Please check the examination details below before entering your candidate information

Candidate surname	Other names

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE (9–1)

Centre Number | Candidate Number

Time 1 hour 30 minutes

Paper reference **4ET1/02**

English Literature

PAPER 2: Modern Drama and Literary Heritage Texts

You must have:
Question Booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **ONE** question from each section.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided
  – *there may be more space than you need.*

Information

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

Advice

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

Turn over ▶

P65910A

©2021 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1/1

P 6 5 9 1 0 A 0 1 1 6

Pearson

stemup.co.uk

SECTION A: Modern Drama

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

Chosen question number:

Question 1 ☒	**Question 2** ☒	**Question 3** ☒
Question 4 ☒	**Question 5** ☒	**Question 6** ☒
Question 7 ☒	**Question 8** ☒	**Question 9** ☒
Question 10 ☒		

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

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

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

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

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

stemup.co.uk

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

stemup.co.uk

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS

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

stemup.co.uk

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

SECTION B: Literary Heritage Texts

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** ☒

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

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 your Answer Booklet.
Clean copies of your set texts may be taken into the examination.

Turn over ▶

P65910A

©2021 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1/1

P 6 5 9 1 0 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

stemup.co.uk

SECTION A: Modern Drama

Answer ONE question on ONE text from this section.

You should spend 45 minutes on your chosen question.

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

EITHER

1 How is Catherine presented in the play?

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

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 Discuss the significance of the title *A View from the Bridge*.

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

(Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)

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

EITHER

3 Mr Birling: 'Look, Inspector – I'd give thousands – yes, thousands.'

Explore the importance of reputation in *An Inspector Calls*.

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

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 How does Priestley present the character of Inspector Goole in the play?

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

(Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

stemup.co.uk

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

EITHER

5 How does Christopher develop as the play progresses?

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

(Total for Question 5 = 30 marks)

OR

6 Explore the theme of love 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 Discuss the importance of truth in *Kindertransport*.

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

(Total for Question 7 = 30 marks)

OR

8 How is Eva/Evelyn presented 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 is Olunde presented as a respected character in the play?

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

(Total for Question 9 = 30 marks)

OR

10 Iyaloja: 'We called you leader and oh, how you led us on...'

Explore the theme of leadership in *Death and the King's Horseman*.

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

(Total for Question 10 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS

stemup.co.uk

SECTION B: Literary Heritage Texts

Answer ONE question on ONE text from this section.

You should spend 45 minutes on your chosen question.

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

EITHER

11 How does Shakespeare present the relationship between Juliet and her father, Lord Capulet?

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 Prologue: 'From ancient grudge break to new mutiny.'

Explore the significance of the feud 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 12 = 30 marks)

***Macbeth*, William Shakespeare**

EITHER

13 Lennox (talking of Duncan's guards): 'No man's life was to be trusted with them.'

Discuss the theme of trust 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 How does Macbeth change as the play progresses?

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

(Total for Question 14 = 30 marks)

stemup.co.uk

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

EITHER

15 In what ways is the relationship between Shylock and Antonio presented in this play?

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 Shylock: 'If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die? And if you wrong us, shall we not revenge?'

Explore the theme of revenge 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 Mr Collins' relationships with other characters 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 17 = 30 marks)

OR

18 Discuss women's attitudes to marriage in the novel.

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 Dickens present Pip 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 Discuss the theme of ambition 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 Explore the significance of the symbol of the scarlet letter in the novel.

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 'Roger Chillingworth is presented as wholly evil in *The Scarlet Letter*.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

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

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

Miller presents Catherine as a young woman caught on the threshold between childhood and adulthood, and much of the tragedy grows from the fact that Eddie cannot allow her to cross it. At the start she is innocent, affectionate and eager to please; by the end she has found a voice sharp enough to condemn the man who raised her. Yet Miller refuses to make her simply a victim or simply a rebel, because even in the final moments she is still reaching out to Eddie with love and guilt.

In the opening scenes Catherine is presented through the eyes of the household as a girl who is being watched. Eddie's comments on her new skirt and the way she walks show that her body is already a source of tension, even though Catherine herself seems unaware of what his attention means. Her eagerness to win his approval is touching: she lights his cigar, fusses over him, and promises that with her first wages she will "buy all new dishes" for the house. The domestic detail is important, because it shows that Catherine imagines her independence as a gift to the family rather than a break from it. At the same time Miller makes clear that she is capable and intelligent. She is "the best student in the whole class" and is offered a job before she has finished her course, so the audience sees that her future is real and that Eddie's resistance is about something other than her readiness.

Beatrice's support is crucial in shaping how we see Catherine. When Beatrice urges her, "Be the way you are, Katie, don't listen to him", the imperatives suggest that Catherine's natural self is being suppressed by Eddie's control. Beatrice becomes a kind of guide, pushing her towards womanhood, and this triangle of aunt, niece

Question number

and uncle structures much of Act One. Catherine's own insistence that she is "not a baby" shows her beginning to resist the role Eddie has fixed for her, although at this stage her protests are still softened by affection.

The arrival of Rodolpho transforms her. Miller's stage direction that she speaks to him "wondrously" captures a sudden, almost childlike enchantment, and when he sings "Paper Doll" she is "enthralled". The song title is quietly ironic: Eddie would like Catherine to remain a paper doll, something pretty and lifeless that he can keep, but Rodolpho's singing awakens her. Her questions to Eddie about why he dislikes Rodolpho show a new willingness to challenge him, and Miller uses these exchanges to make the audience aware of the gap between what Eddie says and what he feels.

The emotional centre of Catherine's development comes at the start of Act Two, when she asks Rodolpho whether he would still marry her if they had to live in Italy. This scene is significant because it shows that she has absorbed Eddie's suspicion that Rodolpho only wants a passport; she is testing the man she loves with doubts that are not really her own. When she finally admits her fear and confusion, her language collapses into urgent imperatives: "Teach me. I don't know anything, teach me, Rodolpho, hold me." The repetition of "teach me" is double edged. It shows her vulnerability and inexperience, but it also shows her choosing for herself, asking for an adult relationship instead of waiting for Eddie's permission. Structurally, this choice is followed immediately by Eddie's drunken return and the kisses, so her step into womanhood becomes the catalyst for the violence that follows.

Catherine's horror when the Immigration officers arrive marks the final break. The stage direction that she "stands a moment staring at Eddie in a realized horror" is

Question number

powerful because it is wordless: the audience watches the knowledge settle on her face before she can speak it. Her later outburst, "You got no more right to tell nobody nothin'! Nobody!", uses multiple negatives and exclamation to show a fury that is finally unrestrained. The girl who once wanted to buy new dishes now denounces Eddie in public, and Miller suggests that his betrayal has destroyed the family she tried so hard to please.

Yet Miller does not leave Catherine in simple anger. At the end she is shown pleading with Eddie, and her words, "Eddie, I never meant to do nothing bad to you", reveal that she still carries guilt and love for him. This is perhaps the most painful aspect of her presentation: although Eddie is responsible for his own downfall, Catherine blames herself, which shows how deeply she has internalised his view of her. Through Catherine, then, Miller explores how love can become possessive and destructive, and how a young woman's growth into independence can be treated as a betrayal by those who cannot let her go. She ends the play no longer a child, but scarred by the cost of becoming an adult.

2 The title A View from the Bridge is significant because it points to perspective: the play is not simply Eddie Carbone's story, but Eddie's story as seen, judged and mourned by someone standing slightly above and outside it. The "bridge" can be read literally, as Brooklyn Bridge overlooking Red Hook, but also figuratively, as the bridges between cultures, between people, and between childhood and adulthood that the characters try, and often fail, to cross. Miller's title invites the audience to share that elevated view, seeing the tragedy coming long before Eddie does.

The most obvious meaning lies in the setting. Alfieri opens by describing Red Hook as "the slum that faces the bay on the seaward side of Brooklyn Bridge", and

Question number

immediately adds a startling metaphor: "This is the gullet of New York swallowing the tonnage of the world." The image of a throat devouring cargo presents the neighbourhood as hungry and brutal, a place where men like Eddie work on the docks and where goods, and illegal immigrants, are absorbed into America. The bridge looms over this community, connecting it to the wealthier city but also reminding the audience that the people below live in its shadow.

More importantly, Alfieri himself is the bridge. As an Italian American lawyer he stands between two systems of justice: the written law of America and the older, unwritten codes of honour that the immigrants have brought from Sicily. He explains that he could have "finished the whole story" long before it ended, which reveals his role as a narrator who already knows the outcome. In this sense, the "view" from the bridge is his: he sees the whole pattern of events from a position of understanding, but cannot change them. His description of himself as "powerless" to stop the story running its "bloody course" is crucial, because it shows that knowledge and distance bring no control. Miller seems to suggest that the lawyer's bridge between cultures is fragile; when Eddie asks for help, Alfieri can only tell him that the law offers nothing.

Formally, Alfieri works like the Chorus in a Greek tragedy, and the title reinforces this classical framing. His language often uses foreshadowing, as when he tells the audience that "there was a trouble that would not go away", making the progress of the plot feel inevitable. The phrase "a view from the bridge" also echoes the bridge of a ship, from which the captain looks down and sees the whole course ahead. The audience is placed in that same position: through Alfieri's interruptions we stand above the action and watch Eddie move towards a fate he cannot see.

The title can also be read through relationships. Beatrice tries to bridge the

Question number

growing distance between Eddie and Catherine, protecting her niece while trying to save her marriage. Her question, "What're you gonna stand over her till she's forty?", exposes Eddie's possessiveness while still speaking to him as a wife. Catherine, too, tries to build a bridge between Eddie and Rodolpho, repeatedly asking what he has against him. Yet every attempt fails, and the structure of the play shows bridges collapsing one by one. When Beatrice tells Catherine she must leave and become a woman, the stage direction that she is "at the edge of tears, as though a familiar world had shattered" captures the painful crossing from girlhood into adulthood, another bridge in the play.

The most destructive failure is the clash between American and Sicilian values. Eddie's phone call to the Immigration Bureau is legal under American law but unforgivable under the community's code, as the earlier story of Vinny Bolzano has warned. Marco spits in Eddie's face, and Eddie's desperate demand for his "name" shows that he is torn between two worlds and belongs fully to neither. His death, stabbed with his own knife, is the point at which the two cultures crash together with no bridge left between them.

Finally, the title suggests a moral perspective. In his closing speech Alfieri admits that "most of the time now we settle for half", yet he confesses that he mourns Eddie, who "allowed himself to be wholly known". From the bridge, Alfieri can see that Eddie was wrong, but also that there was something grand in his refusal to compromise. Miller therefore leaves the audience with a double view, judging Eddie while also feeling the pity and fear of tragedy. The title is significant because it is the play's lens: it asks us not just what happened, but how we should see it.

3 In An Inspector Calls, reputation matters more to the older characters than truth,

Question number

conscience or human life. Priestley shows that the Birlings and Gerald are constantly performing respectability, and the Inspector's visit exposes that performance as a fragile shell covering selfishness and cruelty. Mr Birling's desperate offer, "I'd give thousands", is the clearest sign of this: when faced with a girl's death, his instinct is not grief but damage control. Through this, Priestley suggests that a society which values reputation above responsibility is morally hollow.

From the opening scene, Mr Birling is anxious to secure his social position. He tells Gerald that the port is "the same port your father gets", a small detail which reveals his insecurity about being a self-made businessman marrying his daughter into the landed Croft family. He boasts that there is "a fair chance that I might find my way into the next Honours List", and the cautious hedging of "a fair chance" and "might" suggests he is both eager and nervous, as if a knighthood would finally confirm his status. Even the engagement is partly about public standing: he looks forward to the Crofts and Birlings working together for "lower costs and higher prices", turning his daughter's happiness into a business merger. The stage direction at the start describing the dining room as substantial but not cosy suggests the same idea: the house is built to impress, not to comfort.

Mrs Birling's concern with reputation takes the form of social etiquette. When her husband compliments the cook she corrects him "reproachfully" with "Arthur, you're not supposed to say such things", showing that she polices class boundaries even at the dinner table. Later her response to the news that Alderman Meggarty is a "notorious womanizer" is shock, not because a girl was exploited, but because a man of standing has behaved badly. Priestley uses dramatic irony here, since the audience is moments away from discovering that her own son has behaved in a similar way.

Question number

As the investigation progresses, the threat to reputation becomes the Birlings' main fear. Mr Birling repeatedly tries to intimidate the Inspector by mentioning his friendship with the Chief Constable and his position as a former Lord Mayor, using status as a shield. When Eric's involvement is revealed, his first concern is that there will be a public scandal, and his offer of "thousands" shows that he believes money can buy silence. The repetition of "thousands" sounds frantic, and it is grimly ironic: he refused Eva a rise of a few shillings, yet will pay any amount to protect his name. Priestley suggests that capitalism measures human beings in money, and Birling's values are exposed as both cruel and absurd.

Mrs Birling is even more rigid. Her declaration "I accept no blame for it at all" and her defiant "You have no power to make me change my mind" show a woman who would rather deny the truth than admit fault. Her comment that a girl "of that sort" would never refuse money reveals how her sense of her own respectability depends on looking down on others. The structure of Act Two is masterful here: she insists that the father of the child should be made an example of, only for the Inspector to let her condemn her own son. Her determination to protect the family's reputation leads her, unknowingly, to destroy it.

Gerald's attitude to reputation is subtler. His affair with Daisy Renton shows that his public role as Sheila's respectable fiancé concealed a private life, and in Act Three he works hardest to prove the Inspector was a fake, perhaps because it would erase his own disgrace. His line "Everything's all right now, Sheila", as he offers her the ring again, suggests that for him, once the threat of exposure has passed, nothing has really happened.

By contrast, Sheila and Eric come to care about what they have done rather than

Question number

how it looks. Sheila tells her parents that they are pretending everything is just as it was before, and Eric attacks his father with "you're not the kind of father a chap could go to when he's in trouble". Priestley uses the generational split to show that reputation is the obsession of the old order, while the young can see beyond it.

The cyclical ending finally punishes the obsession with reputation. Mr Birling celebrates that the Inspector was a hoax and mocks "the famous younger generation", only for the telephone to ring with news that a girl has died and a police inspector is on his way. The family's reputation, which they thought had been saved, is about to be tested in public. Priestley leaves the audience with the message that reputation built on selfishness cannot survive the truth, and that what matters is not how we appear, but how we treat others.

4 Priestley presents Inspector Goole as far more than a police officer: he is a moral force, part detective, part prophet, part conscience, who enters the Birlings' comfortable world in order to break it open. His mysterious identity is never resolved, and that ambiguity is central to his power, because it shifts the audience's attention from who he is to what he says. Through him, Priestley delivers the play's message that "we are responsible for each other".

The Inspector's entrance is carefully timed. He arrives just as Mr Birling is lecturing Gerald and Eric that a man should "mind his own business and look after himself and his own". The sharp ring of the doorbell interrupts this selfish philosophy, so structurally the Inspector appears as its answer. Priestley's stage directions state that he "creates at once an impression of massiveness, solidity and purposefulness". These abstract nouns suggest that he is less a person than a

Question number

principle, solid and immovable where the Birlings are complacent. He also has "a disconcerting habit of looking hard at the person he addresses before actually speaking", which makes him unsettling and gives him control of every exchange. The lighting change from "pink and intimate" to "brighter and harder" when he enters reinforces this: the rosy glow of the celebration is replaced by a harsh light of scrutiny.

His method of questioning is deliberate and controlled. He insists on "one line of enquiry at a time", and this shapes the whole structure of the play, which unfolds like a chain of confessions, each character revealing a link in Eva Smith's downfall. The Inspector shows them the photograph one at a time, so that no one else sees it, and this careful management of information keeps both the characters and the audience in suspense. Priestley borrows the form of the well-made detective play, but uses it to investigate moral rather than criminal guilt.

Goole's language changes with each character, which shows his intelligence. With Mr Birling he is blunt, refusing to be impressed by his status and reminding him that "public men" have "responsibilities as well as privileges". With Sheila he is gentler, recognising that she is capable of remorse. With Mrs Birling he becomes cold and relentless, allowing her to condemn the father of Eva's child before revealing that it is Eric. His impatience grows as the evening goes on, and his outburst that he is losing patience with "you people" shows that he speaks with moral authority over the whole class the Birlings represent, not just this family.

His name is also suggestive. "Goole" sounds like "ghoul", hinting at something ghostly or supernatural. He seems to know everything before he is told; Sheila later reflects that he "never seemed like an ordinary police inspector", and the final revelation that no Inspector Goole exists in the local force deepens the mystery.

Question number

Priestley never explains him, and this suggests that the Inspector may be a symbol of conscience, of the future, or even of divine judgement. Some readers see him as a time traveller who knows that a real investigation is coming.

The climax of his role is his final speech, which has the tone of a sermon. The image of "millions and millions and millions of Eva Smiths and John Smiths" uses repetition to widen the focus from one girl to the whole working class, turning a single case into a political argument. The metaphor "We are members of one body" has a biblical echo, presenting society as a single organism in which every part depends on the others. Then the speech ends with a terrifying warning: if men will not learn this lesson, they will be taught it "in fire and blood and anguish". The tricolon has an apocalyptic, almost hellish quality, and for an audience first watching the play in 1945, it would have echoed two world wars which the characters, in 1912, cannot foresee. This dramatic irony gives the Inspector the authority of a prophet.

After he leaves, his influence continues through Sheila and Eric, who repeat his words and refuse to forget. Sheila's memory of "fire and blood and anguish" shows that she has become his voice in the play. The older characters try to dismiss him as a hoax, but the final phone call announcing the arrival of a real inspector suggests that his judgement cannot be escaped. The title itself, An Inspector Calls, places him at the heart of the play: he is the visitor who brings the truth.

Ultimately, Priestley presents Inspector Goole as his mouthpiece, a dramatic device in a kind of morality play who challenges the audience as much as the Birlings. His mystery is the point. Whether he is a man, a ghost or a conscience, he forces everyone on stage, and in the audience, to look at their own responsibility for others.

Question number

5

Christopher develops from a boy who lives within strict, self-protective boundaries into a young man who has tested those boundaries and discovered what he is capable of. Stephens presents this growth not as a cure or a transformation of who Christopher is, but as an expansion of his world: he remains logical, honest and uncomfortable with touch, yet by the end he has travelled alone to London, faced painful truths about his family and begun to imagine an independent future. The play can be seen as a dramatic bildungsroman, a coming of age story staged through Christopher's own eyes.

At the start of the play Christopher's world is small and ordered. The opening image of Wellington's body with the garden fork through it is shocking, and Christopher's reaction when Mrs Shears screams and the policeman touches him shows how frightening unpredictable people are to him. He explains, "I do not like people shouting at me. It makes me scared that they are going to hit me or touch me", and the plain declarative sentences reflect his need for clarity and control. His caution with new people is equally striking: when a new member of staff arrives at school he does not speak to them "for weeks and weeks" but watches "until I know that they are safe". The repetition suggests how slowly trust develops for him.

Wellington's death becomes the catalyst for change. Christopher's decision to investigate forces him into situations he would normally avoid. He admits that "talking to other people in our street was brave", and the adjective "brave" shows that he is aware of the effort this costs him. His reasoning, "if you're going to do detective work you have to be brave so I had no choice", is typical of his logic, turning courage into a necessary step in a problem, yet it also shows a growing

Question number

maturity in choosing to face his fears. His direct interrogatives, such as "Do you know who killed Wellington?", reveal that he is starting to engage with others, even if he does so in a literal, unsocial way. The detective role gives him a structure within which he can be bold.

The structural turning point comes when Christopher discovers his mother's letters and realises that she is alive. His flat statement, "Mother had not died. Mother had been alive all the time", has a stunned simplicity; the repetition of "Mother" shows him trying to process an overwhelming fact. This discovery, followed by Ed's confession that he killed Wellington, shatters Christopher's trust in his father. Stephens shows that growing up means confronting the reality that adults lie, even those who love you.

His journey to London is the most dramatic evidence of his development. He uses his father's bank card, buys a ticket and navigates the trains and the Underground, overcoming a terrifying level of noise and crowds. In the stage adaptation, the physical theatre and the sensory overload of lights, sound and moving bodies put the audience inside his panic, so we feel how difficult every step is. The stage direction "He approaches an information counter" seems simple, but within the play it is a moment of real courage, because he is choosing to speak to a stranger. Even the episode in which he climbs down onto the tracks to rescue his rat Toby shows that he can act decisively, if dangerously, under pressure.

The second half of the play is framed as Siobhan reading and then staging Christopher's book, which adds another layer to his development. Christopher becomes an author shaping his own story, and the play within a play suggests that he is gaining control over how he is seen.

Question number

By the end Christopher has passed his A level Maths and begun to rebuild trust with Ed, who gives him a puppy and commits to a slow process of earning his trust back. His confidence is evident in his speech to Siobhan: "And I know I can do this because I went to London, and because I solved the mystery". The fronted conjunction "And" and the repeated "because" create a sense of accumulating achievement, as if each success is evidence in a proof. He imagines that he "can live in a flat with a garden and a proper toilet", which is both funny and moving, because his ambitions are concrete and personal. The final repeated question, "Does that mean I can do anything?", is left without a firm answer from Siobhan. This open ending is significant: it shows that Christopher has developed hope, but Stephens is honest that the future is uncertain.

Overall, Christopher develops in confidence, independence and understanding of the adult world, but he remains recognisably himself. Stephens suggests that growth does not mean becoming like everyone else; it means finding the courage to live fully in the world on one's own terms.

6 Love in The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time is rarely simple or romantic. Stephens presents it as something messy, flawed and often damaging, expressed through lies, anger and failure as well as through care. Yet the play also suggests that love can be shown in unusual forms, and that the most enduring love is the kind that adapts to the needs of the person loved, as Ed and Judy eventually learn to do for Christopher.

The relationship between Ed and Christopher is the emotional heart of the play. Because Christopher dislikes being hugged, Ed cannot show love in conventional ways. The stage direction in which Ed "holds his right hand up and spreads his

Question number

fingers out in a fan" and Christopher "does the same with his left hand" so that their fingers touch is a beautiful visual symbol. It shows a private language of affection, gentle and controlled, built around Christopher's needs. Ed's love is also fierce. When he is told the school lacks the facilities for Christopher to sit A level Maths, he snaps, "Then get the facilities." The short imperative shows a protective, combative love: he will fight institutions on his son's behalf.

However, Ed's love is also destructive. He hides Judy's letters and tells Christopher his mother has died, choosing a lie he believes will protect them both. His explanation that he did it to protect Christopher suggests that love has made him fearful rather than honest. His anger at Roger, "I will not have that man's name mentioned in my house", reveals that his love for Judy, and his hurt, has not disappeared; the possessive "my house" shows him clinging to what remains of his family. Love and jealousy are tightly bound together for him.

This becomes tragic in the subplot of Wellington. Ed's relationship with Mrs Shears breaks down, and his bitter remark that "she cared more for that bloody dog than us" shows a man who felt rejected and replaced. His killing of the dog is an act of jealous rage, so the mystery that drives the whole plot is, ironically, rooted in a failed love. Stephens uses the structure of the detective story to reveal that the real "curious incident" is human emotion, which Christopher struggles to understand.

Judy's love is presented largely through her letters, which allow the audience to hear her voice before she appears. She writes of her affair with Roger, "And then we realised that we were in love", and the simple romantic phrasing contrasts painfully with the fact that she abandoned her son. Her apology, "I'm sorry, Christopher. But I still love you", shows that her love is real but insufficient; the

Question number

conjunction "But" places her feelings against her actions. Judy also has a romanticised imagination, dreaming of a life in a farmhouse in the South of France with someone called Jean, which shows her longing for an idealised love that reality cannot provide. Ironically, she ends up in a cramped flat in London with Roger, and their relationship quickly sours when Christopher arrives. Her accusation that Roger made her "look like a complete idiot" shows how fragile that romance was. When she finally leaves Roger to care for Christopher, Stephens suggests that maternal love has at last become stronger than romantic love.

Siobhan offers a different kind of love: patient, professional and steady. Her simple question "Are you ok?" when Christopher returns shows care without pressure. She never demands affection back, and in many ways she is the adult who understands best how to love Christopher, by listening and helping him to structure his thoughts. Her role as narrator, reading Christopher's book aloud, also allows the audience to see him with her compassionate eyes.

Christopher's own love is harder to define. He rarely uses emotional language, and his feelings are often shown through actions, such as his desperate search for his mother and his devotion to his rat Toby, or through his distress when trust is broken. When he discovers Ed killed Wellington, his terror shows how much he depended on his father's honesty. The slow rebuilding of their relationship, symbolised by the gift of a puppy, suggests that love must be earned through trust.

By the end, Ed and Judy reach an arrangement about Christopher's care, showing that their shared love for their son has outlasted their love for each other. Stephens presents love as imperfect and often hurtful, but also as something that can be relearned. In a play where emotional expression is difficult, the most

Question number

powerful moments of love are often silent: fingers meeting in a fan, or a father waiting patiently to be trusted again.

7

Truth in Kindertransport is both necessary and dangerous. Samuels builds the play around a buried secret, Evelyn's childhood identity as Eva, a Jewish girl sent from Germany to England, and she shows how hiding that truth has protected Evelyn while also damaging her and everyone close to her. The play asks whether some truths are too painful to face, but ultimately suggests that a life built on concealment cannot hold.

The structure of the play is itself a process of uncovering. Scenes in the attic in the present, where Faith is preparing to leave for university, are interwoven with scenes from Eva's past in Hamburg and Manchester. The audience therefore knows more than Faith from early on, and dramatic irony is created as we watch her move closer to a truth her mother is desperate to keep hidden. Even the setting is significant: an attic is a place for storing things that are no longer used, and the image of a key jangling in the lock suggests that Evelyn has locked her past away, literally as well as emotionally.

Evelyn's concealment is shown to be a survival strategy. As a child, Eva's change into Evelyn is gradual: she learns English, adapts to Lil's household and eventually changes her name. The listing in the stage direction, "EVA takes off two rings, a charm bracelet, a watch and a chain with a Star of David on it", is significant, because each object represents a part of her identity, including her Jewish faith, being stripped away. Removing the Star of David in particular shows her abandoning the truth of who she is in order to belong. As an adult, her obsessive cleaning and her controlled, clipped manner suggest that she must constantly work

Question number

to keep the past out.

Faith's determination to discover the truth drives the present day action. When she finds documents and letters in the attic, her questions become relentless: "What else? What else do you remember?" The repetition shows her hunger to understand where she comes from, and it contrasts sharply with Evelyn's reluctance to give details. For Faith, the truth matters because it is also her own story; she has believed Lil to be her real grandmother, and the revelation makes her question her whole identity. Her frustration explodes when she calls Evelyn a "terrible mother", which shows how secrecy has damaged their relationship. Faith's wish to trace relatives in America shows that, for her, truth means reconnection, whereas for Evelyn it means reopening a wound.

Lil is complicit in the secret, and Samuels presents this as a mixture of love and fear. When Faith asks her directly about the past, Lil avoids answering, provoking Faith's question "Why are you being so cagey?" The colloquial adjective suggests that Faith can sense something is being hidden. Lil's anxious "Aren't I real now?" reveals that she has her own reasons to fear the truth: if Faith embraces her Jewish heritage, Lil may lose her place as grandmother. Truth, then, threatens not only Evelyn's identity but the bonds of the family she has built.

The play also shows that people have tried to shield Eva from the truth since childhood. Helga promises that she will soon follow her daughter to England, and when this does not happen Eva begins to doubt that the promise was ever honest. This sense of betrayal marks the start of her rejection of her mother. Lil, too, tries to protect Eva from the harsh realities of what is happening in Germany. Samuels suggests that these protective lies, however loving, leave Eva feeling abandoned and unable to trust.

Question number

The most powerful confrontation with truth comes through Helga, who appears in Evelyn's memory to challenge her directly: "Why have you lost yourself, Eva?" The use of her original name is pointed, as if Helga is refusing to accept the identity Evelyn has built. The abrupt stage direction "Ship's horn sounds out" breaks into the moment, suggesting a truth buried so deep it can only surface as a fragment of memory. The recurring figure of the Ratcatcher, from the story book Eva brought from Germany, works in a similar way: he embodies the fear Evelyn has never resolved, and his presence in different forms throughout the play shows that the past keeps returning however hard she tries to suppress it.

Samuels does not offer an easy resolution. The truth comes out, but it does not heal everything; Evelyn remains wounded and Faith remains unsettled. Yet the play suggests that Faith's insistence on knowing is right, because only by acknowledging the past can the cycle of loss and secrecy be broken. Truth in Kindertransport is painful, but its absence is shown to be even more destructive.

8 Samuels presents Eva/Evelyn as a divided character: a frightened Jewish child who survives by becoming someone else, and an English woman whose survival has cost her the ability to feel at ease with her own past. By staging her at different ages, sometimes in the same scene, the play shows that Evelyn has never fully left Eva behind. She is a victim of history, but also a complex, sometimes cold figure whose choices hurt the people who love her.

As a young child in Hamburg, Eva is presented as innocent, lively and close to her mother. Her eager assurance as she boards the train, "Mutti! Vati! Hello! Hello! See. I did get into the carriage", shows a child who sees the journey almost as an

Question number

adventure and wants to make her parents proud. The repeated greetings and exclamations convey her excitement and her need for reassurance. Her affection for Helga is open and simple; she says "I love you too", and her questions are those of a trusting child. Yet the stage direction in which she "quickly sneaks her mouth organ into the case" hints at a quiet independence and disobedience, perhaps foreshadowing her later rejection of her mother.

In England, Eva's character begins to change under pressure. Lil initially insists that she stop speaking German, and the play shows Eva gradually taking on English habits and attitudes. As a child she clings to her jewellery and to the hope that her parents will follow, working hard to find them jobs so that they can come. When this hope fades, her loyalty becomes resentment. Samuels uses this shift to show how abandonment, even when it is a sacrifice made out of love, can feel like betrayal to a child.

The symbolic moment when "EVA takes off two rings, a charm bracelet, a watch and a chain with a Star of David on it" captures her transformation. The list slows the action and makes each object feel like a part of her past being given up, culminating in the Star of David. By removing it she rejects her Jewish identity, and her later decision to change her name to Evelyn completes this process. Structurally, the change of name is a turning point: Eva effectively erases herself in order to belong.

As an adult, Evelyn is presented as controlled, tense and reserved. Her obsessive cleaning and her habit of offering practical help in a crisis, such as asking "Would cups and saucers be of any use?", suggest a very English way of coping, focusing on order and politeness to avoid emotional exposure. This line is almost comic in its understatement, yet it reveals how far she has trained herself to suppress

Question number

feeling. Her relationship with her daughter Faith is strained: she seems distant and critical, but her fussing over what Faith needs for university shows that she does care deeply, even if she cannot express it openly.

Evelyn's bitterness towards Helga is one of the most disturbing aspects of her presentation. When Helga survives the war and comes to take her to America, Eva refuses to go, and as an adult Evelyn describes her mother in harsh terms, comparing her "razor eyes" to those of the Ratcatcher. This comparison is shocking, because it links her own mother with the figure of terror from her childhood story book. Samuels suggests that Evelyn's trauma has twisted love into fear and anger; she cannot forgive Helga for sending her away, even though it saved her life.

The Ratcatcher himself is central to how Evelyn is presented. His recurring appearances show that the fears of her childhood still haunt her, and that her calm adult surface conceals deep anxiety. The juxtaposition of past and present scenes, with young Eva and adult Evelyn sometimes sharing the stage, emphasises that the two identities cannot be separated. When Helga asks "Why have you lost yourself, Eva?", the question goes to the heart of Evelyn's tragedy: she has survived, but at the price of losing who she was.

Evelyn's relationship with Lil also shows how her identity has been rebuilt. Lil, who seemed thoughtless at first, becomes her trusted mother figure and the keeper of her secrets. This bond shows Evelyn's capacity for love and loyalty, but it also means that she has chosen Lil over Helga, England over Germany, and silence over truth.

Overall, Samuels presents Eva/Evelyn with sympathy but without sentimentality.

Question number

Through her, the play explores the long shadow of the Kindertransport, suggesting that escape from danger did not mean escape from loss. Evelyn is both a survivor and someone still trapped in her past, and the play leaves the audience understanding, if not always admiring, the choices she has made.

9 Soyinka presents Olunde as the most respected character in the play because he is the only one who fully understands what honour demands and is willing to pay its price. He is respected by his community, grudgingly by the colonial characters, and finally by the audience, yet Soyinka makes that respect deeply uncomfortable: it is earned through a death that should never have been his. Olunde becomes the moral centre of the play precisely because he holds two worlds in his mind and is not mastered by either.

Soyinka builds Olunde's reputation before he ever appears. We learn from the Pilkingses that he defied his father to go to England to study medicine, and that Elesin disowned him for it. This structural delay creates expectation: the audience assumes that Olunde has been "rescued" from his culture, which is exactly how Simon Pilkings sees him. When he finally enters in the fourth scene, Soyinka overturns that assumption. Olunde has returned not to escape tradition but to honour it, having travelled home on hearing of the King's death so that he can bury his father. The respect he shows is quiet and deliberate, and it immediately marks him out from the noisy, self-indulgent Elesin of the market scenes.

His conversation with Jane Pilkings is where Soyinka shows that Olunde's respect is intellectual as well as dutiful. Jane expects him to condemn the ritual, but he speaks with calm precision and refuses to be patronised. His accusation, "I discovered that you have no respect for what you do not understand", turns the

Question number

colonial gaze back on itself. The verb "discovered" is pointed: he presents his years in England as a kind of anthropological study of the British, reversing the usual relationship between observer and observed. Soyinka gives him controlled, articulate English that is more polished than Jane's, which undermines any idea that the colonisers are the educated party. Respect here is something Olunde demands for his culture, not something he begs for.

Soyinka also uses this dialogue to plant the play's central idea. When Jane recounts the story of the ship's captain who blew up his vessel to protect others, Olunde replies, "I find it rather inspiring. It is an affirmative commentary on life". The paradox of calling a death "affirmative" is deliberate. Olunde sees self-sacrifice for the community as an act that confirms life rather than denies it, and this links the British captain directly to the Yoruba ritual. Structurally, the episode foreshadows his own death: the audience may not yet realise it, but Olunde is explaining the logic of the choice he will make himself.

The most striking moment of the play comes when Olunde sees his father brought in under arrest. Soyinka uses stillness and silence on stage, and then Olunde's devastating rejection: "I have no father, eater of left-overs." The insult is carefully chosen. Elesin has enjoyed every privilege of his position, the food, the cloth, the bride, but has refused the duty that gave those privileges their meaning. To call him an "eater of left-overs" reduces the great Horseman to a scavenger living off a feast that belongs to others. Olunde's respect for the role is so great that he cannot respect the man who has abandoned it, and this reversal of the father and son relationship is one of the play's sharpest ironies.

His death, which takes place off stage, is revealed in the final scene with enormous dramatic force when Iyaloja uncovers his body before Elesin. Her words,

Question number

"There lies the honour of your household and of our race", elevate Olunde from an individual to a symbol of the whole community. The noun "honour" is shifted from the father to the son, and the phrase "our race" suggests that Olunde has saved more than his family's name. The play's final scene also offers the image that, because he could not bear to let honour fly out of doors, he stopped it with his life, a vivid image of a son physically blocking the escape of something precious. The respect for Olunde is therefore inseparable from the shame of Elesin, and the contrast between them is the backbone of the play's structure.

Yet Soyinka does not let the audience feel simple admiration. Olunde's sacrifice is also a tragedy: a young doctor, trained to preserve life, dies to repair his father's failure, and Elesin then strangles himself, too late to matter. Iyaloja's closing instruction to turn the mind to "the unborn" suggests that a whole future has been sacrificed. I think this is why Olunde is so powerfully presented. He is respected because he acts with complete integrity, but the cost of that integrity makes the audience question the failures of everyone around him, Yoruba and British alike, that made his death necessary.

10

Soyinka explores leadership as a sacred trust rather than a personal possession. In the Yoruba world of the play, a leader is someone who carries the community on his shoulders and must, if necessary, die for it; in the colonial world, leadership is administration, authority and order. Iyaloja's bitter line, "We called you leader and oh, how you led us on", captures the play's central concern: Elesin enjoys the status of a leader while betraying its responsibility, and Soyinka measures every other figure against that failure.

In the opening market scene, Elesin is presented as a magnetic leader. He arrives

Question number

surrounded by drummers and the Praise-Singer, and the market women treat him with reverence. His long, playful storytelling, especially the tale of the Not-I bird, shows his command of language and his ability to hold an audience. Soyinka writes much of his speech in rich, rhythmic verse, which elevates him and links his authority to the poetic traditions of his people. Yet the pun in the closing line of the quotation, "led us on", is already latent here. Elesin uses his position to take what he wants: he demands fine cloth from the women, and then the young bride who is already promised to Iyaloja's son. The women's anxious reasoning, "If we offend you now, we have mortified the gods", reveals how leadership in this society brings almost unlimited power, because the leader is the community's link to the spiritual world. Soyinka allows the audience to sense that this power is being enjoyed too much.

Iyaloja offers a different model of leadership. As "Mother" of the market, she speaks for the women and is obeyed without question. Her language is often gentle but commanding, as when she calms the others with "Daughters, please". She grants Elesin his bride, but she also reminds him of the weight of what he leaves behind in the world he is about to depart. Soyinka uses her almost as the leader of a Greek chorus: she voices the community's judgement, guides the market women's reactions and, in the final scene, becomes the moral authority who pronounces on Elesin's failure. In a play dominated by male titles, it is striking that the most consistent leader is a woman who leads through wisdom and responsibility rather than display.

The Praise-Singer is another kind of leader, one who guides the spirit rather than the people. In the third scene he leads Elesin into the trance that should carry him to the King, and his words, "Elesin Alafin, I no longer sense your flesh", suggest that leadership is a journey that the leader must ultimately make alone.

Question number

Against these Yoruba leaders, Soyinka sets Simon Pilkings, the District Officer. His leadership is bureaucratic and confident, but it rests on misunderstanding. He orders Sergeant Amusa to stop the ritual and arrest Elesin, believing he is preventing a barbaric act. Soyinka satirises this authority: the Pilkingses dress in egungun costume to attend a fancy dress ball, and the scene of the Prince's visit at the Residency is full of empty protocol. The market girls mock Amusa by imitating the speech of colonial officers, and the comedy shows that the colonisers' leadership looks ridiculous from outside. In the cell, Elesin admits, "First I blamed the white man, then I blamed my gods for deserting me". The confessional tone and the steady list of excuses show a leader finally facing the truth that the weakness was his own.

The true example of leadership comes, ironically, from the son Elesin disowned. Olunde, who returns from England, takes his father's place and dies so that the ritual can be completed. He leads by example rather than by title, and Soyinka presents this as the purest form of leadership in the play: leadership as sacrifice. His rejection of his father, "I have no father, eater of left-overs", reverses the natural hierarchy between father and son, and the image of the Horseman as a scavenger strips Elesin of all dignity.

In the final scene, Iyaloja's condemnation completes Soyinka's argument. When she says "We called you leader and oh, how you led us on", the exclamation "oh" carries grief as well as anger, and the double meaning of "led us on" suggests both guidance and deception. Elesin's suicide in chains comes too late to restore order. The play can be read as a warning, perhaps to leaders of any society, that power without responsibility destroys those who trust it. Soyinka's ending, with Iyaloja telling the bride to turn her mind to "the unborn", suggests that the future now

Question number

depends on a new generation who must learn what real leadership costs.

11 Shakespeare presents the relationship between Juliet and Lord Capulet as one built on love but governed by power. At first Capulet appears a protective, even tender father; once Juliet's will clashes with his, that love is revealed to depend on obedience. Through this relationship Shakespeare explores the patriarchal structure of Elizabethan family life, in which a daughter was her father's property, and he suggests that a father's authority, used without understanding, helps to push Juliet towards her tragic end.

Our first impression of Capulet is surprisingly gentle. When Paris asks for Juliet's hand in Act 1 Scene 2, Capulet insists that "My child is yet a stranger in the world" and asks him to "Let two more summers wither in their pride, / Ere we may think her ripe to be a bride." The rhyming couplet gives his words a measured, reasonable tone, and the image of Juliet as fruit not yet "ripe" suggests he wants to protect her. He even calls her "the hopeful lady of my earth", having lost his other children, and tells Paris that "My will to her consent is but a part". For an Elizabethan audience, used to fathers arranging matches for wealth and status, this is an unusually considerate father who seems to value his daughter's consent. However, the language of ripeness also reveals that Juliet is being discussed as something to be harvested and given away, and she is absent from the conversation entirely.

The turning point comes after Tybalt's death. In Act 3 Scene 4 Capulet abruptly promises Juliet to Paris, declaring "I think she will be ruled / In all respects by me". The verb "ruled" exposes the hierarchy beneath his earlier gentleness. He then hastens the date, finally settling on Thursday, without consulting her at all.

Question number

Structurally, this sudden decision acts as a catalyst: it compresses the time Juliet has to escape and accelerates the play towards catastrophe. Dramatic irony intensifies the scene, because the audience knows that Juliet is at that moment with Romeo, already married, so Capulet's confident control is built on ignorance.

Act 3 Scene 5 shows the relationship breaking apart. When Capulet asks whether his wife has "delivered to her our decree", the legal noun "decree" turns a marriage into a royal command. Juliet's refusal provokes a storm of abuse: "Hang thee, young baggage! Disobedient wretch!" The exclamatory, broken sentences and the jagged, irregular rhythm of his verse show a man who has lost control. His insults, including "green-sickness carrion" and "tallow-face", are cruelly physical, and his threat to "drag thee on a hurdle thither" uses the image of a traitor being dragged to execution, suggesting that disobedience is a kind of treason against the head of the household. Most chillingly, he says that if she refuses, she can "hang, beg, starve, die in the streets". The asyndetic list moves relentlessly towards death and foreshadows the real tragedy. His conditional statement, "An you be mine, I'll give you to my friend", reveals that in his mind his love and his ownership are the same thing.

Juliet's response is significant. She kneels, pleading "Good father, I beseech you on my knees", and the physical gesture shows that she still respects him, but Capulet will not listen. Juliet's isolation is complete when her mother refuses to help, and this drives her to the Friar and the dangerous plan with the potion. In this sense, Capulet's authority does not simply fail to stop the tragedy; it helps to create it.

Shakespeare uses irony to deepen the relationship in Act 4. When Juliet pretends to submit and promises she is "ever ruled" by him, Capulet is delighted, calling her a "wayward girl" now "reclaimed", and he even brings the wedding forward to

Question number

Wednesday. When Juliet is found apparently dead, his grief is genuine and poetic: "Death lies on her like an untimely frost / Upon the sweetest flower of all the field." The return to images of nature recalls his earlier talk of ripeness, now destroyed before its time, and his line that death is his "son-in-law" bitterly mocks the marriage he forced on her.

In the final scene, Capulet's love is finally expressed in an act of reconciliation. Taking Montague's hand, he calls it "my daughter's jointure", the marriage settlement a father would offer. The irony is painful: the only dowry Juliet receives is peace between the families, purchased with her death. Shakespeare therefore presents the relationship as tragic not because Capulet does not love Juliet, but because a patriarchal society teaches him to express that love as control. An Elizabethan audience might have sympathised with his anger at disobedience, yet the play invites us to question a system in which a daughter's voice counts for so little.

12 The feud is the engine of Romeo and Juliet. It frames the play, sets its action in motion, turns a love story into a tragedy and only ends when it has consumed the children of both houses. Shakespeare presents it as senseless, inherited and self-perpetuating, and the Prologue's line "From ancient grudge break to new mutiny" captures its significance: an old hatred, whose origin nobody remembers, continually erupts into fresh violence. Through it, Shakespeare explores the danger that family honour poses to individuals and to the peace of the state.

The Prologue makes the feud central before a single character appears. The sonnet form, usually associated with love poetry, is used here to introduce hatred, so love and violence are bound together from the start. The adjective "ancient" suggests a

Question number

grudge that has outlived its cause, and "mutiny" implies rebellion against lawful order. The repetition in "civil blood makes civil hands unclean" is a bitter paradox, since "civil" means both belonging to the citizens and civilised: the citizens of Verona are behaving in the least civilised way possible. The Prologue also tells us that only "their children's end" could remove "their parents' rage", so the audience watches the play knowing that the feud will be ended only by death. Shakespeare's structure turns the tragedy into a kind of inevitable process.

The opening scene shows how far the feud has spread. Servants such as Sampson and Gregory, who have no personal stake in the quarrel, are eager to fight, and Sampson boasts that "A dog of the house of Montague moves me". Reducing the enemy to a "dog" shows how the feud dehumanises both sides. The comic bawdy of the servants quickly gives way to a real brawl, and when Tybalt enters, his words "peace? I hate the word, / As I hate hell, all Montagues, and thee" make him the embodiment of the feud. Even the old heads of the houses join in, with Capulet calling for his "long sword", which his wife mocks by suggesting he needs a crutch instead. Shakespeare presents the feud as absurd as well as dangerous: old men who should know better are dragged into the violence of the young.

The Prince's intervention establishes the political significance of the feud. He condemns the families as "Rebellious subjects, enemies to peace", and the noun "subjects" reminds them that their duty to the state should outweigh loyalty to family. He reveals that there have been "Three civil brawls, bred of an airy word", and the image of an "airy word" stresses how trivial the cause is compared with the bloodshed. For an Elizabethan audience, aware that feuding noble families threatened social stability and that duelling was illegal, the Prince represents the order that private vendettas undermine.

Question number

The feud gives the love story its tragic intensity. Juliet's cry "My only love sprung from my only hate!" uses antithesis to show that the lovers' relationship is defined from the beginning by the quarrel. In the balcony scene her plea "Deny thy father and refuse thy name" and her question "What's in a name?" suggest that the feud depends only on labels, yet the rest of the play proves how powerful those labels are.

Act 3 Scene 1 is the structural turning point, where the feud destroys the lovers' hopes. Tybalt seeks out Romeo to avenge his presence at the Capulet feast, and Romeo's refusal to fight, because Tybalt is now his kinsman, is misunderstood. Mercutio fights in his place and is killed, and his dying curse, "A plague o' both your houses!", repeated with growing bitterness, places the blame on both families equally. The curse becomes a prophecy fulfilled. Romeo's revenge on Tybalt leads to his banishment, and his cry "O, I am fortune's fool!" suggests he feels trapped by forces larger than himself. From this point the feud drives events towards catastrophe: the banishment separates the lovers, Capulet hastens the marriage to Paris, and the plan with the potion fails.

In the final scene the feud is ended, but at a terrible price. The Prince tells the fathers, "See what a scourge is laid upon your hate", and his judgement that "All are punished" spreads responsibility across the whole community. Capulet offers Montague his hand and calls it "my daughter's jointure", while Montague promises to raise a statue of Juliet in gold. These gestures of reconciliation feel hollow, since golden statues cannot replace living children. Shakespeare's circular structure, beginning and ending with the families and the Prince, shows that the peace has been bought only with the deaths the Prologue foretold. The significance of the feud, then, is that it reveals how inherited hatred, sustained by pride and honour, can destroy the very future that families exist to protect.

Question number

13

In Macbeth, trust is constantly offered and constantly betrayed. Shakespeare creates a world in which appearances deceive, kings misjudge their subjects, husbands and wives grow apart and supernatural voices speak in riddles. Lennox's remark that "No man's life was to be trusted with them" is itself an irony, since the guards he blames are innocent and the real murderer is standing beside him. Through the theme of trust, Shakespeare warns a Jacobean audience about treachery against a rightful king and shows that, once trust is broken, a whole kingdom sinks into suspicion and fear.

The witches establish the theme in the opening scene with the paradox "Fair is foul, and foul is fair". The chant, in its tight rhyming rhythm, warns that nothing can be taken at face value, and the inversion of moral opposites foreshadows a play in which the most trusted figures prove the most dangerous. For an audience under James I, who had written about witchcraft and believed witches were agents of the devil, the witches' presence would immediately signal that anyone who trusts them is in spiritual danger.

Duncan is the play's most tragic example of misplaced trust. After the execution of the traitorous Thane of Cawdor he reflects that "There's no art / To find the mind's construction in the face", admitting that Cawdor was "a gentleman on whom I built / An absolute trust". At precisely this moment Macbeth enters, and Shakespeare's structure creates sharp dramatic irony, since Duncan immediately places the same absolute trust in the man who will murder him. The metaphor of trust as something "built" suggests a solid foundation, yet the play shows how quickly it can collapse. When Duncan arrives at Inverness he praises the castle's "pleasant seat", and the gentle language contrasts with the audience's knowledge

Question number

of the plot already forming inside. Lady Macbeth's advice to "look like th'innocent flower, / But be the serpent under't" makes deception a deliberate strategy, and the serpent image recalls Satan's betrayal in Eden, linking the betrayal of a king to the original sin.

Banquo offers a contrast, because he does not trust the witches. He warns that "The instruments of darkness tell us truths" in order to betray us "In deepest consequence". The idea that evil uses small truths to win confidence explains exactly what happens to Macbeth, and Banquo's caution makes him a model of the loyal subject. Shakespeare's flattering portrayal of Banquo, from whom James I claimed descent, reinforces the message that wise men do not place their trust in the forces of darkness.

After the murder, trust disappears from Scotland. Malcolm and Donalbain flee, Donalbain observing that "There's daggers in men's smiles". The metaphor shows that even friendliness has become a weapon, and the brothers' flight ironically makes them appear guilty. Macduff's refusal to attend the coronation, choosing to go home to Fife instead, suggests his quiet distrust of Macbeth. Macbeth himself becomes trapped in suspicion. He no longer trusts Banquo, whose "royalty of nature" he fears, and he even sends a third murderer to watch the first two. He also stops confiding in his wife, telling her to "Be innocent of the knowledge, dearest chuck" before Banquo's murder. The affectionate term "chuck" is undercut by secrecy: the partnership that once planned Duncan's death together is breaking down. Lady Macbeth's earlier distrust of her husband, fearing his nature was "too full o'th'milk of human kindness", has been replaced by his distrust of everyone.

In Act 4 Scene 3 Shakespeare dramatises the difficulty of rebuilding trust. Malcolm tests Macduff by claiming to be more vicious than Macbeth, listing his

Question number

supposed lust and greed. Only when Macduff despairs for Scotland does Malcolm reveal the truth. The scene is long and slow, which shows how carefully trust must be rebuilt in a kingdom poisoned by treachery. It also suggests the qualities of a good king: Malcolm is cautious where Duncan was too trusting.

Finally, Macbeth's trust in the apparitions destroys him. Told that none "of woman born" can harm him and that he is safe until Birnam Wood comes to Dunsinane, he grows reckless. When the wood seems to move, he begins "To doubt th'equivocation of the fiend / That lies like truth", and the paradox "lies like truth" echoes the play's opening. Once Macduff reveals that he was "from his mother's womb / Untimely ripped", Macbeth curses the "juggling fiends" who deceived him. Shakespeare's structure brings the theme full circle: the man who betrayed the trust of his king is himself betrayed by the forces he trusted. Malcolm's restoration to the throne reassures the audience that order, based on the Divine Right of Kings, can be rebuilt, but only after the play has shown how fragile trust is and how much destruction follows when it is abused.

14

Macbeth changes from a celebrated hero into a tyrant whom even his own soldiers abandon, yet Shakespeare presents this change as gradual and psychologically convincing rather than sudden. At the start he is brave, loyal and tormented by conscience; by the end he is numb to fear and to feeling. Shakespeare charts this descent carefully, using imagery, soliloquy and structure to show how ambition, encouraged by the supernatural and by Lady Macbeth, corrupts a good man, and he offers a Jacobean audience a warning about the consequences of killing a divinely appointed king.

Before Macbeth even appears, Shakespeare builds his heroic reputation. The

Question number

Captain calls him "brave Macbeth" and describes how he "unseamed" the rebel Macdonwald "from the nave to th'chops". The brutal image shows that Macbeth is capable of extreme violence, but at this point his violence serves the king, so it is presented as loyal heroism. Duncan's warm address, "O valiant cousin", confirms Macbeth's place within the natural order of loyalty and reward. Shakespeare establishes this high status so that the audience can measure how far Macbeth falls.

The change begins with the witches. Their prophecy that he will be king makes him "start", and in his aside he admits that the "suggestion" of murder has a "horrid image" that makes his hair stand on end and his heart knock at his ribs. The fact that he imagines murder so quickly suggests the ambition was already present, but his physical horror shows his conscience is still alive. When Malcolm is named Prince of Cumberland, Macbeth's aside "Stars, hide your fires; / Let not light see my black and deep desires" marks a darker step. The contrast between light and darkness shows him choosing concealment, and the aside form isolates him from the court even while he stands among them. Contemporary audiences, who believed in the Divine Right of Kings, would recognise that he is now contemplating not just murder but a sin against God's order.

Even so, Shakespeare stresses Macbeth's resistance. In his Act 1 Scene 7 soliloquy he lists the reasons not to kill Duncan, and admits he has only "Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself". He tells his wife "We will proceed no further in this business", and it takes her taunts about his manhood to change his mind. His final decision, "I am settled", sounds firm, but it has been pushed into place by another. This suggests that, at this stage, Macbeth is still divided between ambition and morality.

Question number

The murder itself shows a man horrified by what he has done. The dagger soliloquy, "Is this a dagger which I see before me", reveals a mind beginning to break, as he cannot tell whether the vision is real or "a false creation" of his "heat-oppressed brain". Afterwards, his question "Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood / Clean from my hand?" uses hyperbole to show overwhelming guilt.

Once he is king, Macbeth hardens. He arranges Banquo's murder without consulting his wife, and his cry "O, full of scorpions is my mind, dear wife!" shows guilt turning into restless paranoia. The appearance of Banquo's ghost at the banquet exposes his fear in public: "Thou canst not say I did it. Never shake / Thy gory locks at me." Yet afterwards he resolves that he is "in blood / Stepped in so far" that going back would be as hard as going on. The extended metaphor of wading through a river of blood shows him accepting violence as a path he cannot leave. His later vow that "The very firstlings of my heart shall be / The firstlings of my hand" reveals a man who no longer reflects before acting, and the slaughter of Macduff's wife and children is the clearest sign of his transformation into a tyrant.

By Act 5, Macbeth has changed so completely that he has almost lost the capacity to feel. He admits "I have almost forgot the taste of fears" and that he has "supped full with horrors". When he hears of Lady Macbeth's death, his reply, "She should have died hereafter", is chillingly flat, and the "Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow" soliloquy presents life as "a walking shadow" that signifies "nothing". The slow repetition creates a weary, dragging rhythm which contrasts with the energy of his earlier speeches.

Even so, his refusal to yield to Macduff, after learning the truth of his birth,

Question number

briefly recalls the "brave Macbeth" of the opening, which gives the play a tragic circularity. However, Malcolm's verdict of "this dead butcher and his fiend-like queen" shows how the world now sees him. Shakespeare presents Macbeth's change as a moral warning to James I's subjects: a man who murders his king destroys not only the kingdom's order but his own humanity.

15 Shakespeare presents the relationship between Shylock and Antonio as one of mutual, long-standing hatred, rooted in religion and money and sharpened by public humiliation. Neither man is simply the villain or the victim: Antonio is generous to his friends but openly cruel to Shylock, and Shylock is wronged but becomes merciless in return. Through their conflict, Shakespeare dramatises the anti-Semitism of his society while also, perhaps, inviting the audience to question it.

The relationship is established through Shylock's first aside, "How like a fawning publican he looks! / I hate him for he is a Christian". The aside lets the audience see Shylock's private hatred, and the blunt statement of religious motive makes him seem vindictive. Yet he immediately adds a financial reason: Antonio lends money without interest, which brings down the rate in Venice. This shows that their quarrel is economic as well as religious. As a Jew, Shylock was barred from many trades, so moneylending was one of the few ways he could earn a living, while Christian teaching condemned usury. Shylock calls his profit "well-won thrift", while Antonio dismisses it as "interest", and their contrasting vocabulary reveals that they cannot even agree on what Shylock's work means. His threat that if he can catch Antonio "once upon the hip" he will "feed fat the ancient grudge" introduces the predatory food imagery that runs through his language and foreshadows the pound of flesh.

Question number

Shakespeare then allows Shylock to explain how Antonio has treated him. In a powerful speech he recalls that Antonio has called him "misbeliever, cut-throat dog" and spat upon his "Jewish gaberdine". The specific detail of spitting on his clothing makes the abuse physical and humiliating, and the sarcastic questions that follow, asking whether he should bow and lend money to a man who called him a dog, expose the hypocrisy of Antonio's request. Antonio's reply is shocking: "I am as like to call thee so again, / To spit on thee again, to spurn thee too." The repetition of "again" shows no remorse, and Shakespeare presents the supposedly noble merchant as openly contemptuous. A modern audience is likely to find Antonio's behaviour difficult to excuse, though an Elizabethan audience, steeped in the anti-Semitism of a society that had expelled Jews from England in 1290, may have shared his attitude.

The bond itself captures the poisonous intimacy of their relationship. Shylock proposes it as a "merry sport", but the penalty of a pound of Antonio's flesh is grotesque. Antonio's response, "The Hebrew will turn Christian: he grows kind", is darkly ironic. He assumes kindness and Christianity are the same thing, yet by the end of the play it is the Christians who force Shylock to convert. The pun on "kind", meaning both generous and of the same kind, suggests Antonio cannot imagine Shylock as kind without becoming like him.

Once Jessica elopes with Lorenzo, taking her father's money, Shylock's hatred focuses entirely on Antonio. In the speech that builds to "Hath not a Jew eyes?" he lists the ways Antonio has "disgraced" him, "laughed at my losses, mocked at my gains, scorned my nation", and asks, "and what's his reason? I am a Jew." The rhetorical questions and lists insist on a shared humanity, and the speech gains sympathy for Shylock. Yet it ends by turning this shared humanity into a

Question number

justification for revenge: "The villainy you teach me I will execute". Shakespeare suggests that Antonio's cruelty has helped to create the very villain he despises.

In the trial scene, the balance of power swings dramatically. Antonio appears resigned, calling himself "a tainted wether of the flock, / Meetest for death", a metaphor of a castrated ram that presents him as a passive sacrifice. Shylock, by contrast, insists on the letter of the law and refuses all offers of mercy. When Portia reveals that the bond allows no blood, the roles are reversed. Antonio's "mercy" to Shylock is to spare his life on condition that he becomes a Christian and leaves his wealth to Lorenzo and Jessica. Shylock's quiet "I am content" and "I am not well" are among the shortest lines he speaks, and their brevity shows a man utterly broken.

Structurally, Antonio's name is in the title and he shares in the comic ending at Belmont, while Shylock disappears from the play after the trial. This contrast leaves an uncomfortable impression. Shakespeare presents a relationship in which both men are motivated by hatred, but the Christian society has the power to destroy the Jew. Whether the audience reads this as a triumph of mercy or as a cruel injustice depends partly on their own time, but the play's language gives Shylock enough humanity to make the second reading compelling.

16 Revenge drives the central plot of The Merchant of Venice, but Shakespeare presents it as something learned rather than innate. Shylock's question, "if you wrong us, shall we not revenge?", argues that vengeance is simply the human response to injury, and the play bears this out uncomfortably: Shylock's revenge is taught to him by Christian cruelty, and the Christians in turn take revenge on him while claiming to show mercy. Shakespeare therefore explores revenge as a cycle,

Question number

and he leaves the audience to judge whether anyone in Venice truly escapes it.

Shylock's desire for revenge is planted from his first scene. His aside, "If I can catch him once upon the hip, / I will feed fat the ancient grudge I bear him", uses the language of wrestling and of feeding, so revenge is imagined as both a physical struggle and a hunger to be satisfied. The adjective "ancient" shows that this grudge is not personal impulse but the result of long history, and Shylock soon explains it, recalling how Antonio has called him "cut-throat dog" and spat on his "Jewish gaberdine". The bond, offered as a "merry sport", disguises revenge as a joke, and the audience is made to feel the menace beneath its apparent playfulness.

The quotation in the question comes from Shylock's most famous speech, and it is central to Shakespeare's treatment of the theme. The series of rhetorical questions, "If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh?", builds a rhythm of undeniable logic, insisting on the physical sameness of Jews and Christians. The movement from bleeding and laughing to poisoning and dying, and then to revenge, is carefully structured: revenge is presented as the last item in a list of natural human reactions. Shylock then turns the argument against the Christians: "The villainy you teach me I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction." The metaphor of teaching suggests that he is a pupil of Christian behaviour, and the threat to "better the instruction" implies that he will outdo his teachers. Shakespeare writes this speech in prose, which gives it a raw, direct force. In an age when Jews were often persecuted on the basis of false accusations, and when stage Jews such as Marlowe's Barabbas were pure villains, it is striking that Shakespeare gives Shylock such a compelling justification.

Shylock's motive is intensified by Jessica's elopement with Lorenzo. Mocked by

Question number

Solanio and Salarino and deserted by his daughter, he turns all his fury on Antonio. When asked what use a pound of flesh could be, he answers "If it will feed nothing else, it will feed my revenge", returning to the food imagery that has followed him since Act I. When Tubal brings news of Antonio's losses, Shylock exclaims "I'll plague him, I'll torture him. I am glad of it." The repeated first person and the short, exclamatory clauses suggest a man consumed by personal grievance.

In the trial scene revenge becomes legalised. Shylock refuses to explain his choice, saying it is simply his "humour", and insists "I crave the law, / The penalty and forfeit of my bond". The verb "crave" makes his legal claim sound like an appetite. Portia's speech on mercy, "The quality of mercy is not strained; / It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven", offers an alternative to revenge: mercy as a divine gift that cannot be forced.

However, Shakespeare complicates the theme by showing the Christians' own vengeance. Portia's reversal, "Tarry a little", turns the law against Shylock, and her promise that "Thou shalt have more justice than thou desir'st" carries a cold irony. Gratiano mocks Shylock and wishes him hanged, echoing Shylock's own triumphant tone back at him. Antonio's apparent mercy, sparing Shylock's life, comes with the condition that he must become a Christian and leave his wealth to Lorenzo and Jessica. For an Elizabethan audience this conversion might have seemed a gift that saved Shylock's soul, but a modern audience is likely to see it as a humiliating revenge disguised as mercy. Shylock's brief, broken lines, "I am content" and "I am not well", suggest that he has been destroyed.

Structurally, the play's movement to the comic harmony of Belmont, from which Shylock is absent, makes the theme more troubling. The man who sought revenge becomes its victim, losing his wealth, his daughter and his faith, while the

Question number

Christians celebrate. Shakespeare seems to suggest that revenge breeds revenge, and that a society which preaches mercy can practise vengeance just as efficiently as the man it condemns. Shylock's question about whether wrong should be met with revenge is never fully answered, and that is perhaps the play's most unsettling achievement.

17 Austen presents Mr Collins' relationships with other characters as almost entirely transactional: he relates to people through rank, property and patronage rather than through feeling. Every relationship he forms, with the Bennets, with Elizabeth, with Charlotte and above all with Lady Catherine de Bourgh, exposes the absurdity of a man who has absorbed the rules of Regency society without any of its sense, and through him Austen satirises a world in which marriage and status can be negotiated like a business deal.

Austen introduces Mr Collins through the form of a letter before the reader ever meets him, so his relationship with the Bennet family begins on paper, in the formal language of a legal settlement. As the male heir who will inherit Longbourn because of the entail, he arrives with a built-in tension, and he offers "the olive branch" as though graciously forgiving the family he will one day turn out of their home. Elizabeth's response, "Can he be a sensible man, sir?", and Mr Bennet's dry reply that he has "great hopes of finding him quite the reverse" establish a relationship of private mockery. In Austen's time, when estates commonly passed to the nearest male relation, Collins' position would not have been unusual, but Austen uses his pomposity to make the injustice of the entail feel ridiculous as well as unfair.

His relationship with Elizabeth is the clearest example of his inability to see other

Question number

people as individuals. Structurally, Austen shows that his choice of wife is interchangeable: he first intends Jane, but when Mrs Bennet hints that Jane is likely to be engaged, he simply transfers his attention to Elizabeth while Mrs Bennet is stirring the fire. The domestic, trivial detail makes the switch comic and almost mechanical. His proposal is a set piece of misjudged rhetoric. He lists his reasons for marrying in numbered order, placing Lady Catherine's advice above any feeling, and only then mentions "the violence of my affections", a phrase made absurd by the cold logic that precedes it. When Elizabeth refuses, he insists it is "usual with young ladies" to reject a man they mean to accept, and reminds her that her "portion is unhappily so small". Austen shows that he cannot imagine a woman having a will of her own. Elizabeth's firm reply, that he "could not make me happy", asserts a modern idea of marriage based on compatibility, and her refusal would have seemed bold to readers in 1813, when a woman with little money was expected to accept any respectable offer.

Collins' relationship with Charlotte Lucas is presented more seriously, and arguably more sadly. Within days of Elizabeth's refusal he proposes to Charlotte, and the speed itself is the criticism. Austen's narrator is unusually blunt: Collins is "neither sensible nor agreeable; his society was irksome", yet Charlotte accepts him "solely from the pure and disinterested desire of an establishment". The phrase "disinterested" is deeply ironic, because the marriage is entirely about interest. Charlotte's earlier admission, "I am not romantic, you know. I never was. I ask only a comfortable home", explains her choice, and Austen does not wholly condemn it. At twenty-seven, with no fortune, Charlotte faced dependence on her family, and marriage was the only respectable provision for such women. When Elizabeth visits Hunsford, she notices how Charlotte manages her husband: she encourages him to work in his garden and chooses a back sitting room so that he will not join her. The marriage functions because Charlotte sees as little of him as possible.

Question number

His most revealing relationship is with Lady Catherine, his patroness. He speaks of her "condescension" and affability with an admiration that empties those words of their usual criticism, and he admits that he enjoys offering the kind of "little things which please her ladyship". His obsequiousness shows how the patronage system of the Church of England tied clergymen to wealthy landowners, and Austen gently mocks a church in which advancement depends on flattery rather than vocation. At the Netherfield ball, he insists on introducing himself to Darcy because Darcy is Lady Catherine's nephew, ignoring Elizabeth's warning about etiquette. Darcy's cold response shows that Collins' grovelling earns him no respect at all, and Collins acts as a foil to Darcy: one is all empty deference, the other proud reserve.

By the end of the novel, Collins' relationships have not changed. His letter after Lydia's elopement suggests that her death "would have been a blessing" in comparison, a cruelty disguised as Christian concern. Mr Bennet's final advice to him, to "stand by the nephew" because "He has more to give", sums up the relationship Austen has exposed throughout: Collins attaches himself to whoever has the most power. Through him, Austen suggests that a society that values rank over character produces men who are ridiculous, and women like Charlotte who must make the best of them.

18 In Pride and Prejudice, women's attitudes to marriage range from the coldly practical to the recklessly romantic, and Austen uses this range to explore a central problem of her society: marriage was the only secure future available to most gentlewomen, yet a marriage made only for security could be a kind of imprisonment. Austen does not simply praise romance and condemn prudence.

Question number

Instead, through Elizabeth, she argues for a marriage that combines love with respect and good sense, while showing sympathy for the women who cannot afford to wait for it.

The novel's famous opening sentence, "It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife", sets the ironic tone for the whole treatment of marriage. The truth is not universal at all; it is the hope of mothers with unmarried daughters, and the irony reverses the sentence's meaning, since it is the women who are in want of the wealthy man. Mrs Bennet embodies this attitude. The narrator tells us that "The business of her life was to get her daughters married", and the word "business" reduces marriage to a commercial project. Her anxiety is comic, but Austen gives it a real basis: because Longbourn is entailed on Mr Collins, the Bennet girls face genteel poverty if they do not marry. At a time when married women's property legally passed to their husbands and few respectable careers were open to women, Mrs Bennet's frantic matchmaking is foolish in manner but not in motive.

Charlotte Lucas represents the most practical attitude. She tells Elizabeth that "Happiness in marriage is entirely a matter of chance", a view that strips marriage of choice and feeling, and she advises that a woman should often "show more affection than she feels" in order to secure a man. When she accepts Mr Collins, the narrator reflects that marriage was "the only provision for well-educated young women of small fortune". The word "provision" makes marriage sound like food or shelter, something needed to survive. Elizabeth is shocked, but Austen seems to allow the reader to feel more sympathy for Charlotte than Elizabeth does at first. Charlotte is plain, twenty-seven and without money, and her decision is presented as rational, even if the later picture of her at Hunsford, carefully arranging her days to avoid her husband, shows its cost.

Question number

Elizabeth's attitude is presented as unusual and, for many contemporary readers, startling. She refuses Mr Collins, despite her mother's fury, and Mr Bennet's witty ultimatum, that her mother will never see her again if she does not marry Collins and he will never see her again if she does, supports her right to choose. More strikingly, she refuses Darcy, one of the richest men in the novel, calling him "the last man in the world whom I could ever be prevailed on to marry". Structurally, this first proposal comes at the centre of the novel, and its failure forces both characters to examine their pride and prejudice. Elizabeth will marry only where she can love and respect, and her confrontation with Lady Catherine shows this most powerfully. When Lady Catherine claims that the "shades of Pemberley" would be "polluted" by her, a metaphor that treats Elizabeth as a contamination of rank, Elizabeth replies, "He is a gentleman; I am a gentleman's daughter; so far we are equal." The balanced syntax mirrors the equality she claims, and it rejects the idea that marriage should be governed by status.

Lydia represents the dangers of an attitude based only on impulse and vanity. She elopes with Wickham with no thought of money or reputation, and her letter treats the scandal as a joke. On her return, she boasts to Jane that she must now take precedence "because I am a married woman", showing that for Lydia marriage is a badge of status rather than a partnership. Elizabeth's fear that Lydia is "lost for ever" reflects how a woman's reputation could be destroyed by living with a man outside marriage, and the irony is that Lydia's marriage only happens because Darcy pays Wickham to go through with it.

Jane's attitude is gentle and romantic, and her eventual marriage to Bingley is presented as a union of two kind natures. Austen herself never married; she is known to have accepted a proposal from a wealthy man and withdrawn her

Question number

acceptance the next day. Perhaps this lies behind Mr Bennet's warning to Elizabeth that he could not bear to see her "unable to respect" her partner in life. Through the contrast of these women, Austen suggests that the ideal marriage, the one Elizabeth finally makes, unites affection, respect and enough security to live well, but she never forgets how few women in her society were free to wait for it.

19 Dickens presents Pip as a flawed but ultimately sympathetic figure whose life traces a moral journey from innocence, through snobbery and self-deception, to humility and gratitude. Crucially, the novel is narrated by an older Pip looking back on his younger self, so Dickens presents two versions of Pip at once: the child and young man who makes mistakes, and the mature narrator who judges them. This double perspective allows Dickens to explore how ambition and class can corrupt a good heart, and how that heart can be recovered.

At the opening, Dickens presents Pip as small, vulnerable and alone. Standing among his parents' graves on the marshes, he describes himself as a "small bundle of shivers" who is "growing afraid of it all and beginning to cry". The phrase reduces him to an object, and the bleak setting emphasises his isolation as an orphan. When Magwitch seizes him, Pip's terror is almost comic, yet his kindness in bringing the convict food and a file is the moral seed of the whole novel. Structurally, this act of compassion will return when Magwitch is revealed as his benefactor, suggesting that Pip's true worth lies in his instinctive goodness rather than in the gentility he later craves.

At home, Pip is mistreated by Mrs Joe, who boasts of raising him "by hand", a phrase that comically conceals the violence of her parenting, and who beats him

Question number

with a cane ironically named "Tickler". The playful name contrasts with the pain it causes, and Dickens uses this irony to criticise the casual cruelty shown to children. Joe, by contrast, treats Pip as a friend and equal. Dickens, who was sent to work in a blacking factory as a boy and felt abandoned by his parents, writes with clear sympathy for children who are neglected or harshly treated.

The turning point comes at Satis House. Estella's contempt teaches Pip to see himself through the eyes of a higher class, and she mocks his "coarse hands" and "thick boots". Afterwards Pip is ashamed of himself and of Joe, and he confesses to Biddy, "I want to be a gentleman". The simple declarative sentence captures the moment his ambition is born, but Dickens makes clear that it is born from shame rather than self-respect. Pip's desire is not really for money, but for Estella, and for the approval of a world that despises his background. In Victorian England, where industrial wealth was beginning to blur old class lines, the question of what made a true gentleman was widely debated, and Dickens uses Pip to suggest that gentility of manners is worthless without gentleness of heart.

When Pip receives his great expectations and moves to London, Dickens presents him at his least likeable. He is embarrassed when Joe visits him in London, and Joe's awkwardness, his hat constantly falling from the mantelpiece, is both comic and painful. Joe's dignified farewell, "I'm wrong in these clothes", and his acknowledgement that Pip will find less fault in him at the forge, show that it is Pip, not Joe, who is out of place morally. The older narrator does not excuse his younger self; he admits that he was "too cowardly to do what I knew to be right", and the balanced structure of the confession shows how fully he now recognises his failure. The return of Magwitch shatters Pip's illusions. He discovers that his fortune comes not from Miss Havisham but from a transported convict, and his first reaction is disgust. Dickens structures the novel so that this revelation forces

Question number

Pip to confront the source of his snobbery: the wealth he has been proud of was earned through the hard labour of the man he finds repellent. Yet over the following chapters Pip's attitude transforms. He risks his own safety to help Magwitch escape, holds his hand at his trial, and stays with him as he dies in prison, telling him that the daughter he lost is alive and that he loves her. Pip's growth here is presented as a recovery of the compassion he showed as a child on the marshes, so the circular structure suggests that redemption means returning to his true self.

By the end, Pip has lost his fortune, falls ill and is nursed by Joe, and finally works as a clerk abroad with Herbert. He has become what Dickens values most: a man who earns his living and repays kindness. The bildungsroman form, popular in the Victorian period, usually ends with a hero who has matured into society, and Dickens follows that pattern, though the ambiguous final meeting with Estella in the ruined garden of Satis House leaves Pip's happiness uncertain. Through Pip, Dickens presents a convincing portrait of a young man whose greatest expectation turns out to be the discovery of his own moral worth.

20 In Great Expectations, ambition is presented as a powerful but dangerous force. Dickens shows that ambition rooted in shame, greed or revenge distorts the people who pursue it, while ambition directed towards honest work or the good of others can be redemptive. The title itself captures this tension: Pip's "great expectations" promise a glorious future, but the novel gradually reveals that what he expected was an illusion, and that the true achievement lies in moral growth rather than social rise.

Pip's ambition is at the centre of the novel, and Dickens shows clearly where it

Question number

begins. Before he visits Satis House, Pip expects to be apprenticed to Joe and is content with the forge. Structurally, his meeting with Estella is the turning point. Her scorn for his "coarse hands" and "thick boots" makes him ashamed of his class, and soon afterwards he confides to Biddy, "I want to be a gentleman". The bluntness of the sentence shows how completely this desire takes hold of him, yet Biddy's gentle question, whether he wants to be a gentleman to spite Estella or to win her, exposes that his ambition has no real foundation of its own. Dickens suggests that Pip's ambition is not for self-improvement but for approval, which is why it makes him unhappy. Even before his fortune arrives, he looks on the forge and on Joe with discontent.

Once Pip receives his expectations, Dickens shows how ambition leads him to betray his origins. In London he spends extravagantly, joins the idle club of the Finches of the Grove and runs into debt, and he is embarrassed by Joe's visit. The irony is that Pip has achieved the outward form of a gentleman while losing the qualities of one. At the time Dickens was writing, Victorian society was fascinated by self-improvement, and Samuel Smiles's Self-Help, published in 1859, celebrated men who rose through their own effort. Pip, however, rises through no effort at all, and Dickens seems to question a culture that measures worth by money and manners rather than by character.

Magwitch's ambition provides a striking contrast and a structural twist. His ambition is to make Pip a gentleman as repayment for the boy's kindness on the marshes. When he returns from Australia, he explains that he "lived rough" so that Pip could live smooth, and that he worked hard so that Pip could be "above work". The parallel structure of these clauses shows the self-sacrificing nature of his ambition, but it is also a kind of possession: he speaks of Pip as the gentleman he has "made". As a transported convict, Magwitch belonged to a despised underclass,

Question number

and his ambition is partly a desire to prove that someone like him can create a gentleman. Ironically, Pip's dream of gentility is revealed to depend on the very class he has learned to despise, and Dickens uses this reversal to expose the hollowness of social snobbery.

Other characters show ambition in its most destructive forms. Miss Havisham's only ambition is revenge on men after being jilted at the altar. She stops every clock at the moment of her humiliation and raises Estella to break men's hearts, urging Pip to "Love her, love her, love her!" The relentless repetition sounds more like a curse than an encouragement. Her greedy relatives, such as Camilla and Sarah Pocket, hover around her in hope of inheritance, and Dickens satirises their false affection. Estella is a victim of someone else's ambition, and her marriage to the brutal Bentley Drummle shows its cost.

Jaggers and Wemmick represent ambition for money and professional success. Wemmick's advice to collect "portable property" reduces life to possessions, and Jaggers is powerful but cold. Yet Wemmick's divided life, with his castle and his Aged Parent at Walworth, suggests that a person can keep their warmth only by separating it from the world of ambition.

Dickens also presents positive forms of ambition. Joe's ambition is simply to do his work well and to look after those he loves. Herbert hopes to make his way in business, and the most generous act in the novel is Pip's secret use of his money to buy Herbert a partnership. This is the first time Pip's ambition is directed towards another person's good, and it is the one investment that survives the collapse of his fortune. His later ambition to save Magwitch, rather than to escape him, shows his moral transformation.

Question number

By the end of the novel, Pip has lost his expectations but gained humility. He works abroad with Herbert and lives frugally, earning what he has. The bildungsroman structure, which traces his growth from boyhood to maturity, ultimately presents the collapse of his first ambition as necessary for his redemption. Dickens suggests that ambition becomes worthwhile only when it is tied to love, loyalty and honest work.

21 The scarlet letter is the central symbol of Hawthorne's novel, and its significance lies in the fact that its meaning never stays fixed. Intended by the Puritan magistrates as a permanent badge of shame for adultery, the letter is gradually transformed by Hester's endurance, by Pearl, and by the community's changing perceptions, until it becomes a sign almost of reverence. Through this shifting symbol, Hawthorne explores sin, guilt and identity, and criticises a rigid society that believes it can define a human being with a single letter.

From the first scaffold scene, Hawthorne presents the letter as both a punishment and an act of defiance. The Puritan authorities intend it as a public sign of disgrace, and the harsh women in the crowd insist that Hester should suffer more, one of them noting that the pang of it "will be always in her heart". The adverb "always" shows how the community expects the punishment to be permanent. Yet Hester has embroidered the letter herself with "gold thread" and extravagant artistry, so that it is described as "fantastically embroidered" upon her bosom. The beauty of the needlework is a quiet rebellion: she accepts the punishment but refuses to be humiliated by it. Hawthorne writes that the letter had "the effect of a spell", enclosing her "in a sphere by herself". The language of magic suggests that the letter does more than mark her; it isolates her from ordinary human relations, which in a close Puritan community of the 1640s was a severe form of

Question number

social death.

Pearl is closely linked to the symbol and extends its significance. Hawthorne calls her "the scarlet letter endowed with life", and Hester dresses her in crimson and gold, so that she becomes a living version of the badge. Pearl is fascinated by the letter, throwing flowers at it and asking her mother what it means. In one scene by the sea she makes a green letter "A" on her own chest out of eel-grass. The colour green, associated with nature and new life, contrasts with scarlet's associations with sin and passion, suggesting that the letter could carry innocent or natural meanings rather than only shameful ones. The letter is also significant because of what it reveals about Dimmesdale. Whereas Hester wears her letter openly, Dimmesdale hides his guilt, and his habit of pressing his hand over his heart becomes a hidden version of the same symbol. During the midnight scaffold scene, a meteor appears to trace a great letter "A" in the sky. Dimmesdale, tormented by guilt, reads it as a sign of his own sin, while the townspeople interpret it as "Angel", marking the death of Governor Winthrop. This episode reflects the Puritan habit of reading divine meaning into natural events, but Hawthorne's ambiguity also suggests that symbols reflect the minds of those who read them. At the climax, when Dimmesdale finally confesses on the scaffold, he tears open his clothing to reveal a mark on his breast, though the narrator deliberately offers several possible explanations for it. Structurally, the three scaffold scenes, at the beginning, middle and end, are all organised around the letter, which shows its importance in shaping the novel.

In the forest, Hester throws off the letter and lets down her hair, and for a moment she seems freed from guilt and the Puritan world. Hawthorne describes her breathing a long sigh as "the stigma" leaves her. Yet Pearl refuses to come to her until she puts it back on, which suggests that the letter has become part of

Question number

Hester's identity and that escape is impossible. Over seven years, Hester's charity and quiet strength change how the town sees her. Hawthorne writes that many people refused to interpret the letter by its original meaning and said it meant "Able". This change is significant because it shows that the community's judgement was never absolute. Even after she could leave, Hester returns to Boston and wears the letter voluntarily, turning a punishment into a chosen sign of her experience. At the close of the novel, her gravestone bears the heraldic inscription "ON A FIELD, SABLE, THE LETTER A, GULES". The language of heraldry, usually associated with noble families, gives the letter dignity, and the final words of the novel are the letter itself.

Writing in 1850, Hawthorne was deeply aware of his Puritan ancestors, including a judge at the Salem witch trials, and in the introductory Custom-House chapter the narrator claims to find the original faded letter and feels a burning heat when he places it on his breast. The letter therefore links Hawthorne's own guilt about his heritage to Hester's story. Ultimately, the scarlet letter is significant because it shows that meaning is created by people, not imposed by law, and that a symbol designed to condemn can become a mark of strength.

22

I largely agree that Roger Chillingworth is presented as evil, because Hawthorne makes him the novel's most destructive figure, a man who deliberately devotes his life to tormenting another human soul. However, I would not say he is wholly evil. Hawthorne gives him a believable motive, a moment of honest self-knowledge, and a final act of generosity, and he presents Chillingworth's evil as something that grows within him rather than something he is born with. In this way, Chillingworth becomes less a simple villain than a warning about what happens when wounded pride and cold intellect replace human sympathy.

Question number

At the start of the novel, Chillingworth is not presented as a monster but as a wronged husband. When he arrives in Boston and sees Hester on the scaffold, he hides his identity and silences her with a gesture, laying his finger on his lips. This secrecy is sinister, but his motive is understandable: his young wife has betrayed him. In the prison scene, he even admits his own share of blame, telling Hester that "Mine was the first wrong" when he drew her youth into a "false and unnatural relation" with his decay. This honest recognition that an old scholar should never have married a young woman without love complicates the idea that he is wholly evil. Hawthorne suggests that his loneliness, his wish to light a fire in a cold heart, was human and even pitiable.

Yet the same scene reveals the beginning of his corruption. He refuses to seek revenge on Hester, but vows to discover her lover, and this decision to make one man the object of his life defines his evil. Hawthorne uses his name as a symbol: "Chillingworth" suggests coldness, and he has chosen it himself, as if his new identity is a mask for a colder self. He becomes Dimmesdale's physician, and the townspeople call him a "leech", a pun on the old word for a doctor which also suggests a parasite slowly draining the minister's life. Structurally, living in the same house as Dimmesdale allows him to probe constantly, and Hawthorne describes him digging into the clergyman's heart like a miner searching for gold. The metaphor turns another man's suffering into treasure, which shows how his curiosity has become a cruel obsession.

As the novel progresses, Hawthorne presents Chillingworth's physical decline as an outward sign of inner evil. His face grows darker and uglier, and the narrator calls him a striking example of man's ability to transform himself "into a devil". The townspeople begin to whisper that he is Satan's emissary, and Hawthorne uses

Question number

demonic imagery, such as a red light glowing in his eyes, to make him seem more fiend than man. Dimmesdale's verdict, that the old man's revenge has been "blacker than my sin" because he has "violated, in cold blood, the sanctity of a human heart", is perhaps the novel's moral centre. Dimmesdale and Hester sinned through passion; Chillingworth sins through calculation, and Hawthorne, writing in 1850 against the background of Puritan theology, seems to regard this cold violation of another's soul as the unpardonable sin.

However, Hawthorne prevents the reader from seeing him as entirely beyond humanity. When Hester begs him to stop, Chillingworth replies that it is not granted to him to pardon, and calls everything that has happened "a dark necessity", ending with "Let the black flower blossom as it may!" This fatalistic language echoes the Puritan belief in predestination: he speaks as if he is trapped by the evil he has set in motion. The image of a "black flower" suggests something that grows naturally once planted, so Hawthorne implies that Chillingworth's evil has taken root in him rather than being his true nature. The ending complicates the statement most of all. After Dimmesdale's public confession and death, Chillingworth seems to wither away, losing his strength and purpose, and he dies within a year. Hawthorne suggests that his life had become entirely dependent on revenge, which is a terrible judgement on him. Yet he leaves a large fortune to Pearl, the child of his wife's adultery, which makes Pearl the richest heiress of her day. The narrator even wonders whether hatred and love may be "the same thing at bottom", and imagines that in the spiritual world Chillingworth and Dimmesdale might find their antipathy changed into love.

Overall, Hawthorne presents Chillingworth as the most evil character in the novel, and his deliberate cruelty towards Dimmesdale is far worse than the sin of adultery that the Puritans punished so harshly. But he is not wholly evil. His

Question number

original grievance is real, he admits his own wrong, and his final legacy to Pearl hints at a buried capacity for good. Hawthorne uses him to show that evil is often a human choice, made slowly, and that the coldness of revenge can destroy the avenger as completely as the victim.