Pearson Edexcel International GCSE (9–1)

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 Booklet with the answer paper.
Clean copies of your set texts may be taken into the examination.

Turn over ▶

P71973A

©2023 Pearson Education Ltd.

J:1/1/1/1/

P 7 1 9 7 3 A

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

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 theme of violence in *A View from the Bridge*.

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

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 Eddie (talking about Rodolpho): 'He – he's just a kid, that's all'.

How far do you agree with the view that Rodolpho is presented as immature 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 How does Priestley present Mrs Sybil Birling in the play?

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

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 'Priestley uses the characters of Eva/Daisy and Edna to represent the working classes.'

Discuss the treatment of the working classes 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 Discuss the presentation of **one** character you respect in the play.

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

(Total for Question 5 = 30 marks)

OR

6 Explore the theme of anger 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 How is Evelyn presented as a mother in *Kindertransport*?

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

(Total for Question 7 = 30 marks)

OR

8 'There are many symbols in the play, such as the Ratcatcher and the Kindertransport.'

Discuss the significance of symbols in the play.

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

(Total for Question 8 = 30 marks)



stemup.co.uk

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

EITHER

9 How does Soyinka present Elesin in *Death and the King's Horseman*?

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

(Total for Question 9 = 30 marks)

OR

10 Discuss the theme of responsibility in the play.

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 'Friar Lawrence agrees to marry Romeo and Juliet in the hope of ending the feud.'

In what ways is hope important in *Romeo and Juliet*?

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

(Total for Question 11 = 30 marks)

OR

12 How does Shakespeare present the Nurse as a motherly figure to Juliet in the play?

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

(Total for Question 12 = 30 marks)

Macbeth, William Shakespeare

EITHER

13 Explore the theme of courage in *Macbeth*.

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

(Total for Question 13 = 30 marks)

OR

14 Lady Macbeth: 'The Thane of Fife had a wife: where is she now? – What, will these hands ne'er be clean?'

In what ways does Shakespeare present Lady Macbeth's conscience in the play?

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

(Total for Question 14 = 30 marks)

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

EITHER

15 'Acts 4 and 5 draw the play to a successful ending.'

How far do you agree with this view?

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

(Total for Question 15 = 30 marks)

OR

16 Discuss the presentation of **one** character you admire in *The Merchant of Venice*.

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

(Total for Question 16 = 30 marks)

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

EITHER

17 How does Austen present Lady Catherine de Bourgh as controlling in the novel?

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

(Total for Question 17 = 30 marks)

OR

18 'First impressions do not always reflect the truth.'

Explore the theme of appearance and reality in *Pride and Prejudice*.

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

(Total for Question 18 = 30 marks)

stemup.co.uk

***Great Expectations*, Charles Dickens**

EITHER

19 How does Magwitch change in the novel?

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

(Total for Question 19 = 30 marks)

OR

20 Explore the significance of different settings in *Great Expectations*.

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

(Total for Question 20 = 30 marks)

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

EITHER

21 Discuss the theme of forgiveness in *The Scarlet Letter*.

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

(Total for Question 21 = 30 marks)

OR

22 Discuss the presentation of **one** character you think suffers the most in the novel.

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

(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

Please check the examination details below before entering your candidate information

Candidate surname	Other names

Centre Number | Candidate Number

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE (9–1)

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.*
- 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.
- Good luck with your examination.

Turn over ▶

P71973A

©2023 Pearson Education Ltd.

J:1/1/1/1/

P 7 1 9 7 3 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

SECTION B

Literary Heritage Texts

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 11 ☒	**Question 12** ☒	**Question 13** ☒
Question 14 ☒	**Question 15** ☒	**Question 16** ☒
Question 17 ☒	**Question 18** ☒	**Question 19** ☒
Question 20 ☒	**Question 21** ☒	**Question 22** ☒

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

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

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

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

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

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

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

In A View from the Bridge, Miller presents violence as something that never really leaves Red Hook. It is pushed down, disguised and held in check by the law, but it keeps returning through gesture, threat and finally the knife. The play is really about whether a "civilized" community can contain the older, instinctive violence of honour, and its tragic answer seems to be that it cannot.

Miller establishes this tension in Alfieri's opening monologue. He tells us that the neighbourhood was once violent but that "Now we are quite civilized, quite American. Now we settle for half, and I like it better." The repetition of "Now" suggests that peace is recent and fragile, and the phrase "settle for half" defines civilisation as compromise. Yet Alfieri immediately undermines his own reassurance by recalling a lawyer in ancient times who "sat there as powerless as I, and watched it run its bloody course." The adjective "bloody" foreshadows the ending before the action has begun, so the audience watches the whole play knowing that violence is coming. Structurally, Alfieri works like a Greek chorus, and his choric framing makes Eddie's violent end feel inevitable rather than accidental.

The story of Vinny Bolzano shows how violence is woven into the community's code. Eddie and Beatrice tell Catherine how the boy who informed was dragged down the stairs until "his head was bouncin' like a coconut", and then spat on by his own family. The grotesque simile is almost comic in its casualness, which is precisely what makes it disturbing: this brutality is treated as justice. Miller places the story early so that it becomes a dramatic warning. When Eddie later phones the Immigration Bureau, the audience already knows the punishment the community reserves for an informer.

Question number

For much of the play, Eddie's violence is contained within his body rather than acted out. When Rodolpho calls Catherine "beautiful", the stage direction notes that Eddie's face is "puffed with trouble", and when Alfieri first meets him he observes that "His eyes were like tunnels". Both images suggest pressure building inside a closed space. Miller uses stage directions here to show the audience what Eddie cannot say, so that his suppressed jealousy reads as a form of violence waiting for release.

That release first comes disguised as play. In the boxing lesson at the end of Act One, Eddie "teaches" Rodolpho and lands a blow that makes him stagger. The family atmosphere of the scene masks a real attack, and violence becomes Eddie's way of reasserting his masculinity over a young man he insists "ain't right". Marco's response is brilliantly understated. He asks "Can you lift this chair?" and raises it above his head while Eddie fails. The stage direction describes the chair "raised like a weapon over Eddie's head", so Miller ends the act on a threat rather than an act of violence. Marco proves he could hurt Eddie and chooses not to, and the silent image is more frightening than a punch.

In Act Two, violence becomes more open but is repeatedly interrupted. Eddie's drunken kisses, first of Catherine and then of Rodolpho, are acts of physical domination as much as desire. After the arrests, Marco spits in Eddie's face and publicly cries "I accuse that one!", but he is restrained. Interestingly, Miller now shifts the conflict onto the question of justice itself. Marco insists "In my country he would be dead now. He would not live this long", and later tells Alfieri that "All the law is not in a book." These lines suggest that, for Marco, violence is not lawless but a deeper, older law of honour. Alfieri demands Marco's promise not to attack Eddie, which shows the modern legal system trying, and failing, to hold

Question number

back that older code.

The ending fulfils every warning. Eddie, desperate to recover his "name", "springs a knife into his hand", and in the struggle Marco turns the blade so that Eddie dies by his own weapon. The irony is precise and tragic: the violence Eddie has carried throughout the play is finally turned on himself. Dying in Beatrice's arms, he becomes almost pitiable, and Alfieri's closing speech admits that he mourns him "with a certain alarm".

Ultimately, Miller suggests that violence is not simply a flaw in Eddie but a force in the whole community, kept quiet by compromise and law but never destroyed. The play's structure, moving from contained gestures to a public killing in the street, makes the audience feel the pressure building, and leaves us uneasy about how thin the line between "civilized" and violent really is.

2 I agree only in part. Rodolpho is certainly presented as youthful, playful and, at first, rather careless, and Miller lets Eddie use that impression as a weapon against him. However, Eddie's claim that he is "just a kid, that's all" tells us more about Eddie's jealousy than about Rodolpho. As the play develops, Miller reveals a young man who is more emotionally mature, and in the end more morally mature, than the man who mocks him.

Miller introduces the brothers in deliberate contrast. Marco does the talking on arrival, introducing "My brother. Rodolpho" as though he were the responsible adult and Rodolpho the younger dependant. Marco is quiet, serious and focused on earning money for his starving children, while Rodolpho chatters about Italy with obvious enjoyment. He confidently lists his musical range, "I sing Napolidan, jazz,

Question number

bel canto", and talks about buying a motorcycle. The list form suggests a young man who is excited about himself and about America, and beside Marco's grim sense of duty this could easily seem immature. Most strikingly, he sings "Paper Doll" in the Carbone flat, even though he is an illegal immigrant who ought to avoid attention. Marco's sharp "Enough!" cuts the song off, and the interruption shows the audience that even his brother sees Rodolpho's carelessness as a danger.

Eddie seizes on these qualities to diminish him. His complaint that "The guy ain't right" and his sneering list of Rodolpho's talents, singing, cooking and making dresses, turn ordinary skills into proof that he is not a real man. Miller seems to want the audience to notice how narrow Eddie's definition of maturity is: for Eddie, being grown up means being physically tough and emotionally closed. The boxing lesson exposes this. Eddie "teaches" Rodolpho and hits him hard enough to make him stagger, and it is Marco who answers the challenge with the chair. On one level, this reinforces the sense that Rodolpho needs protecting. On another, it makes Eddie look like the childish one, a grown man bullying a guest in order to prove a point.

Miller also leaves room for doubt about Rodolpho's motives. Eddie insists that he only wants a passport, and Rodolpho's own words to Catherine, "I want you to be my wife, and I want to be a citizen", place love and citizenship side by side in one balanced compound sentence. A sceptical reader might hear immaturity here, a young man who cannot separate romance from self-interest. Yet the scene in which this line appears actually shows the opposite. When Catherine asks whether they could live in Italy, he refuses to take her back to poverty, and he answers her insecurity with honesty rather than flattery. He understands what marriage will cost them both, which is a sign of considered, adult thinking.

Question number

Catherine's response is important evidence. When she weeps and tries to explain her love for Eddie, she turns to Rodolpho, and he responds with tenderness and patience. Her plea, "teach me, Rodolpho, hold me", reverses Eddie's view entirely: to Catherine, Rodolpho is the one with experience and wisdom, the one who can lead her out of childhood. Miller structures this scene just before Eddie returns drunk, so the contrast is sharp. Rodolpho stays calm, while Eddie forces kisses on both of them in a moment of chaotic, impulsive behaviour that is far more immature than anything Rodolpho does.

Rodolpho's maturity is clearest in Act Two. After Eddie has betrayed both brothers to the Immigration Bureau, Rodolpho does not seek revenge. Instead he comes to Eddie and says "It is my fault, Eddie. Everything. I wish to apologise." The short, simple sentences sound humble rather than weak, and he takes responsibility for something that is plainly not his fault in order to restore peace. In the final confrontation, his desperate exclamations, "No, Marco, please! Eddie, please, he has children!", show him trying to protect both his brother and the man who wronged him. He thinks of Eddie's family even at the moment of greatest danger, which Marco and Eddie, locked in their struggle for honour, cannot do.

Overall, Miller first allows the audience to share Eddie's view of a light-hearted, rather naive boy, and then steadily overturns it. Rodolpho's immaturity is mostly surface: his singing and enthusiasm. Underneath, he proves to be forgiving, self-aware and committed to peace, so that by the end the question of who is "just a kid" is turned back on Eddie himself.

3 Priestley presents Mrs Sybil Birling as the most rigid and least changed member of the family: a woman whose obsession with status, propriety and reputation makes

Question number

her blind to her own cruelty. If the Inspector's visit is a test of conscience, Mrs Birling fails it most completely, and Priestley uses her to show how social superiority can harden into moral coldness.

Her character is fixed in the opening stage directions. She is "a rather cold woman and her husband's social superior." Placing "cold" before any other detail tells the audience how to read her, while "social superior" explains her confidence: she has married beneath her and never lets anyone forget it. Her first lines confirm this. When Birling compliments the cook, she corrects him "reproachfully" with "Arthur, you're not supposed to say such things", and when Sheila uses the word "squiffy" she exclaims "What an expression, Sheila! Really, the things you girls pick up these days!" Both rebukes are about manners rather than morals. Priestley establishes early that what matters to her is how things look, which prepares us for her later judgements.

She also accepts and teaches a narrow, conventional role for women. Advising Sheila about Gerald's absence the previous summer, she explains that men with "important work to do" spend nearly all their time on business, and that Sheila will have to "get used to that, just as I had." The line hints at a hidden disappointment in her own marriage, but rather than questioning it she passes it on. Ironically, this complacency also blinds her to the truth about Gerald and, later, about Eric.

Her treatment of Eva Smith is the centre of her characterisation. As a "prominent member" of the Brumley Women's Charity Organisation, she should help women like Eva, yet she uses her influence to have the girl refused. Her reasons are trivial and snobbish. Eva had called herself "Mrs Birling", which was "one of the things that prejudiced me against her", and she was "giving herself ridiculous airs". The

Question number

phrase "a girl in her position" and her contempt for "girls of that class" show a woman who believes that the poor should not have dignity or feelings. Her sneer at Eva "claiming elaborate fine feelings and scruples" is especially revealing, because it suggests she thinks moral sensitivity belongs only to the upper classes. Most damningly, she dismisses the girl's refusal of stolen money with "As if a girl of that sort would ever refuse money!", an assumption that collapses when we learn that Eva did exactly that.

Priestley's structure exposes her through dramatic irony. Determined to deflect blame, she insists that the young father of the child is responsible and should be made to confess publicly. The audience, and Sheila, begin to realise long before she does that she is condemning her own son. Sheila's frantic warnings make the tension almost unbearable, and the act ends with Eric's entrance, a carefully timed curtain that turns her self-righteousness into horror. Priestley's use of this "well-made play" structure means that Mrs Birling literally talks herself into the trap, which makes her guilt seem self-created.

Her language when confronting the Inspector is forthright and proud. She tells him "You have no power to make me change my mind" and declares "I accept no blame for it at all." These definite, unqualified statements contrast with Sheila's growing uncertainty and pain, and they show how social confidence protects her from self-examination. She treats the Inspector as an impertinent inferior, with her offended "I beg your pardon", rather than as the voice of conscience. Even when Eric accuses her of killing Eva and his child, she does not reflect; she simply appears shocked and broken for a moment.

The ending confirms that she has learned nothing. Once the Inspector's identity is doubted, she quickly recovers her composure and boasts "I was the only one of you

Question number

who didn't give in to him." She takes pride in her stubbornness, as if refusing to change were a virtue, and she sides with her husband in treating the evening as a fuss to be forgotten. Priestley's final telephone call therefore falls on her as much as anyone: the lesson is about to be repeated precisely because she refused to hear it.

Overall, Priestley presents Mrs Birling as a powerful study in moral blindness. Through stage directions, dramatic irony and her clipped, superior speech, he makes her a woman who confuses respectability with goodness, and her refusal to change leaves the audience to judge her far more harshly than she ever judges herself.

4 Priestley treats the working classes in An Inspector Calls as people who are essential to the comfort of the Birlings and yet almost invisible to them. Eva/Daisy and Edna represent two sides of the same situation: Edna is the quiet, obedient servant who is seen but barely noticed, while Eva is the worker who dares to want more and is crushed for it. By keeping both women largely silent or offstage, Priestley makes their absence itself a powerful comment on how the working classes are treated.

Edna is the more easily overlooked of the two, which is exactly the point. She appears only briefly, clearing the table, fetching drinks and announcing the visitor with "Please, sir, an inspector's called." Her polite, formal phrasing and her quick exit show that she knows her place, and the Birlings speak in front of her as if she were part of the furniture. Mrs Birling gives her instructions and dismisses her, and nobody in the family considers what she might think of their conversation. Priestley's stage directions keep her at the edges of the scene, and that marginal position on stage mirrors her position in society: useful, necessary, but without a

Question number

voice. It is significant that the Inspector's entrance is announced by a servant, as though the working classes are literally ushering in the judgement that is about to fall on the family.

Eva Smith, by contrast, is never seen at all. She exists only through the Inspector's account and the family's memories, and her death happens before the play begins. This form is crucial. Because the audience never meets her, she becomes a figure on whom the family project their prejudices, and we are forced to judge them by how they speak about her. Her ordinary name, "Eva Smith", makes her an everywoman, and the Inspector later broadens her into "millions and millions and millions of Eva Smiths and John Smiths". The triple repetition of "millions" turns one dead girl into a whole class, which is perhaps Priestley's clearest signal that she represents the working classes rather than simply herself.

The treatment Eva receives is presented as a chain of exploitation. Birling sacks her for leading a strike for higher wages, and his justification is chilling in its casualness: workers who do not like "the usual rates" can go elsewhere. He sees his employees purely as costs, and claims it is his "duty to keep labour costs down". His fear that, if not controlled, they will soon be "asking for the earth" uses hyperbole to make modest demands sound greedy. The Inspector turns his own phrase against him, replying that "it's better to ask for the earth than to take it", a neat reversal suggesting that the real greed belongs to the employers. Eric's question "Why shouldn't they try for higher wages? We try for the highest possible prices" exposes the double standard through balanced syntax, placing the workers' desire and the owners' desire side by side.

The other characters continue the pattern in different ways. Sheila has Eva dismissed from Milwards out of petty jealousy, which shows that the working

Question number

classes are vulnerable not only to economic power but to the moods of the rich. Gerald rescues her and then discards her, and Eric uses her while drunk. Each relationship begins with a member of the upper class holding all the power. Mrs Birling's treatment is the cruellest, because her charity exists to help women like Eva, yet she refuses her because of her "ridiculous airs" and sneers at "girls of that class". The phrase sums up the attitude Priestley is attacking: the belief that poor people are a separate kind, with fewer feelings and less right to dignity. Sheila's realisation, "these girls aren't cheap labour", followed by "they're people", marks the turning point that the younger generation can reach and their parents cannot.

The Inspector is the working classes' voice in the play, speaking for those who cannot speak for themselves. His final speech uses the collective "We are members of one body. We are responsible for each other", replacing Birling's individualism with a vision of shared humanity. His warning that otherwise men will be taught "in fire and blood and anguish" gives the treatment of the working classes an almost apocalyptic weight, as though injustice will inevitably return as violence. Structurally, the final phone call announcing another girl's death and another inspector suggests that the story of Eva could be repeated endlessly.

Overall, Priestley treats the working classes with deep sympathy while showing how the powerful treat them with indifference. Edna's silence and Eva's absence are not weaknesses in the play but its sharpest technique: they make the audience notice the people the Birlings refuse to see.

5 The character I respect most in the play is Christopher Boone. It would be easy to see him only as a boy who struggles with a world that overwhelms him, but

Question number

Stephens presents him as someone of remarkable courage, honesty and determination. What earns respect is not that he finds life easy, but that he keeps going in spite of how hard it is, and the play's form invites the audience to experience that difficulty alongside him.

From the opening moment, Christopher is placed at the centre of a crisis that is not his fault. The play begins with the stage direction "A dead dog lies in the middle of the stage. A large garden fork is sticking out of its side", and Christopher is found beside it. Mrs Shears screams at him, and he responds by putting his hands over his ears, a gesture that shows how painful noise and anger are for him. Yet instead of withdrawing, he decides to find out who killed Wellington. That choice is the first reason to respect him, because his investigation forces him to do the very things he finds hardest.

His questioning of the neighbours is a good example. Christopher dislikes strangers and finds conversation confusing, yet he knocks on doors and asks Mrs Alexander directly, "Do you know anything about Wellington getting killed?" The plain, literal question shows his honesty: he does not use small talk or pretence, and he says exactly what he means. Stephens lets the audience laugh gently at the awkwardness of these exchanges, but the humour never mocks Christopher. Instead, it highlights how much bravery is involved in each small step, especially when his father has angrily forbidden him to carry on.

Christopher's honesty also stands out against the adults around him. Almost every adult in his life lies to him at some point: Ed hides Judy's letters and tells him that his mother has died, and the truth about Wellington is concealed until Ed finally confesses. Christopher, by contrast, will not lie and tries to describe the world exactly as it is. This contrast gives his perspective a kind of moral clarity,

Question number

and makes the audience question the adults' assumption that they know better. When he discovers that his father killed the dog, his decision that he can no longer feel safe with him is logical and, in a painful way, brave.

His journey to London is the clearest demonstration of his courage. He has never travelled alone, yet he leaves Swindon with Toby and finds his way through stations, trains and the Underground. Stephens's form is crucial here. The ensemble surround Christopher with announcements, signs and voices, and the staging makes the audience feel the sensory overload he is battling against. Because we are placed inside his experience, we understand that each decision he makes is an achievement. His climb down onto the tube track to rescue Toby is genuinely dangerous, and although it shows his limited sense of risk, it also shows loyalty and determination to protect the creature that depends on him.

Christopher's confidence about his own abilities is another reason to respect him. His declarative "I am going to get an A grade" is not boastful but certain, and the play rewards that certainty when he sits his A level maths exam in spite of everything that has happened. His love of maths, prime numbers and patterns is presented as a source of order and strength rather than simply as a quirk. Structurally, the play even gives him the last word after the curtain call, when he returns to explain the maths, so that his voice and his way of seeing the world frame the whole production.

Siobhan's role adds to our respect. As she reads from his book, she acts as narrator and the play's structure becomes a performance of Christopher's own story. This metatheatrical device reminds the audience that Christopher is the author of his experience, not simply a subject being observed. By the closing moments of the main action, when he asks Siobhan "Does that mean I can do

Question number

anything?", his question sums up how far he has come. The repetition of the question suggests both hope and uncertainty, and Siobhan's silence leaves the answer open, but the audience has seen enough to believe in him.

Overall, I respect Christopher because Stephens shows him facing a world that is loud, dishonest and frightening, and responding with honesty, logic and extraordinary courage. Through the play's physical staging, its narrative frame and his own direct, determined language, he emerges as its true hero.

6 In The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time, anger is the hidden engine of the plot. The mystery Christopher sets out to solve is, in the end, the result of one man's loss of temper, and almost every turning point in the play is caused by an angry outburst. Yet Stephens does not present anger simply as wickedness. He shows it as the product of grief, frustration and love that has gone wrong, and he contrasts it with the patience that Christopher needs and rarely receives.

The play opens with the consequence of anger before we know its cause. The stage direction "A dead dog lies in the middle of the stage. A large garden fork is sticking out of its side" is shocking and almost absurd, and the violence of the fork tells us that this was no accident. Mrs Shears then turns her own anger on Christopher, screaming at him to "Get away from my dog". The stage direction showing Christopher putting his hands over his ears makes the audience see anger from his point of view: not as an emotion to be understood but as noise and threat. From the first scene, Stephens establishes Christopher as someone on whom other people's anger falls.

Ed's anger is the most significant in the play, and Stephens builds it gradually.

Question number

When Christopher mentions Mr Shears, Ed's reaction is sudden and disproportionate, and he forbids his son from investigating further. His frustration surfaces in harsh questions such as "Jesus, Christopher, how stupid are you?", where the blasphemy and the insult show how quickly his patience can snap. Ed admits his weakness himself, saying "I know I lose my rag occasionally", and the colloquial phrase almost minimises it, as though it were a minor flaw rather than a danger. The climax of this build-up comes when Ed finds Christopher's book. His cry "What am I going to do with you, Christopher?" is a question without an answer, revealing helplessness beneath the rage, and the scene ends in physical violence. Structurally, this moment marks the point at which the private family tension becomes a crisis.

The revelation that Ed killed Wellington transforms the theme. He explains that a "red mist" came down after an argument with Mrs Shears, and his line "You know what that bloody dog was like" shows how his anger at her, and at his collapsed marriage, was displaced onto the animal. The image of a red mist suggests that anger blinds him, temporarily erasing his judgement. This is the "curious incident" of the title, and it means that the mystery Christopher has been so carefully investigating has been anger all along. Stephens's structure is clever here: Christopher's logical detective work uncovers an act that is the opposite of logic.

Christopher himself is not free from anger. When the policeman grabs him, he lashes out and hits him, and later he screams and groans when he is overwhelmed. These outbursts, however, are presented differently. They are responses to being touched or overloaded rather than deliberate cruelty, and the audience is encouraged to see them with sympathy. Judy's letters reveal another side of this. She remembers being at "the end of my tether" and having to pay for "two broken mixers" while waiting for Christopher to stop screaming. Her honesty suggests that

Question number

the anger and exhaustion of family life fed into her decision to leave, so anger becomes a cycle passing between parents and child.

In London, Roger Shears adds a further version of anger, drunken and resentful. His question "Don't you ever, ever think about other people for one second, eh?" uses repetition to show his building rage, and the irony is that Christopher literally finds it hard to imagine other people's thoughts. Roger's aggression is the final push that sends Judy and Christopher back to Swindon, so once again anger directly drives the plot.

Against all this, Stephens places calmer figures. Siobhan's voice, measured and encouraging, provides a constant alternative to the shouting adults, and her narration frames the play with patience. By the end, Ed attempts to rebuild trust by giving Christopher a puppy and promising to earn his trust gradually. This suggests that anger can be repaired, though slowly and imperfectly.

Overall, Stephens presents anger as a force that wounds, deceives and divides, but also as a deeply human response to loss and frustration. Through stage directions, the structure of the mystery and the contrast between angry and patient voices, he invites the audience to understand anger without excusing it.

7 Samuels presents Evelyn as a mother who loves her daughter but cannot show it freely, because her own experience of being mothered was broken by separation. She is controlling, guarded and often cold, yet the play's structure makes the audience understand why. By placing Evelyn's present beside her past as Eva, Samuels suggests that Evelyn's mothering is shaped by the trauma of losing her own mother, and that this damage is in danger of being passed on.

Question number

From the start, Evelyn's relationship with Faith is marked by distance. As Faith prepares to leave home, Evelyn busies herself in the attic, and the repeated stage direction "Evelyn continues to polish" suggests that she uses cleaning to avoid real conversation. The polishing is a practical form of care, but it also places a barrier between mother and daughter. Their exchanges about Faith's new flat are brittle. When Evelyn remarks "You said it was a bargain", Faith retorts "Maybe you should have come to see it", a line which exposes how little Evelyn has shared in her daughter's life even while trying to manage it. The quick, sharp dialogue shows two people talking past each other.

Evelyn's language is a key part of her presentation. She speaks in a formal, controlled register, for example "This continual vacillation is not helpful to either of us", which sounds more like a manager than a mother. The Latinate vocabulary distances her from emotion, and contrasts with Faith's blunt, informal speech. This clash of registers suggests that Evelyn has built a carefully correct English identity, and that formality has become her defence. Faith's complaint that "I'm not fourteen any more" shows how this control feels to a grown daughter: Evelyn still treats her as a child who must be organised.

The discovery of Evelyn's past transforms the relationship. When Faith finds letters and objects from Germany in the attic, she learns that her mother was once Eva, a Jewish child sent to England on the Kindertransport. Faith's anger is intense: she calls Evelyn a "terrible mother" and an "awful lying cow of a mother". The insults are crude and wounding, and they show how Evelyn's silence has been experienced as betrayal rather than protection. Yet Samuels allows Evelyn to explain herself in one of the play's most powerful lines: "Germany spat me out. England took me in." The bodily verb "spat" conveys rejection and disgust, while

Question number

the short parallel sentences show how completely she has divided her life into before and after. Her secrecy as a mother is, in this light, an attempt to protect Faith from a past she herself could not bear.

The structure of the play is essential to this understanding. Scenes from Eva's childhood with Helga and Lil interweave with scenes between Evelyn and Faith, often on the same attic stage. As a result, the audience watches Eva as a daughter and Evelyn as a mother almost simultaneously. Helga sends Eva away to save her life, and the separation leaves Eva feeling abandoned; when Helga survives the war and comes to take her to America, Eva rejects her. Samuels makes us see that Evelyn's mothering is shaped by these two experiences: being let go, and then refusing to go back. Her declaration "I'd rather die than go back" when Faith wants to contact relatives shows that she cannot reopen the past even for her daughter's sake. Lil, by contrast, is warmer with Faith and more willing to talk, which highlights by comparison how closed Evelyn has become.

There are moments, however, when Evelyn's love is visible. Towards the end she breaks down, and her vulnerability suggests that the coldness has been a mask. Even so, the stage direction "Faith tries to get close to Evelyn. Evelyn does not turn to face Faith" captures her tragedy as a mother. The physical refusal to turn is a silent stage image that says more than dialogue could: she wants closeness but cannot accept it. Her belief, expressed through the image of a chipped glass being "ruined forever", hints that she sees herself as permanently damaged and therefore unable to repair what lies between them.

The play's final image confirms this ambiguity. As the shadow of the Ratcatcher covers the stage, Samuels suggests that the fear and loss of Evelyn's childhood still hang over her relationship with Faith. Overall, Evelyn is presented as a mother

Question number

who is controlling and distant, but whose coldness grows out of her own wounded childhood. Through her formal language, the interweaving structure and powerful stage directions, Samuels invites the audience to judge her less as a bad mother than as a damaged daughter who has never stopped being one.

8 Symbols are central to Kindertransport because they allow Samuels to show what her characters cannot say. Evelyn has buried her past so deeply that she rarely speaks of it directly, so objects, stories and stage images carry the weight of memory and fear for her. The Ratcatcher and the Kindertransport are the two most important symbols, but smaller objects such as the mouth organ, the buttons and Evelyn's cleaning build a network of meaning that links the child Eva to the adult Evelyn.

The Ratcatcher is the play's most powerful and threatening symbol. He comes from the German story Der Rattenfänger, which Eva reads as a child, and his language is openly terrifying: "I will take the heart of your happiness away". The image of taking a child's "heart" makes him a figure of loss rather than simple violence, and this fits exactly what happens to Eva, who is taken away from her parents and, in a sense, from herself. Samuels gives the Ratcatcher his own music, which sounds whenever Eva is distracted or in danger. This aural motif creates tension and foreboding, and it tells the audience that the threat is always near even when nothing is visibly happening.

What makes the Ratcatcher especially significant is that he changes shape. The same figure reappears as the Nazi Border Official who humiliates Eva on the train, the Postman who jokes that everyone in Germany learnt to march, and the Station Guard who suspects her. By doubling these roles, Samuels turns the Ratcatcher

Question number

into a symbol of every authority figure who might separate or reject a vulnerable child. This suggests that Eva's fear is not confined to Nazi Germany but follows her into England, where ordinary people also become threats in her eyes. The symbol therefore shows how trauma spreads and distorts perception.

The Kindertransport itself, which gives the play its title, works as a double symbol. On one level, it represents rescue: the train carries Eva to safety in England. On another, it represents separation and loss, because the same journey takes her away from Helga, perhaps forever. The Officer on the train empties her bag and marks her label with a large Star of David, which becomes a symbol of being branded by her identity. Samuels places this frightening episode at the heart of the journey, so the symbol of escape is shadowed by humiliation. The title therefore holds the play's central paradox: what saves Eva also breaks her.

Smaller symbols develop this idea. Before she leaves, Helga insists that Eva sew on her own buttons, and the task seems to stand for the independence Helga wants her daughter to have, the ability to hold herself together alone. Eva's mouth organ, which she explains "was my last birthday present and I'm just beginning to get the tunes right", symbolises her childhood and the life she is trying to keep. The phrase "just beginning" is poignant, because her childhood is about to be cut short. Structurally, the mouth organ returns when Evelyn finds it in the attic and does not remember it, which suggests how completely she has erased her past. One object therefore marks both the beginning and the forgetting of Eva's story.

Evelyn's obsessive cleaning is a symbol of control. The repeated stage direction "Evelyn continues to polish" shows her trying to keep everything spotless and in order, as though a clean surface could cover what lies beneath. The attic setting reinforces this: it is the place where the past has been literally boxed away above

Question number

the family home. Her remark that "A chipped glass is ruined forever" can be read as a symbol of how she sees herself, damaged by her experiences beyond repair. Samuels uses ordinary domestic objects to reveal deep psychological wounds.

The play's ending gives the symbols their final significance. The stage direction states that "the shadow of the Ratcatcher covers the stage", so the play closes not with resolution but with an image of lasting darkness. This suggests that Evelyn's life, and perhaps Faith's, will always be overshadowed by the past, and that the reconciliation between mother and daughter remains incomplete.

Overall, symbols in Kindertransport are significant because they connect past and present, child and adult, and make visible the fear and loss that Evelyn tries to hide. Through the shape-shifting Ratcatcher, the double meaning of the Kindertransport and the quiet power of everyday objects, Samuels shows that trauma cannot simply be packed away.

9 Soyinka presents Elesin as a magnificent but fatally divided figure: a man of "enormous vitality" whose very love of life, which makes him the perfect symbol of his people, is also what makes him unable to leave it. The play is built around the gap between Elesin's words and his will, and Soyinka uses his language, the structure of the five scenes and the contrast with his son to show how a great man can betray the order he was born to protect, and how he finally, too late, recovers some of his honour.

In the opening market scene Elesin is presented almost as a performer. He arrives in procession with drummers and praise-singers, and the stage direction's description of his "infectious enjoyment of life" makes him immediately attractive

Question number

to the audience. His language is rich, proverbial and playful. He calls the market "my roost" and boasts that "the juiciest fruit on every tree was mine", a metaphor that suggests a lifetime of appetite and privilege. The fruit imagery is double-edged: it shows that his status as the King's Horseman has brought him every pleasure, but it also hints that he is a man ruled by his senses. Soyinka seems to be planting the seed of his failure in the very speech that celebrates him.

The most important dramatic method in this scene is the tale of the Not-I bird. Elesin acts out, with energy and comic timing, how everyone from the farmer to the hunter flees when Death calls, each crying "not I". By telling this story he claims to be the exception, the one man who does not fear death, and he asserts that "we are already parted, the world and I". The present tense here is striking because it speaks of his departure as if it has already happened. Yet structurally the tale is deeply ironic: the audience will later watch Elesin become a Not-I bird himself. Soyinka lets his hero define his own failure before he commits it.

The turning point comes when Elesin sees the young woman betrothed to Iyaloja's son. His tone shifts from public ritual to private desire, and he insists that he deserves "a bed of honour" before he dies. The word "honour" is used to dress up lust, and Iyaloja's reluctant agreement, fearing that to refuse him would offend the gods, shows how much power his role gives him. He even imagines that "the fruit of this union will be rare", echoing the earlier fruit imagery, so that a child is presented as his last earthly harvest. It is possible to read this sympathetically, as a wish to leave something living behind, but Soyinka's structure suggests it is the moment the "earth-held" part of Elesin begins to win.

In Scene 3 Soyinka presents Elesin at his most transcendent. The rhythm of the

Question number

drums and the Praise-Singer's questions create a trance, and the Praise-Singer's line "Elesin Alafin, I no longer sense your flesh" suggests that he really is passing beyond the world. However, the scene is broken by the switch to the Residency ball, and when we next see Elesin he is in chains.

In the final scene Elesin's language changes completely. The confident boasting is replaced by confession. He admits that "my will was squelched in the spittle of an alien race", a disgusting, physical image that blames the colonial intervention of Pilkings. Yet he also acknowledges that there was a "longing" on his "earth-held limbs", and tells Iyaloja that his powers, charms and even his voice deserted him. Soyinka allows him to see that the real enemy was inside him. Iyaloja's scornful questioning of the man who once claimed every ripe fruit throws his opening boast back at him, and the tone of the play becomes almost a trial.

Olunde's role is essential in presenting Elesin. When they meet in Scene 4, Olunde's cry "I have no father, eater of left-overs" reduces his father to a scavenger who has outlived his purpose. Olunde, educated in England, has kept faith with tradition while Elesin, who never left, has broken it. The revelation of Olunde's body is the climax of Elesin's shame, and it prompts his final act: he strangles himself with the chain that held him. This is a painful irony, as the symbol of his captivity becomes the means of a death that is no longer ritual but despair.

Ultimately Soyinka presents Elesin as tragic rather than simply weak. His love of life is genuinely admirable, and his final suicide shows he cannot live without honour. Yet the death comes too late to save the world from "tumbling in the void of strangers", and it is his son who has paid the debt. Elesin is a warning that greatness of words means nothing without strength of will.

Question number

10

In Death and the King's Horseman responsibility is not simply a personal duty but a thread that holds a whole world together. Soyinka shows that Elesin's responsibility to follow the King into death is also a responsibility to the living, the dead and the unborn, and the tragedy comes from the collision between characters who each believe they are acting responsibly. The play suggests that true responsibility means placing the community above the self, and it judges characters by whether they can do so.

At the centre is Elesin's duty as the King's Horseman. In the market scene he appears to embrace it completely, telling the women he "will not delay" and acting out the tale of the Not-I bird to prove that he alone does not fear Death's call. The Praise-Singer reminds him, in riddling verse, of what is at stake: the world must not be allowed to slip from its course. Elesin is repeatedly called "father" by the women, a word that shows how his role makes him responsible for the whole community, almost like the King himself.

However, Soyinka presents the burden of responsibility as also bringing privilege, and this is where it begins to fail. Iyaloja's fear that "if we offend you now, we have mortified the gods" shows how the community must obey him because of his role, so when he demands the young bride, she cannot refuse. Iyaloja herself acts responsibly: she gives up the girl betrothed to her own son in order to keep the ritual safe. Yet she also warns Elesin solemnly of what will follow if the living are left with the consequences of his choices. The structure of the scene, moving from joyful celebration to this solemn warning, makes the audience aware that responsibility has been put at risk by desire.

Question number

Soyinka also gives the Praise-Singer a responsibility of his own. His role, rooted in the West African tradition of praise-singing, is to honour and guide the Horseman. In Scene 3 his questions and the rhythm of the drums lead Elesin into the trance, and his words "Elesin Alafin, I no longer sense your flesh" suggest he is literally escorting him to the threshold. In the final scene the Praise-Singer's bitter questions about why Elesin failed show that this responsibility has turned into the duty to judge.

Against this, Soyinka sets Simon Pilkings, who also believes he is acting responsibly. As District Officer he sees it as his duty to stop what British law calls suicide, and his flippant concern about whether they will be "one native chief short by tomorrow" reveals how lightly he takes another culture's beliefs. His prose speech, casual and joking, contrasts sharply with the dense verse of the Yoruba characters, and this contrast in form exposes how narrow his understanding of responsibility is. Earlier, he and Jane wear the egungun costume to a fancy dress ball, which even Amusa, a Muslim policeman, finds disturbing. Amusa's refusal to speak to Pilkings while he wears it shows that he, at least, recognises a responsibility to what is sacred. Pilkings' sense of duty is therefore presented as authority without wisdom.

Olunde is the clearest example of responsibility fulfilled. In Scene 4 he tells Jane about a ship's captain who blew himself and his ship up to save the harbour and its people, and he admires this as a sacrifice for the community. This story prepares the audience for his own act. Although he has been educated in England and disowned by his father, he returns understanding his duty better than Elesin does. His scorn, "I have no father, eater of left-overs", reverses the expected relationship: the son now takes on the father's role. When his body is revealed, the dramatic shock comes from the fact that the responsibility has passed down to

Question number

the next generation, which is exactly the disorder the ritual was meant to prevent.

Elesin's final recognition that "my will was squelched in the spittle of an alien race" is partly a refusal of responsibility, blaming Pilkings, but Soyinka makes him admit too that the "longing" on his "earth-held limbs" was his own. His suicide with his chains is an attempt to take responsibility at last, but it comes too late. The play ends with Iyaloja making sure that the Bride performs her duty by closing his eyes, and with her instruction to "forget the dead, forget even the living" and turn their minds "only to the unborn". This closing structure shifts responsibility forward to the future.

Soyinka therefore presents responsibility as both noble and devastating. Characters who place the community above themselves, like Iyaloja and Olunde, are given dignity, while those who put self or narrow authority first, like Elesin and Pilkings, bring about destruction. The play's power lies in showing that the failure of one man's duty unbalances a whole world.

11 Hope is important in Romeo and Juliet precisely because Shakespeare tells us at the start that it will fail. The Prologue announces "a pair of star-cross'd lovers" whose deaths will end their parents' strife, so every hopeful moment in the play is watched by an audience that knows the outcome. Shakespeare uses hope to create tension, to make the lovers sympathetic and to deepen the tragedy, and Friar Lawrence's decision to marry them shows that even the wisest characters place their trust in a hope that fate has already ruled out.

The Friar's motive is the clearest example. When Romeo asks him to perform the marriage, the Friar agrees because "this alliance may so happy prove / To turn your

Question number

households' rancour to pure love". The modal verb "may" reveals that his plan is a gamble, and the antithesis of "rancour" and "pure love" shows how dramatic a transformation he hopes for. To an Elizabethan audience, a friar was a figure of spiritual authority, so his hope would seem reasonable and even holy. Yet he also warns that "these violent delights have violent ends", and this foreshadowing undercuts his optimism. Shakespeare presents hope as a well-meaning but dangerous force, because it encourages haste.

Hope also shapes the older generation's view of Juliet. Capulet tells Paris that "the earth hath swallow'd all my hopes but she", a line that suggests other children have died and that all his ambitions are now invested in his only daughter. This makes his later fury at her refusal to marry Paris more understandable, if not forgivable, because in a patriarchal society a daughter's marriage was the family's hope for wealth and alliance. At the ball, too, Capulet tells Tybalt to leave Romeo alone because he "bears him like a portly gentleman". This moment offers a glimmer of hope that the feud is cooling, but Tybalt's furious exit, swearing that the intrusion will "convert to bitter gall", shows how fragile that hope is.

For the lovers themselves, hope is bound up with the language of light. In the balcony scene Romeo describes Juliet as "the sun" and Juliet asks him to "deny thy father and refuse thy name", hoping that love can simply rise above identity. Yet her imagery also contains doubt: she fears their contract is "too rash, too unadvised, too sudden, / Too like the lightning". The repetition of "too" and the simile of lightning, bright but instantly gone, capture a hope that already senses its own brevity. Shakespeare structures the play so that the lovers' hopeful private scenes are constantly interrupted by the public violence of Verona.

That violence destroys the most important hope of all. In Act 3 Scene 1 Romeo,

Question number

newly married, refuses to fight Tybalt and tells him he loves him "better than thou canst devise". Romeo is acting on the Friar's hope of reconciliation, but his peacemaking leads directly to Mercutio's death and Mercutio's curse, "a plague o' both your houses!". Romeo's cry that he is "fortune's fool" shows his realisation that hope has turned against him. The placing of this scene at the centre of the play marks the structural turning point from comedy to tragedy.

After this, hope becomes increasingly desperate. On the morning after their wedding night, Romeo assures Juliet that "all these woes shall serve / For sweet discourses in our time to come", but Juliet sees him "as one dead in the bottom of a tomb". Her vision is a chilling piece of dramatic irony that cancels his reassurance. The Friar's potion plan is a final, ingenious hope, but it depends on a letter that never arrives. To an audience who believed strongly in fate and providence, the plague that delays Friar John would suggest that hope cannot outrun destiny.

In the tomb, Shakespeare turns hope into agony. Romeo notices that "beauty's ensign yet / Is crimson in thy lips and in thy cheeks", details that tell the audience Juliet is alive, but he reads them as a sign of beauty rather than life. Hope is present on stage but invisible to him. Only after both lovers die do the fathers reconcile, with Capulet asking "O brother Montague, give me thy hand". The promise of golden statues offers a public hope for peace in Verona, but it is a hope purchased with the lives of the young.

Overall, hope matters in the play because it is what makes the tragedy so painful. Shakespeare gives his characters real reasons to hope, yet frames those hopes with the Prologue and with a society ruled by violence and patriarchal control. The final reconciliation suggests that hope is not entirely false, but that in Verona it can

Question number

only be fulfilled at the highest possible cost.

12 Shakespeare presents the Nurse as the person who has truly mothered Juliet: she has fed her, known her, joked with her and kept her secrets in a way that Lady Capulet never has. Yet he also shows the limits of this love. The Nurse is a servant, practical and earthy, and when Juliet most needs a mother's courage she offers only a servant's compromise. Through this relationship Shakespeare explores how class, money and patriarchal marriage shaped family life in his time, and he makes Juliet's final isolation all the more painful.

The Nurse's first scene, Act 1 Scene 3, establishes her as a mother in all but name. Lady Capulet begins to discuss Juliet's marriage but immediately loses confidence and calls "Nurse, come back again", as if she cannot speak to her own daughter without help. The Nurse, by contrast, knows Juliet's age "unto an hour". Her long, rambling speech about the earthquake, the day Juliet was weaned and the time the little girl fell on her face is comic, but it is also full of tender detail that only someone who has raised a child could remember. Her claim that Juliet "wast the prettiest babe that e'er I nursed" uses a superlative to show fierce maternal pride. Shakespeare structures the scene so that the Nurse dominates in speech while Lady Capulet's lines are brief and formal, a contrast that tells the audience where Juliet's emotional bond lies.

The context of wet-nursing deepens this. In wealthy Elizabethan households it was common for a mother to hand her baby to a wet nurse, and the Nurse reveals that her own daughter Susan died, so Juliet seems to have taken the place of the child she lost. This explains the intensity of her affection: she is not simply an employee but a grieving mother who has transferred her love. It also explains Lady

Question number

Capulet's distance, since she married young and handed her child over, a pattern Shakespeare's audience would have recognised.

Like a mother, the Nurse is closely involved in Juliet's romantic life. She acts as go-between, carrying messages to Romeo and warning him not to lead Juliet "in a fool's paradise". This shows protective instinct: she wants to make sure his intentions are honourable before she helps. When she returns in Act 2 Scene 5, she teases Juliet by delaying the news, complaining "Fie, how my bones ache!" The comedy depends on their intimacy; only someone who feels like family could tease so freely, and Juliet's frustrated affection, coaxing and pleading with her, is the behaviour of a daughter. When the news finally comes, the Nurse's bawdy pun that Juliet "shall bear the burden soon at night" shows her frank, physical attitude to marriage, very different from Juliet's idealised language of love but still warm.

However, Shakespeare reveals the Nurse's limitations as the tragedy develops. In Act 3 Scene 2 she is so overcome with grief for Tybalt that she confuses Juliet into thinking Romeo is dead. Later, after Capulet's brutal threats that Juliet may "hang, beg, starve, die in the streets", Juliet turns not to her mother, who coldly refuses to help, but to the Nurse. The Nurse's answer is a shocking betrayal: she advises Juliet to marry Paris, praising him as "a lovely gentleman" and dismissing Romeo as "a dishclout to him". She even says "I think you are happy in this second match". This pragmatic view would have made sense to a servant who depended on the Capulets for her living, and in a society where daughters had little choice, she may believe she is offering sensible survival. Yet she completely ignores that Juliet is already married and that bigamy would be a sin.

Juliet's response marks the end of her childhood. Alone, she calls the Nurse "ancient damnation" and declares "thou and my bosom henceforth shall be twain".

Question number

The image of separation from her "bosom" is poignant, because the Nurse literally nursed her. From this point Juliet acts alone, and Shakespeare makes the Nurse's maternal role vanish at the moment it is most needed. When the Nurse later finds Juliet apparently dead, her repeated, almost hysterical lamentation of the "woeful day" is genuine grief, but it comes too late.

Overall, Shakespeare presents the Nurse as Juliet's real mother in love, humour and devotion, and as a sharp contrast to the cold, formal Lady Capulet. Yet by showing her fail Juliet in Act 3, he suggests that the Nurse's motherhood was always limited by her status and her worldly outlook. Juliet's loss of both mother figures leaves her isolated, which is a crucial step towards the tragedy.

13 In Macbeth Shakespeare explores courage as a quality that can be either noble or monstrous, depending on what it serves. At the start, courage is the defining virtue of a loyal soldier; by the middle, Lady Macbeth has twisted it into a willingness to commit murder; and by the end, true courage belongs to those who fight to restore the rightful order. For a Jacobean audience who prized manly valour but also believed in the Divine Right of Kings, the play asks a disturbing question: what happens when a brave man turns his bravery against his king?

The play opens by celebrating Macbeth's physical courage. The wounded Captain describes "brave Macbeth, well he deserves that name", and the violent image of him unseaming a rebel "from the nave to the chops" shows a ferocious warrior. Macbeth and Banquo are compared to "eagles" and "the lion" while their enemies are "sparrows" and "the hare", an animal imagery that suggests a natural hierarchy of strength. Ross even calls Macbeth "Bellona's bridegroom", making him the husband of the goddess of war. Shakespeare builds up this reputation so that the

Question number

audience feels the full weight of his fall. Yet there is already a hint that his courage is limited to the battlefield: when the witches speak, Banquo asks why he seems to "start, and seem to fear / Things that do sound so fair". The man who fears nothing in battle is shaken by his own thoughts.

Lady Macbeth exploits this. In Act I Scene 7, when Macbeth decides to "proceed no further", she attacks his manhood, asking whether he will "live a coward" in his own esteem and claiming that "when you durst do it, then you were a man". Here courage is redefined as the daring to commit evil, and masculinity becomes a weapon. Her horrifying image of plucking her nipple from her baby's "boneless gums" and dashing "the brains out" shows that she sees courage as the destruction of natural feeling. In a society where women were expected to be gentle and submissive, her rejection of maternal tenderness would have seemed unnatural, even demonic, especially given her earlier call to the spirits to "unsex me here". Macbeth's reply, "I dare do all that may become a man; / Who dares do more is none", offers a different, moral definition of courage, but he is persuaded to abandon it.

After the murder, Shakespeare shows that this false courage brings terror rather than strength. Macbeth cannot return the daggers, and Lady Macbeth calls him "infirm of purpose". Later, at the banquet, the ghost of Banquo reduces him to panic, and she asks scornfully "are you a man?". Macbeth insists that he could face "the rugged Russian bear" or "the armed rhinoceros", listing dangerous animals to prove his bravery, but he cannot face the ghost of the friend he murdered. Shakespeare suggests that guilt destroys courage from within. Macbeth's explanation, that his fear is only "the initiate fear that wants hard use" and that "we are yet but young in deed", is chilling: he believes he can train himself out of conscience, and the murder of Macduff's family shows that he does.

Question number

Shakespeare contrasts this with genuine courage in other characters. Lady Macduff bitterly accuses her absent husband of cowardice, saying that "all is the fear, and nothing is the love", yet when Macduff hears of his family's slaughter he shows a fuller courage, insisting that he must "feel it as a man" before turning grief into action. Here Shakespeare suggests that true manliness includes emotion as well as bravery. Young Siward fights Macbeth fearlessly and is killed, and Ross's reassurance that he "paid a soldier's debt" gives him an honourable death, unlike the tyrant's.

In the final act, Macbeth's courage returns, but in a bleak, nihilistic form. He declares "at least we'll die with harness on our back", and even when Birnam Wood moves and Macduff reveals that he was not "of woman born", he refuses to yield and cries "lay on, Macduff". There is something admirable in this, and it reminds the audience of the warrior from Act 1. Yet his courage now has no purpose beyond itself; it is the courage of despair, following his speech that life signifies "nothing". Macduff, whose "voice is in my sword", fights for Scotland and for justice, and he ends the play holding the tyrant's head.

Ultimately, Shakespeare presents courage as essential but dangerous. Without loyalty and conscience it becomes the "vaulting ambition" that destroys Macbeth. By ending with Macduff's righteous courage and Malcolm's restoration, the play reassured King James, who had survived the Gunpowder Plot in 1605, that bravery used to defend a rightful king is heroic, while bravery used against him leads only to destruction.

14 Shakespeare presents Lady Macbeth's conscience as something she tries to kill but

Question number

cannot. In the first act she deliberately suppresses it, calling on dark spirits to strip away her humanity; through the middle of the play it is buried beneath her control and quick thinking; and in the sleepwalking scene it erupts, uncontrollable, through her broken speech. The line "The Thane of Fife had a wife: where is she now?" captures this collapse perfectly, because the woman who once mocked guilt is now haunted by a murder she did not even commit. Shakespeare uses her to show a Jacobean audience that conscience is part of God's natural order, and that no one can escape it.

At first, Lady Macbeth appears to have no conscience at all. Reading Macbeth's letter, she immediately decides that he "shalt be / What thou art promised", and her fear is not of murder but of her husband's "nature", which is "too full o' th' milk of human kindness". The maternal metaphor shows that she regards compassion as a weakness. Her soliloquy, "Come, you spirits / That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here", then becomes a ritual of self-transformation. She asks to be filled "from the crown to the toe top-full / Of direst cruelty" and for her blood to be made thick, to "stop up th' access and passage to remorse". The word "remorse" reveals that she knows conscience exists within her and must be actively blocked.

In Act 1 Scene 7 she uses this hardness to overpower Macbeth's scruples. She mocks him with "when you durst do it, then you were a man" and claims she would have "dashed the brains out" of her own baby had she sworn to it. The brutality of the image shocks because it reverses the expectations of a society that saw women as gentle, nurturing and subservient. Yet Shakespeare includes small signs that her conscience has not been destroyed. On the night of the murder she admits that she would have killed Duncan herself "had he not resembled / My father as he slept". This brief moment of hesitation, placed in the

Question number

middle of her boldest scene, suggests that natural feeling is still alive beneath her cruelty.

Immediately after the murder, her confidence seems absolute. She dismisses Macbeth's horror at his bloody hands with "a little water clears us of this deed". The adjective "little" minimises the crime, and the idea that guilt can be washed away like dirt shows her refusal to recognise its spiritual weight. She takes control again at the banquet, explaining away Macbeth's terror at Banquo's ghost as an illness from his "youth". Yet Shakespeare structures her role so that she grows quieter as Macbeth grows more violent. She is not told of the plans to kill Banquo or Macduff's family, and her line "Nought's had, all's spent, / Where our desire is got without content" shows a bleak recognition that the crown has brought no peace. Conscience is beginning to work on her in private.

The sleepwalking scene is the climax of this. Shakespeare changes her speech from confident blank verse into fragmented prose, which signals the breakdown of her mind. The Doctor and Gentlewoman watch her rub her hands, and her cry "Out, damned spot!" shows that the "little water" was never enough. Her question "What, will these hands ne'er be clean?" is a direct echo of her earlier boast, and the irony is devastating. The line "The Thane of Fife had a wife: where is she now?" is especially revealing. Its sing-song rhythm sounds almost like a nursery rhyme, suggesting a regression to childhood, while the content shows that she feels responsible for a murder she had no direct part in. Her conscience seems to have taken on the guilt of everything Macbeth has done.

Shakespeare's language here is full of the senses. She complains that "all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand", where "little" now emphasises her vulnerability rather than her contempt. The repeated "O, O, O!" and

Question number

"To bed, to bed, to bed" show thought collapsing into sound. Elizabethans believed that sleepwalking could be a sign of a troubled soul, and the Doctor's remark that "more needs she the divine than the physician" tells the audience that her sickness is spiritual: she needs a priest, not medicine.

Her death off stage, reported as probable suicide by Malcolm in the closing lines, completes the arc. Malcolm's label "fiend-like queen" judges her by her early actions, but the audience has seen more. Shakespeare presents Lady Macbeth's conscience as the force that finally defeats her: she could command murder, but she could not command her own mind, and that inner punishment reinforces the play's warning that crimes against the natural order cannot go unpunished.

15 In many ways Acts 4 and 5 bring The Merchant of Venice to a successful ending. The trial resolves the central threat of the bond with real dramatic power, and Belmont restores the comic world of love, music and marriage. Yet I would argue that the ending is only successful on the terms of a romantic comedy written for a Christian Elizabethan audience. For a modern audience, and arguably even for Shakespeare himself, the treatment of Shylock leaves a shadow over the play that the moonlit final act cannot fully remove.

Act 4 is undeniably successful as a climax. The courtroom setting is formal and public, and the Duke presides over a situation in which every major strand of the plot meets. Shakespeare builds the tension slowly. Shylock refuses every appeal and sharpens his knife on stage, a visual detail that keeps the audience aware of the physical danger to Antonio. Portia's famous speech, "The quality of mercy is not strained", uses the image of mercy that "droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven" to present it as a divine gift that falls on everyone equally. For a Christian

Question number

audience who knew the New Testament emphasis on mercy over strict law, this would have been the moral heart of the play.

The reversal is brilliantly structured. Portia appears to grant Shylock everything, and the audience, unlike Bassanio and Antonio, knows she is in disguise, which creates dramatic irony and suspense. Then comes the turn: "Tarry a little; there is something else", followed by the revelation that the bond gives "no jot of blood". The short, simple line stops the action dead, and the whole power of the scene shifts. In terms of plot, this is a deeply satisfying resolution: the villain's own literalism defeats him, and Antonio is saved. Portia, who as a woman could never have been a lawyer in Shakespeare's England, proves herself the cleverest person in Venice, which would have surprised and delighted the original audience.

However, the punishment of Shylock complicates any sense of success. He loses half his wealth to Antonio and is ordered to "presently become a Christian". To an Elizabethan audience, in a country from which Jewish people had been expelled since 1290 and where anti-Semitic stereotypes were common, this might have seemed merciful, even a chance of salvation. Yet Shakespeare gives Shylock a devastatingly brief response, "I am content", followed by his request to leave because "I am not well". After his earlier eloquence, these short, broken lines are painfully quiet, and he leaves the stage for good. For many audiences this moment undermines the triumph of mercy that Portia praised.

Act 5 is designed to heal the tension. The setting moves from the hard, commercial world of Venice to the harmony of Belmont, and the act opens with Lorenzo and Jessica's lyrical exchange, repeating "In such a night". Yet even here Shakespeare introduces doubt, because the lovers they mention, such as Troilus, Thisbe and Dido, all suffered tragic or faithless love. This subtle allusion suggests

Question number

that romantic harmony is fragile. Lorenzo's speech on music, warning that the man who "hath no music in himself" is "fit for treasons", celebrates order and beauty, but it may also remind the audience of the absent Shylock, who earlier ordered his house shut against the sound of revelry.

The ring plot provides a comic and successful ending to the romantic strand. Portia and Nerissa pretend outrage at their husbands for giving away their rings, and Portia teases Bassanio that "by this ring the doctor lay with me". The sexual joke and the eventual revelation of their disguise bring the kind of unravelling of mistaken identity that Shakespeare's audiences expected at the end of a comedy. Portia also gives Antonio the news that three of his argosies "are richly come to harbour suddenly", a sudden piece of good fortune that seems almost magical.

Yet Antonio remains alone at the end, without a partner, and Jessica says little in Act 5 once she has made her escape. Nerissa's reference to the "special deed of gift" from "the rich Jew" reminds the audience that the happiness of Belmont is partly paid for with Shylock's wealth. Gratiano's bawdy closing couplet about "keeping safe Nerissa's ring" ends the play on laughter, but it is laughter that pushes uncomfortable questions aside.

Overall, I agree that Acts 4 and 5 draw the play to a successful ending in terms of structure and genre: the threat is defeated, the lovers are united and the plot strands are neatly tied. However, I do not think it is wholly successful as a moral ending. Shakespeare gives Shylock such human, painful moments that the final celebration in Belmont feels incomplete, and this unease is perhaps what makes the play so powerful today.

Question number

16

The character I admire most in The Merchant of Venice is Portia. In a play dominated by men, money and law, Shakespeare presents her as the most intelligent, witty and resourceful person on stage, a woman who accepts the limits of a patriarchal society in public while quietly finding ways to outwit it. She is not flawless, and some of her remarks reveal the prejudices of her world, but her wit, her loyalty and her rescue of Antonio make her the true hero of the play.

From her first appearance, Shakespeare makes her engaging. Her opening line, "my little body is aweary of this great world", contrasts "little" and "great" to suggest a woman who feels small and trapped, and it immediately echoes Antonio's sadness in the first scene. The reason is her father's will: she complains that "the will of a living daughter" is "curbed by the will of a dead father". The repetition of "will", meaning both desire and legal testament, shows Shakespeare's wordplay and captures her situation exactly. In Elizabethan England, a daughter of a wealthy family was expected to obey her father in marriage, and Portia's decision to honour the casket test even after his death shows a dutiful loyalty that the original audience would have admired. What I admire is that she obeys without losing her spirit.

That spirit is clearest in her wit. In prose conversation with Nerissa, she mocks her suitors one by one, describing the Neapolitan prince who does nothing but talk of his horse and the drunken German. These sharp, comic portraits show a mind that sees through status and pretension. It is true that her comment after the Prince of Morocco fails, "let all of his complexion choose me so", is uncomfortable for a modern audience, and it reminds us that she shares the racial prejudices of her time. However, this flaw makes her a more realistic character rather than an idealised one.

Question number

Portia is also admirable in love. When Bassanio chooses the lead casket, her speech, "You see me, Lord Bassanio, where I stand, / Such as I am", is humble and generous. She calls herself "an unlessoned girl, unschooled, unpractised", a tricolon that sounds modest but is deeply ironic, since she will soon prove herself better schooled in the law than all the men of Venice. She gives Bassanio herself, her house and her servants, saying that all that is hers "is now converted" to him. In a society where a wife's property passed to her husband, this is a formal surrender of power, yet she gives the ring with a warning, which shows she has not entirely given up control.

Her greatest moment is the trial scene. When she hears that Antonio is in danger, she does not wait for the men to solve the problem; she disguises herself as the lawyer Balthazar and travels to Venice. For an Elizabethan audience, a woman entering the male world of the law would have been startling, and the dramatic irony of her disguise lets the audience enjoy her cleverness while Bassanio and Antonio are unaware. Her speech "The quality of mercy is not strained" is the moral centre of the play. The image that mercy "droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven" presents it as natural and divine, and her argument that it blesses both "him that gives and him that takes" shows genuine wisdom, not just cleverness. I admire that she gives Shylock every chance to choose mercy before turning the law against him with "Tarry a little; there is something else".

Some readers find her treatment of Shylock harsh, especially as the judgement strips him of his wealth and forces his conversion. This is a fair criticism. However, Shakespeare's Christian audience would have seen Portia's actions as just, and it is Antonio and the Duke, rather than Portia, who impose the forced conversion. Within the values of the play, she saves an innocent life by using the very literalism Shylock relied upon.

Question number

Finally, Portia's control of the ring plot in Act 5 shows her playfulness and her shrewdness. By testing Bassanio's loyalty and teasing him before revealing the truth, she reminds him, and the audience, that she is his equal. She also brings news that Antonio's ships are safe, so that she becomes the source of almost every happy outcome in the play.

Overall, I admire Portia because Shakespeare shows her turning the limits placed on women into opportunities. Bound by her father, confined to Belmont and barred from the professions, she nonetheless becomes the cleverest, most compassionate voice in the play. Her flaws make her human, but her wit and courage make her unforgettable.

17 Austen presents Lady Catherine de Bourgh as a woman whose need to control others is total, reaching from Charlotte's poultry to Darcy's choice of wife. Yet the more she tries to command, the more ridiculous she becomes, and her final attempt at control produces the very marriage she wants to prevent. Through her, Austen satirises an aristocracy that mistakes rank for wisdom, in a Regency society where birth still claimed the right to rule.

Lady Catherine's control is first shown indirectly, through the people who depend on her. Mr Collins owes his living at Hunsford to her patronage, and his speech is full of her. He even marries because she has told him to, proposing to Elizabeth and then to Charlotte within days, as though choosing a wife were simply another way of obeying his patroness. His praise of her "affability and condescension" is comic, because he admires as kindness what is really a reminder of her superiority. Austen structures the novel so that we hear about Lady Catherine long before we

Question number

meet her, and the build up makes her actual appearance feel like the arrival of a monarch at court.

At Rosings, her control becomes a matter of conversation itself. Austen's narrator notes that she delivers her opinions in a way that shows she is used to "dictating to others", and she instructs Charlotte on "the care of her cows and her poultry". The comic bathos of these details is deliberate: an earl's daughter applies her authority to the smallest domestic matters, finding "fault with the arrangement of the furniture" in someone else's home. Her boast that if she had ever learnt music she would have been "a great proficient" is a perfect piece of Austen's irony, since it shows a woman so sure of her own superiority that she claims credit for a skill she has never practised. Even her generosity is a form of command: she offers Elizabeth the piano in Mrs Jenkinson's room, where "She would be in nobody's way", which places Elizabeth firmly among the servants and embarrasses even Darcy.

Austen also shows how this control damages those closest to her. Anne de Bourgh is pale, sickly and silent; she never speaks directly in the novel. Her silence is a structural comment: the daughter has been so completely managed that she has no voice of her own. Lady Catherine's plan that Anne will marry Darcy treats both young people as pieces in a family arrangement, reflecting a period in which aristocratic marriages were often used to keep estates and wealth together.

The climax of her controlling nature is her visit to Longbourn in the third volume. Her language becomes absolute and imperious: "This match, to which you have the presumption to aspire, can never take place." The modal certainty of "can never" and the insulting noun "presumption" show that she believes she can forbid the future simply by declaring it. She reminds Elizabeth that she is "not to be trifled

Question number

with" and asks, with outrage, whether "the shades of Pemberley" are to be "thus polluted". The metaphor of pollution reveals her view of class as a kind of purity, with Elizabeth's family imagined as a stain. However, Elizabeth's calm refusal exposes the limits of this power. She insists she will act only as will "constitute my happiness, without reference to you", and her reply that Lady Catherine has "insulted me in every possible way" turns the older woman's rank against her, since true good breeding is shown by Elizabeth, not by the aristocrat. Earlier Lady Catherine had been startled that Elizabeth would give her opinion "very decidedly for so young a person"; now that same independence defeats her completely.

Structurally, Austen gives Lady Catherine a final ironic twist. When she reports the conversation to Darcy, hoping to end the attachment, she instead shows him that Elizabeth has not ruled him out, and this gives him the hope to propose again. Her controlling impulse therefore becomes the instrument of the happy ending, and Austen's comedy rewards the heroine who refuses to be controlled.

Context deepens this satire. Austen, writing from the gentry rather than the nobility, uses Lady Catherine to mock the assumption that title and wealth bring authority. It is also significant that Lady Catherine, unlike Mrs Bennet, holds property in her own right and declares there is no need to entail estates away from the female line, so Austen shows that power in a woman's hands is not automatically wiser than in a man's. Ultimately, Lady Catherine is presented as controlling yet powerless where it matters, because Austen's novel values judgement and character above rank.

18 Austen originally called her novel First Impressions, and the whole book can be read as a test of how far appearances can be trusted. She shows that almost

Question number

every character judges by surfaces, and that even her intelligent heroine is deceived. The novel suggests that reality is only reached through time, evidence and honest self-examination, a view that fits Austen's preference for reason over the impulsive feeling celebrated by many writers of her age.

The opening sentence immediately warns the reader not to accept things at face value. "It is a truth universally acknowledged" sounds like a solemn statement of fact, but the irony is that the "truth" is really the wishful thinking of mothers like Mrs Bennet. From the first line, Austen teaches us to listen for the gap between what is said and what is real.

The Meryton assembly then sets up the central misjudgement. Darcy's appearance first wins admiration, but his manners quickly turn opinion against him, and his remark that Elizabeth is "tolerable, but not handsome enough to tempt me" fixes him in her mind as arrogant. Soon she calls him "the proudest, most disagreeable man in the world". Austen's use of free indirect discourse places us inside Elizabeth's perspective, so the reader shares her prejudice and is misled along with her. Darcy, too, is wrong about Elizabeth, and Austen structures his change subtly: within chapters he is noticing "a pair of fine eyes", showing that a first verdict can be quietly reversed by closer attention.

Wickham is the clearest example of the gap between appearance and reality. He has a handsome face and "very pleasing address", and his account of Darcy's cruelty is believed because it flatters what Elizabeth already wants to think. Austen's form as a novel of manners is important here: in a society governed by polite behaviour, a charming manner can easily pass for good character. When Darcy's letter reveals Wickham's attempt to elope with Georgiana for her fortune, Elizabeth is forced to admit that he had "all the appearance of goodness". The

Question number

noun "appearance" is pointed, as it concedes that goodness was only a costume.

The letter itself is a key structural device. By shifting from dialogue to a long written document, Austen allows Darcy to present the facts calmly, and Elizabeth to reread them. Reality, the novel suggests, comes from reflection rather than first reactions. Her response is the moral turning point of the book: "Till this moment I never knew myself." The short, absolute sentence shows that the deepest gap between appearance and reality lay within Elizabeth, whose pride in her own perception was itself a form of blindness.

Pemberley then confirms the truth. Austen describes the estate as a place where natural beauty had been "so little counteracted by an awkward taste", and the house becomes a metaphor for its owner: substantial, tasteful and without false display. The housekeeper's warm praise offers testimony from someone who has known Darcy all his life, which carries more weight than the gossip of a ballroom. Austen thus moves from the public, performative space of Meryton to the private, honest space of a home, and Elizabeth's judgement moves with it.

The theme is reinforced through minor characters. Mrs Bennet is obsessed with appearances, yet her vulgarity damages her daughters' prospects, and Lydia's elopement with Wickham shows the real danger of trusting charm. Charlotte Lucas claims that "Happiness in marriage is entirely a matter of chance", and her marriage to Collins suggests a deliberate choice to ignore reality for security, a choice made understandable by the economic position of women without fortune in Austen's time. By contrast, Jane and Bingley are exactly what they seem, though Jane's habit of thinking well of everyone shows that excessive trust in appearances can be its own kind of error.

Question number

Overall, Austen agrees that first impressions do not always reflect the truth, but she does not dismiss them entirely: Elizabeth's dislike of Darcy's pride was partly justified, and he too must change. The novel's real lesson is that judgement must be tested, revised and grounded in evidence, which is why its final title, borrowed from Fanny Burney's Cecilia, names the two faults that most distort what we see.

19 Magwitch changes from a figure of terror into one of the most loving and morally redeemed characters in Great Expectations. However, Dickens suggests that the deepest change is not in Magwitch himself but in how Pip, and the reader, see him. Through this, Dickens challenges Victorian assumptions that criminals are born wicked and that gentility is a matter of money and manners.

Magwitch's first appearance is pure Gothic horror. He bursts from among the graves with the command "Hold your noise!", and Pip describes "A fearful man, all in coarse grey" who "limped, and shivered, and glared, and growled". The list of verbs, joined by repeated "and", builds an almost animal portrait, and the final "growled" makes him sound like a beast rather than a man. Setting this meeting in a churchyard on the marshes, among the graves of Pip's family, ties Magwitch from the start to death and fear. His threats, demanding that Pip bring "wittles" and a file, are delivered in rough dialect that marks his low class. Yet Dickens plants hints of something more. Magwitch is shivering and starving, and when he is recaptured he lies to protect Pip, claiming he stole the food himself from the blacksmith's. This small act of loyalty suggests that his violence is the product of desperation rather than cruelty.

Structurally, Dickens then removes Magwitch for most of the novel. He is transported to Australia, and Pip's rise to gentility unfolds without any knowledge

Question number

of who is paying for it. This absence is essential to the novel's design, because it allows Pip and the reader to assume, as Pip does, that Miss Havisham is his benefactor. When Magwitch returns in the third stage of the novel, the revelation is shattering. He has worked as a sheep farmer and made his fortune, and he declares with pride, "I've made a gentleman on you!" His love is real, as he calls Pip "dear boy" and tells him he is "more to me nor any son", but his manners are still coarse, and Pip feels only disgust, saying his repugnance could not have been greater "if he had been some terrible beast". The irony is sharp: Pip, the supposed gentleman, behaves with less feeling than the convict.

Magwitch's own account of his life, told under the name Provis, deepens the reader's sympathy. His summary of his past, "In jail and out of jail, in jail and out of jail", uses repetition to suggest a cycle he never had the power to break. His earliest memory is of stealing turnips to survive. Dickens uses this narrative to criticise a society that punished poverty rather than relieving it. The contrast with Compeyson makes the point clear: at their trial, Compeyson's gentlemanly appearance earns him a lighter sentence, while Magwitch is judged by his rough exterior. Dickens, who saw how the Victorian legal system favoured respectability, exposes the hypocrisy of judging by class.

In the final stage, Magwitch's change becomes a kind of redemption. He risks execution by returning to England, which shows that his love for Pip outweighs his own safety. After the failed escape on the Thames, he is injured, tried and condemned, but he faces death with dignity. Pip's attitude transforms at the same time: he holds Magwitch's hand, visits him daily and recognises in him "a much better man than I had been to Joe". The deathbed scene, in which Pip tells him that his lost daughter is alive and is a beautiful lady, and that he loves her, gives Magwitch peace. Pip's prayer, "O Lord, be merciful to him a sinner!", echoes the

Question number

parable of the publican and the Pharisee, reminding Victorian readers that humility and repentance matter more than social standing.

Context adds force to this transformation. The Hulks and transportation were real features of the early nineteenth century in which the novel is set, and Dickens was openly critical of institutional brutality. Magwitch's success in Australia also reflects the period's fascination with the self-made man, yet Dickens suggests that wealth alone cannot make a gentleman, since Magwitch's true worth lies in his loyalty and love.

In conclusion, Magwitch changes from a terrifying outcast to a faithful, almost saintly father figure. Yet by the end, the reader senses that he was never as monstrous as the frightened child believed. Dickens uses him to show that real gentility is a matter of the heart, a lesson Pip learns only when it is almost too late.

20 In Great Expectations, settings are never just backgrounds: they mirror Pip's inner life and carry Dickens's judgement on Victorian society. The marshes and forge represent humble honesty, Satis House represents the false glamour of wealth and the poison of the past, and London represents both the opportunities and the corruption of the modern city. As Pip moves between these places, the reader traces his moral journey from innocence through snobbery to understanding.

The novel opens in the churchyard on the marshes, a "bleak place overgrown with nettles". Pip recalls realising that "the dark flat wilderness beyond the churchyard" was the marshes, and the accumulation of bleak adjectives creates a desolate, Gothic atmosphere. It is significant that Pip first gains his sense of identity

Question number

among the gravestones of his parents, as if he begins life an orphan in a hostile world. The prison ship nearby, "like a wicked Noah's ark", uses a religious simile ironically: instead of a vessel of salvation, it is a floating prison. Yet this is where Pip's fortune secretly begins, since it is the escaped convict who will later fund his expectations. Dickens thus suggests from the outset that respectability and criminality are more closely bound than Victorian society liked to admit.

The forge, by contrast, is plain and warm. Pip describes "a wooden house, as many in our country were", a simple phrase that places him firmly in the working class. Joe's forge, with its fire and honest labour, is associated with goodness, even though the kitchen is also the scene where Mrs Joe brought Pip up "by hand", harshly and with the Tickler. Once Pip has seen Satis House, however, the forge changes in his eyes, and he admits that "under its influence I continued at heart to hate my trade and to be ashamed of home". The setting has not changed; Pip has. Dickens uses the retrospective first-person narrative here powerfully, as the older Pip looks back with regret on his younger self's contempt.

Satis House is the novel's most symbolic setting. Its name, from the Latin for "enough", is bitterly ironic, since no one in it is satisfied. The clocks stopped at "twenty minutes to nine", the rotting wedding feast, and the house "dismal" with "many iron bars" turn Miss Havisham's home into a prison of her own making. Pip notices that the passages were "all dark", lit only by candles, which shuts out daylight, time and life itself. Dickens repeats the word "strange", describing "the strange house and the strange life", to show Pip's bewilderment as he is drawn into a world of decay that looks like wealth. For a Victorian reader, Satis House, beside its derelict brewery, also suggests a gentry class living off old money and frozen in the past.

Question number

London offers Pip the gentility he craves, but Dickens immediately undercuts its glamour. One of the first places he sees is the area near Newgate and Smithfield, a "shameful place" all "asmear with filth and fat and blood and foam" that "seemed to stick to me". The verb "stick" foreshadows how the corruption of the city, and of the money funding him, will cling to Pip. Dickens, who was deeply critical of public executions and prisons, makes London a place where crime and law sit side by side, most clearly in Jaggers's office in Little Britain. By contrast, Wemmick's home in Walworth, his little "Castle" with its drawbridge and the Aged Parent, shows a man who keeps his warmth separate from his work. This split setting suggests the divided self that modern city life demands.

When Joe visits London, he says he is "wrong in these clothes" and "wrong out of the forge", recognising that people belong where they can be themselves. Pip only understands this after his fortune collapses and he returns to the forge, nursed back to health by Joe.

The ending brings the structure full circle. Pip returns to the site of Satis House to find "no house now", only "the wall of the old garden". The garden imagery recalls Eden, and as Pip leads Estella out of "the ruined place", he sees "no shadow of another parting from her". The destruction of the house suggests that the false expectations it represented have finally been cleared away, allowing a humbler, more honest future.

Overall, Dickens uses settings to dramatise the gap between appearance and worth. The novel's most impressive spaces are morally empty, while its humblest, the forge and Wemmick's Castle, hold the truest values.

Question number

21

In The Scarlet Letter, Hawthorne explores forgiveness as something a rigid society almost entirely withholds, but which individuals struggle, and often fail, to grant to one another and to themselves. The Puritan community punishes rather than forgives; Chillingworth refuses to forgive; Dimmesdale cannot forgive himself; and Hester, the most wronged, becomes the novel's truest example of mercy. Through these contrasts, Hawthorne, writing in 1850 about seventeenth-century Boston, questions a religion that preached grace but practised judgement.

The novel opens by showing a community in which forgiveness seems impossible. The prison door, with its iron spikes, and the crowd of stern women outside the jail establish a setting of punishment. Some of the women believe Hester should be branded on the forehead or even put to death, and the scaffold scene turns her shame into public spectacle. In a colony where religion and law were one, adultery was a crime as well as a sin, and Hawthorne implies that the Puritans confused their own severity with God's justice. Yet even here there is a glimmer of compassion. One onlooker remarks that, whatever Hester does, "the pang of it will be always in her heart", which suggests an understanding that her suffering is inward and lasting, and perhaps deserves mercy.

Chillingworth's meeting with Hester in prison introduces a more complicated idea. He admits his own fault in marrying a young woman: "We have wronged each other." This balanced phrase suggests a moment of forgiveness, and he says he seeks no revenge against Hester herself. However, his forgiveness has a sinister limit. He vows to discover her partner, and his long torment of Dimmesdale shows that refusing to forgive can destroy the one who refuses. Hawthorne charts his transformation physically, as his face grows darker and more twisted, so that his lack of forgiveness becomes visible evil. When Hester later begs him to let go of his vengeance, he answers fatalistically, "Let the black flower blossom as it may!"

Question number

The image of a dark flower suggests that his hatred has grown naturally from the wrong done to him, but that he has chosen to cultivate rather than uproot it.

Dimmesdale's struggle is with self-forgiveness. Because he hides his sin, he cannot be publicly pardoned, and so he punishes himself in private with fasting, vigils and a "bloody scourge". Hawthorne uses his midnight vigil on the scaffold to show this inner torment, as he stands where Hester stood but in darkness, where no one can see. When Pearl asks him to stand with them in daylight, he says he will do so only at the great judgement day, which shows he believes forgiveness can come only from God. The irony is that his people revere him more each time he calls himself a sinner, so his false confession only deepens his guilt.

The forest scene brings forgiveness to the centre of the novel. When Hester reveals that Chillingworth is her husband, Dimmesdale is at first furious with her for keeping the secret, but he relents and forgives her. Hester's claim that "What we did had a consecration of its own" offers a radical alternative to Puritan law, suggesting that love itself might sanctify their act. Hawthorne places this moment in the forest, a wild space outside the colony's control, as if forgiveness and freedom can only exist beyond the reach of its rules.

The climax resolves the theme through confession. Dimmesdale finally stands on the scaffold with Hester and Pearl in daylight, and Chillingworth's cry, "Thou hast escaped me!", shows that confession has freed him from the man who would not forgive. Dimmesdale's words to him, "May God forgive thee! Thou, too, hast deeply sinned!", show that he has passed from self-hatred to mercy, even for his tormentor. Structurally, Hawthorne makes the three scaffold scenes chart a movement from public shame, through hidden guilt, to open confession and release.

Question number

Hester, meanwhile, earns a different kind of forgiveness through her life. Her charity leads many to say the letter stands for "Able", and she is eventually regarded with reverence. Strikingly, she chooses to return and wear the letter even when no one demands it, which suggests she no longer seeks the colony's pardon. Her forgiveness of the community that shamed her is shown through her quiet help to other suffering women.

Ultimately, Hawthorne, whose own ancestor had been a harsh Puritan judge, presents forgiveness as more Christian than the punishment the Puritans imposed. Those who forgive, like Hester and finally Dimmesdale, are released, while Chillingworth, who refuses, withers away soon after his victim's death.

22 Hester Prynne is the character whose suffering is most visible in The Scarlet Letter, but I would argue that Arthur Dimmesdale suffers the most. Hester's punishment is public, and because it is public it can be endured, answered and eventually transformed. Dimmesdale's guilt is hidden, and Hawthorne presents secret sin as a slow poison that corrodes body, mind and soul. Through him, Hawthorne suggests that a society obsessed with outward purity drives its most respected members into the worst private torment.

From the first scaffold scene, Hawthorne builds dramatic irony around Dimmesdale's position. As Hester stands with Pearl before the crowd, it is her own lover, the young minister, who is called on to urge her to name the father. His appeal is eloquent and trembling, and the reader later realises that he is pleading for his own exposure while lacking the courage to confess. Hester's silence protects him, but it also traps him. In a Puritan colony where ministers were treated almost as living saints, confession would mean the loss of everything, and

Question number

Hawthorne shows how this pressure keeps him silent for seven years.

Dimmesdale's suffering is then dramatised through his body. He grows pale and thin, and his habit of pressing his hand over his heart becomes a recurring gesture that symbolises the hidden letter he carries. Hawthorne's narrator describes how "a terrible machinery had been brought to bear" on his well-being, and the mechanical metaphor suggests a torture that grinds on relentlessly. His private penance is extreme: he fasts, keeps long vigils and lashes himself with a "bloody scourge". Hawthorne's Gothic form allows the reader to see this torment as almost supernatural, culminating in the hint of a mark on his chest.

His suffering is intensified by Chillingworth, who becomes his physician and lives with him. The name "leech", used for doctors at the time, gains a horrible double meaning, as Chillingworth feeds on Dimmesdale's misery. Unlike Hester, who at least knows her enemy, Dimmesdale does not know that the man probing his heart is the husband he has wronged. This is a uniquely cruel situation: his closest companion is his tormentor, and every act of care is secretly an act of revenge.

The irony of his public life adds to his pain. The more he calls himself a sinner from the pulpit, the more his congregation reveres him, taking his words as the humility of a saint. Hawthorne shows that his attempts at truth only deepen his lie, so he becomes, in his own eyes, a hypocrite twice over. In the forest he tells Hester, "Happy are you, Hester, that wear the scarlet letter openly upon your bosom! Mine burns in secret!" The contrast between "openly" and "in secret", and the fiery verb "burns", sum up the argument that hidden guilt is more painful than open shame.

By contrast, Hester's suffering, though great, gives her strength. She is shunned,

Question number

raises Pearl alone and watches the minister decline, but her letter also frees her to think independently, and through her charity many come to read it as "Able". Pearl suffers too, as an isolated child whom other children reject, yet she has her mother's love and is finally released into a happy, wealthy life. Chillingworth's suffering is real at first, as a husband who returns to find his wife has betrayed him, but his pain becomes chosen malice. Dimmesdale's alone has no outlet.

Structurally, Hawthorne makes his three scaffold scenes trace Dimmesdale's journey. In the first he looks down on Hester from the balcony among her judges; in the second, the midnight vigil, he stands where she stood but in darkness, crying out where no one will answer; in the third, after the Election Sermon, he climbs the scaffold in daylight with Hester and Pearl and confesses. Only then does his suffering end, and he dies in Hester's arms after Pearl kisses him. His release through confession, and the narrator's moral, "Be true! Be true! Be true!", make his story the clearest lesson of the novel.

Hawthorne, whose ancestor John Hathorne was a judge in the Salem witch trials, was deeply aware of the cruelty of Puritan certainty. Through Dimmesdale he suggests that such a culture not only punishes the openly sinful but tortures those who must hide. That is why, although Hester is the novel's heroine, Dimmesdale is the character who suffers the most.