OXFORD
INTERNATIONAL
AQA EXAMINATIONS

INTERNATIONAL GCSE
ENGLISH LITERATURE

Paper 1 Prose and drama

Tuesday 7 May 2019 07:00 GMT Time allowed: 1 hour 30 minutes

Materials
For this paper you must have:
- an Oxford International AQA Examinations 16-page answer book.

Instructions
- Use black ink or black ball-point pen.
- Do **not** use pencil.
- Write the information required on the front of your answer book.
- Answer **one** question from **Section A** and **one** question from **Section B**.

Information
- The marks for questions are shown in brackets.
- There are 30 marks available for each section.
- The maximum mark for this paper is 60.

stemup.co.uk

Section A: Prose

Answer **one** question from this section on your chosen text.

Either

Charles Dickens: *Great Expectations*

0 1 In this extract Pip has just met Estella for the first time.

> 'He calls the knaves, Jacks, this boy!' said Estella with disdain, before our first game was out. 'And what coarse hands he has! And what thick boots!'
>
> I had never thought of being ashamed of my hands before; but I began to consider them a very indifferent pair. Her contempt for me was so strong, that it became infectious, and I caught it.
>
> She won the game, and I dealt. I misdealt, as was only natural, when I knew she was lying in wait for me to do wrong; and she denounced me for a stupid, clumsy labouring-boy.
>
> 'You say nothing of her,' remarked Miss Havisham to me, as she looked on. 'She says many hard things of you, yet you say nothing of her. What do you think of her?'
>
> 'I don't like to say,' I stammered.
>
> 'Tell me in my ear,' said Miss Havisham, bending down.
>
> 'I think she is very proud,' I replied, in a whisper.
>
> 'Anything else?'
>
> 'I think she is very pretty.'
>
> 'Anything else?'
>
> 'I think she is very insulting.' (She was looking at me then with a look of supreme aversion.)
>
> 'Anything else?'
>
> 'I think I should like to go home.'

Starting with this extract, explore how Dickens presents the relationship between Pip and Estella in *Great Expectations*.

[30 marks]

or

0 2 Write about how Dickens presents money and social class in *Great Expectations*.

[30 marks]

stemup.co.uk

or

Harper Lee: *To Kill a Mockingbird*

0 3 In this extract Scout is describing Atticus.

This extract cannot be reproduced here due to third party copyright restrictions.

Starting with this extract, explore how Lee presents Atticus in *To Kill a Mockingbird*.

[30 marks]

or

0 4 How does Lee present different types of prejudice in *To Kill a Mockingbird*?

[30 marks]

Turn over for the next question

stemup.co.uk

or

Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie: *Purple Hibiscus*

0 5 In this extract Papa is visiting Kambili's school after she has come second in her class.

> "Where is your class?" he asked.
>
> I pointed to the building by the group of mango trees. Papa came out of the car with me and I wondered what he was doing, why he was here, why he had driven me to school and asked Kevin to take Jaja.
>
> Sister Margaret saw him as we walked to my class. She waved gaily, from the midst of students and a few parents, then quickly waddled over to us. Her words flew generously out of her mouth: how was Papa doing, was he happy with my progress at Daughters of the Immaculate Heart, would he be at the reception for the bishop next week?
>
> Papa changed his accent when he spoke, sounding British, just as he did when he spoke to Father Benedict. He was gracious, in the eager-to-please way that he always assumed with the religious, especially with the white religious. As gracious as when he presented the check for refurbishing the Daughters of the Immaculate Heart library. He said he had just come to see my class, and Sister Margaret told him to let her know if he needed anything.

Starting with this extract, explore the ways Adichie presents the differences between the public and the private sides of Papa in *Purple Hibiscus*.

[30 marks]

or

0 6 How are family members shown to be supportive of each other in *Purple Hibiscus*?

[30 marks]

stemup.co.uk

or

Kazuo Ishiguro*: Never Let Me Go*

0 7 In this extract Kathy is remembering one of her first encounters with Ruth.

> The South Playing Field was the one used most by the Juniors and it was there, in the corner by the poplars, that Ruth came up to me one lunchtime, looked me up and down, then asked:
>
> 'Do you want to ride my horse?'
>
> I was in the midst of playing with two or three others at that point, but it was clear Ruth was addressing only me. This absolutely delighted me, but I made a show of weighing her up before giving a reply.
>
> 'Well, what's your horse's name?'
>
> Ruth came a step closer. 'My *best* horse,' she said, 'is Thunder. I can't let you ride on *him*. He's much too dangerous. But you can ride Bramble, as long as you don't use your crop on him. Or if you like, you could have any of the others.' She reeled off several more names I don't now remember. Then she asked: 'Have you got any horses of your own?'
>
> I looked at her and thought carefully before replying: 'No. I don't have any horses.'
>
> 'Not even one?'
>
> 'No.'
>
> 'All right. You can ride Bramble, and if you like him, you can have him to keep. But you're not to use your crop on him. And you've got to come *now*.'

Starting with this extract, explore how Ishiguro presents the relationship between Kathy and Ruth in *Never Let Me Go*.

[30 marks]

or

0 8 How does Ishiguro present Tommy in *Never Let Me Go*?

[30 marks]

Turn over for the next question

stemup.co.uk

or

Markus Zusak: *The Book Thief*

0 9 In this extract Rudy has covered himself in charcoal and is pretending to be the black athlete, Jesse Owens.

> The starter signalled them forward. A crowd materialised around every square centimetre of Hubert Oval's circumference. They were all calling out one thing. They were chanting Rudy Steiner's name – and his name was Jesse Owens.
>
> All fell silent.
>
> His bare feet gripped the soil. He could feel it holding on between his toes.
>
> At the request of the starter, he raised to crouching position – and the gun clipped a hole in the night.
>
> For the first third of the race, it was pretty even, but it was only a matter of time before the charcoaled Owens drew clear and streaked away.
>
> 'Owens in front,' the boy's shrill voice cried as he ran down the empty straight, straight towards the uproarious applause of Olympic glory. He could even feel the tape break in two across his chest as he burst through it in first place. The fastest man alive.

Using this extract as a starting point, explore how Zusak presents the character of Rudy in *The Book Thief*.

[30 marks]

or

1 0 How does Zusak show the effects of grief and guilt in *The Book Thief*?

[30 marks]

stemup.co.uk

or

Oxford AQA Short Stories Anthology

1 1 In this extract from *The Fly in the Ointment* the father is talking to the son about his business.

> "Listen to this," the father said and leaned forward on the table as his son leaned back, holding his right fist up as if he had a hammer in his hand and was auctioning his life. "I am 65. I don't know how long I shall live, but let me make this clear: if I were not an optimist I wouldn't be here. I wouldn't stay another minute." He paused, fixing his son's half averted eyes to let the full meaning of his words bite home. "I've worked hard," the father went on. "For thirty years I built up this business from nothing. You wouldn't know it, you were a child, but many's the time coming down from the North, I've slept in this office to be on the job early next morning." He looked decided and experienced like a man of forty, but now he softened to sixty again. The ring in the hard voice began to soften into a faint whine and his thick nose sniffed. "I don't say I've always done right," he said. "You can't live your life from A to Z like that. And now I haven't a penny in the world. Not a cent. It's not easy at my time of life to begin again. What do you think I've got to live for? There's nothing holding me back. My boy, if I wasn't an optimist I'd go right out. I'd finish it."

Starting with this extract, explore the ways writers present strong characters. Write about the father from *The Fly in the Ointment* and **one** character from **one** other story from the Oxford AQA Anthology.

[30 marks]

or

1 2 Explore the ways old people are presented in *A Real Durwan* and in **one** other story from the Oxford AQA Anthology.

[30 marks]

Turn over for Section B

stemup.co.uk

Section B: Drama

Answer **one** question from this section on your chosen text.

Either

William Shakespeare: *Julius Caesar*

1 3 In this extract Cassius is talking to Brutus about Caesar**.**

> **CASSIUS**
> Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world
> Like a Colossus, and we petty men
> Walk under his huge legs and peep about
> To find ourselves dishonourable graves.
> Men at some time are masters of their fates:
> The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars
> But in ourselves, that we are underlings.
> Brutus and Caesar: what should be in that 'Caesar'?
> Why should that name be sounded more than yours?
> Write them together, yours is as fair a name;
> Sound them, it doth become the mouth as well;
> Weigh them, it is as heavy; conjure with 'em,
> 'Brutus' will start a spirit as soon as 'Caesar'.

Starting with this extract, explore how Shakespeare presents Caesar as a ruler in *Julius Caesar.*

[30 marks]

or

1 4 'The conspirators act purely from selfish motives.'

To what extent do you agree with this view of the presentation of the conspirators in *Julius Caesar*?

[30 marks]

stemup.co.uk

or

William Shakespeare: *Macbeth*

1 5 This extract occurs shortly after Macbeth has killed Duncan.

LADY MACBETH
These deeds must not be thought
After these ways; so, it will make us mad.

MACBETH
Methought I heard a voice cry, 'Sleep no more:
Macbeth does murder sleep', the innocent sleep,
Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care,
The death of each day's life, sore labour's bath,
Balm of hurt minds, great nature's second course,
Chief nourisher in life's feast.

LADY MACBETH
What do you mean?

MACBETH
Still it cried, 'Sleep no more' to all the house;
'Glamis hath murder'd sleep', and therefore Cawdor
Shall sleep no more: Macbeth shall sleep no more.

Starting with this extract, explore how Shakespeare presents the effects of guilt in *Macbeth*.

[30 marks]

or

1 6 How does Shakespeare explore ideas about kingship in *Macbeth*?

[30 marks]

Turn over for the next question

stemup.co.uk

or

J.B. Priestley*: An Inspector Calls*

1 7 In this extract Mrs Birling meets the Inspector for the first time.

MRS BIRLING [*same easy tone*]: I'm Mrs Birling, y'know. My husband has just explained why you're here, and while we'll be glad to tell you anything you want to know, I don't think we can help you much.

SHEILA: No, Mother – please!

MRS BIRLING [*affecting great surprise*]: What's the matter, Sheila?

SHEILA [*hesitantly*]: I know it sounds silly –

MRS BIRLING: What does?

SHEILA: You see, I feel you're beginning all wrong. And I'm afraid you'll say something or do something that you'll be sorry for afterwards.

MRS BIRLING: I don't know what you're talking about, Sheila.

SHEILA: We all started like that – so confident, so pleased with ourselves until he began asking us questions.

[MRS BIRLING *looks from* SHEILA *to the* INSPECTOR.]

MRS BIRLING: You seem to have made a great impression on this child, Inspector.

INSPECTOR [*coolly*]: We often do on the young ones. They're more impressionable.

Starting with this extract, explore how Priestley presents the differences between the younger generation and the older generation in *An Inspector Calls*.

[30 marks]

or

1 8 How does Priestley present the world of business and money in *An Inspector Calls*?

[30 marks]

stemup.co.uk

or

Arthur Miller: *The Crucible*

1 9 In this extract John Proctor has confessed to witchcraft but is now refusing to sign his confession.

This extract cannot be reproduced here due to third party copyright restrictions.

Starting with this extract, explore the extent to which John Proctor is presented as a good man in *The Crucible*.

[30 marks]

or

2 0 How does Miller present the character of Reverend John Hale in *The Crucible*?

[30 marks]

Turn over for the next question

stemup.co.uk

or

Lorraine Hansberry: *A Raisin in the Sun*

2 1 In this extract Walter and Beneatha are discussing the cheque for $10 000 which is due to arrive the following day.

This extract cannot be reproduced here due to third party copyright restrictions.

Starting with this extract, explore how Hansberry presents the importance of money in *A Raisin in the Sun*.

[30 marks]

or

2 2 How does Hansberry present the character of Walter in *A Raisin in the Sun*?

[30 marks]

END OF QUESTIONS

Copyright information

For confidentiality purposes, acknowledgements of third-party copyright material will be published in a separate booklet rather than including them on the examination paper or support materials. This booklet is published after each examination series and is available for free download from www.oxfordaqaexams.org.uk after the live examination series.

Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for. In some cases, efforts to contact copyright-holders may have been unsuccessful and Oxford International AQA Examinations will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgements. If you have any queries please contact the Copyright Team, AQA, Stag Hill House, Guildford, GU2 7XJ.

Copyright © 2019 Oxford International AQA Examinations and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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

01

Dickens presents the relationship between Pip and Estella as one built, from its very first moment, on inequality: she is the cold, high star and he is the "coarse" boy who looks up at her. Yet the novel gradually reveals that this inequality is manufactured. Both children are shaped by Miss Havisham's revenge and by a society obsessed with class, so that their relationship becomes Dickens's means of exploring how love can be poisoned by pride, and how only suffering can make it equal.

In the extract, Estella's power lies in her language. Her exclamations, "And what coarse hands he has! And what thick boots!", are spoken about Pip rather than to him, as if he were an object on display. The scorn in "He calls the knaves, Jacks" is especially revealing: Pip's mistake is not stupidity but a working-class word, so from the start Dickens ties her contempt to class. Her verdict, a "stupid, clumsy labouring-boy", piles up adjectives like a sentence passed in court. What makes the moment so painful is the older Pip's retrospective narration. He admits he "had never thought of being ashamed" of his hands before, and the disease imagery of contempt that "became infectious, and I caught it" suggests that Estella does not merely insult him; she infects him with a new way of seeing himself. The whole of Pip's later snobbery towards Joe could be traced back to this moment of contagion.

Dickens also makes the relationship a triangle rather than a pair. Miss Havisham "looked on", a spectator to a game she has arranged, and her repeated "Anything else?" draws out Pip's confession as if she were feeding on it. His answers move from "proud" to "pretty" to "insulting", capturing the contradiction at the heart of

Question number

his feelings: he is wounded and attracted at once. The final answer, "I think I should like to go home", is touchingly childlike, yet the reader knows that Pip will never feel at home at the forge again. The bracketed detail of Estella's "look of supreme aversion" works as a stage direction, showing that she is performing a part, perhaps one she has been trained to play.

This sense of training is confirmed across the novel. Miss Havisham's whispered command "Love her, love her, love her!" turns love into an obsession and a weapon. Estella's very name, suggesting a star, presents her as beautiful, distant and unreachable, something Pip can gaze at but never hold. Even as a young woman she warns him plainly that she has "no heart", and Dickens makes her honesty almost a kindness: unlike Miss Havisham, she does not pretend to offer what she cannot give. Pip, however, cannot listen. His desperate declaration that she has been "in every line I have ever read" shows how completely she has become the centre of his "great expectations", so that wanting Estella and wanting to be a gentleman become the same desire.

Dickens uses irony to undermine the class divide that Estella first insists on. Pip later discovers that she is the daughter of Magwitch, the convict, and Molly, a servant accused of murder. The proud girl who mocked his "thick boots" is, by birth, lower than the blacksmith's boy. For a Victorian readership anxious about rank and respectability, this revelation suggests that class is an accident, and that the contempt it breeds is both cruel and absurd.

The relationship is also darkened by Estella's marriage to Bentley Drummle, the brutal "Spider". Her choice seems deliberately self-punishing, as though she would rather be used than loved, and it devastates Pip. Dickens suggests that both of them are casualties of Miss Havisham's plan: she has been taught to wound, and

Question number

he has been taught to long for the one person who cannot love him back.

In the final chapter, set in the ruins of Satis House, Dickens finally presents them as equals. Estella, abused by Drummle and now widowed, says that "suffering has been stronger than all other teaching", while Pip has lost his fortune and his illusions. The garden of the ruined house, where the extract's cruel games began, now becomes a place of tenderness. Dickens famously rewrote the ending after Bulwer-Lytton's advice; in the first version they simply part. The published ending, with Pip seeing "no shadow of another parting", is still carefully hedged, and many readers find it ambiguous. Perhaps Dickens suggests that a relationship which began in contempt can be healed, but only after both have been humbled, so that the "coarse" boy and the proud star finally meet on the same level.

02 Dickens presents money and social class as forces that promise to raise people up but more often distort them. In Great Expectations wealth is rarely earned honestly, class is rarely a measure of worth, and the desire to rise socially corrupts relationships. Through Pip's journey from the forge to London and back, Dickens questions the Victorian ideal of the "gentleman" and suggests that true value lies in loyalty, kindness and work, not in money or birth.

At the start of the novel Pip's world is poor but not yet ashamed of itself. The forge is hard and Mrs Joe brings him up "by hand", a phrase that comically conceals violence, yet Joe's love gives the home warmth. Class only becomes a problem when Pip is sent to Satis House. Estella's scorn for his "coarse hands" and "thick boots" makes him see himself through the eyes of the rich, and Dickens shows how quickly that view is absorbed. Pip's confession, "It is a most miserable thing to feel ashamed of home", is narrated by his older self with painful honesty,

Question number

so that the first-person voice both shows his snobbery and judges it.

Dickens is particularly sharp about the way money makes people servile. Mrs Joe and Pumblechook are excited by Miss Havisham's wealth long before Pip benefits from it, and their fantasies about what he might gain reveal their greed. When Pip comes into his fortune, Pumblechook's transformation is grotesque: he fusses over him and keeps asking "May I? May I?" to shake his hand, the repetition exposing his sycophancy. The comedy has a moral edge. Pumblechook claims credit for Pip's rise, showing that social climbers love money more than people. Similarly, Miss Havisham's relatives, such as Camilla and Sarah Pocket, hover around her like vultures, waiting for an inheritance, and Dickens presents their politeness as a mask for appetite.

Money also changes Pip, and Dickens makes this the most uncomfortable part of the novel. When Joe visits him in London, Joe's awkward manners, his hat that keeps falling, and his insistence on calling Pip "sir" are described with a mixture of comedy and shame. The reader laughs, but also notices that Pip is the one who has made the visit miserable. Joe, by contrast, understands class better than Pip does, gently explaining that "life is made of ever so many partings welded together", an image from his own trade which gives his words a quiet dignity. Dickens even uses Trabb's boy, who mocks Pip in the street with "Don't know yah!", to puncture his new airs, suggesting that the working class can see through pretension.

The figure of Magwitch is central to Dickens's critique. Pip assumes his fortune comes from Miss Havisham, a respectable lady; instead it comes from a transported convict who has made money in Australia. Pip's horror at Magwitch's return is described physically, as he shrinks from his touch, showing that Pip

Question number

cannot separate the man from his class. Yet Magwitch's claim to be his "second father" is, in its way, the most generous act in the novel. Dickens contrasts him with Compeyson, a man who looked and spoke like a gentleman and therefore received a lighter sentence at their trial. For Victorian readers who trusted appearances and accents, this is a deliberate challenge: the legal system rewards the look of class rather than the truth of character.

Herbert Pocket offers the novel's moral principle when he says that no man who was not a true gentleman at heart was ever a true gentleman in manner. His father and Herbert himself are kind but not rich, and Herbert's honest work as a clerk becomes a model of earned success. Wemmick, too, separates his office self, obsessed with "portable property", from his loving home life at the Castle, showing how a money-driven city forces people to divide themselves.

By the end, Pip loses his fortune when Magwitch's property is seized by the Crown. Dickens structures this loss as a kind of salvation. Pip falls ill, and it is Joe who nurses him and secretly pays his debts, reversing the earlier humiliation in London. Pip finally works his way up with Herbert's firm, "not in a grand way", but honestly. Dickens therefore presents money and class as false measures of worth: the novel's real gentlemen are a blacksmith and a convict, while the snobs and flatterers are exposed as hollow.

03 Lee presents Atticus as the moral centre of To Kill a Mockingbird, but she does so with a quiet irony: the qualities that his children at first see as weaknesses are exactly the ones the reader learns to admire. In the extract, Scout catalogues what is wrong with her father, yet every complaint becomes evidence of a man whose strength is moral rather than physical, and whose courage lies in restraint. Across

Question number

the novel Lee uses him to show what integrity looks like in a town ruled by prejudice, while hinting that even he cannot fully change it.

The extract opens with a blunt judgement: "Atticus was feeble: he was nearly fifty." The colon gives the line the flat certainty of a child's logic, and the humour comes from the gap between the young Scout's opinion and the adult reader's understanding. Scout complains that he does not hunt, play poker, drink or do the manly things other fathers do, that he works in an office and simply reads. Lee makes the narration double-voiced here: the child Scout is embarrassed, but the older narrator, looking back, allows us to sense that this is a man who does not need to prove himself. His love of reading links him to reason and reflection, setting him apart from the violent masculinity that the novel associates with men such as Bob Ewell. In a Southern town of the 1930s, where manhood was often measured by guns and physical toughness, Atticus's quietness is almost a form of resistance.

This setup makes the mad dog episode that follows especially powerful. When Heck Tate hands him the rifle and Atticus kills Tim Johnson with one shot, the children discover that he was once known as "One Shot Finch". Lee structures the chapter so that the reader's view of Atticus changes as suddenly as the children's. Miss Maudie explains that he chose not to shoot because he felt it gave him an unfair advantage over living things, and her role as an adult commentator gives the reader the interpretation that Scout cannot yet reach. The mad dog itself can be read symbolically as the "sickness" of racism moving through Maycomb, which Atticus will face again in the trial.

Atticus's goodness is also shown through his teaching. His advice that you never understand a person until you "climb into his skin and walk around in it" is the

Question number

novel's central moral lesson, and its physical, almost childlike image makes empathy something Scout can grasp. Likewise, his warning that "it's a sin to kill a mockingbird" introduces the novel's key symbol of innocence destroyed. Lee often presents Atticus through dialogue rather than description, so that his values emerge from how he speaks to his children: patiently, honestly, and as equals.

The trial presents Atticus at his most public and most principled. He takes Tom Robinson's case knowing he will lose, telling Scout that he could not hold up his head in town if he refused. In his closing speech he insists that "in our courts all men are created equal", deliberately echoing the Declaration of Independence to remind the jury that American ideals are being betrayed. Lee shows his skill as a lawyer when he exposes that Tom's left arm is useless, making Mayella's account impossible. The reaction of the black community in the gallery, standing as he leaves and Reverend Sykes's words "Miss Jean Louise, stand up. Your father's passin'", is one of the most moving moments in the book, showing that his integrity is recognised by those the town despises.

Yet Lee does not present Atticus as flawless. He underestimates Bob Ewell, dismissing the spitting incident and assuming the threat is empty, which nearly costs his children their lives. When Bob is found dead, Atticus at first insists that Jem must face the law, showing a rigid belief in the legal system. It is Heck Tate who persuades him to protect Boo, and Scout who completes the lesson by saying that exposing Boo would be "sort of like shootin' a mockingbird". Perhaps Lee suggests that Atticus's faith in law must be balanced by mercy.

Overall, Lee presents Atticus as a man whose quiet goodness is underestimated, first by his children and then by Maycomb. The extract's comic list of his failings prepares the reader to see that real courage, as he tells Jem, is not a man with a

Question number

gun in his hand, but the willingness to stand alone for what is right.

04 Lee presents prejudice in To Kill a Mockingbird as a web of attitudes rather than a single evil. Racism is the most destructive strand, but it is tied to snobbery about class, suspicion of anyone who is different, and the comfortable hypocrisy of "respectable" people. By filtering these prejudices through Scout, a child who does not yet share the adults' assumptions, Lee makes them look strange and irrational, inviting the reader to question attitudes that Maycomb treats as natural.

Racial prejudice dominates the second half of the novel and is exposed most clearly through the trial of Tom Robinson. Lee constructs the case so that the evidence points overwhelmingly to Tom's innocence: his left arm is crippled, Mayella's bruises are on the right side of her face, and Bob Ewell is left-handed. The guilty verdict therefore shows that the jury is not judging facts but colour. Lee heightens the injustice through contrast. Tom is polite and careful, while Bob Ewell is crude, mocking and disrespectful to the court. Yet Tom's most honest moment is also his most dangerous: when he says he "felt right sorry" for Mayella, the courtroom stiffens, because a black man pitying a white woman threatens the town's racial hierarchy. In the segregated South of the 1930s, Lee suggests, a black man could be condemned not for a crime but for stepping out of his place.

Lee also shows racism in the structure of the town itself. The black community lives beyond the dump, past the Ewells, a geography that places them literally below even the poorest white family. The reactions to Atticus's decision to defend Tom, with children taunting Scout and the lynch mob at the jail, show how far the community will go to protect this order. Tom's later death, shot while trying to escape, is described almost briefly, as if it barely matters to the town, which is

Question number

exactly Lee's point.

Social prejudice and class snobbery form a second layer. In the school scenes, Miss Caroline cannot understand Walter Cunningham's poverty, and Scout herself mocks him for pouring syrup over his food. Calpurnia's sharp rebuke that he is "comp'ny" teaches Scout that manners matter more than money. Aunt Alexandra, obsessed with "Fine Folks" and family background, forbids Scout from playing with Walter, revealing that the respectable classes also look down on the poor whites. Lee shows how this snobbery runs downwards: the Cunninghams look down on the Ewells, and the Ewells, despised by everyone, cling to their sense of superiority over black people. Prejudice becomes a ladder, with each group stepping on the one below.

Lee is particularly ironic in her treatment of hypocrisy. Miss Gates teaches the class about Hitler's persecution of the Jews and declares that in America "we don't believe in persecuting anybody", yet Scout overhears her outside the courthouse speaking contemptuously about black people. The missionary circle scene is equally pointed: Mrs Merriweather laments the suffering of the Mrunas in Africa while complaining about her own black servants. Lee lets these contradictions speak for themselves through dialogue, and Scout's innocent narration, which records rather than condemns, makes the adults' blindness even more obvious to the reader.

Lee is careful to show that prejudice is not only one-directional. When Calpurnia takes the children to First Purchase church, Lula objects to white children being brought there. This brief moment suggests that segregation breeds distrust on both sides, although Lee also shows that the rest of the congregation welcomes them warmly, so Lula's hostility appears as a reaction to oppression rather than an equal prejudice.

Question number

Finally, prejudice against difference is embodied in Boo Radley. In the early chapters he is a "malevolent phantom", built from rumour and gossip, and the children's games turn him into a monster. As the novel develops, Boo leaves gifts in the tree, puts a blanket around Scout during the fire and finally saves the children from Bob Ewell. Jem's realisation that Boo stays inside because he wants to suggests he understands how cruel the outside world can be. When Scout stands on the Radley porch and sees the street through Boo's eyes, she finally understands Atticus's lesson about standing in another person's shoes, the empathy he first taught her when he told her to "climb into his skin and walk around in it".

Through these different types of prejudice, Lee shows that ignorance and fear are learned, and that empathy is the only cure. The mockingbirds of the novel, Tom and Boo, are both destroyed or hidden by prejudice, and Lee leaves the reader to decide whether Maycomb, unlike Scout, will ever learn.

05 Adichie presents Papa as a man divided between a dazzling public reputation and a frightening private reality. In public he is generous, devout, brave and admired; at home he is a tyrant who punishes his family in the name of the same God he praises in church. Rather than presenting these as simply true and false faces, Adichie suggests that both sides grow from the same roots, his hunger for approval and his colonial schooling, which is why Kambili finds it so hard to separate the father she fears from the father she loves.

The extract shows the public Papa at work. Sister Margaret greets him "gaily" and her words fly "generously out of her mouth", a playful image that captures how

Question number

eagerly people seek his attention. Papa responds in kind: he is "gracious", but Kambili adds the telling qualification that his graciousness is "eager-to-please". The detail that he "changed his accent", sounding "British, just as he did when he spoke to Father Benedict", is central. Adichie shows that Papa's public self is partly a performance shaped by colonial values. He adjusts his voice for "the white religious" in particular, and the phrase suggests he still measures himself against white authority. The reference to the cheque "for refurbishing the Daughters of the Immaculate Heart library" reminds us that his public goodness is also bought and displayed, generosity that earns status.

What makes the extract unsettling is what lies beneath its calm surface. Kambili's anxious questions, "what he was doing, why he was here", are piled up in a single breathless sentence, revealing her fear. The reader knows that Papa has come because she came second, and that in his eyes second place is a failure. Behind his polite talk lies an expectation that she must be first, and the visit becomes a quiet act of surveillance. Kambili's narration is restrained, almost flat, but that restraint is itself a sign of how she has learned to hide her emotions.

Across the novel, the public Papa is impressive. He owns factories and publishes the Standard, a newspaper that criticises the military regime even when it is dangerous to do so, and he supports Ade Coker, its editor. He gives huge sums to the church and to his village, where people honour him with a title meaning one who does for the community. He even receives a human rights award. Adichie deliberately makes his public virtues real: he is genuinely brave politically, which complicates any simple judgement of him.

The private Papa is the opposite. The novel's opening sentence, with Papa flinging his missal and breaking the figurines, immediately introduces violence into the

Question number

home, and the figurines, which Mama polishes after each beating, become a symbol of her suffering. Papa beats Mama so badly that she loses a baby, pours boiling water over Kambili's feet for sharing a house with her "heathen" grandfather, telling her "You burn your feet", and later beats her almost to death over a painting of Papa-Nnukwu. Adichie shows that his religion, which in public appears virtuous, becomes in private a justification for cruelty. He even weeps and embraces his children after hurting them, insisting that he acts for their own good. These moments of tenderness are perhaps the most disturbing part of his characterisation, because they show that he believes his violence is love.

Adichie uses contrast to expose this split. At Aunty Ifeoma's flat in Nsukka there is laughter, debate and singing in Igbo, while Papa's house in Enugu is silent and governed by timetables. Papa's rejection of his own father, whom he will not allow into his house because he follows traditional religion, shows how his public loyalty to the colonisers' Christianity costs him his private family bonds. The small domestic rituals reveal both sides at once: his "love sips" of tea, which Kambili treasures, feel like communion but also show how tightly he controls what his children receive.

The division finally destroys him. Mama poisons his tea, using the very ritual of affection as the means of his death, and the public world mourns a great man while his family knows a different truth. Kambili's continued love for him, even at the end, prevents Adichie's portrait from becoming a simple villain. Through Papa, Adichie suggests that a man can be a hero in public and a tyrant at home, and that a society which admires public goodness may not see the suffering hidden behind closed doors.

Question number

06

In Purple Hibiscus Adichie presents family support as something that has to survive under pressure. In Papa's house support must be secret, silent and often physical, a matter of glances and shared suffering, while in Aunty Ifeoma's home it is open, loud and generous. Through this contrast Adichie suggests that real support is not about money or obedience but about protecting and freeing one another, and the novel's most powerful acts of loyalty are also acts of sacrifice.

The bond between Kambili and Jaja is the clearest example of support within Papa's household. Because speech is dangerous in the Enugu house, Adichie shows the siblings communicating through their eyes, a private language that Papa cannot police. This silent connection becomes a form of resistance: each of them knows what the other is enduring without needing to say it. Jaja's deformed little finger, crushed by Papa as a punishment for a religious test, makes him a physical reminder of what both children suffer, and his protectiveness grows from that shared pain. Kambili's narration, often quiet and understated, gives these small gestures great weight, so the reader senses how much love is hidden beneath fear.

Mama's support is quieter still, and at first it seems passive. She polishes her ballet-dancer figurines after each beating, and she stays with Papa, defending him to Ifeoma. Yet Adichie gradually reveals that Mama has been protecting her children in the only way she knows. When she finally poisons Papa's tea, the act is shocking, but it can be read as the most extreme form of maternal support: she removes the danger her children have lived with all their lives. Adichie leaves the morality uncertain, perhaps deliberately, so that the reader must decide whether this is love, desperation, or both.

Aunty Ifeoma represents a more open model of family support. Though she is a widowed lecturer struggling with power cuts, food shortages and the expense of

Question number

gas, she welcomes Kambili and Jaja into her crowded flat in Nsukka. Adichie contrasts the sparse food and loud debates at her table with the silent, expensive meals in Papa's house. Ifeoma's family argue, laugh and sing, and her encouragement of her children to question things becomes, for Kambili and Jaja, a new kind of care. She supports her own father too, bringing Papa-Nnukwu to her flat when he is ill, and showing him the respect that Eugene withholds. For Mama, Ifeoma offers a lifeline, suggesting that a woman's life does not end with a failed marriage, and providing somewhere to go after Papa's violence.

Papa-Nnukwu himself offers a moving example of support across division. Although his son refuses to enter his house and treats him as a "heathen", he still prays in the mornings for Eugene's wellbeing. Kambili, watching his ritual, is surprised by its gentleness, and Adichie uses this moment to show that love can persist even when it is rejected. His prayer quietly contrasts with Papa's harsh piety.

Adichie also shows how support grows between cousins. Amaka is at first scornful of Kambili, mocking her silence and wealth, but she later gives her the unfinished portrait of Papa-Nnukwu, an act of trust and friendship. When Papa destroys the painting and beats Kambili, the fragments become a symbol of the love he cannot tolerate. Obiora, too, becomes a model for Jaja, showing him what it is to speak up.

The ending makes sacrifice the strongest form of support. When Papa dies, Jaja takes the blame for the poisoning to protect Mama, and he is imprisoned. Mama and Kambili pay bribes and visit him, trying to improve his conditions, and Kambili's narration focuses on her hopes for his release. The novel closes with images of rain and new growth, and the purple hibiscus that Jaja planted, a cutting from Ifeoma's garden, becomes a symbol of the freedom that family

Question number

support has made possible.

Overall, Adichie presents family members supporting each other most fully when they resist the control that has harmed them. In Papa's house, support is a secret; in Ifeoma's, it is a way of life. By the end, Kambili, Jaja and Mama have learned to protect one another openly, even at great cost, suggesting that love, not authority, is what truly holds a family together.

07 Ishiguro presents the relationship between Kathy and Ruth as a lifelong friendship shaped by power, rivalry and a deep, unspoken need for each other. From the first moment, Ruth leads and Kathy follows, but Kathy is never as passive as she seems: she watches, calculates and quietly resists. Because the whole story is told by Kathy, looking back after Ruth's death, the relationship is always seen through the lens of memory, and the reader must judge how far her account is fair, and how far it is itself an act of forgiveness.

The extract establishes Ruth's dominance with striking economy. She chooses Kathy rather than the other way round, approaching her, looking her "up and down", and singling her out while Kathy is playing with others. The offer "Do you want to ride my horse?" sounds generous, but it is an invitation into Ruth's world on Ruth's terms. Her imaginary stable has rules and hierarchies: "Thunder" is too dangerous, Bramble is permitted, and she twice insists "you're not to use your crop on him". The repeated prohibition shows a child who needs control, even over make-believe animals. The final command, "And you've got to come now", ends the conversation with an order, not a request. Ishiguro uses the innocence of the game to reveal the shape of the friendship to come.

Question number

Yet Kathy is already playing her own game. She is "absolutely delighted" but makes "a show of weighing her up", and she "thought carefully" before admitting she has no horses. This is a subtle moment: Kathy realises that saying no will make her the grateful recipient, and so she chooses dependence deliberately. Her narration, with its careful qualifications such as names she does not "now remember", reminds us that this is memory reconstructed, and that the adult Kathy is still trying to understand the child she was. Ishiguro's understated, conversational style makes even this small negotiation feel significant.

At Hailsham, the pattern continues. Ruth forms a "secret guard" to protect Miss Geraldine, inventing plots and deciding who belongs, while Kathy is allowed in but never in charge. The pencil case episode shows the first real crack. Ruth implies that Miss Geraldine gave her the pencil case, a sign of special favour, and Kathy, who suspects it came from the Sales, hints that she knows the truth. Ruth's distress makes Kathy feel guilty, and Ishiguro presents a friendship in which both girls know exactly where to wound each other. Kathy's later regret suggests that their bond depends on protecting each other's illusions.

Ruth's pretence of knowing how to play chess, moving the pieces with false confidence while refusing to admit she does not know the rules, is a small symbol of her wish to appear in command of a world she does not understand. At the Cottages, this need for control becomes harsher. She imitates the gestures of the older veterans to seem sophisticated, and Kathy's observation of this hurts her. Their quarrels become crueller, with Ruth using private knowledge against Kathy, especially about her feelings and her sexuality, to make her feel isolated. Most damaging of all, Ruth keeps Kathy and Tommy apart, staying with Tommy herself even though she senses that Kathy is the one he truly loves. Ishiguro suggests that Ruth's possessiveness is driven by fear: in a world where the students' futures

Question number

are already decided, controlling relationships is the only power she has.

The trip to see the stranded boat and the end of Ruth's life transform the relationship. Kathy becomes Ruth's carer, and Ruth, weakened by donations, finally admits that keeping Kathy and Tommy apart was the worst thing she did. She gives them Madame's address and urges them to seek a deferral, attempting to make amends. This confession reverses the power of the extract: the girl who once gave Kathy a horse now gives her the chance of love. Whether this is complete redemption is left open, but Kathy's tender description of the scene suggests that she has forgiven her.

Overall, Ishiguro presents Kathy and Ruth's relationship as a mirror of their limited lives. Their games, rivalries and reconciliations are intensely human, perhaps the strongest evidence of the "souls" that Hailsham tried to prove they possessed. The extract's imaginary horses, with their rules and gifts, capture the whole friendship: a mixture of control and generosity, of play that is never quite only play.

08 Ishiguro presents Tommy as the character who feels most openly what the others try to hide. As a child he is the outsider whose rages make him a target; as a young man he becomes the one who searches most hopefully for a way out; and in the end his anger returns as a clear-sighted howl against the fate that all the students quietly accept. Seen through Kathy's loving and protective narration, Tommy becomes the emotional heart of the novel and perhaps its most honest voice.

In the early Hailsham chapters, Tommy is defined by his temper tantrums. Kathy remembers him raging in a field while the other boys, having deliberately excluded

Question number

him from a football team, watch and laugh. Ishiguro gives the scene a painful precision: Kathy notices the mud flying onto the polo shirt Tommy was proud of, a small detail that makes his loss of control both comic and pitiful. The tantrums seem childish, but they can also be read as an early, instinctive protest. Tommy is the only child who cannot fit himself into Hailsham's expectations, and his anger expresses a sense, which he cannot yet name, that something about their lives is wrong.

His difficulty with art deepens this outsider status. At Hailsham, creativity is prized, and the students' work is collected for the Gallery, so Tommy's lack of conventional talent leaves him mocked and isolated. Miss Lucy tells him it does not matter if he is not creative, which calms him and stops the tantrums, but she later reverses this, saying she was wrong. Ishiguro uses Tommy as the channel through which Miss Lucy's guilty truth begins to leak into the story. Kathy's narration of these conversations, recalled at second hand from Tommy, shows how closely she followed his life, and how much his confusion mattered to her.

At the Cottages, Tommy secretly draws tiny imaginary animals, detailed mechanical creatures with intricate metallic parts. These drawings are highly symbolic. Like the clones themselves, the animals are made things, part living and part machine, and Tommy draws them with care and vulnerability. Ruth mocks them cruelly, but Kathy finds them moving. Ishiguro suggests that Tommy, despite seeming the least intellectual of the three, understands their position more deeply than the others: his creatures are beautiful but built for a purpose, exactly like the students.

Tommy's relationship with Kathy is central to his presentation. In Norfolk, the "lost corner" of England, he helps her search for and find a copy of her lost tape

Question number

with the song "Never Let Me Go", a gesture of tenderness that reveals his love long before either of them can act on it. His relationship with Ruth keeps them apart for years, and Tommy's passivity here is frustrating, yet Ishiguro shows that he is gentle rather than weak, loyal to Ruth even when he senses she is wrong. When he and Kathy finally become lovers, during his time as a donor, their relationship has a quiet urgency, coloured by the knowledge that time is running out.

The visit to Madame and Miss Emily is the turning point. Tommy has built a theory that the Gallery's purpose was to identify true love, so that couples could earn a deferral. When Miss Emily explains that deferrals never existed and that the art was only collected to prove the students had souls, Tommy's hope collapses. On the drive back he asks Kathy to stop, gets out and screams and raves in a dark field, just as he did as a child. Ishiguro's structural echo is deliberate: the child's tantrum and the adult's despair are the same response, but now the reader fully understands what Tommy is raging against. Kathy runs to hold him, and the scene is perhaps the only moment in the novel where anyone openly protests the system.

In his final stages, Tommy pushes Kathy away, telling her she cannot understand what it is to be a donor and asking for a different carer. This is heartbreaking, but it also shows his dignity: he wants to spare her the last part of his suffering. After his fourth donation he "completes", and his death is reported with Ishiguro's characteristic restraint. The novel's final scene, with Kathy at a Norfolk fence imagining Tommy appearing across the field, shows how completely he has become her lost love and her lost hope.

Overall, Ishiguro presents Tommy as the conscience of the novel. His anger, art

Question number

and love reveal the humanity that the clones' society denies, and his tragedy lies in the fact that, even when he sees the truth most clearly, he cannot change it.

09 Zusak presents Rudy Steiner as a boy whose joyful, rebellious innocence makes him the moral heart of Himmel Street, and whose death is therefore the novel's most painful loss. The Jesse Owens episode captures him perfectly: he is an ordinary child, more interested in running than in politics, yet his hero worship quietly exposes the absurdity of the Nazi racial ideas surrounding him. Over the novel Zusak shows that innocence being tested and darkened, but never destroyed.

The extract is narrated as if it were a real Olympic final, and the gap between the grandeur of the language and the reality of the scene is both comic and touching. The "crowd" that "materialised around every square centimetre" of Hubert Oval is imaginary, and the empty field becomes, in Rudy's mind, a stadium. Zusak lets the boy's fantasy take over the narration, so that we are invited inside his imagination rather than laughing at him from outside. The paradox that the crowd is chanting "Rudy Steiner's name" and yet "his name was Jesse Owens" suggests how completely he wants to become his hero. For a reader aware that Owens had humiliated Hitler's idea of Aryan supremacy at the 1936 Berlin Olympics, this is quietly subversive: a blond, blue-eyed German boy who looks like a Nazi poster child chooses a black American athlete as his idol.

Zusak's sentence structure creates tension and release. The single-line paragraph "All fell silent." slows the narrative, and the sensory focus on his "bare feet" gripping the soil, so that he can feel it "between his toes", roots his fantasy in physical detail. The metaphor of the gun that "clipped a hole in the night" is typical of Zusak's playful, unexpected imagery and gives the moment a sudden

Question number

violence, perhaps foreshadowing the real gunfire and bombs that will later fill the night sky. The final fragment, "The fastest man alive.", is triumphant, but because Death narrates the novel and reveals Rudy's fate long before it happens, the phrase carries a terrible irony on any rereading. The boy who feels most alive here is the one we know will not survive.

The aftermath of the race shows the danger of Rudy's innocence. When his father, Alex Steiner, finds him, he does not condemn Owens but explains, in his own way, that Rudy cannot paint himself black in Nazi Germany. Rudy does not understand why admiring a runner should be dangerous, and this naivety becomes the way Zusak shows the reader how ordinary children were caught up in a political world they had not chosen.

Rudy's kindness is shown most clearly through his loyalty to Liesel. His repeated request, "How about a kiss, Saumensch?", is comic and cheeky, but it also becomes a running motif of affection that Liesel always refuses. When Viktor Chemmel throws her book into the icy Amper river, Rudy wades in to rescue it, and his courage is entirely selfless. Similarly, in the Hitler Youth he defends Tommy Müller, whose ear infection makes him unable to hear orders, and is punished by Franz Deutscher for it. Zusak presents Rudy's goodness through action rather than speech: he protects the weak instinctively.

As the war intensifies, Zusak darkens Rudy's character. When Nazi officials want to take him to an elite school and his father refuses, Alex is sent to fight. Rudy's grief turns into anger: he dreams of killing Hitler and sets off to find his father, before giving up. The boy who once played at being Owens now sees directly how politics destroys ordinary families. Yet even here his compassion survives, most strikingly when he places his teddy bear beside a dying enemy pilot whose plane

Question number

has crashed. The gesture is childish and yet profoundly humane.

Rudy's death in the bombing of Himmel Street is the structural climax of his story. Death tells us about it in advance, and this foreshadowing means that his innocence is always shadowed by our knowledge of his fate. When Liesel finally kisses his dead lips, the motif of the refused kiss is completed with heartbreaking irony: the love she withheld comes too late. Through Rudy, Zusak suggests that the true cost of Nazism lies not only in its obvious victims but in the destruction of goodness itself, and Death's tenderness towards him persuades the reader that he was the best of Himmel Street.

10 Zusak shows grief and guilt as forces that can either paralyse people or push them towards compassion, and the novel is built around the difference between the two. Characters such as Michael Holtzapfel are destroyed by what they feel, while Hans Hubermann and, eventually, Liesel turn their pain into acts of kindness or creation. By making Death the narrator, Zusak frames the whole story as one long act of mourning, suggesting that grief is not an interruption to life in Nazi Germany but its constant background.

The novel opens with grief. Liesel's younger brother dies on the train, and at his burial in the snow she picks up The Grave Digger's Handbook. Zusak makes her first theft an act of grief rather than greed: the book is the only thing she can hold onto from her brother and, implicitly, from the mother who abandons her. Her recurring nightmares on Himmel Street show how grief continues inside her, and it is significant that Hans comforts her by sitting with her through the night and teaching her to read. Zusak structures her healing around words, so that the effects of grief become the beginning of her education.

Question number

Hans himself is shaped by guilt that dates back to the First World War. Through flashback, the non-chronological narrative reveals that Erik Vandenburg volunteered Hans to stay behind and write letters on the day the rest of their unit was killed. Hans owes his life to a man who did not survive, and rather than letting this guilt consume him, he turns it into a promise to Erik's widow. Zusak's structure makes the consequence powerful: years later, that promise brings Max to the basement. Guilt here becomes a moral debt that Hans repays at enormous personal risk, and the reader sees how an ordinary man's private conscience leads him to resist the Nazi regime.

Max, in contrast, is tormented by guilt for having left his family behind to save himself. His survival feels like a betrayal, and Zusak shows this through his isolation in the basement and his imagined fights with Hitler. When Hans gives bread to an old Jewish man in the parade through Molching and is whipped for it, his own guilt grows, because his compassion has put Max in danger and forced him to leave. Zusak suggests that, under a cruel regime, even goodness can produce guilt.

The most devastating example is Michael Holtzapfel. Returning from Stalingrad, where his brother Robert died, he cannot bear that he has survived. His suicide shows guilt at its most destructive, and Zusak pairs it with the grief of his mother, Frau Holtzapfel, who is left with no sons at all. These characters act as a warning: grief and guilt without any outlet lead only to despair. The plain, almost gentle way Death narrates his end makes it more painful, because it denies the reader any dramatic distance.

Ilsa Hermann offers a middle path. Her son died in the First World War, and her

Question number

grief has left her withdrawn, sitting silently in her husband's house surrounded by books. At first she appears frozen in mourning, but her relationship with Liesel slowly draws her outwards. By giving Liesel a blank book and encouraging her to write, she passes on the lesson she herself learned too late: grief should not swallow a whole life. Zusak uses her as a contrasting character to show that recovery is possible, even if it is slow.

Liesel's final experience of grief is the destruction of Himmel Street, where she loses Hans, Rosa and Rudy at once. Zusak has prepared us for this through Death's foreshadowing, so the reader grieves in advance alongside her. Crucially, Liesel survives because she is in the basement writing her story, and that act of writing becomes her way of coming to terms with loss. Her reflection that she has "hated the words and I have loved them" suggests that language is both the weapon of Nazi propaganda and the means of healing. Even Death admits at the close, "I am haunted by humans", showing that grief touches the narrator too. Ultimately Zusak suggests that grief and guilt are unavoidable, but that what matters is whether they lead to cruelty, despair or love.

11 In both The Fly in the Ointment and Graham Greene's The Destructors, strength is presented as something hidden beneath an unimpressive surface. Pritchett's father seems broken and pitiable, yet his strength lies in his power to control and manipulate; Greene's Trevor seems quiet and odd, yet his strength is a cold, absolute will that takes over a whole gang. Both writers make their characters' strength unsettling rather than admirable.

In the extract, the father appears at first to be a defeated old man who has just lost his business, but Pritchett fills the description with hints of power. He leans

Question number

"forward on the table as his son leaned back", and the contrast in body language shows him pressing his presence upon Harold, who retreats. The simile of him holding up his fist "as if he had a hammer in his hand and was auctioning his life" is revealing: even when describing his despair he performs it, turning his own life into a sale. The image suggests that he cannot stop being a businessman, and that his emotions are themselves a kind of bargaining.

The father's speech is a carefully controlled display. The short, emphatic declarative "I am 65." and the insistence "let me make this clear" show a man used to command. He pauses, "fixing his son's half averted eyes" so that his words can "bite home", and the verb "bite" hints at aggression beneath the self-pity. Pritchett describes him shifting between ages: he looks "like a man of forty" and then "softened to sixty again". This fluctuation suggests that his weakness is partly a role he can put on, and the "faint whine" and sniffing nose become tools of emotional pressure. His veiled threat, "I'd go right out. I'd finish it", is perhaps the most manipulative moment, because it makes his son responsible for his survival. His strength, then, is psychological: he dominates through guilt.

The pride in "For thirty years I built up this business from nothing" also reminds us of the genuine strength that made him successful. The detail of sleeping in the office to be on the job early shows determination and endurance. Pritchett allows the reader a moment of sympathy and even admiration before the ending exposes him. When Harold offers to try to raise some money, the father's softness disappears and he immediately wants to know how much, his face hardening into shrewd calculation. Structurally, this sudden reversal reveals that his talk of being finished with money was never true. The title's idiom, a small flaw that spoils something good, fits this moment: the son's tenderness is spoiled by the father's grasping nature, but it is also proof that his old strength has survived bankruptcy

Question number

intact.

Trevor in The Destructors is strong in a different way. He joins the Wormsley Common Gang as an outsider whose name provokes laughter, yet he accepts the mockery in a matter-of-fact way, and the gang shorten him to "T.". This reduction to a single letter makes him seem impersonal and mysterious. Greene shows his strength in the way he silently takes over the leadership from Blackie: his plan to destroy Old Misery's house from the inside is so ambitious that the others are swept along by it. Like the father, Trevor controls people through words and planning rather than physical force.

Greene presents this strength as chilling. Trevor's family has "come down in the world", his father having once been an architect, and he admires Mr Thomas's house as beautiful, yet he wants to destroy it. When asked whether he hates the old man, he insists there would be no fun in hatred, and his claim that "There's only things" suggests a frightening emptiness of feeling. Set in post-war London among bomb sites, the story implies that the destruction of the Blitz has bred a generation for whom ruin is a form of creativity. Trevor's methodical organisation of the gang, cutting pipes, stripping floors and leaving the walls standing, is described with almost military precision, so that his strength becomes a kind of discipline turned towards nothing.

Both writers therefore present strength ambiguously. Pritchett's father is strong because he survives and manipulates; Trevor is strong because he imposes his will on others. Neither is a hero. Each story ends with a reversal: the father's mask slips, and the house collapses when the lorry pulls away, leaving the driver laughing. Through these endings, both writers suggest that strength without kindness is closer to ruthlessness, and that the most powerful characters are often

Question number

the most disturbing.

12 In A Real Durwan and The Fly in the Ointment, old people are presented as figures who invite pity, but both writers complicate that pity. Jhumpa Lahiri's Boori Ma is a displaced, vulnerable woman whose stories of a lost past may or may not be true, while V. S. Pritchett's father appears ruined and fragile until the ending reveals his hard, calculating nature. In each story, age becomes a kind of performance through which the old try to hold on to dignity or power, and the reader is left uncertain how much sympathy they deserve.

Lahiri presents Boori Ma first as someone on the edge of the community. She is an elderly woman who sweeps the stairwell of a Calcutta apartment building and sleeps beside its gate, acting as an unofficial doorkeeper. She is a refugee who was separated from her family and forced to Calcutta after Partition, so her poverty is the result of history rather than personal failure. For a reader aware of the millions displaced in 1947, she becomes representative of a whole generation of uprooted older people whose former lives simply vanished.

Yet Lahiri complicates our sympathy through Boori Ma's endless stories. She tells the residents about her past wealth, her husband, her daughters' weddings and the luxury she once enjoyed, but the details shift each time she tells them. The residents are unsure whether to believe her, and Lahiri's narrative perspective leaves the reader equally unsure. Boori Ma's voice is described with sharp, sour imagery, as if her sorrow has made it brittle, and this suggests that her storytelling is both a lament and a kind of complaint. It is possible to read her as a fantasist, even a self-pitying one, and yet her stories also seem to be the only way she can keep her identity alive. Her repeated insistence that the residents

Question number

should believe her becomes poignant because, in the end, nobody does.

Structurally, Lahiri builds towards Boori Ma's expulsion. As the residents become wealthier, symbolised by the new basins installed in the building, they lose their tolerance for her. When Boori Ma loses her savings on one of her walks and the basin is stolen in her absence, the residents blame her and throw out her bedding. Their final verdict, that the building needs a real durwan, reduces her to a failed function rather than a person. The irony is bitter: the community that once relied on her as its guardian now casts her out at the first opportunity. Lahiri suggests that old people without status are tolerated only while they are useful, and her quiet, detached narration makes the cruelty more striking because no one in the story seems to notice it.

Pritchett's father, by contrast, appears to be an old man brought low by financial ruin. He announces "I am 65." and claims that he does not know "how long I shall live", which invites pity for his age and fragility. The "faint whine" in his voice and his "thick nose" sniffing present him as weak and self-pitying, and his claim that he has not "a penny in the world" seems to place him, like Boori Ma, in a position of loss. His threat that he might "finish it" makes his age seem desperate.

However, Pritchett shows that this frailty is at least partly a performance. In the extract, the father "looked decided and experienced like a man of forty" before he "softened to sixty again", suggesting that age is something he can switch on and off for effect. His raised fist, "as if he had a hammer in his hand", shows that he is still a forceful presence. At the end of the story, when his son offers to raise some money, his softness vanishes and he immediately demands to know how much, revealing that his grasping nature is unchanged. The structural reversal forces the reader to reassess all the pity they felt.

Question number

Both writers therefore present old people as figures of sympathy whose reliability is questionable. Boori Ma uses stories to protect her dignity, and her exaggerations make her vulnerable; the father uses his age to manipulate his son, and his exaggerations make him powerful. I find Boori Ma more deserving of sympathy, because her performance harms no one, whereas the father's is a tool of control. Together, the stories suggest that how society treats the old says as much about the young as it does about the old themselves.

13

Shakespeare presents Caesar as a ruler who is two figures at once: a towering public image of almost godlike power, and a physically frail, vain and sometimes indecisive man. Much of what we learn about him comes from others, especially his enemies, so the play constantly asks whether Caesar is truly a tyrant in the making or whether the "Colossus" is largely a creation of the men who fear him. For an Elizabethan audience anxious about an ageing queen with no heir, this question of how far one ruler should dominate a state was highly charged.

In the extract, Cassius presents Caesar through the hyperbolic image of a Colossus that can "bestride the narrow world". The metaphor makes Caesar monstrous in scale, while the adjective "narrow" suggests that the world itself has shrunk to make room for him. In contrast, Cassius and Brutus become "petty men" who "peep about" under his legs. The verb "peep" is deliberately humiliating, reducing proud Roman nobles to timid creatures, and the image of finding "dishonourable graves" implies that under Caesar's rule even death will be shameful. Shakespeare shows that, to the conspirators, Caesar's power threatens the very identity of Roman men.

Question number

Yet Cassius's rhetoric also undermines Caesar. His famous claim that "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars / But in ourselves" denies that Caesar's rise is fated, implying that his greatness exists only because others have allowed it. Cassius then reduces Caesar to a mere name, using a sequence of imperatives, "Write them together", "Sound them", "Weigh them", to prove that "Brutus" is just as weighty. The parallel structure is manipulative and persuasive, and it suggests that Caesar's authority is a kind of reputation rather than real superiority. Earlier in the same scene, Cassius tells stories of Caesar nearly drowning in the Tiber and shaking with fever, exclaiming that a man of "such a feeble temper" should rule the world. Shakespeare uses these reported accounts to expose a human, vulnerable Caesar behind the legend, though we should remember they come from a jealous rival.

When Caesar appears in public, he seems to confirm both versions. In his first entrance he dismisses the Soothsayer's warning, "Beware the ides of March", by calling him a dreamer, which shows confidence but also dangerous arrogance. His judgement of Cassius, with his "lean and hungry look", reveals a shrewd political mind: "He thinks too much: such men are dangerous." Yet immediately he adds that he is deaf in one ear, and his claim "for always I am Caesar" shows him trying to keep the public mask fixed even as the private weakness shows. Casca's account of the crown being offered three times, which Caesar refuses while the crowd cheers, before he falls in an epileptic fit, presents a ruler who performs humility for the people while longing for power.

Shakespeare develops this through Caesar's habit of speaking of himself in the third person, as in "Caesar shall go forth". This makes him sound like a monument rather than a man, and it is central to his presentation as a ruler: he has begun to believe in his own myth. His wavering over Calpurnia's dream, however, shows

Question number

how easily he is manipulated. Decius flatters him into attending the Senate by reinterpreting the dream and hinting that the Senate plans to give him a crown, and Caesar's question "Shall Caesar send a lie?" shows pride overriding caution. He calls the senators "graybeards", revealing contempt for the institutions he is supposed to serve.

In the Senate, Caesar compares himself to the "northern star", fixed and unmoving, in his refusal to pardon Publius Cimber. Ironically, this boast of constancy comes moments before his death, and the line "Et tu, Brute? Then fall, Caesar" turns the third-person grandeur into tragic recognition. Yet Caesar's power outlives him. Antony's speech turns the crowd against the conspirators, and Caesar's ghost appears to Brutus. Brutus's admission at Philippi that Caesar is "mighty yet" suggests that Caesar's real power as a ruler lies in the idea of Caesar, which no dagger can kill.

Ultimately, Shakespeare refuses to give a simple verdict. Caesar is arrogant, superstitious and physically weak, yet he is also popular, astute and, in his will, generous to the people. By presenting him largely through others' eyes, beginning with Cassius in this extract, Shakespeare makes the audience question whether the conspirators killed a tyrant or merely the image of one.

14 I largely disagree that the conspirators act "purely" from selfish motives, although Shakespeare certainly shows that selfishness, envy and ambition drive most of them. The word "purely" cannot account for Brutus, whose motives are presented as genuinely idealistic, nor fully for Cassius, whose jealousy is mixed with a real love of republican freedom. Shakespeare deliberately blurs the line between principle and self-interest, and this ambiguity is what makes the assassination so

Question number

troubling for the audience.

Cassius is the conspirator whose motives seem most personal. In Act 1 Scene 2 his speech to Brutus is full of resentment: he describes Caesar as a Colossus under whose legs "we petty men" must "peep about", and complains that "this man / Is now become a god". His stories of rescuing Caesar from the Tiber and watching him shake with fever reveal wounded pride: what really angers Cassius is that a man he considers weaker than himself now towers over him. His insistence "I was born free as Caesar" suggests that his hatred is rooted in rivalry. Caesar's own judgement that Cassius has a "lean and hungry look" and "thinks too much" reinforces the sense of a man driven by envy.

Shakespeare also presents Cassius as manipulative, almost Machiavellian. At the end of Act 1 Scene 2, his soliloquy reveals that he plans to throw forged letters, apparently from Roman citizens, through Brutus's window to win him over. He even reflects that Brutus's "honourable metal" may be "wrought" from its true nature. The image of metal being shaped suggests that Cassius sees Brutus as raw material for his own scheme, and the dramatic irony allows the audience to see his deception while Brutus does not. This supports the view that selfishness lies at the heart of the plot.

Yet Cassius cannot be dismissed entirely. His rhetoric repeatedly appeals to Roman liberty, and his claim that "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars / But in ourselves" shows a belief that free men must take responsibility for their fate. For an audience familiar with the Roman Republic's fear of kings, this would have seemed a real political conviction. In the quarrel scene he admits he loves Brutus and is wounded by his criticism, revealing an emotional depth that complicates a purely selfish reading. At Philippi he chooses death rather than capture, which

Question number

suggests a commitment beyond self-interest.

Brutus is the strongest evidence against the statement. In his orchard soliloquy in Act 2 Scene 1, he admits he knows "no personal cause to spurn at him, / But for the general". He fears what Caesar might become rather than what he is, using the metaphor of a "serpent's egg" that must be killed "in the shell". The reasoning is uneasy and speculative, and his insomnia shows the strain of the decision. Shakespeare presents him not as selfish but as tormented by duty. When he insists "Let's be sacrificers, but not butchers, Caius", he tries to turn the murder into a ritual for the good of Rome, and refuses Cassius's advice to kill Antony too.

After the murder, Brutus's speech to the plebeians, "Not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more", is written in balanced, logical prose that reflects his rational idealism. The antithesis presents his choice as a painful sacrifice of friendship for the state. However, Shakespeare shows that this idealism is naive. He allows Antony to speak at the funeral, and Antony's emotive rhetoric quickly turns the crowd. Brutus's flaw is not selfishness but a trust in honour that blinds him to how others act.

The other conspirators are more clearly self-interested. Casca's sneering account of the crown being offered suggests contempt rather than principle, and Decius's flattery of Caesar, reinterpreting Calpurnia's dream, shows a cynical skill in manipulation. Shakespeare's final verdict comes through Antony at the end of the play. Calling Brutus "the noblest Roman of them all", he claims that all the conspirators except Brutus acted "in envy of great Caesar". This judgement, from Brutus's enemy, carries great weight because it is unexpectedly generous.

Ultimately, the statement is true of most of the conspirators but not of all.

Question number

Shakespeare presents a conspiracy in which envy and ambition provide the energy, but Brutus provides the moral justification. The tragedy is that his genuine idealism is exploited by others' selfishness, so that a murder committed partly for Rome leads to civil war. Shakespeare seems to warn that good intentions cannot purify a violent act driven by more selfish men.

15 Shakespeare presents guilt as a force that attacks the mind, the body and, above all, the natural peace of sleep. In this extract Macbeth's guilt is immediate and overwhelming, while Lady Macbeth tries to suppress it; across the play, Shakespeare reverses their positions, so that Macbeth hardens his conscience into tyranny while Lady Macbeth is destroyed by the guilt she denied. For a Jacobean audience, who believed regicide was a sin against God, these effects would seem a natural punishment for disturbing the divine order.

The extract opens with Lady Macbeth's warning that "These deeds must not be thought / After these ways; so, it will make us mad." Her instinct is to block thought itself, as if guilt can be controlled by refusing to reflect. The prediction is deeply ironic, since madness is exactly what awaits her. Shakespeare plants here the seed of her later collapse, suggesting that suppressed guilt does not disappear but returns more violently.

Macbeth, by contrast, cannot stop thinking. He reports a voice crying "Sleep no more", and the hallucinated voice externalises his conscience, as if guilt has taken on a separate life. The metaphor "Macbeth does murder sleep" is central: by killing Duncan, who was asleep, he has murdered sleep itself, and so lost his own right to rest. Shakespeare then gives him a sequence of tender metaphors, describing sleep as what "knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care", "sore labour's bath" and "Balm of

Question number

hurt minds". The listing slows the verse and lingers on everything Macbeth has forfeited. The domestic, healing imagery of knitting, bathing and balm shows that sleep is a restorer, and its loss means his "hurt mind" will never be soothed. Calling sleep the "Chief nourisher in life's feast" also links to Duncan as a generous host, deepening the sense that Macbeth has violated hospitality and nature together.

Lady Macbeth's short, blunt question "What do you mean?" contrasts sharply with his poetic outpouring, showing that she cannot or will not understand his guilt. Macbeth's reply moves through his titles: "Glamis hath murder'd sleep", "Cawdor / Shall sleep no more", "Macbeth shall sleep no more". The repetition and the progression through his names suggest that guilt infects every part of his identity, including the very titles that ambition won him. The rhythm of the final line, with its repeated "sleep no more", sounds like a curse or a sentence passed upon him.

Elsewhere in this scene, Shakespeare uses blood as a symbol of guilt. Macbeth asks whether "all great Neptune's ocean" could wash the blood from his hand, and decides it would rather turn the seas red, an image of guilt so vast it stains the whole world. Lady Macbeth's dismissive "A little water clears us of this deed" shows her attempt to treat guilt as a physical stain that can be scrubbed away. Their contrasting attitudes create dramatic irony that pays off later.

As the play develops, Macbeth's guilt turns into paranoia rather than repentance. He tells his wife "O, full of scorpions is my mind", an image of constant, poisonous torment, and Banquo's ghost appears at the banquet as a visible form of his guilt. Lady Macbeth notes that he lacks "the season of all natures, sleep", confirming the curse of the extract. Yet Macbeth chooses to go further, claiming he is "in blood / Stepp'd in so far" that returning would be as hard as going on. Guilt, for

Question number

him, becomes a reason to commit more murders. Only near the end, when he tells Macduff that his soul is already too "charged" with Macduff's family's blood, does a trace of his earlier conscience return.

Lady Macbeth's path is the opposite. In the sleepwalking scene of Act 5, she cannot sleep properly, demands light by her continually, and repeatedly washes her hands, crying "Out, damned spot!" The broken prose of her speech contrasts with her earlier controlled verse, showing that guilt has shattered her mind. Her lament that "all the perfumes of Arabia" will not sweeten her "little hand" directly reverses her earlier belief that a little water would clear them. The structure links this scene back to the extract: the woman who said such thoughts would "make us mad" is now mad. Her offstage death, possibly suicide, completes the effect.

Through this extract and its echoes, Shakespeare suggests that guilt cannot be escaped. Macbeth loses sleep and peace, and Lady Macbeth loses her sanity and life, showing the audience that the murder of a king destroys the murderers from within.

16 Shakespeare explores kingship by setting rightful, nurturing kings against a usurping tyrant, and by showing that a king's character directly shapes the health of the whole nation. Duncan, Edward the Confessor and finally Malcolm represent kingship as a sacred trust, while Macbeth shows what happens when the crown is seized through murder. Writing for King James I, who believed in the divine right of kings and claimed descent from Banquo, Shakespeare presents true kingship as God-given, and its violation as a sickness that spreads through the land.

Duncan is presented as a generous, fatherly king. He rewards loyalty with titles,

Question number

making Macbeth Thane of Cawdor, and his promise "I have begun to plant thee, and will labour / To make thee full of growing" uses the metaphor of a gardener to suggest that good kingship nurtures its subjects. However, Shakespeare also hints at weakness. Duncan admits "There's no art / To find the mind's construction in the face" about the traitorous first Thane of Cawdor, only to place his trust immediately in Macbeth. The dramatic irony suggests that his trusting nature, though virtuous, leaves him vulnerable, raising the question of whether a king must also be shrewd.

Macbeth himself recognises Duncan's virtues in his Act 1 Scene 7 soliloquy. He says Duncan has been "So clear in his great office" that his virtues will "plead like angels, trumpet-tongued" against his murder. The religious imagery presents Duncan's kingship as holy, so that killing him becomes a cosmic sin. The fact that Macbeth knows this and still proceeds makes him more culpable, and Shakespeare uses the soliloquy to define good kingship through the eyes of the man who will destroy it.

The murder disrupts the natural order. After Duncan's death, Ross and an Old Man describe darkness by day and Duncan's horses turning wild and eating each other. These unnatural events reflect the belief in the Great Chain of Being, in which the king was God's representative; when he is killed, nature itself rebels. Kingship is presented not just as a political role but as the keystone of an ordered universe.

Macbeth's own reign is presented as a tyranny that brings no satisfaction. He soon realises that "To be thus is nothing, / But to be safely thus", showing that a crown gained by murder brings only fear. His complaint about a "fruitless crown" and "barren sceptre" reveals that he cannot found a dynasty, and his insecurity drives him to murder Banquo and Macduff's family. As king he rules by terror

Question number

rather than love: he places spies in the thanes' houses, and his subjects increasingly call him "tyrant". Angus's simile that his title hangs "like a giant's robe / Upon a dwarfish thief" brilliantly captures the illegitimacy of his rule, suggesting that he is too small for the office he has stolen.

Shakespeare uses imagery of disease and wounds to show the effect of bad kingship on the nation. Malcolm describes Scotland as a country that "weeps" and "bleeds", with each new day adding a gash to her wounds. Caithness later speaks of Malcolm as the "medicine" of the sick state. The personification of Scotland as a wounded body suggests that the king and his country are bound together, and that a tyrant poisons the whole land.

In contrast, the English king Edward is presented as an ideal monarch. A doctor describes how he heals the sick with his touch, and Malcolm says he has a "heavenly gift of prophecy". Edward is never seen on stage, which makes him almost a symbol of holy kingship. His healing power is a direct contrast to Macbeth, who spreads disease, and a compliment to James I, who himself practised touching for the "king's evil".

Malcolm's testing of Macduff in Act 4 Scene 3 explores what makes a king. By pretending to be lustful, greedy and destructive, Malcolm shows his caution, a quality Duncan lacked. He then lists the "king-becoming graces", such as justice, temperance, mercy and lowliness, giving the audience a clear definition of virtuous rule. This scene suggests that Malcolm has learned from his father's trusting nature and will combine goodness with wisdom.

The play ends with order restored. Malcolm dismisses Macbeth and his wife as "this dead butcher and his fiend-like queen" and promises to reward his thanes by

Question number

making them earls. His final speech, ending with a promise to act "by the grace of Grace", returns kingship to its proper religious foundation. Shakespeare suggests that true kingship comes from God and serves the people, while a crown taken by ambition destroys both the king and his kingdom.

17 Priestley builds An Inspector Calls around a widening gap between the generations, but the difference is not simply one of age. It is a difference in the capacity to change. The young are "impressionable", open to the Inspector's lesson of shared responsibility, while the old are fixed in the selfish habits of 1912. Writing in 1945, as Britain chose what kind of society to rebuild, Priestley places his hope in the young and presents the older generation as the obstacle to a fairer world.

The extract captures this division at the moment it becomes visible. Mrs Birling enters with a "same easy tone", and her opening, "I'm Mrs Birling, y'know", relies on her name and status to do the work for her. Her confident prediction that "I don't think we can help you much" shows that she has already decided the matter concerns people beneath her. Sheila's response is completely different in rhythm. Her broken, pleading "No, Mother, please!" and the stage direction "hesitantly" show someone who has lost her certainty, and this loss is presented as moral progress. When she says "you're beginning all wrong", the word "beginning" suggests the interrogation is a process the family must pass through, and Sheila, who has been through it, now speaks with the authority of experience rather than of rank.

Sheila's line "We all started like that, so confident, so pleased with ourselves" is in effect Priestley's warning to the audience. The past tense places her own complacency behind her, and the repeated "so" mocks the self-satisfaction the

Question number

Birlings displayed at the dinner. Mrs Birling's reply, "I don't know what you're talking about", is ironic, because her refusal to understand will be her downfall. The stage direction "affecting great surprise" reveals that she performs her emotions, a woman whose manners are a mask.

The exchange that closes the extract is especially sharp. By calling her grown daughter "this child", Mrs Birling belittles Sheila and treats her new moral seriousness as a childish phase. The Inspector, speaking "coolly", turns her condescension back on her: "We often do on the young ones. They're more impressionable." The adjective "impressionable" is double-edged. Mrs Birling hears weakness, but Priestley invites us to hear openness, the ability to be shaped by truth. The Inspector's words are also a quiet threat, implying that the older generation are harder to reach and will be treated less gently.

Across the play, this contrast is developed through dramatic irony. In Act One Mr Birling mocks "the famous younger generation who know it all" and lectures Eric and Gerald on looking after oneself and dismissing "community and all that nonsense", yet his claim that the Titanic is "unsinkable, absolutely unsinkable" exposes his judgement to a 1945 audience as worthless. Priestley thus undermines the elder's authority before the Inspector even arrives. Sheila, by contrast, responds to Eva's story with immediate empathy: "these girls aren't cheap labour", she protests, rejecting her father's economic language and recognising Eva as a person.

Mrs Birling's hypocrisy is the clearest example of the older generation's blindness. She insists the father of the child should be made an example of, declaring "It's his responsibility", without realising she is condemning her own son. The audience, and Sheila, see the truth long before she does, and Sheila's desperate "Mother, stop" shows the younger generation trying, too late, to save their parents from

Question number

themselves. Eric's accusation "You killed her" reverses the normal order of authority, as the son judges the mother.

The ending makes the difference permanent. Once Gerald suggests the Inspector was a hoax, Mr and Mrs Birling return at once to relief and self-congratulation, worried mainly about a "public scandal". Sheila and Eric refuse to forget. Sheila says it frightens her the way her parents talk, and insists that the lesson remains true whether the Inspector was real or not. Priestley stages this as an argument across the room, the young and the old literally on opposite sides, before the final telephone call shatters the parents' complacency.

However, Priestley does not idealise youth absolutely. Gerald, though young, sides with the older generation because he shares their class interests, which suggests that the real division is between those willing to accept responsibility and those protecting privilege. Even so, the play's structure gives the final moral word to Sheila and Eric. Priestley presents the young as the generation who must learn the lesson of "fire and blood and anguish" that their parents refuse, and in doing so he speaks directly to the post-war audience who would build the welfare state.

18 In An Inspector Calls, Priestley presents the world of business and money as a system that reduces people to costs and treats every relationship as a transaction. Through Arthur Birling above all, he exposes capitalism in 1912 as profitable for the few and ruinous for the many, and by setting the play just before two world wars he invites his 1945 audience to reject that world in favour of collective responsibility.

The setting establishes this from the first moment. The stage directions describe

Question number

the Birlings' dining room as "substantial and heavily comfortable, but not cosy and homelike". The contrast between comfort and homeliness suggests that money has bought the family luxury but not warmth, and the "heavily" hints at the weight of wealth pressing down on human feeling. Birling himself is introduced as "a hard-headed, practical man of business", and the phrase "hard-headed" implies that the qualities which make him successful also make him unfeeling.

The engagement dinner shows that even love is shaped by commerce. Birling looks forward to the day when Crofts and Birling are "working together", hoping for "lower costs and higher prices". He treats his daughter's engagement as a merger, and his sycophantic remarks about Gerald's parents, alongside his boast that he may be in line for a knighthood, reveal a man anxious to buy his way into a higher class. Priestley mocks him through dramatic irony: his speech about a world of business free from war, and his confidence that the Titanic is "unsinkable", show that his "practical" judgement is worthless. His insistence that "a man has to make his own way" sums up the selfish individualism that the Inspector will dismantle.

Eva Smith's story begins in Birling's factory, where business is shown at its most ruthless. Birling explains, without guilt, "It's my duty to keep labour costs down", and the word "duty" is revealing, since his only moral obligation is to profit. He adds that if he did not come down sharply on the strikers "they'd soon be asking for the earth". The Inspector's reply, "it's better to ask for the earth than to take it", turns the phrase against him and suggests that it is the owners, not the workers, who are greedy. Eric's question, "Why shouldn't they try for higher wages? We try for the highest possible prices", exposes the double standard at the heart of capitalism. Sheila's protest that "these girls aren't cheap labour" makes the same point: business language strips workers of their humanity.

Question number

Money also brings power, and Priestley hints at corruption. Birling reminds the Inspector that he was once Lord Mayor and plays golf with the Chief Constable, assuming that wealth places him above the law. Later, desperate to avoid scandal, he offers to give "thousands" to put things right, as if responsibility could be settled with a cheque. The Inspector's rebuke that "Public men, Mr Birling, have responsibilities as well as privileges" shows Priestley's view that wealth brings moral obligations Birling has never accepted.

The other episodes extend this idea. At Milwards, Sheila uses the power of a wealthy customer to have Eva sacked, and the shop obeys because her family's account matters more than a shop girl's livelihood. Gerald keeps Daisy Renton in rooms and gives her money, and although he seems kinder, the relationship depends on financial dependence. Eric's affair ends with him stealing from his father's office to support Eva, which shows how deeply money has corrupted the family. Most bitterly, Mrs Birling assumes the worst of Eva for refusing stolen money: "As if a girl of that sort would ever refuse money!" Priestley uses dramatic irony here, since Eva's refusal shows her to have more integrity than the wealthy woman judging her. Mrs Birling's charity work, meanwhile, is presented as a matter of status rather than compassion, prestige for a prosperous family rather than real help.

The Inspector's final speech offers the alternative. His insistence that "We are members of one body" replaces the language of costs and profits with the language of community, and his warning of "fire and blood and anguish" links selfish capitalism to the wars that followed. Priestley, a socialist writing as Labour came to power, presents the Birlings' world of business and money as morally bankrupt. The fact that Mr and Mrs Birling return to their complacency at the

Question number

end, while Sheila and Eric do not, suggests that this world can change only when a new generation refuses its values.

19 Miller presents John Proctor as a good man, but never as a simple or saintly one. He is a flawed, guilty husband who has betrayed his wife, yet he grows into a man whose goodness lies in refusing to lie, even to save his own life. In this extract, as he confesses and then refuses to sign, Miller dramatises the struggle that defines him: the struggle between survival and integrity. By the end of the play, I think Miller wants us to see Proctor as good precisely because he has had to earn it.

The tension of the extract comes from Proctor's shifting position. Having agreed to confess to witchcraft, he resists every step that would make the lie public. He will not name others, insisting that he speaks only his own sins, and this already marks him as better than the court: he will damn himself but not his neighbours. His question about how he can teach his three children "to walk like men in the world" if he sells his friends shows that his goodness is bound up with what he will pass on. The phrase "walk like men" links morality to dignity and upright posture, an image that returns when he finally refuses to crawl.

The climax of the scene is his refusal to give Danforth his signature. His cry "Because it is my name! Because I cannot have another in my life!" uses anaphora and exclamation to build an almost unstoppable force, and the repeated "Because" shows a man discovering his reasons as he speaks them. His self-abasement, that he is "not worth the dust on the feet of them that hang", is moving, because he still sees Rebecca and Martha as better than himself. Yet the plea "I have given you my soul; leave me my name!" reveals that, for Proctor, his name is the last

Question number

thing that truly belongs to him. Miller, who refused to name names before the House Un-American Activities Committee, gives Proctor's resistance a clear personal and political force. Proctor's retort, "God does not need my name nailed upon the church!", shows his contempt for public shows of piety, and it is the court's insistence on the public document that pushes him to tear it up.

To judge the extent of his goodness, however, we must look back to the start of the play. In Act One Miller's commentary describes him as "a sinner, a sinner not only against the moral fashion of the time, but against his own vision of decent conduct". His affair with Abigail is the root of the tragedy, and his half-hearted denial, "We never touched, Abby", together with his admission that he may think of her "softly from time to time", shows he is still tempted. In Act Two, the dramatic irony of his forgetting the commandment against adultery when Hale tests him is painful: the one law he cannot recall is the one he has broken. Elizabeth's line "The magistrate sits in your heart that judges you" suggests that his guilt is self-inflicted, and that his struggle to be good is an inner battle.

Even so, Proctor is respected in Salem. He is admired as a man who will not be easily led, and his contempt for Parris's greed and hellfire sermons shows an honest scepticism. In Act Three his courage becomes public. He ruins his own reputation to save Elizabeth, confessing "I have known her, sir. I have known her", and the plain, repeated statement shows that he values truth more than his good name in the village. When Mary Warren betrays him, his cry that the court will "pull Heaven down and raise up a whore" shows his anger against hypocrisy.

Some readers may question his final choice. Dying leaves Elizabeth and his children without a husband and father, and his insistence on his "name" could be read as pride. He himself says, "I cannot mount the gibbet like a saint. It is a

Question number

fraud", which shows his awareness of his own imperfections. Yet the tender reconciliation with Elizabeth, where she admits "It needs a cold wife to prompt lechery", suggests that both are now honest, and that forgiveness has freed him to act.

Ultimately Miller presents Proctor as good to a great extent, but his is a hard-won goodness. When he says he sees "some shred of goodness in John Proctor", the word "shred" is modest and fragile, yet it is enough. Elizabeth's final words, "He have his goodness now. God forbid I take it from him!", confirm that he has achieved it by the end. Miller's tragedy suggests that goodness is not innocence but the courage to tell the truth when lying would be easier.

20 Miller presents Reverend John Hale as the one major character in The Crucible who genuinely changes. He arrives in Salem as a proud, eager expert, certain that evil can be measured and defeated through learning, and he leaves as a broken man who has lost faith in the very system he served. Through Hale's journey, Miller explores how intelligent, well-meaning people can become instruments of injustice, and how real moral courage involves admitting that one was wrong.

Hale's first appearance in Act One is carefully staged. Miller's stage directions describe him as "nearing forty, a tight-skinned, eager-eyed intellectual", and tell us that this is "a beloved errand for him". The adjective "eager-eyed" suggests enthusiasm bordering on vanity: Hale is excited, not fearful, because the crisis gives him the chance to prove his expertise. The books he carries are a powerful visual symbol. When Parris remarks on their weight, Hale replies, "They must be; they are weighted with authority." The pun on "weighted" links physical heaviness with intellectual and religious power, and the audience may sense the irony that

Question number

such authority will crush innocent people. His confident claim that "the Devil is precise; the marks of his presence are definite as stone" shows his faith in a rational, almost scientific approach to the supernatural, a faith Miller exposes as dangerous.

At first Hale is presented as sincere rather than wicked. He warns the villagers not to jump to conclusions and insists he will not proceed on superstition. Yet his zeal drives the hysteria. His intense questioning of Tituba, offering her a way to save herself by naming others, creates the pattern of accusation and confession that will dominate the play. Miller suggests that Hale's good intentions are not enough when he is so certain of his own rightness.

Act Two marks the beginning of his doubt. Visiting the Proctors alone, without the court's authority, he seems uneasy, and his test of Proctor's Christianity reveals a narrow, legalistic religion: he notes that Proctor rarely attends church and that his third child is not baptised. His remark that "Theology, sir, is a fortress; no crack in a fortress may be accounted small" shows how rigid his thinking still is. The fortress metaphor implies a defensive, closed system that cannot admit error. The dramatic irony of Proctor forgetting the commandment against adultery hints that human goodness is more complicated than Hale's tests allow, and when Elizabeth is arrested, Hale's uncertainty visibly grows.

The structural turning point comes in Act Three. As the court ignores evidence and Mary Warren's testimony collapses, Hale becomes Proctor's ally. When Proctor confesses his adultery, Hale exclaims, "I believe him! This girl has always struck me false!", and the exclamation marks show a man finally breaking free of the court's logic. His final outburst, "I denounce these proceedings, I quit this court!", is one of the play's most dramatic moments. The two short clauses show decisive

Question number

action, and by leaving the court Hale rejects the authority he once embodied. For a 1950s audience living through McCarthyism, Hale represents those who supported the hunt for enemies until they saw its cruelty.

In Act Four, Miller shows Hale transformed and tormented. He has returned to Salem to persuade the condemned to confess, admitting bitterly, "I come to do the Devil's work. I come to counsel Christians they should belie themselves." The repetition of "I come" emphasises his despair, and the paradox of a minister doing "the Devil's work" shows how completely his world has been turned upside down. His guilt is overwhelming: "There is blood on my head! Can you not see the blood on my head!!" The image of blood recalls the guilt of Macbeth and suggests he feels personally responsible for the executions. His plea to Elizabeth that "Life, woman, life is God's most precious gift; no principle, however glorious, may justify the taking of it" shows how far he has travelled from the man who valued theology above all.

Yet Miller makes Hale's final position morally complex. Elizabeth replies that she thinks this is "the Devil's argument", and the audience may agree that by urging Proctor to lie, Hale has lost sight of truth. Proctor's integrity contrasts with Hale's pragmatism. Still, Hale's humanity in valuing life over doctrine makes him sympathetic. Ultimately, Miller presents Hale as a tragic figure of learning without wisdom who, too late, discovers that the books "weighted with authority" were no guide to justice.

21 In A Raisin in the Sun, Hansberry presents money as the force that both binds and divides the Younger family. The insurance cheque for ten thousand dollars promises escape from poverty and racial confinement, but each character sees it as

Question number

the key to a different dream. Hansberry shows that money matters enormously to a black family in 1950s Chicago, yet by the end of the play she suggests that dignity, family and pride are worth more than any sum.

The extract, in which Walter and Beneatha argue about the cheque the night before it arrives, shows how money has already begun to poison family relationships. Walter resents Beneatha's ambition to become a doctor, believing that her education will take money he wants for his liquor store. His bitter suggestion that she should "go be a nurse like other women" reveals not only sexism but frustration: he feels that his sister's dream is being placed above his own. Beneatha's insistence that the money belongs to Mama, and that it is for Mama to decide how to use it, shows that she understands something Walter does not: the cheque is the price of their father's life, not a prize to be fought over. The sharpness of their dialogue, with its quick interruptions and insults, shows that the coming money brings tension rather than joy, as if the cheque has turned siblings into rivals.

Hansberry uses the cramped setting to show why money matters so much. The stage directions present a tired, overcrowded apartment where furniture is worn and the family share a bathroom with neighbours. Travis sleeps on the living room sofa. Money here is not luxury but space, light and privacy. Mama's struggling plant, kept alive by the one small window, becomes a symbol of a family trying to grow in a place without enough sunlight, and her wish for a house with a garden shows that, for her, money means the chance to let her family flourish.

For Walter, money represents manhood and respect. As a chauffeur to a rich white man, he feels trapped in a servant's role, and he sees the liquor store as his chance to become a businessman. In his argument with Mama he claims that

Question number

money "is life", and when Mama reflects that "Once upon a time freedom used to be life" he replies that it was always money and they simply did not know it. Hansberry uses this exchange to show a generational shift: Mama's generation fought for freedom from slavery and lynching, while Walter's believes that in post-war America only money brings status. The audience may sympathise with his hunger for dignity, yet Hansberry warns that his materialism is dangerous.

Mama's decision to use part of the money for a house in Clybourne Park shows a different value. For her, money buys a home and a future, but this choice also brings the family into conflict with racial prejudice. Mr Lindner's offer to buy them out reveals that white society also sees money as a tool, using it to keep black families out of white neighbourhoods. In this way Hansberry, writing when restrictive covenants and housing segregation shaped Chicago, shows money as entangled with racism.

The structural turning point is the loss of the money. When Walter entrusts it to Willy Harris, who disappears with it, including the portion meant for Beneatha's education, the family's dreams seem destroyed. Walter's despair leads him to consider accepting Lindner's offer, and his rehearsal of a degraded performance before Mama shows how close money comes to costing him his self-respect. Mama's response, that "There is always something left to love", reminds the family that love must not depend on success.

The climax reverses everything. Facing Lindner, Walter refuses the money, explaining that his father earned the house for them "brick by brick". By invoking his father, Walter places family pride above financial gain, and Mama's comment that he has come into his manhood shows that he has found the respect he wanted, not through wealth but through integrity. Hansberry therefore presents

Question number

money as vitally important, a means of escape and opportunity, but ultimately subordinate to dignity. The play suggests that the family will still struggle financially, yet they leave the apartment richer in self-belief than any cheque could make them.

22 Hansberry presents Walter Lee Younger as a frustrated, restless man whose dreams have been "deferred" by poverty and racism, and whose search for respect drives the whole play. He is often selfish, bitter and reckless, yet Hansberry encourages the audience to understand rather than simply condemn him. By the end, Walter's refusal of Lindner's money transforms him into an almost heroic figure who finally earns the respect he craved, not through wealth but through dignity.

From his first appearance, Walter is presented as tense and dissatisfied. The stage directions describe him as "a lean, intense young man" with "nervous movements and erratic speech habits". The adjective "intense" and the restless "nervous movements" suggest a man full of energy that has nowhere to go, as if his body expresses the frustration of a life confined to a crowded apartment. His speech in the opening scene reinforces this. When Ruth tells him to eat his eggs, he explodes, "Damn my eggs... damn all the eggs that ever was!" The hyperbole turns a trivial domestic moment into an outburst against the routine that traps him, and the comic exaggeration masks real despair. Walter feels that no one, least of all his wife, believes in his dreams.

Walter's dissatisfaction is closely tied to his job. As a chauffeur to a wealthy white man, he spends his days serving others, and Hansberry suggests that this role denies him the dignity of manhood that American society promised. He describes

Question number

how he sees the future stretched out in front of him and feels it is empty, and his comment that God gave the black man nothing but dreams reveals a bitterness rooted in racial injustice. For a 1959 audience, Walter's frustration would echo the limited opportunities open to African American men, many of whom were confined to service jobs regardless of ability.

However, Hansberry does not present Walter as purely sympathetic. His treatment of the women in his family is often harsh. He mocks Beneatha's ambition to become a doctor, telling her to "go be a nurse like other women", and complains that he is surrounded by women with small minds, a self-pitying view that ignores their sacrifices. His belief that money "is life" shows a materialism that Mama finds frightening. When she tells him that "Once upon a time freedom used to be life", Hansberry sets two generations against each other, and Walter seems to have lost sight of the values his parents fought for. His drinking and neglect of work after Mama buys the house show a man sinking into self-destruction.

The central turning point of his character is the loss of the money. Mama gives Walter control of the remaining money, a gesture of trust intended to restore his pride, but he hands it all to Willy Harris, including Beneatha's share. The scene in which Bobo reveals that Willy has disappeared is devastating, and Walter's anguish shows the cost of his recklessness. Hansberry uses this structural fall to raise the stakes: Walter must now choose between money and self-respect. His decision to accept Lindner's offer, and his bitter rehearsal of the humiliating role he believes white society expects, crying "Captain, Mistuh, Bossman", shows how deeply racism has damaged his sense of self. The audience is shocked, but Mama's plea to "measure him right" asks us to consider the hardships he has endured before we judge.

Question number

The climax completes Walter's transformation. Faced with Lindner in front of his son, Travis, Walter refuses the offer. His speech is hesitant at first, but as he explains that his father earned the house for them "brick by brick", he grows in confidence. The image of bricks suggests a slow, patient building of dignity across generations, and by invoking his father, Walter places himself in a line of proud men. The presence of Travis is significant: Walter becomes the role model he previously failed to be. Mama's comment that he has finally come into his manhood, and her image of a rainbow after the rain, confirm that this is his redemption.

Overall, Hansberry presents Walter as a complex, deeply human character. His faults are real, but they grow from the pressures of poverty, racism and wounded pride. His journey from bitterness to dignity suggests Hansberry's hope that, even when dreams are deferred, people can find the strength to stand up for themselves. Walter's final victory is not financial at all, but moral, and that is what makes him the true centre of the play.