Christopher is shown at the mercy of other people's assumptions. Discovered beside the dead Wellington, he is immediately blamed by Mrs Shears, and the stage direction that "Christopher puts his hands over his ears" presents his fear physically and silently, in contrast to her shouting. When the policeman questions him, his literal answer, "I'm talking to you", is perfectly truthful but is interpreted as rudeness, and the situation escalates until he hits the officer and is arrested. Stephens creates both comedy and pathos here: the audience laughs at the literalness but also sees how easily someone who thinks differently can become a victim of a system built on unspoken rules. The most serious way in which Christopher is a victim is through his parents. Ed has told him that his mother died, and the discovery of her letters hidden in his father's bedroom is the play's most devastating turning point. The stage directions here are brief and stark: "His thrashing has exhausted him. He has been sick." The short declarative sentences strip the moment of any comfort and force the audience to witness the physical effect of the lie. His father's confession that he also killed Wellington compounds the betrayal, and Christopher's conclusion that he can no longer feel safe with him shows how deeply he has been wronged. Ed's anger, captured in outbursts such as "Jesus, Christopher, how stupid are you?", suggests that Christopher is also a victim of a parent who often cannot control his

Question number

frustration.

Judy's letters reveal another layer of victimhood. Through them she confesses that she was "at the end of my tether", describing chaotic episodes of screaming and broken mixers. The confessional, almost apologetic tone of the letters, read aloud while Christopher listens, creates sympathy for Judy, but it also makes the audience realise that Christopher was abandoned because his mother could not cope. He has been a victim of adult weakness for most of his childhood without knowing it.

Christopher's journey to London presents him as a victim of the world itself. Stephens uses the ensemble to create overwhelming sound and movement, with voices calling out fragments of signs and announcements, so that the audience shares something of the sensory assault Christopher experiences. His physical danger peaks when he climbs onto the Underground track to rescue Toby, and the stranger's warning, "you're going to get yourself killed", heightens the tension and reminds us how vulnerable he is. Even in London he is not safe: Roger Shears turns on him, sneering "You think you're so clever, don't you?", and the bitterness of the line shows Christopher once again absorbing adult resentment he has done nothing to deserve.

However, the play persistently resists casting him solely as a victim. The form itself is significant: Siobhan reads from the book Christopher has written, and the second half is presented as a play that he and others are performing. This metatheatrical structure gives Christopher control of his own narrative, so he is the author of his story rather than a passive subject. His investigation into Wellington's death shows determination and courage, and the journey to London, undertaken alone despite his fears, is presented as heroic. Above all, he sits his A

Question number

level Maths and achieves an A star, triumphing over the obstacles placed in front of him.

The ending reinforces this ambiguity. Christopher's final question, "Does that mean I can do anything?", is left hanging, without a clear answer, and this openness invites interpretation: it may suggest that the world will continue to limit him, or that his potential genuinely has no ceiling. Stephens closes with Christopher's sense of possibility rather than his suffering. Overall, Christopher is clearly presented as a victim of deception, misunderstanding and adult failure, but the play's structure and its focus on his achievements insist that he is also its hero, defined by resilience rather than by what has been done to him.

6 Conflict runs through every level of The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time. Stephens presents it within families, between neighbours, between Christopher and the society around him, and inside Christopher himself. What is striking is that much of the conflict springs not from malice but from love, frustration and an inability to communicate, so that the play becomes an exploration of how people who care for each other can still do great damage.

The play begins with the result of a hidden conflict. The dead Wellington, speared by a garden fork, is a violent, shocking image that opens the drama in medias res, and the mystery Christopher sets out to solve is, in fact, the story of a conflict between adults. When Ed eventually confesses, his explanation shows how resentment built up between him and the Shears household. He admits that the dog was killed when "the red mist comes down", an idiom that suggests a sudden loss of control, and his comment that Mrs Shears "cared more for that bloody dog than us" reveals the jealousy and rejection beneath the act. Stephens makes the

Question number

audience understand Ed without excusing him: the conflict is human and pitiable, but its consequences are brutal.

The conflict between Christopher's parents is revealed through Judy's letters, which are staged with Judy herself speaking them. Their confessional tone exposes a marriage worn down by the strain of looking after Christopher. She writes that "by the end we stopped talking to each other very much because we knew it would always end up in an argument." The long, weary sentence, with its sense of resignation, conveys a conflict that ended not in a single explosion but in silence. Her letters also reveal her inner conflict and guilt: "I'm sorry Christopher. But I still love you." The short sentences and the plea that he will not "stay too angry" with her show a mother torn between love and the knowledge that she failed him.

The central conflict of the play is between Christopher and his father. Ed's lie about Judy's death and his confession to killing Wellington shatter Christopher's trust, and his response is to flee. Christopher's reasoning that a man who could kill a dog might kill him is logical by his own standards, which makes the breach seem total. Stephens presents this conflict physically as well as verbally: Ed's outbursts of frustration and Christopher's terror of being touched turn the stage into a space of tension. Yet the play also traces the slow work of reconciliation. Ed's gift of a puppy and his patient attempts to rebuild trust in small steps suggest that conflict, in this play, can be eased by love, though not erased.

When Christopher reaches London, the conflict between Judy and Roger becomes visible. Roger's resentment towards Christopher surfaces when he returns drunk and sneers, "You think you're so clever, don't you?" The conflict turns physical, and the stage direction "She grabs Roger. She pulls him away from Christopher" shows Judy choosing her son over her partner. The short, active sentences of the

Question number

direction make the moment sharp and decisive, and it marks a turning point in Judy's role, from a mother who left to one who protects.

Christopher is also in conflict with the wider world. Crowds, noise and unfamiliar places overwhelm him, and Stephens dramatises this through the ensemble during the journey to London. The overlapping voices calling "Sweet Pastries", "Heathrow Airport Check In Here" and "Bagel Factory" clash together, turning ordinary signs into a disorienting barrage. The form puts the audience inside Christopher's experience, so that the conflict between him and society feels sensory rather than abstract. Similarly, the opening confrontation with the policeman, in which his literal answers are mistaken for insolence, shows how quickly misunderstanding can turn into conflict.

Finally, Christopher is in conflict with himself, struggling against his own fears in order to act. His decision to travel to London alone, despite everything that terrifies him, is presented as an internal battle he wins. Stephens shows this through moments where Christopher groans, counts or retreats into maths to calm himself, which suggest an inner turmoil the audience can see but not fully enter.

In conclusion, Stephens presents conflict as the engine of the play, from the violent mystery of the opening to the domestic arguments revealed later. Yet the play suggests that most of these conflicts arise from human weakness, jealousy and the failure to understand one another, rather than from cruelty, and its ending, with Christopher's success and his tentative reconnection with both parents, implies that conflict can be survived, if not entirely resolved.

7 I strongly agree that Lil and Helga are both important in Eva's life, but Samuels

Question number

presents their importance in very different ways. Helga, the birth mother, gives Eva life twice over, first by bearing her and then by sending her away to safety, yet she becomes a source of pain and resentment. Lil, the foster mother, gives Eva a home, a language and a new identity, and becomes the lasting presence in her adult life. The play's dual time frame allows Samuels to show that Eva's identity is shaped by the tension between these two women, and that neither can simply replace the other.

Helga's importance is established at the very start, in Hamburg, as she prepares Eva for the journey. Her conviction that sending her daughter away is right, "Any good parent would do that", shows the painful logic of love in a time of danger. The decision almost certainly saves Eva's life, so in the most literal sense Helga is the most important person in it. The detail of Helga making Eva sew a button on her own coat is especially telling. Helga refuses to do it for her, insisting that Eva must learn to manage alone, and the domestic task becomes symbolic of the independence that Helga knows her daughter will need. The scene is tender but strained, and Samuels lets the audience sense, through dramatic irony, that the separation will last far longer than either of them imagines.

Lil's importance begins when Eva arrives in Manchester. Her first words of sympathy, "Poor lamb. You must be exhausted", are warm and colloquial, and the gentle animal metaphor contrasts with the threatening imagery of the Ratcatcher that haunts Eva. The language barrier between them, as Lil cannot understand Eva's German, emphasises the scale of what Eva has lost. However, Lil quickly becomes her protector and guide, and the parallel between Helga's coat button and Lil sewing up Eva's skirt shows Samuels deliberately pairing the two mothers through acts of care. Where Helga taught self-reliance, Lil offers practical comfort, and the juxtaposition suggests that Eva's mothering has passed from one woman

Question number

to the other.

However, Lil's importance is not entirely positive. Her reference to Jewish customs as "old laws" suggests that she sees Eva's religion as outdated, and she does little to help Eva keep hold of her heritage. Eva's decision to become Evelyn, to abandon her German name and Jewish identity, can be read as a consequence of Lil's influence as well as of trauma. Helga's attempt to remind her that "Eva was the name of your great-grandmother" shows the weight of family history that Evelyn has chosen to discard, and this moment confirms that Helga has lost her hold over her daughter.

The reunion between Helga and Evelyn after the war is the climax of Helga's importance, and the most painful scene in the play. Helga has survived the camps and wants her daughter to come with her to New York, but the language barrier now runs the other way. Helga speaks German and Evelyn replies, "I'm sorry. I don't quite understand." The polite, formal English shows how completely Evelyn has become a stranger to her mother. Evelyn's anger erupts in the accusation "I never wanted to live without you and you made me", which reframes Helga's sacrifice as abandonment. Her rhetorical question, "What is more cruel than that?", and her claim that Helga is "punishing me for surviving" reveal how Helga remains important precisely as a wound that never heals.

Lil, by contrast, remains a constant presence. In the present-day scenes she is elderly, still in Evelyn's life and treated by Faith as a grandmother. Structurally, she acts as a mediator between Evelyn and Faith, trying to calm the tension when Faith discovers the hidden past: "No-one's accusing you, love." The affectionate tone and the address "love" show her continuing role as peacemaker and comforter. Her presence across both time frames gives her an importance that is sustained

Question number

rather than dramatic.

Ultimately, Samuels suggests that both women matter enormously, but in different ways. Helga gives Eva survival and a heritage she cannot fully reject, while Lil gives her a home and a future. It is deeply ironic that Evelyn comes to see Helga's decision to save her as a betrayal, while she forms her strongest bond with the woman who helped her forget. The play's structure, with past and present sharing the stage, implies that Eva can never be whole without reconciling the two mothers who shaped her, and the fact that she never fully manages this is part of its tragedy.

8 Samuels presents love in Kindertransport as powerful but painfully complicated. The love between mothers and daughters drives every major decision in the play, yet it is also the source of its deepest wounds: Helga's love leads her to send Eva away, Eva's need for love leads her to reject her mother and her past, and Evelyn's fear of loss makes her struggle to love her own daughter openly. Through the play's interwoven time frames, Samuels suggests that love can save a life and still leave scars that last for generations.

The play opens with Helga's love for Eva expressed through small, practical acts. Helga makes Eva sew the button on her own coat, refusing to do it for her. On the surface this seems strict, but it reveals a love that looks ahead: Helga knows Eva will soon be alone and must learn independence. The scene is tender and tense at once, and the dramatic irony is acute, because the audience knows, as the characters do not, that the separation will last for years rather than months. Helga's symbolic language, "You are my jewels", shows how precious Eva is to her, and the jewellery she entrusts to her daughter becomes a material sign of family

Question number

love. Later, when Eva sells the jewellery, the act represents her rejection of her old life and of the love it symbolises.

The very act of sending Eva on the Kindertransport is presented as the ultimate expression of love, but Samuels makes clear that the child cannot experience it that way. Evelyn's later accusation, "You should have hung on to me and never let me go", reveals how sacrifice can feel like abandonment. The play therefore asks the audience to consider whether love is measured by the parent's intention or the child's experience, and it refuses to give an easy answer.

Lil's love is warmer and more immediate. From her first greeting she treats Eva with kindness, and she becomes everything to her: protector, teacher and mother. Their love is perhaps mutual dependence, since Lil's own children have grown up and Eva fills a space in her life. The strength of this bond is shown most powerfully when Helga returns and asks Evelyn to go to New York with her. Evelyn is physically sick at the thought of leaving, a bodily reaction that shows how completely her love has transferred to Lil and to England. Evelyn later describes her love for her adopted country with striking imagery: "Germany spat me out. England took me in. I love this place". The violent verb "spat" contrasts with the embrace of "took me in", and the short, balanced sentences give the declaration a stubborn, almost defiant quality. Her love for England is bound up with gratitude and fear, rather than simple affection.

Helga's love, by contrast, becomes desperate. On the quayside she pleads, "What am I making you do! I am your mother. I love you. We must be together." The short, repeated declarations and the exclamation show raw emotion breaking through, and the bluntness of "I am your mother" reveals Helga's belief that love should be enough to reclaim her daughter. Its failure is heartbreaking. Samuels lets

Question number

the audience see a mother who has survived the camps sustained by love, only to find that love unreturned.

Love between Evelyn and Faith is presented as strained by secrecy. Evelyn has hidden her past, and Faith's discovery of the letters and documents in the attic forces both of them to confront what their relationship lacks. Evelyn's coldness and anxiety can be read as the legacy of a childhood in which love was associated with loss, so she struggles to express it openly. Lil again acts as a bridge, showing love to Faith as a grandchild and trying to soothe the tension between mother and daughter.

Structurally, the jumps between past and present, with characters from different decades sharing the stage, emphasise the complexity of love across time. Helga's raw grief is juxtaposed with the calm surface of Evelyn's middle-class life decades later, so that the audience sees both the immediacy of the loss and its long aftermath. The shadow of the Ratcatcher, a figure from a children's story, hangs over these scenes as a reminder of the forces that tore families apart.

In conclusion, Samuels presents love as the force that saves Eva and the force that wounds her. It is shown through sacrifice, comfort, desperation and silence, and the play suggests that love in times of persecution cannot be simple. By showing three generations of women bound together and divided by it, Samuels leaves the audience with a moving sense that love endures, but that its expression can be distorted by the history people live through.

9 On the surface, the conflict in Death and the King's Horseman clearly comes from a clash between Yoruba culture and British colonial rule: Pilkings's arrest of Elesin

Question number

is the event that destroys the ritual. However, I would agree with the statement only in part. Soyinka himself warns in his Author's Note against the "facile tag" of "clash of cultures", calling the colonial factor "a catalytic incident merely". The deepest conflict in the play is within Elesin, between his duty to cross into the world of the ancestors and his love of the world he must leave, and the British intervention exposes this failure rather than creating it.

The clash of cultures is certainly dramatised vividly. Soyinka structures the play so that the vibrant, poetic market scene is followed abruptly by the Pilkingses' bungalow, where the couple are dancing in egungun costumes. The juxtaposition is deliberately jarring: what the Yoruba treat as the sacred dress of the ancestral dead, the British treat as fancy dress for a ball. Amusa's broken English, "I cannot against death to dead cult. This dress get power of dead", is comic on the surface, but it carries real moral weight. Although Amusa is a Muslim and serves the colonial police, he understands the sanctity of other beliefs in a way his educated employers do not, so the language of the "native" is shown to hold more wisdom than that of the rulers.

Pilkings's contempt is revealed through his own words. He threatens to "feed you pork" if Amusa offers more "superstitious nonsense", a joke that shows a casual disregard for Amusa's faith as well as for Yoruba belief. Later he snaps at Iyaloja, "Must your people forever speak in riddles?" The rhetorical question shows that he cannot hear the proverbial, metaphorical language of the Yoruba as anything other than obstruction. Soyinka makes the Resident even more absurd, pleased that "a bit of colour always appeals to the natives". The ironic humour here mocks colonial condescension and suggests that the British are blind to the culture they claim to govern.

Question number

Olunde is the character who most clearly articulates the clash. Having trained as a doctor in England, he tells Jane that he discovered the British "have no respect for what you do not understand", and he rebukes her: "You believe that everything which appears to make sense was learnt from you". Yet Olunde also complicates the idea of a simple binary. He has absorbed western learning without losing his Yoruba identity, and he is able to see the British wartime sacrifice of a ship's captain as comparable to his father's duty. His conversation with Jane is a debate of equals, and the fact that he wins it suggests Soyinka wants to show that the two cultures could understand one another if the colonisers were willing to listen.

However, the real tragedy is rooted in Elesin. In the opening scene he is a magnificent, sensual figure who declares "This market is my roost", and the Praise-Singer's questions and the women's anxious "Nothing will hold you back?" create dramatic tension long before Pilkings knows anything. Most tellingly, Elesin demands to marry a young woman on the very day of his death. Iyaloja grants it, "The best is yours", but the women are uneasy, admitting "This language is the language of our elders, we do not fully grasp it". Soyinka implies here that Elesin's attachment to earthly pleasure is already weakening his will. When he later confesses that his will was "squelched in the spittle of an alien race", he partly blames the British, yet he also admits that he committed a "blasphemy of thought", welcoming the idea that the gods might have sent the stranger to stop him. The colonial arrest therefore becomes an excuse for a failure that is spiritual and personal.

Iyaloja's final judgement supports this reading. She tells Elesin that the world once "saluted" him as "a pith-laden being" but that he is now an "emptied bark". The metaphor of a hollow tree places the blame squarely on him rather than on Pilkings. Structurally, the climax is not a confrontation between British and Yoruba

Question number

but the moment Olunde's body is revealed: the son completes the duty the father abandoned, and Elesin strangles himself with his chain too late to matter. The colonial chain becomes the instrument, but not the cause, of his death.

In conclusion, the clash of cultures is the trigger for much of the visible conflict, and Soyinka satirises colonial arrogance sharply. Yet the play's most profound conflict is metaphysical and internal: a man's struggle between duty and desire, and a community's fear that the world itself will be "wrenched" adrift if that duty is not fulfilled. The British are a catalyst, but Elesin's weakness is the tragedy.

10 Soyinka presents Iyaloja and the women of the market as the living heart of the Yoruba community: they are its memory, its moral voice and, in the end, its judges. At first they appear as admirers who celebrate and indulge Elesin, but as the play develops they become fierce guardians of tradition who defy the colonial authorities and hold Elesin accountable for his failure. Through them, Soyinka suggests that the survival of a culture rests not only with its great men but with the ordinary people who sustain it.

In the opening scene the market is Elesin's natural stage, and the women's role is partly that of an adoring audience. Elesin calls the market "my roost", and the women respond to his playful, theatrical complaint about being insulted by dressing him in rich cloths. This comic episode shows that they are eager to please him, yet beneath the humour is real fear. Their anxious lines, "For a while we truly feared / Our hands had wrenched the world adrift / In emptiness", reveal the cosmic weight they attach to his journey. The verb "wrenched" suggests violent dislocation, as if a single insult could break the link between the living and the ancestors. The women are therefore presented as deeply spiritual, aware that

Question number

Elesin's ritual death protects the whole order of their world.

Iyaloja stands apart from the other women as their leader. She is called the "Mother" of the market and addresses the women as "Daughters", a form of address that frames the market as a family and her authority as maternal rather than political. When Elesin asks for the young woman betrothed to her son, Iyaloja grants her: "The best is yours". Her reasoning, "If we offend you now we have mortified the gods", shows that she places the community's spiritual duty above her personal interest. Yet Soyinka gives her moments of shrewd doubt. She warns that a man's choices will follow him, and the women's admission, "This language is the language of our elders, we do not fully grasp it", hints at unease about a request that seems to bind Elesin more tightly to the earth just as he must leave it. Their questioning, "Nothing will hold you back?", becomes painfully ironic in retrospect.

Formally, the women function like a chorus. They comment on the action, voice the community's feelings and share in the rhythmic, poetic language of praise and song. This gives the play a ritual quality, so that Elesin's passage is presented as a public, collective event rather than a private death. The chorus also gives Soyinka a way to show the community's reaction when the ritual is disrupted.

In the third scene, the women's strength and wit become a form of resistance. When Amusa and his constables come to arrest Elesin, the women block their path and humiliate them, and the young girls mimic the manners and accents of the British, staging a parody of colonial club life. This scene is both comic and political: the market women refuse to be intimidated, and by imitating the colonisers they expose them as absurd. Soyinka presents these women as more powerful in their own space than the uniformed officers who serve the colonial

Question number

state.

Iyaloja's power is most striking in the final scene, where she confronts Pilkings and Elesin. She dismisses Pilkings as a "child", reversing the colonial assumption that the British are the adults and the Africans the children. Her contempt shows that she does not recognise his authority over matters of the spirit. Towards Elesin she is unrelenting. Using rich, proverbial metaphor, she calls him an "emptied bark that the world once saluted for a pith-laden being". The image of a hollow trunk which only looks solid captures her sense that his honour was a shell. Her line "Now look at the spectacle of your life. I grieve for you" combines scorn with genuine grief, so she acts as Elesin's conscience as well as his accuser.

Structurally, it is Iyaloja and the women who bring Olunde's body to Elesin, a dramatic choice that makes them the agents of the play's tragic revelation. They force Elesin, and the audience, to confront the cost of his failure. Iyaloja's final words, urging the Bride to forget the dead and the living and turn her mind "only to the unborn", give the women the last voice in the play, suggesting that they carry the community's future.

Overall, Soyinka presents Iyaloja and the market women as dignified, witty and morally formidable. They begin as Elesin's admirers but end as his judges, and in doing so they embody the values of a culture that endures even when its leaders fail.

11 The Nurse is important in Romeo and Juliet in three linked ways: she is Juliet's closest companion, she is a source of earthy comedy, and she is a crucial agent of the plot. Shakespeare uses her to make the secret marriage possible, but also,

Question number

through her final betrayal, to isolate Juliet completely. Her importance therefore changes across the play, from comic mother figure to a character whose practical, worldly view of love throws the intensity of the lovers into sharp relief.

From her first appearance, Shakespeare establishes the Nurse as closer to Juliet than her own mother. Lady Capulet cannot manage the conversation about marriage without her, dismissing her and then calling her straight back: "Nurse, give leave awhile, / We must talk in secret: Nurse, come back again". The awkward reversal suggests a distance between mother and daughter that the Nurse fills. Her long, rambling speech about Juliet's weaning, and her claim that she can tell Juliet's age "unto an hour", show a physical, intimate knowledge of the child. The superlative in "Thou wast the prettiest babe that e'er I nursed" conveys warm, uncomplicated love. Shakespeare's audience would have recognised this relationship: wealthy families commonly gave their babies to wet nurses, and her passing reference to her own daughter Susan, who is "with God", hints at the cost such women often paid. This brief detail adds pathos, implying that Juliet has taken the place of the child the Nurse lost.

The Nurse is also central to the play's comedy. Her repeated bawdy joke about her husband's comment that Juliet will "fall backward" when she is older introduces a crude, physical view of sex which contrasts with the idealised language of the lovers. In Act 2 Scene 5, Shakespeare uses her for comic delay. Juliet is desperate for news from Romeo, but the Nurse complains "Fie, how my bones ache!" and dwells on her headache until Juliet replies with exasperated politeness. The structure of the scene builds tension through the Nurse's teasing, and the audience enjoys Juliet's impatience. Yet the comedy also reveals the Nurse's affection: she plays with Juliet because she knows the news is good, finally urging her, "Go, girl, seek happy nights to happy days". The innuendo here is typical of her, reducing

Question number

marriage to its physical pleasures.

Her importance to the plot cannot be overstated. As a servant she naturally acts as a messenger, a role familiar to an Elizabethan audience, and she uses this freedom to carry messages between the lovers. When she meets Romeo, she warns him not to lead Juliet "into a fool's paradise", a vivid image that shows her protective instinct. By arranging the meeting at Friar Lawrence's cell, she becomes a catalyst for the hasty marriage, and in doing so she defies Capulet's plans for Paris. Shakespeare therefore makes a lower-status character responsible for one of the play's most decisive events.

However, after Tybalt's death the Nurse's limitations begin to show. Her panicked cry "We are undone, lady, we are undone!" and her confusing account make Juliet think Romeo is dead. She curses Romeo, yet she still agrees to find him so that the couple can spend their wedding night together. This shows her loyalty, but also her tendency to follow her feelings of the moment.

The turning point comes in Act 3 Scene 5. After Capulet threatens to throw Juliet out, the Nurse advises her to marry Paris, saying "I think you are happy in this second match" and dismissing Romeo as "a dishclout" compared with the County. Her advice is pragmatic: she knows that a young woman in a patriarchal household has no safety without her father's favour. Yet she ignores the fact that the marriage would be bigamous and the depth of Juliet's love. Juliet's response, privately calling her "Ancient damnation! O most wicked fiend!", is a dramatic shift, and her vow that the Nurse and her "bosom henceforth shall be twain" marks the end of their closeness. Structurally, this betrayal is vital: it cuts Juliet off from her last confidante and drives her to the Friar's dangerous plan. Later, when she takes the potion, she says her "dismal scene" must be acted "alone", and

Question number

the Nurse's absence is felt.

Fittingly, it is the Nurse who discovers Juliet apparently dead, and her repeated "O woeful, woeful, woeful day!" is genuine grief, even if it borders on the comic. Overall, the Nurse is important because she embodies a loving but limited, everyday view of the world. Shakespeare uses her to make the tragedy possible and, by her failure to understand Juliet's love, to make it inevitable.

12 Shakespeare presents power in Romeo and Juliet as operating on several levels at once. There is the political power of the Prince, the domestic power of fathers, and the emotional power of love and hate, but over all of these lies the power of fate, which the Prologue announces before the action begins. The tragedy suggests that human authority is ultimately fragile: the Prince cannot keep the peace and Capulet cannot control his daughter, while love, hate and fortune drive events to an ending that no one in Verona can prevent.

Prince Escalus represents legitimate political power. In Act 1 Scene 1 he enters after the brawl and addresses the fighters as "Rebellious subjects, enemies to peace", a phrase that frames the feud as a threat to the state. His warning that if they ever "disturb our streets again" their lives "shall pay the forfeit of the peace" establishes his power over life and death. To an Elizabethan audience, a ruler with the power to execute or banish without trial would have seemed natural. Yet Shakespeare shows the limits of this authority. The feud breaks out again in Act 3, and after Tybalt's death the Prince chooses banishment rather than death for Romeo. Structurally, this decision is pivotal: it separates the lovers and leads directly to the Friar's plan and the deaths in the tomb. Even the Prince's mercy contributes to the tragedy, and his final judgement, "All are punished", includes

Question number

himself, since he has lost his kinsmen Mercutio and Paris.

Lord Capulet's power is patriarchal. Early in the play he seems a gentle father, telling Paris "Let two more summers wither in their pride / Ere we may think her ripe to be a bride". The metaphor of Juliet as fruit that must ripen is affectionate, but it also shows that he regards her future as his to decide. Juliet herself accepts this at first, promising "I'll look to like, if looking liking move", a careful, balanced line that shows her obedience is conditional and limited to what her parents permit. In Act 3 Scene 5, when she refuses to marry Paris, Capulet's power becomes brutal. He threatens that she may "hang, beg, starve, die in the streets", and the list of monosyllabic verbs sounds like blows. In Shakespeare's patriarchal society, a daughter's marriage was a matter of family alliance, and her disobedience would have been shocking. Yet Juliet's rebellion suggests that his power over her body does not extend to her heart, and Shakespeare invites sympathy for a young woman with so little control over her own life.

Against these social powers, Shakespeare sets the power of emotion. Hate is a destructive force embodied by Tybalt, who declares, "peace? I hate the word, / As I hate hell, all Montagues, and thee". The simile equating peace with hell shows how hate has inverted his values. Love, however, is presented as equally powerful. Juliet's paradox "My only love sprung from my only hate" shows love emerging from the feud itself, and the sonnet form of the lovers' first exchange suggests that love creates its own sacred order. Love gives both characters the courage to defy their families, but Friar Lawrence warns that "These violent delights have violent ends", implying that its power is dangerous when it is so intense.

Above all, Shakespeare presents fate as the most powerful force in the play. The Prologue calls the couple "star-crossed lovers", and by revealing the ending at the

Question number

outset Shakespeare makes the audience watch the characters struggle against a fate already sealed. Elizabethan audiences were fascinated by astrology and many believed the stars shaped human lives, so this framing would have carried real weight. After killing Tybalt, Romeo cries "O, I am fortune's fool!", recognising himself as a plaything of chance. When he hears of Juliet's death, he defiantly says "Then I defy you, stars!", but his attempt to resist fate brings about the very ending the Prologue foretold. The dramatic irony here is painful, as the audience knows that Juliet is alive.

Finally, death itself holds power in the closing scene. Romeo personifies death as a lover, saying it "hath sucked the honey of thy breath" but has had "no power yet upon thy beauty". The irony is that death has no power because Juliet is not dead, yet Romeo's belief brings death about. In the end, the deaths achieve what no ruler or father could: they end the feud, and the Prince sees in them a "scourge" laid upon the families' hate.

Overall, Shakespeare presents power as layered and unstable. Human authority attempts to impose order, but the stronger forces of love, hate and fate overwhelm it, suggesting that the greatest power in Verona lies beyond human control.

13

Shakespeare presents madness in Macbeth as the inevitable consequence of crime against the natural order. Both Macbeth and Lady Macbeth suffer forms of mental disintegration, but they move in opposite directions: Macbeth's mind is tormented early by hallucinations and then hardens into a numb, nihilistic despair, while Lady Macbeth, who begins as the more controlled of the two, collapses into sleepwalking and suicide. Through these parallel journeys, Shakespeare suggests that the mind itself rebels against sin, so that madness becomes a form of punishment.

Question number

The theme is introduced almost immediately. After the Witches vanish, Banquo asks, "have we eaten on the insane root / That takes the reason prisoner?" The metaphor of reason taken "prisoner" suggests that the supernatural threatens sanity from the outset. Macbeth's own reaction is telling: his "horrible imaginings" make his hair stand on end and shake his "single state of man", so the mere thought of murder already divides him. To a Jacobean audience, contact with witches was a spiritual danger, and many believed madness could result from the influence of evil spirits.

Lady Macbeth seems at first to invite something like madness. She calls on spirits to "unsex me here" and fill her "top-full / Of direst cruelty", and she complains that her husband is "not without ambition, but without / The illness should attend it". The euphemism "illness" is revealing: she regards the ruthlessness needed for murder as a kind of disease, one she wishes on him. Her invocation of dark spirits would have suggested demonic possession to an audience who often linked madness with the devil.

Macbeth's first clear hallucination comes before the murder. "Is this a dagger which I see before me", he asks, and he then calls it "a dagger of the mind, a false creation, / Proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain". Shakespeare uses the soliloquy form to let the audience into his disordered mind, and the dagger which turns bloody as he watches suggests that his imagination is already dragging him toward the deed. After the murder, he hears a voice crying "Sleep no more! / Macbeth does murder sleep". Sleep, which he describes as healing and restorative, has been destroyed, and the loss of it foreshadows his mental torment. Lady Macbeth warns that "These deeds must not be thought / After these ways; so, it will make us mad", a line full of dramatic irony, because it is she who will be

Question number

driven mad.

As king, Macbeth's madness becomes paranoia. He confesses "O, full of scorpions is my mind, dear wife!", a vivid metaphor for thoughts that sting and poison him, and the fear of Banquo leads to further murder. At the banquet, he sees Banquo's ghost and cries "Never shake / Thy gory locks at me". Shakespeare leaves it uncertain whether the ghost is real, since only Macbeth sees it, and the scene's structure, with Lady Macbeth desperately explaining it away as "the very painting of your fear", dramatises the public exposure of his disorder. The feast, a symbol of social harmony, collapses, reflecting the way his inner chaos spills into the kingdom. In the play's world, the murder of a king disrupts the Great Chain of Being, and the disorder reaches into the human mind as well as nature.

By Act 5, the two characters have reversed positions. Lady Macbeth's sleepwalking scene shows her guilt breaking through. Her fragmented prose, unlike her earlier commanding verse, reveals a mind in pieces, and her obsessive "Out, damned spot!" shows her trying to wash away blood that only she can see. The question "who would have thought the old man to have had so much blood in him?" replays the murder, while "The Thane of Fife had a wife: where is she now?" shows that Macbeth's later crimes haunt her too. The Doctor's verdict, "More needs she the divine than the physician", reflects a contemporary belief that such disorders of the soul were better treated by a priest than a doctor.

Macbeth, meanwhile, seems beyond madness in the usual sense. Some say "he's mad", while others call it "valiant fury", yet his own words suggest exhaustion: he has "supped full with horrors" and can no longer be frightened. He asks the Doctor, "Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased", but he could almost be speaking of himself. After Lady Macbeth's death, his speech "Tomorrow, and

Question number

tomorrow, and tomorrow" reduces life to "a tale / Told by an idiot", a bleak image in which meaning itself has collapsed.

In conclusion, Shakespeare presents madness as the mind's punishment for violating God's order. Lady Macbeth breaks under guilt, while Macbeth's mind becomes hollow and despairing. For a Jacobean audience, this would have reinforced the belief that regicide corrupts not only the kingdom but the soul.

14 Shakespeare presents Macbeth's relationship with the Witches as one of fascination that turns into dependence and, finally, betrayal. The Witches never order Macbeth to kill anyone; instead they speak in riddles that awaken desires he already has. As the play develops, the balance of the relationship shifts: at first they seek him out, but by Act 4 he seeks them, demanding answers. Through this changing relationship Shakespeare explores how far evil comes from outside a person and how far it is chosen.

From the very first scene, the Witches are presented as targeting Macbeth. Their meeting is planned "Upon the heath", "There to meet with Macbeth", and the chant-like rhythm and rhymes set them apart from the human characters. Their paradox "Fair is foul, and foul is fair" establishes a world of moral inversion. Strikingly, Macbeth's first line, "So foul and fair a day I have not seen", unconsciously echoes them, suggesting a connection before they have even met. Shakespeare plants the idea that Macbeth is already in tune with their world. For an audience in 1606, this would have been deeply unsettling. King James I, for whom the play was written, believed passionately in witchcraft, had written Daemonologie and had been involved in the North Berwick witch trials. Witches were seen as real agents of the devil, so Macbeth's link to them signals spiritual

Question number

danger.

The first meeting in Act 1 Scene 3 shows how quickly Macbeth is drawn in. He is struck by their appearance, "So withered and so wild in their attire", but it is their words that captivate him. The three greetings, "Thane of Glamis", "Thane of Cawdor" and "King hereafter", form a structured progression from what he is, to what he will soon be, to what he desires. Banquo's question, "why do you start, and seem to fear / Things that do sound so fair?", is revealing, because Macbeth's alarm suggests that the idea of kingship has touched a secret ambition. When the Witches vanish, he begs "Stay, you imperfect speakers, tell me more", showing his hunger for their knowledge. Banquo notes that he seems "rapt withal", a word implying that he is almost spellbound.

Shakespeare contrasts Macbeth's reaction with Banquo's warning that "The instruments of darkness tell us truths, / Win us with honest trifles, to betray's / In deepest consequence". Banquo sees the trap clearly, and his wisdom highlights Macbeth's choice. When the Cawdor prophecy comes true, Macbeth's aside reveals that he is already thinking of murder, though he still hopes that "chance may crown me, / Without my stir". At this point the relationship is ambiguous: the Witches have offered a prophecy, but Macbeth's imagination supplies the means. The letter to Lady Macbeth, in which he calls them "weird sisters" who "saluted" him with "Hail, king that shalt be", shows how he has absorbed their words and shared them, drawing his wife into the relationship too.

After Banquo's murder and the appearance of his ghost, the relationship reverses. Macbeth declares that he will go "to the weird sisters" so that they may tell him more, and now he is the one who seeks them out. In Act 4 Scene 1 he addresses them as "you secret, black, and midnight hags", showing contempt even as he

Question number

demands their help. The Witches, meanwhile, recognise his corruption before he enters: "By the pricking of my thumbs, / Something wicked this way comes". The pronoun "something" dehumanises him, suggesting he has become as evil as they are. The apparitions exploit his desperation. They warn him to "Beware Macduff" but assure him that "none of woman born / Shall harm Macbeth" and that he is safe until Birnam Wood comes to Dunsinane. These equivocations give him a false confidence. Hecate has already warned that "security / Is mortals' chiefest enemy", so the audience understands that the reassurance is a trap.

In the final act, Macbeth clings to the prophecies, boasting "I bear a charmed life". When Macduff reveals he was "from his mother's womb / Untimely ripped", Macbeth finally sees the betrayal and condemns the "juggling fiends" who "palter with us in a double sense". The relationship ends with Macbeth recognising that he has been deceived, yet it is too late. Throughout, Shakespeare suggests the Witches are tempters rather than puppet-masters: they reveal the future, but Macbeth's ambition chooses the path. For a Jacobean audience, this would have been a warning that those who trust the powers of darkness bring about their own damnation.

15 Loyalty is a central theme in The Merchant of Venice, and Shakespeare explores it through friendship, marriage, family and faith. The play celebrates the self-sacrificing loyalty between Antonio and Bassanio, and it tests the loyalty of husbands to wives through the ring plot. Yet it also presents loyalty in more troubling ways: Jessica's betrayal of her father is rewarded, while Shylock's loyalty to his bond and his people leads to his ruin. Shakespeare therefore invites us to ask whose loyalty is valued in Venice, and why.

Question number

The most important loyalty is between Antonio and Bassanio. In the opening scene Antonio offers everything: "My purse, my person, my extremest means, / Lie all unlocked to your occasions". The alliterative list builds to a superlative, suggesting a love without limits, and the image of things "unlocked" implies complete openness. Bassanio openly acknowledges his debt: "To you, Antonio, / I owe the most in money and in love". The pairing of "money" and "love" is significant in a mercantile city, where emotional and financial bonds are intertwined. Structurally, the whole plot depends on this loyalty, because Antonio's willingness to borrow from Shylock on Bassanio's behalf creates the bond. In Elizabethan England, as in Venice, a merchant's word was his bond, so Antonio's readiness to risk his life for a friend would have seemed honourable.

In the trial scene this loyalty reaches its climax. Bassanio declares that his life, "my wife, and all the world" are not esteemed above Antonio's life. The hyperbole is sincere, but Shakespeare adds dramatic irony, as Portia, disguised as the lawyer, remarks drily that his wife would give him "little thanks" for that. The moment is comic, but it raises a serious question: can loyalty to a friend and loyalty to a wife coexist?

Portia's own loyalty is first directed to her dead father. She is bound by the casket test, lamenting that "the will of a living daughter" is "curbed by the will of a dead father". The wordplay on "will" shows the tension between her desire and her duty, yet she obeys, and Nerissa reassures her that her father was "ever virtuous". In a patriarchal society, daughters were expected to submit to their fathers' choices even after death, so Portia's obedience would have been admired. Her friendship with Nerissa also shows a loyalty that goes beyond the relationship of mistress and servant, since Nerissa agrees to marry Gratiano only if Bassanio chooses correctly, tying her happiness to Portia's.

Question number

Jessica presents loyalty as a painful dilemma. She admits "Alack, what heinous sin is it in me / To be ashamed to be my father's child!", a rhetorical question that shows she recognises her duty but cannot feel it. She distinguishes herself from Shylock: she is "a daughter to his blood" but not "to his manners". Her elopement with Lorenzo is a double betrayal, of her father and of her faith, and her couplet "I have a father, you a daughter, lost" is coolly final. Shakespeare adds to the cruelty when we hear that she has traded her mother's ring for a monkey. Shylock's grief, "it was my turquoise; I had it of Leah when I was a bachelor", is one of the few moments of tenderness he shows, and his insistence that he would not have given it "for a wilderness of monkeys" transforms him into a betrayed husband and father. A Christian audience might have applauded Jessica's conversion, but a modern audience may feel uneasy that disloyalty is rewarded simply because it moves her towards Christianity.

The ring plot brings the theme together in the final act. Bassanio had promised that parting from Portia's ring would "presage the ruin" of his love, yet he gives it to the "lawyer" out of loyalty to Antonio. Portia's teasing shows that she wants to test the strength of his promise, and Antonio steps in again, offering to be bound "again", this time with his soul as surety. The structure is circular: the play begins with Antonio pledging his body for his friend and ends with him pledging his soul, but now loyalty in friendship is subordinated to loyalty in marriage.

Finally, Shylock's own loyalty is to his bond and to his "tribe". He swears "Cursed be my tribe / If I forgive him!", and his loyalty to the letter of the law becomes destructive. Ironically, he is punished by being forced to convert, so he is denied loyalty to his own faith. In an England where anti-Semitism was widespread and Jews had been expelled since 1290, this outcome might have seemed just, but

Question number

Shakespeare's presentation exposes how selectively Venice rewards loyalty: it is valued when it serves Christian friendship and marriage, and crushed when it belongs to an outsider.

16

To a large extent, Shylock does cause his own downfall: it is his insistence on the pound of flesh, and his refusal of mercy in the trial scene, that gives Portia the opportunity to destroy him. However, Shakespeare also makes clear that his hatred has been created by years of Christian abuse, and that Venice is quick to exploit his isolation. I would argue that Shylock's choices bring about his ruin, but those choices are shaped by a society that has already made him its enemy.

From his first appearance, Shylock reveals a hatred that makes his fall seem self-inflicted. In an aside he states, "I hate him for he is a Christian", and adds that if he can catch Antonio "once upon the hip" he will "feed fat the ancient grudge" he bears him. The image of feeding suggests an appetite for revenge, and the aside form allows the audience to see that his friendliness to Antonio is a mask. The "merry bond" he proposes, a pound of flesh as forfeit, seems to be a joke, but the audience already suspects its danger. To an Elizabethan audience, who had seen Marlowe's villainous Barabas in The Jew of Malta and who lived in a country from which Jews had been expelled in 1290, this would have confirmed the stereotype of the cruel, grasping Jew.

Yet Shakespeare complicates this picture immediately. Shylock reminds Antonio that he has called him "misbeliever, cut-throat dog" and spat upon his "Jewish gaberdine". Antonio does not deny it, replying that he is likely to do so again. The bond can therefore be seen as a response to public humiliation rather than simple malice. Shylock's speech in Act 3 Scene 1, "Hath not a Jew eyes?", develops this.

Question number

The series of rhetorical questions, culminating in "If you prick us, do we not bleed?", insists on shared humanity and exposes Christian hypocrisy. Crucially, he concludes that "The villainy you teach me I will execute", suggesting that his revenge is learnt behaviour. Shakespeare places this speech just after Jessica's elopement, and the structure is important: Shylock has lost his daughter and his ducats, and his grief hardens into a determination to have Antonio's life. His cry "I'll plague him, I'll torture him" shows how pain and humiliation turn into obsession.

Jessica's betrayal adds to the sense that his isolation is partly his own doing. She complains that "Our house is hell", suggesting that Shylock's harshness has driven her away. On the other hand, the Christians use his absence at dinner to steal his daughter and his wealth, so the "kindness" of the invitation is itself a betrayal. Shakespeare leaves us uncertain whether Shylock's household is cold because of his nature or because of the hostility he faces.

The trial scene is where Shylock most clearly causes his own downfall. Given repeated opportunities to show mercy, he refuses. He insists that the pound of flesh is "dearly bought", "'tis mine and I will have it", and the possessive emphasis shows that he regards Antonio's body as property. Portia's speech, "The quality of mercy is not strained", argues that mercy is "an attribute to God himself", offering Shylock a chance to rise above revenge. His blunt reply, effectively demanding the law and his bond, seals his fate. The stage image of Shylock whetting his knife, mocked by Gratiano's pun on "sole" and "soul", presents him as monstrous in that moment. Had he taken the money, he would have walked away a wealthy man, so his downfall is the direct consequence of his choice.

However, the way he is defeated suggests that Venice was waiting to crush him.

Question number

Portia's legal trick, that the bond allows "no jot of blood", turns the law he relied on against him, and she then invokes a statute against any "alien" who seeks a citizen's life. The word "alien" is telling: despite living in Venice, Shylock is never accepted as one of its people. His punishment is severe. He loses half his wealth and is forced to "presently become a Christian". His lament that they take his life when they take "the means whereby I live", and his final "I am not well", are muted and pitiful, inviting a sympathy that his earlier cruelty seemed to forbid. Although many in Shakespeare's audience would have relished his defeat, later productions, from Edmund Kean in the nineteenth century onwards, have often played Shylock as a victim.

In conclusion, Shylock does cause his own downfall, because his refusal of mercy gives his enemies the weapon they need. Yet Shakespeare shows that his vengefulness has been taught by Christian cruelty, and his punishment is harsher than justice requires. He is responsible for his fall, but he is not its only cause.

17 Austen presents Mr and Mrs Bennet as a comic but ultimately cautionary portrait of a failed marriage. They are the source of much of the novel's laughter, yet beneath the comedy Austen exposes two kinds of parental failure: Mrs Bennet's foolish, anxious obsession with marriage and Mr Bennet's witty but irresponsible withdrawal. In a Regency society where an entailed estate left five daughters with no secure future, both failures carry real danger.

Austen establishes the couple at once through dialogue rather than description, so that the reader judges them by how they speak. The famous opening, "It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife", is ironic: the "truth" is really Mrs Bennet's, since it is

Question number

the mothers of single daughters who are in want of rich men. Her breathless chatter about Bingley is answered by her husband's dry teasing, and when she protests that he has "no compassion" for her "poor nerves", he replies that he has "a high respect" for them, as "they are my old friends". The joke is funny, but it is also cruel. Austen then summarises them with narratorial precision: he is "so odd a mixture of quick parts, sarcastic humour, reserve, and caprice", while she is "a woman of mean understanding, little information, and uncertain temper". The balanced lists invite comparison, and the closing judgement that "the business of her life was to get her daughters married" reduces her to a single function.

Mrs Bennet is presented largely through comic exaggeration, yet Austen allows us to see why she behaves as she does. Because Longbourn is entailed on Mr Collins, the daughters face genteel poverty unless they marry, so her fixation has a real economic basis in a society where women could not inherit or earn independently. However, her methods undermine her aims. Sending Jane to Netherfield on horseback in the hope of rain is a scheme of farcical cunning, and at the Netherfield ball she loudly predicts Jane's marriage within Darcy's hearing. Austen's irony is structural: the mother most desperate for good matches does most to drive the eligible men away, and Bingley's sisters, the novel suggests, are glad to escape her. Her hysterical lamentation over Lydia's flight, followed by her delight in wedding clothes once the marriage is arranged, shows that she cares about the fact of a wedding, not the character of the husband or the disgrace behind it.

Mr Bennet is more attractive, and Austen deliberately lets him charm us before revealing his faults. He shares Elizabeth's wit, and his verdict on her refusal of Mr Collins, that from now on she "must be a stranger to one of your parents", is a delightfully reversed ultimatum that sides with his favourite daughter's judgement. Yet his humour is often a way of avoiding responsibility. His dismissal of Mary at

Question number

the ball, "You have delighted us long enough", publicly humiliates her, and his philosophy that we live "to make sport for our neighbours" reveals a man who treats his family as entertainment. The structural turning point comes in Chapter 42, where Elizabeth reflects that her father, "captivated by youth and beauty", married unwisely and then retreated to his library and his sarcasm. Austen makes clear that his failure to restrain Lydia, whom he allows to go to Brighton for the sake of peace, leads directly to her elopement with Wickham.

The crisis exposes both parents. Mrs Bennet takes to her room, while Mr Bennet's search in London is ineffective, and it is Darcy and Mr Gardiner who actually rescue the family's name. For once Mr Bennet admits, "Let me once in my life feel how much I have been to blame", but Austen undercuts this moment by having him add that the feeling "will pass away soon enough". The irony suggests that his self-knowledge is real but shallow, and he soon returns to joking. In Regency England an unmarried daughter living with a man could ruin all her sisters' prospects, so the reader feels how close his indolence came to disaster.

Ultimately, Austen uses the Bennets as a foil for the marriages that end the novel. Their mismatched union, based on attraction rather than respect, contrasts with Elizabeth and Darcy's relationship, built on mutual understanding and moral growth. The final chapter wryly notes that Mrs Bennet remained "occasionally nervous and invariably silly", refusing her any transformation. Mr and Mrs Bennet are therefore not simply comic figures: through them Austen warns her readers, especially young women, that marriage chosen unwisely brings lasting unhappiness, and that a parent's wit is no substitute for guidance.

18 In Pride and Prejudice, reputation is the currency of a whole society. Austen shows

Question number

that in Regency England a person's standing, and above all a woman's, depended on how they were seen, yet she also questions whether reputation reflects true worth. The novel repeatedly exposes the gap between public opinion and private character, so that learning to look past reputation becomes part of Elizabeth's moral education.

Austen first shows how quickly reputations are made and how unreliable they are. At the Meryton assembly Darcy is admired for his "ten thousand a year" until his manners offend, after which the room decides that he is "the proudest, most disagreeable man in the world". The narrator's ironic summary, in which public opinion swings within a single evening, suggests that a community's judgement rests on wealth and surface manners. Wickham exploits exactly this. His charm and "pleasing address" allow him to build a reputation as Darcy's wronged victim, and Elizabeth believes him because his story flatters her prejudice. Structurally, Austen withholds the truth until Darcy's letter, so that the reader shares Elizabeth's mistake and, like her, must reread the evidence. Her cry, "Till this moment I never knew myself", marks the moment she realises that she too judged by reputation.

For women, reputation is presented as both precious and fragile. When Elizabeth walks to Netherfield to nurse Jane, Mrs Hurst mocks her petticoat "six inches deep in mud", treating physical exertion as a breach of decorum. Austen invites us to side with Elizabeth, whose loyalty to her sister matters more than appearances, and Darcy himself notices that the exercise has brightened her eyes. The Bingley sisters' sneering exposes a culture in which ladies were expected to be decorous and passive, and Austen gently satirises it. Yet she never pretends that reputation is unimportant. Charlotte's marriage to Mr Collins, in which she asks only "a comfortable home", shows a woman of twenty seven securing respectability

Question number

because, without fortune, a single woman's position was precarious.

The novel's central crisis, Lydia's elopement with Wickham, demonstrates how one woman's reputation could destroy her whole family. Mary's pompous moral that "loss of virtue in a female is irretrievable" is comic in its sermonising tone, but it states the brutal truth of the period. Mr Collins's letter is even harsher, declaring that "The death of your daughter would have been a blessing in comparison of this". The grotesque exaggeration exposes the cruelty of a society that would rather see a girl dead than disgraced, and Austen's irony targets Collins's lack of Christian charity. Lydia, by contrast, seems unaware of any damage: her letter treats the elopement as a joke, and she returns to Longbourn proudly showing off her ring. Her thoughtlessness heightens the reader's sense of how close the family comes to ruin, since her sisters' chances of marriage depend on the family name.

Darcy's relationship with reputation is more complex. His pride stems partly from a sense of family honour, and his first proposal is insulting because he dwells on the "inferiority" of Elizabeth's connections, as though marrying her would damage his standing. However, Austen reveals that his reserve also protects others: he does not expose Wickham publicly because doing so would reveal Georgiana's near elopement. At Pemberley, Mrs Reynolds's praise that he is "the best landlord, and the best master" offers a reputation earned by conduct rather than manners, and Elizabeth's view of him changes. Most tellingly, Darcy secretly pays Wickham to marry Lydia, saving the Bennets' reputation while refusing credit. Austen structures the novel so that true goodness works quietly, in contrast to Wickham's public charm.

Lady Catherine represents reputation as rank. Her outrage at the idea of Elizabeth marrying Darcy, and her question whether the shades of Pemberley are to be "thus

Question number

polluted", shows an aristocrat who believes that birth matters more than character. Elizabeth's reply, "He is a gentleman; I am a gentleman's daughter; so far we are equal", uses balanced syntax to assert a dignity based on worth rather than wealth. It is one of the novel's most quietly radical moments.

Austen herself published the novel anonymously, as "by the author of Sense and Sensibility", partly because a woman writer's reputation needed protecting. Perhaps that is why she treats the theme with such double vision. She accepts that reputation shaped every life in her world, especially women's, yet through Elizabeth and Darcy she suggests that real worth lies in character, and that the wise reader, like the wise heroine, must learn to see beneath the surface.

19 Violence runs through Great Expectations from its first page to its last, but Dickens is interested in more than physical brutality. He presents violence as something that circulates through society: the cruelty of the law, the casual beatings of the home and the psychological damage inflicted by one person on another. By tracing how violence shapes Pip, Dickens criticises a Victorian world that punished harshly but rarely asked why people became violent in the first place.

The novel opens with a scene of terror that sets its Gothic tone. On the bleak marshes beside the churchyard, Magwitch erupts from among the graves with "Hold your noise!" and threatens to "cut your throat". The semantic field of physical force, as he seizes Pip and tilts him upside down, is filtered through the older narrator's memory of a small child's fear. Magwitch's threat that he will have Pip's "heart and liver out" sounds monstrous, yet Dickens complicates it, because the convict is starving and shivering in a leg iron. Violence here is the product of

Question number

suffering, and the image of a hunted man prefigures the novel's wider critique of the penal system, from the hulks moored in the estuary to the gallows.

Violence also lies at the heart of Pip's home. He tells us that his sister has brought him up "by hand", a phrase that comically conflates feeding with hitting. Mrs Joe's cane, "Tickler", is given a playful name, but the narrator's description of it as "worn smooth by collision with my tickled frame" uses ironic understatement to show how routine the beatings are. Joe, too, is a victim, and Dickens hints that his gentleness comes from witnessing his own father's brutality to his mother. For a Victorian reader, physical punishment of children was widely justified by religious teaching, and wives had little legal protection against their husbands, so Dickens's sympathetic portrayal of the beaten child and the gentle, abused husband quietly questions accepted norms.

Orlick embodies violence at its most frightening. His attack on Mrs Joe with a convict's filed leg iron links him symbolically to Pip's own guilty secret, since Pip feels responsible for the iron. Later, Orlick lures Pip to the sluice house on the marshes and plans to kill him, blaming Pip for everything that has gone wrong in his life. This structural echo of the opening returns Pip to the marshes and to helpless terror, but it also forces him to confront his own resentments, as Orlick is in some ways a dark double who expresses the anger Pip suppresses. Dickens suggests that violence breeds violence, and that envy and humiliation can turn into murderous rage.

Dickens extends violence into the respectable world of London. Jaggers's office is decorated with death masks of hanged clients, and his housekeeper Molly, with her unusually strong wrists, was tried for strangling another woman. Bentley Drummle is described as sulky and brutish, and at dinner he almost flings a glass at a

Question number

rival's head. Pip's later discovery that Drummle treated Estella with cruelty shows that a gentleman's money can hide violence as easily as a convict's rags reveal it. Dickens, who campaigned against public executions, makes clear that the law's own violence is no better: Magwitch is condemned to death alongside many others in a single sentencing, a scene the narrator describes with weary horror.

Perhaps the most destructive violence in the novel is psychological. Miss Havisham, jilted on her wedding day, raises Estella as a weapon against men, urging her to "break their hearts". The repetition of the imperative turns love into an act of war, and Estella later admits that she has no heart to give. The fire in which Miss Havisham is badly burned can be read as a symbolic punishment, the violence she has inflicted on others finally consuming her, while Pip's burned hands mark his own painful moral growth.

By the end, Compeyson drowns while struggling with Magwitch in the river, and the novel's violent cycle is broken only through forgiveness. Pip's care for the dying Magwitch, and Joe's patient nursing of Pip, offer an alternative to the brutality of the forge, the courtroom and Satis House. Dickens therefore presents violence not as random cruelty but as a social disease, and suggests that only compassion and loyalty can heal it.

20 Pip's friends are central to Great Expectations because they measure his moral growth. As a bildungsroman narrated by an older, wiser Pip, the novel looks back on a young man who confuses gentility with worth and so undervalues the people who love him. Dickens contrasts true friends, Joe, Biddy, Herbert, Wemmick and finally Magwitch, with false ones such as Pumblechook and Drummle, suggesting that real friendship crosses the barriers of class that Victorian society held so

Question number

dear.

Joe is the novel's moral centre and Pip's first friend. Although he is Pip's brother in law, he treats the orphan as an equal, and their shared phrase "ever the best of friends" becomes a refrain. When Joe explains that he told Mrs Joe there was "room for him at the forge", his simple dialect conveys a generosity that the narrator, looking back, recognises as noble. Dickens structures the relationship as a painful arc. Once Pip learns of his expectations he becomes ashamed of Joe, and when Joe visits London in his Sunday clothes, awkwardly calling Pip "Sir", the comedy of the hat that keeps falling off is undercut by Pip's coldness. The older narrator's guilt is clear. Joe's own explanation, that he is "wrong out of the forge", shows dignity rather than humiliation, and his line that "life is made of ever so many partings welded together" uses a blacksmith's metaphor to express a wisdom Pip lacks. Joe's later nursing of the feverish Pip, and his quiet payment of Pip's debts, complete the circle: Pip finally sees that the friend he rejected was the truest gentleman of all.

Biddy offers a different kind of friendship, based on honesty. Pip confides in her about his longing to be a gentleman for Estella's sake, and she gently questions whether Estella is worth gaining. Her plain speaking exposes Pip's snobbery, and his condescension towards her reveals how far he has fallen. By marrying Joe at the end, Biddy confirms the values of loyalty and goodness that Pip has neglected.

Herbert Pocket is Pip's closest friend among his own generation. Their friendship begins comically, as the "pale young gentleman" challenges Pip to a fight at Satis House, and this structural echo makes their later reunion in London all the more warm. Herbert renames Pip "Handel", a gesture that playfully frees him from his blacksmith past, and he gently teaches him table manners without making him

Question number

feel ashamed. Herbert's cheerful but unrealistic dreams of making his fortune in shipping and insurance mirror Pip's own expectations, yet Herbert remains good natured and honest. Significantly, the one generous act Pip performs with his money is secretly buying Herbert a place at Clarriker's, and Dickens suggests that wealth is redeemed only when it serves friendship.

Wemmick shows how friendship survives in the hostile world of Victorian London. In Jaggers's office he is dry and mechanical, his mouth like a post office, but at his Walworth home, with its drawbridge and his deaf father, the Aged P, he is affectionate and kind. Dickens uses this divided character to criticise a commercial city that forces people to hide their feelings, a world he knew well from his own early work as a clerk. Wemmick's warning note, "Don't go home", proves his loyalty when Magwitch is in danger.

The most surprising friend is Magwitch. Pip's childhood kindness on the marshes is repaid by the convict's fortune made in Australia, and his declaration that Pip is "more to me nor any son" reveals a devotion that Pip at first finds repulsive. In Victorian society, a gentleman's wealth coming from a transported criminal would have been a scandal, and Pip's horror reflects these class anxieties. Yet as he hides Magwitch and tries to help him escape, Pip's disgust turns into love. Holding the hand of the dying man in prison, he finally values a person for his heart rather than his status.

Through Pip's friends, Dickens dismantles the idea that being a gentleman depends on money or birth. False friends like Pumblechook flatter Pip when he is rich, but true friends remain when his expectations collapse. Their importance is therefore moral as much as personal: they are the means by which Pip learns humility, gratitude and love.

Question number

21 Hawthorne presents Hester Prynne as a woman whom society tries to define by a single letter, and whose quiet strength gradually overturns that definition. Punished for adultery by the Puritan community of seventeenth century Boston, she is shamed, isolated and scrutinised, yet Hawthorne makes her the novel's moral heart: dignified, passionate, compassionate and intellectually bold. Writing in 1850 about his own ancestors' world, Hawthorne uses Hester to question the harshness of Puritan judgement.

From her first appearance, Hawthorne presents Hester as defiant rather than broken. She emerges from the prison door with Pearl in her arms and walks to the scaffold, where the crowd expects to see a woman crushed by disgrace. Instead she is "a figure of perfect elegance on a large scale", and the narrator says her beauty "made a halo of the misfortune and ignominy in which she was enveloped". The religious image of a halo is deliberately provocative, transforming a condemned sinner into something like a saint, and the comparison to a Madonna with her infant reinforces the idea. Even the letter itself, embroidered with "fantastic flourishes of gold thread", shows her refusing to let the community control its meaning. What was intended as a badge of shame becomes a work of art, so the symbol already begins to slip from the Puritans' grasp.

Hawthorne contrasts Hester's integrity with the hypocrisy around her. The harsh matrons in the crowd argue that she deserves a brand on her forehead or death, revealing a community more interested in punishment than mercy. Hester's refusal to name Pearl's father, even when Dimmesdale himself publicly urges her to speak, shows both loyalty and moral courage, and the dramatic irony of this scene, since the reader later learns that the minister is the father, exposes the gap between

Question number

public virtue and private guilt. In her prison conversation with Chillingworth, her plain admission, "I felt no love, nor feigned any", presents her as honest even about her own marriage.

Structurally, the novel traces Hester's long endurance. Living in a cottage on the edge of the settlement, between the town and the wilderness, she supports herself with her needlework and helps the poor, even though they insult her. Over time, Hawthorne tells us, many people begin to read the "A" as meaning "Able", so that her actions literally rewrite the symbol. Yet Hawthorne does not idealise her suffering. In the chapter "Another View of Hester" he describes how her beauty has faded, her hair hidden beneath a cap, and her nature hardened. The narrator observes that "The scarlet letter had not done its office", meaning that punishment has made her think more freely rather than repent. She questions the position of women in society, and the narrator presents these speculations with a mixture of admiration and anxiety, reflecting debates about women's rights that were stirring in Hawthorne's own America.

The forest scene shows Hester at her most vital. Away from the town's laws, she urges Dimmesdale to flee with her, unfastens the letter and throws it aside, and takes off her cap so that her dark, abundant hair falls on her shoulders. Hawthorne's pathetic fallacy, as sunshine floods the forest, suggests that nature sympathises with her love, which the Puritans condemn as sin. Yet Pearl refuses to approach until the letter is restored, and Hester reluctantly pins it back on. This structural reversal suggests that she cannot simply escape her past; her identity has been shaped by it.

At the end of the novel, after Dimmesdale's confession and death, Hester leaves Boston but chooses to return and to wear the letter of her own free will. She

Question number

becomes a counsellor to troubled women, comforting them with the hope of a future in which relations between men and women will be fairer. This return is significant: she takes ownership of the symbol rather than letting it be imposed on her. Her shared gravestone with Dimmesdale, marked with the single letter on a dark field, closes the novel with sombre dignity.

Overall, Hawthorne presents Hester as a heroine who transforms shame into strength. Through her, he criticises the rigid, unforgiving Puritan society that judged her, while suggesting that compassion, endurance and honesty are truer virtues than outward conformity. She remains one of the most complex women in American fiction precisely because Hawthorne allows her both suffering and defiance.

22 Revenge is central to The Scarlet Letter because it drives the novel's plot and reveals Hawthorne's deepest moral concern: that the desire to punish can become a greater sin than the wrong it punishes. Revenge takes two forms in the novel, the public vengeance of the Puritan community on Hester and the private, secret revenge of Roger Chillingworth on Dimmesdale. In both cases Hawthorne suggests that vengeance corrupts those who pursue it.

The novel opens with the community's revenge. As Hester stands on the scaffold, the matrons in the crowd demand harsher punishment, one arguing that she "ought to die" for bringing shame upon them all. Hawthorne presents these women as coarse and pitiless, and their speech contrasts sharply with Hester's silent dignity. The scarlet letter itself is a form of institutional revenge, a permanent public humiliation intended to make Hester a living warning. The narrator remarks that the community uses her to embody their images of "woman's frailty and

Question number

sinful passion", and this phrase reveals how punishment dehumanises her, turning a woman into a symbol. Writing in 1850 about seventeenth century Boston, Hawthorne, whose own ancestor had been a judge at the Salem witch trials, seems to question a theocratic society that blurred the line between justice and vengeance.

However, the novel's most powerful study of revenge is Chillingworth. When he arrives in Boston and sees his wife on the scaffold, he hides his identity and visits her in prison. Strikingly, he tells Hester that he seeks no vengeance against her, admitting that he wronged her by marrying her when he was old and she was young. His anger is directed entirely at her unknown lover, and his vow, "he shall be mine", has a possessive, almost demonic ring. The short, chilling statement foreshadows the intimate nature of his revenge: he wants not to kill Dimmesdale but to own his soul.

Hawthorne structures the middle of the novel around this secret torment. Chillingworth becomes Dimmesdale's physician, the "leech", and eventually moves into the same house so that he can probe the minister's guilt. The narrator describes "a quiet depth of malice, hitherto latent, but active now", which led him to imagine a revenge more intimate than any mortal had inflicted on an enemy. The language of depth and latency suggests something buried and poisonous slowly rising to the surface. Hawthorne also tracks Chillingworth's physical transformation: he grows darker and more misshapen, and Hester sees in him something like a fiend. This Gothic motif implies that revenge visibly deforms the soul, and the novel's frequent hints that he is in league with the devil turn a scholar into a figure of evil.

Hawthorne makes his moral judgement clearest through Dimmesdale's words in the

Question number

forest. The minister tells Hester that Chillingworth's revenge "has been blacker than my sin", because he has "violated, in cold blood, the sanctity of a human heart". The phrase "cold blood" contrasts calculated cruelty with the warm, passionate sin of the lovers, suggesting that for Hawthorne a deliberate assault on the inner self is the worst crime of all. Hester herself admits to bitter hatred of Chillingworth, yet she does not act on it, and her restraint highlights the difference between feeling and pursuing revenge.

The climax shows the self destructive nature of vengeance. When Dimmesdale climbs the scaffold to confess, Chillingworth tries to stop him and cries that he has escaped him, as though confession has robbed him of his victim. After the minister's death, Chillingworth withers and shrivels away, dying within the year. Hawthorne implies that he has made revenge "the very principle of his life", and once its object is gone he has nothing left to live for. Ironically, he leaves his fortune to Pearl, the child of the man he tormented, a final act that perhaps hints at some redemption or at least the exhaustion of hatred.

Revenge was a popular subject in fiction of the period, as in Dumas's The Count of Monte Cristo, but Hawthorne treats it not as heroic justice but as spiritual sickness. Through the contrast between Chillingworth's corrosion and Hester's compassionate endurance, the novel suggests that forgiveness and honesty heal, while revenge, whether pursued by a community or a single man, destroys both its victim and its agent.