Introduction

These exemplar answers have been chosen from the summer 2018 examination series.

OCR is open to a wide variety of approaches and all answers are considered on their merits. These exemplars, therefore, should not be seen as the only way to answer questions but do illustrate how the mark scheme has been applied.

Please always refer to the specification https://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/171200-specification-accredited-a-level-gce-english-literature-h472.pdf for full details of the assessment for this qualification. These exemplar answers should also be read in conjunction with the sample assessment materials and the June 2018 Examiners' report or Report to Centres available from Interchange https://interchange.ocr.org.uk/Home.mvc/Index

The question paper, mark scheme and any resource booklet(s) will be available on the OCR website from summer 2019. Until then, they are available on OCR Interchange (school exams officers will have a login for this and are able to set up teachers with specific logins – see the following link for further information http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/interchange/managing-user-accounts/).

It is important to note that approaches to question setting and marking will remain consistent. At the same time OCR reviews all its qualifications annually and may make small adjustments to improve the performance of its assessments. We will let you know of any substantive changes.
Question 1a and 1b, Coriolanus

1  Coriolanus

Answer both parts (a) and (b).

(a) Discuss the following passage from Act 1 Scene 3, exploring Shakespeare’s use of language and its dramatic effects.

(b) ‘The female characters are always positioned outside the main events of the play.’

Using your knowledge of the play as a whole, show how far you agree with this view of women in Coriolanus.

Remember to support your answer with reference to different interpretations.
Exemplar 1

1

A. The passage encapsulates the antithesis that permeates Shakespeare’s 1608 play ‘Coriolanus’, as the feminine setting proves a stark juxtaposition against Volumnia’s ‘masculine’ lexis. Throughout the passage, Volumnia and Virgillia oppose each other in their perception of greatness and heroism, for Volumnia action and warefare is eloquence, whilst Virgillia prefers peace. The passage encapsulates the domineering tendency of Volumnia, evoking the conflicting nature that pervades the play.

As the stage direction suggests, Volumnia and Virgillia were on ‘two low stools’ sewing, this encapsulates their confinement to the domestic sphere. Due to their sex, both Volumnia and Virgillia are entrapped within a characteristically female setting, unable to break away from their patriarachal prescriptions. They sit sewing in ‘Marcuis’ house’, demonstrating their confinement to the male dominating sphere - as even despite femininity equating to the domestic, ‘Marcuis’ home’ reminds readers of their lower standing to men. Along with their entrapment to a Marcus’ home, through staging the pair sitting down and sewing, viewers of the play can identify their inferiority. They are beneath the ‘manly’ patricians, whose invovlement in war and politics is strictly male dominated. Volumnia and Virgillia’s physical inferiority lucidly highlights the inequity that permeates the play, as the women are barred from invovlement solely due to their sex. The stage direction establishes the hierarchy of the play, projecting the ‘lower standing’ of the women. Both are sat ‘down’ on ‘low’ stools, projecting a gendered hierarchy that permeates the play. It lucidly illustrates their separation from a world of violence and aggression that Marclus embodies. Their lower standing sets a precedent for their confinement, demonstrating an occuring theme throughout literature, of female submissiveness. They cannot escape their gendered entrapment, and therefore adopt ‘feminine’ traits in order to appease their patriarachal tropes.
Throughout the passage, it is apparent Volumnia's lexis juxtaposes her feminine setting, as her violence demonstrates her contrast against supposed 'femininity'. Whilst Virgillia is portrayed as submissive and an atypical woman 'sewing' in distress, Volumnia projects harsh and brutal language. She sent her 'tender-bodied' son to a 'cruel war', and relishes his success on the battlefield. This violent lexis, desiring her son to prove 'himself a man' contrasts against Virgillia's quiet nature. Volumnia is dominating, she is masculine and violent with her words, however she is entrapped due to her gender. Shakespeare utilises the 'traditionally feminine' setting in order to highlight the contrast between Volumnia and supposed femininity. For Shakespeare, femininity equates peace, sewing, and quiet - everything Volumnia is not. The passage encapsulates Volumnia's 'masculine' qualities, as her brutal lexis aligns her to the traditionally 'male' stereotype of warefare. This contrast provokes confusion for a reader and viewer, whose expectations for a woman sewing is to be quiet and submissive. Volumnia defies expectations within this passage, as her Machiavellian lexis juxtaposes the stereotypical, submissive woman.

As Volumnia suggests 'the breasts of Hecuba (...) looked not lovelier than Hector's forehead when it spit forth blood', she demonstrates her denial of oppressive femininity. The classical reference portrays Volumnia's hatred of femininity - she is confined to sewing, giving birth, and nurture all due to her gender. Her violent lexis surrounding the 'breasts' demonstrates her denial of traditional 'womanhood', just alike to Lady Macbeth in Shakespeare's 1605 play 'Macbeth'. Lady Macbeth's outcry 'unsex me' and 'come to my woman's breasts and milk them for gall' correlates to Volumnia's denial of gender stereotypes. For both characters, with their confinement to a feminine sphere, bars them from achieving the power and domination they desire, and they therefore attempt to distance themselves away from tropes of femininity. Shakespeare utilises Volumnia, and Lady Macbeth, to highlight the juxtaposition of femininity and masculinity, as during the 1600s, gender expression was subject to a binary.
Volumnia desires power; she yearns political power but her gender prohibits this. Throughout this passage, she demonstrates her reliance upon her son, Marcus, in order to ‘play out’ her own desires. She sent her son into a ‘cruel war’ as she relishes the ‘bloody brow’. For Volumnia, her success is marked through her son’s power on the battlefield, and so she pushes him to fight in order to bolster her on self-esteem and power. Whilst her gender prohibits her political and battlefield win, she uses her only option, her son. For Volumnia, Marcus has become a ‘shell’ for her to guide through war. This passage demonstrates Volumnia’s manipulation. She cleverly moulds her son to win, in order to reap satisfaction. Her evocation of Marcus treading upon Aufidius’ neck showcases her own desires to crush her enemies. Her visceral language evokes imagery of bloodless and warefare, which she pushed her son into when he was ‘tender bodies’. For Volumnia, language is her only outlet of aggression, and for Marcus his sword is his weapon of destruction. Volumnia yearns power and destruction.

Whilst Volumnia projects masculinity and violence, Virgillia contrasts such aggression. Volumnia’s thirst for blood juxtaposes Virgillia’s lexis, as she suggests ‘no blood!’. The antithesis between the aggressive and violent lexis of Volumnia and the peaceful language of Virgillia is exacerbated through the structure of this passage. Volumnia dominates the scenes she is in, taking control of conversations and manipulating them for her own desire. In comparison, Virgillia is quiet and ‘submissive’ to her devouring mother-in-law. She has a mere few lines, whilst Volumnia’s language permeates the pages. Shakespeare reinforces the antithesis of Volumnia, through his portrayal of Virgillia. Virgillia embodies the patriarchal prescription of femininity, she is silent, submissive, and on a lower standing. For an audience the disparity between the two highlights Volumnia’s deviation from social norms, as her behaviours are outside of beliefs surrounding how a woman should behave. The passage encapsulates a typical 1600 expectation of women, in the form of Virgillia, and demonstrates the conflict of Volumnia.
Throughout this passage, Shakespeare utilises visceral lexis in order to highlight the antithesis of his play. The femininity and masculinity dichotomy is alluded to throughout this passage, as Volumnia's violent language juxtaposes her gendered prescription. The passage acts as a microcosm for the confinement of women within both literature and reality, as 'womanhood' too often prohibits power and success.

B. 'The female characters are always positioned outside the main events of the play'

Using your knowledge of the play as a whole, show how far you agree with this view of women in Coriolanus.

Within William Shakespeare's 1608 'Coriolanus', the patriarchal trope of women being barred from the main events evades the text. Whilst Coriolanus fights on the battlefield and political realm, his mother Volumnia and wife Virgillia are left in the background. As actress Harriet Walter suggests regarding the role of women in Shakespearean plays, in her 'Open Letter to Shakespeare' (2016), 'being outside the violence they can comment on it, they can foresee the consequences but are helpless to prevent them from occurring'. However, the complexity of Volumnia's character both adopts and contrasts the propositions - lucidly evoking the antithesis that permeates the play.

Walter’s critique of Shakespearean women encapsulates Virgillia’s role within the play. As critic George Gerwig (1954) suggests Virgillia is 'characteristically female'. Virgillia is outside of the violence, beyond the brutalities perpetrated by her Roman hero husband, Coriolanus. She outcries
‘O Jupiter, no blood!’, distancing herself from the violence of warfare, and the ensuement of bloodloss and destruction. Her ‘characteristically female’ tendencies demonstrate her character as outside of the conflict of the play, as her evident submissiveness and appeasement of peace contrasts the violence that permeates the play. With this, Shakespeare demonstrates how women are fundamentally outside of the main events of the play. Their gender bars them from conflict, warfare, and politics - and they are entrapped within femininity and domesticity. From a feminist perspective, Virgilia characterises typical prescriptions of ‘womanhood’ that permeates both fiction and reality. Her submissive aura, desires for love and peace, alludes to the passive stereotype that surrounds women. She encapsulates the feminine side of the male-to-female dichotomy, contrasting against any signs of gender fluidity. Shakespeare utilises Virgilia in order to project the pitfalls of femininity, as she will never be involved within the actions of the play. The text therefore demonstrates women outside of the main events, as their gender bars them and prohibits them to passivity.

Whilst Virgilia projects peace and femininity, Volumnia’s violent lexis presents her as a conflict against supposed womanhood. Through pushing her ‘tender bodied’ Coriolanus into a ‘cruel war’ Volumnia brought ‘psychological disaster upon her son’ Una Ellis-Fermor 1984. Her desires for power and dominating ensued a utilisation of Coriolanus to obtain success, leading to his eventual demise. Just alike to Virgilia, whose womanhood bars her from the main events of the play, Volumnia is entrapped within domesticity. She too sits on a ‘low stool’, sewing, lucidly illustrating her confinement to constrictions to femininity. As Walter suggests, despite Volumnia’s own desires she will never be involved within the actions of the play. For Shakespeare, her sex demonstrates a confinement to the domestic sphere, and she can ‘comment on’ the pitfalls and success of her ‘war-machine’ son, and ‘foresee the consequences’ of his denial of Rome and consul - but never obtain such power and domination herself. Whilst Coriolanus rises to the top in both the battlefield and political world, Volumnia is entrapped within his ‘house’ sewing, physically on a lower standing. Even
with her visceral language, desiring her son’s return with a ‘bloody brow’, she is encased within her female trap. The play therefore demonstrates how women cannot escape their gender, both Volumnia and Virgilia are barred due to their uncontrollable gender.

The projection of Volumnia’s complexity, however, contrasts the Walter’s critique of Shakespearean women - suggesting not all women are barred from the main events of the play. Volumnia’s inherent masculinity encapsulates the conflict of her character, and demonstrates the convulsions that permeates the play. ‘Coriolanus’ critic Linda Bamber (1964) suggests Volumnia is ‘quite incapable of change and devoid of complexity’, however it is her underlying and manipulative motives that rebuke this proposition. On the surface, Volumnia is stripped down because of her gender, barred from the battle field and prohibited from taking office. However, the she is the undercurrent that drives Coriolanus’ actions throughout. Whilst many critics see the play demonstrating the ‘antithesis between the principle and compromise, the state and the individual’ (Richard G. Moulton, 1907), is it not Volumnia who brings ‘psychological disaster upon her son’? Volumnia’s own motives are the driving force behind the play, and she moulds and manipulates the ‘main events’ of Shakespeare’s text. Coriolanus is submissive to Volumnia, calling her before his wife, and kneeling down in front of her, inferior to her domination. Volumnia is the underlying current throughout the play, she manipulates her son in order to obtain her own desires. Whilst on the surface it appears she is entrapped within her femininity and encased within the domestic sphere, she cleverly utilises her position in order to mould her son. As Coppelia Kahn (1981) suggests ‘Volumnia has succeeded all too well in making her son not a person, a personification, a grotesque caricature of Roman manhood’. Volumnia bred a war hero, but also a man with pitfalls and inner saboteurs. With this, this contrasts the proposition that women are barred from the play, as Volumnia is the perpetrator of destruction. It is Volumnia who blindly leads her son to his eventual death at the hands of Aufiduis.
Through a Marxist interpretation, it can be argued that women are not the only characters barred from the main events of the play. The 'lower-standing' position of the plebeians demonstrates their prohibition from the core events. Whilst the borgeious patricians precipitate control of the 'belly fable', they utilise the plebeians in order to gain success - just as Volumnia manipulates Coriolanus.

The hero's 'churlish and uncivil' (Plutarch 1594, source for 'Coriolanus') character ensues condemnation of the plebeians - with zoomorphic insults of them being 'souls of geese', along with medical lexis of 'boils and plagues'. The plebeians are always on the peripheral of the patricians. They are onlookers to Coriolanus, until they 'banish' him, their only breakaway from their proleteriat position. The contempt the characters shows towards the plebeians is evident in Coriolanus' visceral hatred of them, and Menenius' political maneuvering, moulding his language to 'appease the lower class'. Their 'low' position bars them from the main actions of the play, as they work to the feed the belly - the patricians - and end up with scraps of meat. 'Coriolanus' therefore demonstrates how both women and social class is a precursor of success.

Shakespeare's 'Coriolanus' is permeated with convulsions and antithesis. The suggestion all women are barred from the events of the play is a monolithic approach to the complexity of the play, and cannot account for the duality of Volumnia's character. Throughout the play, Volumnia's domination contrasts the submissive archetype of women. The play demonstrates the complexity of womanhood - women are not subject to dichotomies, but rather a fluid, changing entity. Shakespeare's play is permeated with antithesis, and it is the reader's subjectivity that dictates the 'woman's role'.

Examiner commentary

1a: The response to the passage pays consistently detailed attention to language and stage effects, aptly fulfilling the dominant AO2. The candidate is especially good on the effect of the 'two low stools', the stereotypical associations of sewing, and Volumnia's 'visceral language'. There are clear insights into Volumnia's psychology throughout, and at the end the contrast between the two women is usefully developed. Even closer reading – perhaps a little more detail on Virgilia's language, for instance – would obtain a higher mark. Level 6, 14 marks

1b: This is a well-developed response. Its lucid argument successfully incorporates a variety of interpretations (A05): Walter, Bamber, Moulton, Marxism, Plutarch's original characterisation of Coriolanus. As in the candidate's answer on 1a, the contrast between Virgilia and Volumnia is put to good effect. Cumulatively, however, the mark is somewhat depressed by such AO1 weaknesses as 'evades' for 'pervades,' 'inner saboteours,' Marcuis and Aufiduius, and 'borgeois patricians.' Level 6, 14 marks
1a)

Act I Scene III is a fundamental development of act I. Prior to this scene the audience had only seen Martius in hostile situations, act I scene I being on the streets of Rome in a protest and act I scene II being on the battlefields of Coriolanus. In contrast to this act I Scene III is in "marcus house"—a domestic setting and instead of extreme confrontation as seen in the prior scenes, the audience is informed on the backstory of Martius which allows for them to understand his arrogant, or what Harold Bloom calls his "Childlike" nature as well as introducing the audience to characters Virgillia and Volumnia who are used by Shakespeare as major plot developments later on in the play.

The scene opens with Virgillia "sewing", denoting to the audience that she is a domesticated Woman which is important for the audience understanding her steryotypically sensitive nature. In the first opening lines of act I scene III the audience is also told that she should "express yourself in a more comfortable sort" by Volumnia, which in the Ralph finness 2010 film adaption and the 2017 Barbican theatre adaption has been in reference to Virgillia physically sobbing, which again reinforces this notion of being the stereotypical sensitive female. On top of this, as it was believed women should be when this play was published in 1608, it can be seen that the character of Virgillia is largely 'seen and not heard' in this passage and when she
does it is often in short lines of prose such as "but had he died in the business, madam, how then?". Which when compared to Volumnia's long speeches structured in verse it becomes clear to the audience that Volumnia is a much more dominant patriarchal-like character when compared to the caring and maternal nature of Virgillia, which can be seen when she says "O' Jupiter no blood" when Volumnia is rejoicing in the fact that he has "His bloody brow". By setting up Virgillia as the opposite of Martius; she is what Ruskin calls "Shakespeare's loveliest character", being caring and maternal while he is arrogant and fierce, foreshadows Virgillia neutralising Coriolanus' anger in Act V.

It is clear from this extract that Volumnia is an extremely dominant character and Shakespeare does this in two ways; Volumnia dominates the dialogue between herself and Virgillia, but also outlines the life choices she's made for Martius, and how they have shaped him to his current state of what Jann Kott describes as "brave, great and noble". This is most evident when she says "to a cruel war I sent him from whence he returned with his brows bound with oak". Volumnia puts herself behind Martius' claims to "fame" telling us she "considering how honour would become him...was pleas'd to let him seek danger where he was like to find fame". For the
audience this creates an understanding into the character of Martius as before this scene his

presented to the audience as an arrogant tyrant who wants to "hang" the people and calls his

comrades "the souls of geese who bear the shapes o' men" but also In how their relationship is.

His mother, Volumnia has allowed the battlefields to nurture him rather than her maternal

instinct which signifies to the audience why Coriolanus has a lack of empathy or even sympathy

for the people of Rome who as can be seen by the grain riots in act I scene I are on the edge of

starvation, or his fellow patricians such as Menenius who are begging for his mercy in Act IV. It

is this relationship that is set up in this scene by Volumnia that ultimately causes the hubris in

Martius to do what Ruth Franklin describes as "fail to reconcile the moral need to be true to

himself with the practical imperative to be populat" that leads in his denoument from Act III to

Act V, resulting in his catastrophe.

Therefore it can be seen in this extract three main characters are set up to the audience, as

Coriolanus' backstory is developed which allows the audience to see why he has the tragic flaw

of hubris, Volumnia is set up and her relationship as a matriarch and being a fundamental part

in Martius' denoument as well as Virgillia's juxtaposing nature is set up which too sets up her

part in the denoument of Coriolanus.
B) 

To some extent it can be argued that female characters are positioned outside of the main events of the play as Ruth Franklin argues, "Coriolanus is...a moving meditation on the political temperament" and when this was published in Shakespeare's First folio in 1608 the political temperament was that of an extremely patriarchal society. However, the structure of this play denotes that there is no subplot and therefore the women cannot be positioned outside the main events of the play. Therefore based on the influential role female characters, specifically Volumnia play in Coriolanus it is the most convincing argument that female characters are not positioned outside of the main events of the play, rather they are a fundamental part of plot development.

Act I Scene III is where Volumnia makes her first appearance. While it can be argued that Martius and Menenius, male characters are more important because they are put in the first scene of the play, it can certainly not be argued that Volumnia and Virgillia's roles in act I scene I is "positioned outside the main events of the play". In this scene Volumnia is used by
Shakespeare to provide the audience with the backstory to Martius, telling us she "to the cruel
wars I sent him" when he was only young. This allows the audience to see why
Martius had
developed into a character that Jann Kott described as "brave, great and noble" and later the
callous and arrogant general, he knows no different, as Volumnia describes; "he came back from
the wars a man", allowing the audience to see that he was nurtured by the
wars rather than the
domestic maternal love. It is also in this scene that the character of Virgillia is set up to the
audience; she is the exact opposite of Martius, and their relationship seems juxtaposed to the
audience, she is what Ruskin describes as "one of Shakespeare's loveliest
characters", being
caring, maternal and the ideal 'domestic woman' of the time. Virgillia's
oppositeness to Martius
may seem trivial in Act I, however it is this trait that in Act V becomes one of the factors of
Martius downfall, and therefore, even the female character who says less lines
than the citizens
is in fact not positioned outside the main events of the play.
In act II and act III, it is strongly argued that the female characters are less
involved in the
main events of the play, as Volumnia, Virgillia and Valeria appear in Act II
scene I, and sparsely
anywhere else in these scenes. Although, it must be noted that in Act II scene
I, Volumnia once
again is used as a plot device by Shakespeare to underline the relationships
between Martius

(soon to be Coriolanus) and the Roman society, and Martius in the domestic realm. By using a

boasting tone when telling Menenius and Virgillia that "on his [Martius'] last expedition he came

back with twenty five wounds upon him" Volumnia sets up the fact that there is a culture of

national pride in Martius body as it represents Rome's victories, this is seen later in Act II

when Martius has to wear the "gown of humility", once again Volumnia has been used by

Shakespeare to convey valuable information to the audience about the reasons for the gown of

humility being worn, a role that becomes very crucial in the climax of the play: as it is where he

mocks the people. On top of this, the fact that Martius interacts with his Mother first, and his

Wife next indicates to the audience the underlying domestic hierarchy that we are told in act I

scene I by a citizen who says "he only does it for pride and his mother", it can also be noted

that this scene is more explicitly played out in the Ralph Finnes 2010 film adaptation where he

shares an almost intimate kiss with his mother yet a kiss on the cheek with his wife.

Shakespeare using the female characters to show the domestic hierarchy in this part of the play

bears significance when considering the effect that his wife, then mother have on him in Act V,

ultimately causing his downfall.
However in act IV and especially act V it is undeniable that female characters are central to 
the main events of the play. In Act IV it is Volumnia who is the only person that in outward 
prose tells Coriolanus "you are too absolute", this is the truth and is evident to 
the audience 
form his actions in Act III, but ironically goes against all of her teachings of 
creating what Jan 
Kott calls "brave, great and noble" characters. Furthermore it must be noted 
that when 
Coriolanus teams with the Volscies and wages war on Rome later in Act IV in 
the 2015 theatre 
adaption of the Play with Tom Hiddleston and the 2017 adaption of the play in the Barbican 
theatre, both of the Tribunes who, using deciet as their power ejected 
Coriolanus from Rome 
are depicted as older Women; as Jann Kott describes the tribunes they are 
"small, disfigured 
and deceptful". The use of older women in the stage context when compared to the immense 

physical prowess of Coriolanus highlights the Tribunes physical and military weaknesses in Acts 

IV and V. However it is the power that is held within the relationship between 
Coriolanus and 
his mother, and then his wife that had been outlined in act II scene I that 
allows the audience 
to see how they deconstruct a character that has turned away powerful male 
friends such as 
Cominius and Menenius. "A Kiss, long as my exile, sweet as my revenge" - it 
can be seen
Examiner commentary

1a: This is a good and secure response. The candidate comments relevantly on the relationships revealed by the passage between Volumnia and both Virgilia and Marcius – how she ‘has allowed the battlefields to nurture him rather than her maternal instinct’. AO2 discussion could, however, profitably be more detailed. ‘Volumnia dominates the dialogue between herself and Virgilia’[sic] but the reader is rarely shown exactly how she does this. (Unfortunately the contrast between Virgilia’s ‘short lines of prose’ and Volumnia’s ‘long speeches structured in verse’ implies that one speaks in prose throughout the passage and the other in verse.) There is some repetition of points already made in 1b (the candidate answered question 1b first) and discussion of new material would help the candidate provide a more developed argument. Level 5, 12 marks

1b: This is a thorough response, ‘good’ rather than ‘excellent’, showing detailed knowledge of the play and making some useful observations about the function of scenes relevant to the question. AO5 (different interpretations) accounts for 50% of the marks for part b) and this is well met by discussion of the critical views of Franklin and Kott and the stage versions of Fiennes and Hiddleston. For a higher mark, argument (AO1) would need to be rather more incisive. The last paragraph repeats the substance of the answer rather than quite providing a conclusion. Level 5, 12 marks

Exemplar Candidate Work

Virgillia's caring nature initially stuns Coriolanus' anger, which is further evident when he says

"like a dull actor I have forgot my part". What Ruskin describes as Virgillia's "lovely" nature is

juxtaposed with Coriolanus' harsh nature in this scene and can be seen to recenter the
character. However it is his mother that causes him to break, as can be seen when he says

"mother what have you done" after he yields to the plight of Rome, knowing it will mean

imminent death.

Therefore, although some may argue that the main focus of the play is on the male characters

such as Coriolanus of Menenius, and women are positioned outside the main events of the play,

it must be remembered that this five-act tragedy was created by Shakespeare to have no

subplots, and therefore the actions of the female characters are fundamental plot developments

In the play as can be seen by the use of female actors as the tribunes in adaptations of this play

and the use of Volumnia and Virgillia as plot devices to set up Martius' back story, his

relationship as a figure of national pride, and through representing their relationship with him

foreshadow his downfall.
Question 2a and 2b, *Hamlet*

2  *Hamlet*

Answer both parts (a) and (b).

(a) Discuss the following passage from Act 4 Scene 4, exploring Shakespeare’s use of language and its dramatic effects.

(b) ‘*Hamlet* is a play about indecision.’

Using your knowledge of the play as a whole, show how far you agree with this view of the play *Hamlet*.

Remember to support your answer with reference to different interpretations.
Exemplar 1

(a)

We are instantly introduced to political matters at the opening of the excerpt: “who commands them, Sir? / The nephew of Fortinbras”. This has the effect of upholding an atmosphere at which the rest of the scene will follow. Shakespeare cleverly sets the scene with aims of bringing attention to external conflict. He later on contrasts this with Hamlet’s exposure of his internal conflict that has accompanied him throughout the play. By doing so, Shakespeare inadvertently suggests that the mechanisms Claudius has used to distract Hamlet, can in no way take his mind away from the mission he is facing within. It should also be noted that Hamlet is further displayed to us as respectful in his ability to address the Captain as “Sir”. This can also be interpreted to reveal his more calculated side. As he later on exposes his “fantasy [for] slain”, we learn of his ability to cover up his private plans and reveal himself in a different manner to ensure his intentions cannot be prevented.

Hamlet conveys some fragmentation in his speech with Shakespeare’s use of caesura in the line, “of thinking too precisely on thy event – / A thought which, quarter’d, hath but one-part wisdom” to reflect his free flow of thought. He seems energetic in speech and this could be due to the adrenaline that is being fed to him by his “divine ambition”. This side of Hamlet is unlike previs of his character in the rest of the play which we are shown. As he cultivates an act of “madness” in other acts, he comes across to the audience as cunning and motivated in his belief of his ability “to do” (kill Claudius).

As Hamlet exposes to us his “will, and strength, and means to” commit murder we become aware of his rise in determination and his sudden action to finally perform the task. We are aware that four whole acts have been spent displaying his indecision and finally, after suggesting that he is the dichotomy of capable and incapable to kill Claudius, he is now strictly capable and focused on his “revenge”. This builds up a lot of drama and sets an extreme dramatic tone now that the event the audience has been waiting for, feels assured is finally about to happen.

He ends his speech exclaiming, “my thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth!” This tone adds climax to the play as the audience begin to believe that he is soon to fulfill his dreaded task. This courage in his remarks finally enable us to believe that Hamlet would in fact make a great king. He finally begins to portray a verbal certainty and noble strength to avenge his father’s murder. He previously compares his father to that of “Hercules” in Act 1, but he himself exudes all the characteristics he says Old Hamlet conveyed. His indecisiveness of “to be, or not to be” is now replaced by an “excitement” for “death”, “danger” and “dare”. This new born decisiveness feeds more fuel to the climax of the play and enhances its dramatic effect.
Shakespeare’s plotline is infused with indecision. Upon finding out about his father’s death, Hamlet is approached by Horatio and told that a Ghost of his father was seen as the castle’s sentinels stood watch. This immense discovery is what spurs the action of the play and ignites the theme of indecisiveness we see in Hamlet.

We are first introduced to Hamlet’s indecisiveness in Act 1, Scene 2 as he questions why God “fix’d his cannon ‘gainst self-slaughter”. After the grief of his father’s death and his mother’s marriage, he is unable to cope with the events in his life and fixes on the idea of suicide. Being aware that it is a sin, we see him exclaiming “O God! O God!” as he struggled to resist his desires of death in order to remain faithful to his Christian beliefs. Alongside the external conflicts of Denmark—the threat of war from Norway—there is already an internal conflict within Hamlet himself. Before Hamlet is even supplied with the knowledge of Claudius’s “foul play”, he lacks strength to take control over his internal battle.

During the Shakespearean era, Christians believed that murder was in fact a sin, and not only was it a sin, it was illegal. Alongside this, Greek mythology stated that ‘a son must avenge a father’s death in order to bring justice to his name and respect in his memory’. It is these two beliefs that could be argued to have delayed Hamlet’s action and elongated his inaction. His inability to side with a singular belief is what caused his inaction in the play, rather than sole Indecisiveness itself. This is evident in the Act 2 where Hamlet finds the perfect opportunity to murder Claudius, but because he is praying, refuses to do so as this would send him to heaven.

However, based on this, it could be argued that it is not indecisiveness that facilitates the play—it is timing instead. Hamlet insists that “my thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth”. His intent to commit murder is at a very high level of certainty, he wishes for nothing less. It is just catching Claudius at the right opportunity in order to secure the deed. During Act 2 Hamlet finds Claudius kneeling down and appreciates that this would be the right time to kill him, but as he is praying becomes aware that it would “send thee to heaven”. During this scene Kevin Branning pans the camera to zoom out of Hamlet. This could show Hamlet’s circumstances as so unfair and complicated that they reduce him.

Hamlet’s alteration between “to be, or not to be” and “my thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth” illustrate his inability to refrain from switching between his certainty and uncertainty. It could be interpreted that his fluctuation in decision is what disrupts the flow of the play. However, being a tragedy during the Shakespearean era meant that this pace and fluctuation of plotline was common in a myriad of Shakespeare’s works.
Society at the time believed that only God had the right to determine where an individual’s life must meet their end, so critics of the era claimed that Hamlet’s indecisiveness could never be justified as he didn’t have the right to act on his grief. However, Clurman argues that “Hamlet was next in line to the throne, and therefore holds the moral leverage to avenge his father’s murder”. I agree with this as kings at the time were perceived and worshipped as a ‘God on earth’. This means that Hamlet, the rightful king, is in fact in a position to dictate the death of Claudius.

Examiner commentary

2a: The opening paragraph sets out some helpful parameters, looking both at the wider context of the scene and some of its detail, at Hamlet’s external and internal situation. The candidate responds to the dominant AO2 (language and effects), exploring some features of language – the possible implications of calling the captain ‘Sir’, ‘fragmentation’, the climactic tone of the final couplet. Quotations are well integrated into the discussion. There is some clear argument (AO1) showing the change in Hamlet to a ‘new born decisiveness’. More detailed discussion of language and/or stage effects would, however, be desirable for a higher mark. Some analysis remains rather general: ‘This builds up a lot of drama and sets an extreme dramatic tone’. The mark is therefore on the borderline between Level 5 and Level 6, showing some excellence, fairly well developed. Level 6, 13 marks

2b: This response – just above ‘good’ - shows elements of excellence. Argument (AO1) is clear and there is apt material on Hamlet’s ‘internal battle’, his ‘inability to side with a singular belief’. There is one reference to a critic (Clurman) and one to a stage interpretation (Branagh) but AO5 is further addressed by the reference to the conflicting Christian and Greek perspectives on murder. While named critics and productions are not essential to exploration of different interpretations, rather more such references here would have provided useful support for the argument and made a higher mark more likely. Level 6, 13 marks
Exemplar 2

24 marks

a)

This piece notably depicts hamlet; shuffling off his antic disposition to be shocked at
the will of other men and ultimately resolving to kill, however this is all the while undercut
with subtle hypocrisy so the question as to if he will is debatable.

Locating the piece; Hamlet is to be sent away. Yet just as he about to leave, and the
passage begins, he meets the "Captain" who informs him of the attack on Poland and its
worthlessness, this then set hamlet into one of his seven soliques as the again ponders his
inaction on its conclusion he then is taken away to England.

Immediately hamlet choice of register is significant. He begin the convocation with
"good sir" a manson quite different to the previous scenes as previously he had his "antic
disposition" here he seems polite and controlled. This would immediately be significant to
the audience who has just seen him kill Polonius and would have the effect of making what
he next says seem more important and trustworthy as he is not at this point mad or being
spied on.

The captain is similarly respectful as the convosation carries on however most
significantly he is being honest. Truth and lies is a consistently prevalent theme throughout
the play which a modern or early audience would pick up on, so here Shakespeare having the
captain say he "speak[s]" "truly" "and with no addition" would be striking and significant to
both the audience and Hamlet himself. so now, with this start, him stating the futility of the
offensive, in a simple yet effective and affecting use of imagery, saying he would not "pay
five ducats... [to] farm it", we both believe him and further makes the image more significant.

This obviously has a profound, empathetic effect on hamlet, as it likely would also the
audience also. Hamlets questioning, "why", shows this moreover his mention of "two
thousand souls and twenty thousand ducats" having no "debate" further cements this. he is
arguably overwhelmed by this, seen as after he mentions death, "why the man dies", he ends,
again politely, the convosation and, upon bluntly dismissing Rosencrantz, is plunged into
thought.
Then begins his soliloquy. He sees another instance of action wishes to "spur his dull revenge", he has previously had this kind of debate and at no point after these has he made the necessary action of killing the king, as a result here the audience may be sceptical as to wheather he really means it. Then in a self-depreciating imagery Hamlet compares himself to a "beast". This may have the effect of again encouraging sympathy towards the prince, yet, may also not, or at least not as effectively as prior ones, as so many of these have been said already.

Hamlet then begins to debate the merit of thought. thematically important as many, including him here as he specifically mentions "godlike reason", believe his overthinking to be a main source of his delay. his cursing of it here gives credence to that idea. However him saying that there may also be Shakespeare's way of exemplifying hamlets hypocrisy to the audience. as he curses "thought" calling it "one part wisdom and ever three parts coward" whilst he is, in the world of the play, thinking.

He admires the soldiers ability to "make mouths at the invisible event" but also, in another example of contradiction describes the "divine ambition" as leading to them being "puff'd". Later this again he uses another similar image calling it a "trick of fame". the use of "trick" and calling this ambition an artificial "puff" are not in fact flattering, something that can be clearly picked up on by the audience. Hence this may be another instance of Hamlet saying something whilst sub-consciously believing another.

In saying this, what he finally resolves here is that he should act, similarly than earlier in act three he says he would "drink hot blood" here he similarly says his "thoughts be bloody or nothing worth". Clearly evoking the typical revenge tragedy hero's language again.

In conclusion it seems that Hamlet here will now go to kill and fulfil his destiny/ ghost-given purpose. Yet Shakespeare's use of similar images earlier and the hypocrisy in the very medium with which the audience hears this may lead to the audience believing this may not happen. This however does actually lead to Hamlet killing, not Claudius, but Rosencrantz and Guildenstern.
b) Hamlet, and the play generally, undeniably involves and highlights the incision in its characters, most notably Hamlet himself. It can then be argued thus that Shakespeare intended the "play [to be] about indecision". In saying this however many other critics argue that there are different primary focuses such as female subjugation/repression. Both of these positions can and have over time been largely debated, which is true is unclear.

As the motion proposes "indecision" is certainly a central theme. Moreover, a large part of Hamlet's seven soliloquies are specifically to do with his inability to actively take revenge. This is and people searching for the reason for the incision is a notably large point of criticism. Psychoanalytical Critics such as Ernest Joans took Hamlet's psyche and scoured it for the source of the indecision. Joans for example, took Frands theory surrounding the Oedipal complex and applied it to hamlet saying that in large part it is hamlets "infantile desires for the mother" that take up most of his thought and thus leads to his inaction. This idea was widely accepted due to the large amount of evidence, the most notably in Hamlet's first soliloquy he talks of his mothers "incestuous sheets" a graphic and significant image showing a too great preoccupation with his mother's sexuality. This was taken further by Janet alderman who believed "Gertrude corruption in the eyes of hamlet" to be the source of his inaction. There are many others also who interpret the play's main idea to be centrally focussing around the cause of hamlets indecision. Another example of interpretation of the play being centred on "incision" is Gerrard's, more accepted in contemporary analysis, idea of the "memetic modal". Which states that hamlet is distraught and cannot take revenge as he cannot find someone to base his revenge off of. He takes "the Players" in act 2 and Fortembras in act 4 but these do not work as they do not share his grief. Gerrard ultimately argues that Laertes is the one whom allows hamlet to take revenge and finally kill Claudius. It then seems that as this is such a common point in interpretation for criticism over time that this is likely what the play is about.

Yet, it is not the unanimous point of interpretation, others cite different ideas and themes as the central point of the piece. For example, many critics see females, and the way
in which the patriarchal society of Denmark treats them, to be the true central focus of the play. Critics such as E. Sholwater focus their critical interpretations on differing aspects; hers specifically, looks primarily at Ophelia and her role. Sholwater says that "Ophelia has been deprived: her sexuality, her language and her thought!". she says she is deprived sexuality by her father telling her to avoid hamlet in Act 1 Scene 3, deprived language as she is told to stop communicating with him also, and finally deprived thought as Ophelia in talking to Laertes in that same scene uses the image of a "lock box" to which only he "has the key" thus preventing her thought. This idea is hugely significant as it shows that not only is Ophelia a complex and, arguably primary, part of the play but also that there is varying equally important aspects of the play other than simply Hamlet and his indecision.

Furthermore, characters such as Gertrude and even Ophelia where often in earlier criticism disregarded. This, as a result of the relative quietness, Gertrude, for example, only has three present of the lines in the play leading critics such as T.S. Elliot to suggest that "Gertrude... is insignificant" pointing to this lack of stage time as a indicator of this. This would then lend credence to the initial view that the play is not only about this but is more about other aspects for example indecision. This then possibly, proves the initial motion true. However as time progressed views and theatrical performances of Ophelia and Gertrude show her not as initially argued a "passive victim to male action" but more and more as a powerful on stage presence. Ophelia, referring again to E. Sholwater's interpretation, was once passive and beautiful and nothing more but in recent productions such as Andrew Scott's exemplifies through the intimate physicality between her and Hamlet that she is someone, who truly loves hamlet but is deprived of him due to male interference sexually frustrated, unable to express her feelings she descends into madness.

It therefore seems that Saying soully that the play is entirely "about" incision may be limiting as it does not account for the great complexity and breadth of the play and its many themes and ideas. I then believe it can be concluded that the play, whilst being in large part about indecision, is about a multitude of things such as the role of woman and their subjugation.
Examiner commentary

2a: This is a good, detailed response. It successfully relates aspects of the passage to such larger themes as truth and lies as reflected in the captain’s professions of honesty. It addresses the dominant AO2 (effects) with discussion of Hamlet’s ‘polite and controlled’ manner to the captain, the possible implications of ‘puff’ and ‘the typical revenge tragedy hero’s language’ at the end. What would be needed for a higher mark is some more precise analysis of language or stage effects. Expression (AO1) is occasionally a little unclear or infelicitous: ‘similarly than earlier in act three … here he similarly says’. Level 5, 12 marks

2b: The candidate presents a case for indecision as the main theme of the play, supporting the argument, and fulfilling AO5 (different interpretations), with references to the views of Jones, Alderman and Gerrard. The rest of the answer turns to other themes which may be considered important, and continues to provide critical support. While this approach has some validity, the force of the answer is weakened, on the whole, by leaving the topic of indecision rather than somehow linking to it the topic of women and the patriarchal society. Another factor which keeps the response in Level 5 (‘good’) rather than Level 6 (‘excellent’) is the sometimes insecure expression (AO1); ‘incision’ several times for ‘indecision; ‘Frauds theory; ‘to base his revenge off of; ‘Sholwater’, are some examples. Level 5, 12 marks
A)

During the section of the passage in which Hamlet talks to himself, Shakespeare has Hamlet ask himself rhetorical questions, this creates a sense of discussion even though Hamlet is not communicating with anyone it also exemplifies Hamlet's inner conflict, for example he asks "is not tomb enough and continent to hide the slain?" Shakespeare plays with Hamlet's inner conflict further by having the next sentence be an exclamative showing Hamlet to be decisive "O, from this time forth, My thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth!" Shakespeare is therefore juxtaposing the two sentences and showing Hamlet to be a floored character as he appears to be decisive but struggles with great inner conflict. We can see Shakespeare use this same technique earlier on in the passage where Hamlet asks himself "What is a man, If his chief good and market of his time Be but to sleep and feed?" answering once again with a decisive statement finished with an exclamation mark "A beast, no more!"

During Hamlet's speech he uses lists many times, Shakespeare does this to show Hamlet's speed of thought as well as his inner struggle. For example Hamlet questions why he hasn't exacted revenge upon Claudius yet as he has "cause, and will, and strength, and means to do't!" Shakespeare chooses this moment to have Hamlet question his willingness as he has just been told of how Fortinbras army is battling over an insignificant piece of land. Later on in the passage Hamlet once again uses a list "death, and danger, care" the personification adds to the increasing tension within the moment, as each word holds greater significance, almost as if Hamlet is building up what he is saying.

Shakespeare uses the dialogue between Hamlet and the Captain to show Hamlet as a naïve character, having Hamlet ask the Captain sincere questions about why Fortinbras's army would fight and risk their lives over something so insignificant as a patch of land. Shakespeare uses the Captain as a means to show the insignificance of the area, as the captain says "To pay five ducats, five. I would not farm it" Shakespeare's repition of the number "five" is clearly an attempt to exaggerate the un-importance of this land. Which in turn makes Hamlet seem unsure of himself and quite naïve, as he had not yet acted upon the fact that he knew Claudius had murdered his father.

B)
In many ways Hamlet is a play about indecision, Shakespeare creates a environment within the high society of Denmark which is shrowded in untrustworthiness and dishonesty, thus creating an overwhelming amount of indecision in the play, as character are unsure who to trust. an example of this is, Gertrude she is not sure whether or not to support Hamlet or Claudius as she has been deceived by both of them, and in the end chooses to sit on the fence, as it seems she accidentally drinks the poison. This is hugely different to the 2017 Almeida production in which Gertrude is a much stronger character as she switches to Hamlet's side and it is made incredibly clear that she knowingly makes the decision to sacrifice herself to save Hamlet's life.

Another character who constantly struggles with indecision is Hamlet, a major driving force of the plot comes from Hamlet's indecision, as he can't decide when or how to exact revenge for his father's death. Shakespeare critic A.C. Bradley says that all of Shakespeare's tragic heroes have one "fatal flaw" Hamlet's being his indecision. There is many examples of this throughout the play, when Hamlet first meets the ghost of his father he is enthralled by every word and vows revenge on Claudius, however his indecision makes him then begin to question if what he saw was some sort of vision from the devil, further complicating the plot and making Hamlet set a trap which he believes will "catch the conscience of the King". Shakespeare further highlights the extremity of Hamlet's issues with indecision through the actions of other characters. For example, upon hearing of his father's death Laertes immediately storms the court and threatens the King's life, in many ways this an exact opposite to Hamlet's approach, and allows for Laertes to seek what he sees as revenge incredibly quickly.

However Hamlet can be seen as quite decisive within certain moments of the play, moments which drastically effect the plot and certain characters. For example the scene between Hamlet and Ophelia where the King and Polonius are listening behind the arras, Hamlet is incredibly decisive and seems to have no regard for Ophelia's feelings as he destroys any love he once had for her, stating that she should "get thee to a nurrey" and asking her "where is your father?" implying his anger comes from his awareness that she has betrayed him and he knows their listening. Within the RSC 2017/18 touring Hamlet, Hamlet's rage is increased as he hears Polonius making noise behind the arras and immediatly throws Ophelia to the ground asking her "where is your father?" whilst covering her face in green paint and exclaiming that she is a "green girl". This version of Hamlet was clearly far more decisive and acted off his emotions, a side of Hamlet explored far less often.

I think I would argue that within the play itself Hamlet's character arc is defined by his indecision but the play itself is not about it, it is more a story of revenge rather than indecision, as that is what drives the story and motivates Hamlet.

**Examiner commentary**

2a: The candidate succeeds in presenting some valid aspects of Hamlet's 'inner struggle' and in identifying a few relevant features of his language – his 'exclamative' sentence showing decisiveness, for instance. Some analysis, however, remains only generally developed and not completely convincing, as in the discussion of death, and danger, dare’ or Hamlet’s questions to the captain suggesting only that he is naive. Technical terms are not essential for every comment, but the section in which Hamlet talks to himself’ does seem rather unsophisticated. Overall this is a generally developed, fairly straightforward answer. Level 4, 8 marks

2b: This answer shows competence rather than the good, clear qualities expected for a higher mark. There are a few relevant references to different interpretations (AOS) – Bradley and two productions – and these could profitably be supplemented. Argument is straightforward, fulfilling AO1 requirements at this level. Level 4, 10 marks
Question 3a and 3b, *Measure for Measure*

3  *Measure for Measure*

Answer both parts (a) and (b).

(a) Discuss the following passage from Act 4 Scene 3, exploring Shakespeare's use of language and its dramatic effects.

(b) 'Shakespeare never forgets the funny side to life in Vienna.'

Using your knowledge of the play as a whole, show how far you agree with this view of *Measure for Measure*.

Remember to support your answer with reference to different interpretations.
Exemplar 1  28 marks

3 Measure for Measure

a) Discuss the following passage from Act 4 Scene 3, exploring Shakespeare's use of language and its dramatic effects.

In this scene Barnadine is used to emphasise how uncontrollable the citizens of Vienna have become under the Duke's ineffective rule. Despite the presence of the manipulative Duke, and supposedly threatening Abhorson, Barnadine maintains control throughout the scene. As a prisoner this subverts the audiences expectations of who should hold the power, truly expressing the unruly nature of Vienna's citizens to its extreme.

His first line in this scene is heard from offstage. In it he shows no respect for the prison staff, exclaiming "A pox o' your throats". This trend continues as he calls Pompey a "rogue" and uses the excuse that he is "sleepy" to avoid death. This defiance of authority symbolises years of lax rule by the Duke, where immoral behaviour has gone ignored and unpunished. Now the authorities in Vienna are unable to control a prisoner, a sentiment holding true irony.

These years without punishment are further highlighted by Barnadine's relationship with the character of Abhorson, as the captive asks in a friendly and conversational manner "How now...what's the news with you?". Through this interaction the audience is shown Barnadine's complete lack of fear of the hangman, a character who should be able to command at least some sense of authority in a prison. His disregard for this figure suggests that he treats the whole of law enforcement in Vienna in the same regard, meaning that at this point they are the prisoners' "friends" to some extent, not the figures of authority that they should be. This makes Pompey's line, intended to be comical, ring true, that the "hangman" is simply his friend.

Pompey too is portrayed in the play as part of the problem as he treats the death of Barnadine as comic, comparing death to "sleep" and showing little empathy at the situation, although Barnadine's life never truly seems to be threatened. However Pompey's overly casual view of death, seems to reflect the growing immorality in Vienna, to the extent where human life, at least in this character's eyes, seems to have little or no value.

As the Duke enters this scene he is forced to reconcile with the effects his rule, or lack thereof, has had on his citizens and the overall climate of the city. Unlike the other scenes featuring this character, here the Duke, like the other characters, holds no authority over
Barnadine. Instead the conversation goes back and forth as Barnadine refuses to "consent to die this day", despite the Duke's insistence that he "must", until the prisoner simply leaves on his own volition, an act which outright defies any authority presented by the Duke. Not only does the audience recognise that it is the Duke that Barnadine is refusing to succumb to, but to those in the play he is a friar, meaning that not only is Barnadine showing disrespect for the law, but he is showing defiance against the religion that is supposed to play an integral role in this society. This dismissal of both sets of morality emphasises how far Barnadine and in turn society in Vienna has fallen from grace.

b) 'Shakespeare never forgets the funny side to life in Vienna.' Using your knowledge of the play as a whole, show how far you agree with this view of Measure for Measure. Remember to support your answer with references to different interpretations.

Over the years many critics have found Measure for Measure one of Shakespeare's harder plays to define and digest, causing the play to face plenty of criticism, especially in regard to its arguably unsatisfying conclusion. This is perhaps best expressed through one critics claim that it is the "one exception" to the "delights" of Shakespeare's other plays. This indignation towards the play perhaps comes from, not only the conclusion, but the struggle for scholars and critics to place it in a particular genre. Shakespeare's plays usually fall into three categories: tragedy, comedy or historical. However with the use of both serious themes and heavy use of comic relief throughout, Measure for Measure does not appear to fit into any of these. Instead critics have labelled it a tragicomedy, or in the case of Bass, a problem play. This is largely because Shakespeare refuses to abandon the comical side of what could have become a dark and serious play, adding an additional level of entertainment that would be sorely missed.

A large amount of the comedy takes place in the scenes featuring the characters of the underworld. Although the audience is perhaps supposed to view them as the somewhat tragic effects of the Duke's rule, they may be perhaps the most likeable characters. The gentlemen's casual discussion of sexually transmitted diseases which they have "purchased" from Mistress Overdone's brothel, although it is a device to highlight the rampant immorality in Vienna, also serves as comic relief after the heavier introduction, where the majority of speech is in verse. Here the tone is more conversational and the light relief perhaps serves to maintain the audiences interest.

Shakespeare not only constructs humour out of the characters of the underworld, but also through Elbow, a member of law enforcement and a most likely more moral character than those such as Lucio, yet his lack of intelligence serves as an effective comic device and diversifies Shakespeare's use of humour. In Elbow's focal scene his malpropds and the way the other characters, such as Pompey, mock this provides the majority of the humour. A key example of this is as he misuses the word "respectable" to describe Pompey's establishment and the treatment of his wife. The ensuing confusion from Escalus results in many comical moments and the interplay between the characters serves to entertain whilst also highlighting the inefficiency of the authorities in Vienna, which in itself becomes almost comic through the level of disrespect of it's citizens, emphasising precisely how "quite
Examiner commentary

3a: This concise but well-developed response has a purposeful opening which, in a few sentences, introduces the function of the scene, the role played by 'the manipulative Duke', the ‘supposedly threatening Abhorson’ and the controlling Barnardine, and the subversion of audience expectations. The candidate goes on to provide more detail in the body of the answer, but never loses sight of the broader implications of the denial of authority for a society which has ‘fallen from grace’. There is careful, detailed consideration of the relationships between characters. AO1 – structure and expression – is consistently strong. AO2 is fulfilled by references to, for example, Barnardine’s ‘friendly and conversational manner’ and the way ‘the conversation goes back and forth’ between him and the Duke. For an even higher mark some rather more direct and detailed attention to language would be needed. Level 6, 14 marks

3b: A confident and well written introduction explores the problem of the play’s genre, linking it clearly to the question: Measure for Measure is a problem play ‘largely because Shakespeare refuses to abandon the comic side of what could have become a dark and serious play.’ This point is developed interestingly, including awareness of some different interpretations (AOS): how ‘The “funny side to life in Vienna” perhaps … has more than entertainment value’, how the comic, ‘perhaps more appealing’ characters are ‘often not what critics remember of the play’. While there are references to ‘one critic,’ ‘critics’, Boas and Johnson, more such references would usefully support the argument. Level 6, 14 marks
Exemplar 2

| 3 | A | Shakespeare uses Act 3, Scene 3, as a<br>comedy to comment on society's perceived<br>inequality of justice and mercy in<br>Measure for Measure. Vienna. Using<br>Barnadine, Shakespeare emphasizes<br>how relaxed the laws under became<br>during Duke Vincentio's reign<br>by showing Barnadine as a<br>neglecting prison warden who is able<br>to do as he pleases. This scene<br>in particular shows the audience<br>the inequalities of the Duke as<br>a ruler due to his inability to<br>punish those who break the law.<br><br>Shakespeare uses comedic effects<br>to often undermine the actuality<br>of the situation. Through Pompey's<br>declaration that Barnadine "must<br>use and be hang'd," a sense<br>of<br>that this hangings is somewhat peaceful is seen.<br>mainly due to Pompey's declaration<br>appearing as if it is a<br>_request and not an order. Alternatively<br>this wake up call that<br>perhaps a reflection of how the<br>Duke uses the laws as a "scarecrow"
but does not act on them. The fact that Shakespeare keeps Barnadine hidden from view and instead answers from “within” his supposed cage is interesting. It could even be Shakespeare using this dramatic effect so that Barnadine appears almost inhuman and even animalistic. Shakespeare could be showing audiences the barrenness of being locked up in cages like animals. Shakespeare furthered this animal-like imagery when Pompey "Can "Weer [Barnadine] straw meal." This heartless response to Pompey’s request to avail him once again emphasizes Barnadine. How one could think that Barnadine could be compared to that of a caged up defenseless animal. Alternatively, Shakespeare could be using comedy to show Barnadine’s complete lack of care, by not verbally replying, to emphasize how routine his appearance to be. The Duke’s lines in Hamlet’s Measure for Measure’s Shakespeare not properly being used, thus Barnadine does not feel
Threatened.

Shakespeare emphasises Bermudine's relaxed outlook on his execution by having him say "I'm sleepy" almost as if he has not enough energy to be put to death. Whilst this appears to be comic, Shakespeare also uses this as a manner to show how the power dynamics in Vienna appear to be reversed. With Bermudine, the prisoner, able to dictate his own fate, his fate which supposedly should be in the hands of others is now in changing hands over him.

This casual manner is once more consolidated when Bermudine greets Abraham, his executioner, as if he is a friend, with "What's the news with you?" The emphasis of Bermudine appearing to be equal to Abraham, his executioner, and Pompey, Angelo's assistant, suggests to the audience the new changing power dynamics that arise from fickle and weak
Alternatively, Shakespeare also uses language to show the importance of religion in regards to death. Bernardine seemingly uses religion as a manner to escape his fate by stating he is not “fit” for excess to pray, and therefore not fit to die. By using this, Shakespeare shows how important religion was at the time. In fact, when the Duke sees the audience, he says that the Duke (dressed as a friar) was come to pray with Bernardine, a prioritization of religion when it comes to death can be seen.

Shakespeare resorts back to Saline when the Duke (dressed as a friar) comes to visit Bernardine. Whilst the “Duke” states he has been “induced” into coming by “charity” into coming to see Bernardine, a sense of satire and irony can be shown to the audience. The fact that the
Duke says this under the guise of a sincere show of genuine concern. The audience may even believe that the Duke has come to carry out a macabre scheme.

finally the irony that 'Barnabas will not consent to die' is not lost on the audience. finally the fact that the Duke states that Barnabas should look forward to the 'joy' after death is ironic. This idea that whilst Barnabas is refusing to pray, and is a criminal, the Duke still believes that if Barnabas is most fit for heaven. Once again contradicts the Duke's fictive innocence and his weakness to easy fogle.
3

B

Whilst not one of Shakespeare’s most famous plays, Measure for Measure can be seen as a comedic problem play that explores a myriad of themes. Comedy and Satire can be found mainly within the brothels of Vienna. Comedy that can be appreciated by the intended 17th Century audience as well as the more modern audience. Moreover, Shakespeare uses this Comedy not only as an escape from the comedic relief for the audience, but also to stress & highlight issues that arise.

Shakespeare shows the more funny side of life in Vienna by using Comedy within the brothels. Mistress Overdone, a prostitute, states that: Shakespeare shows uses Comedy when Lucio states that “he has purchased many” a “disease” under “her (mistress Overdone) roof.” This comedic relief of the trivialisation and idea of sexually transmitted diseases
Start scene: An audience view normal and unaltered the attitude to sex is in measure for what we are Vienna. This may appear normal to a more modern audience due to the issue statement being at perhaps reflecting a modern audience’s more liberal attitude to sex especially concerning the idea of FFD’s not being considered shameful but in fact common. Whereas this could be interpreted differently by the intended 17th century audience due to the very puritanical views of many. Even leading to the play being shut down briefly in 1640 by puritans and James I at attempting to ban broadside. This in fact could take away the comedic aspect, regarding showing Lucio as some clownish roguish character, who cannot be trusted. Alternatively with the connection of the threats and bribes Sense law sharing the same literary space, this comedic attitude towards sexuality could have resonated.
Exemplar Candidate Work

However within his idea of comedy, brands being a means of comedic relief, Shakespeare also stresses a deeper meaning to the brands. By using comedy to show the naivety of set work, Shakespeare shows how not just buy are chances such as wisenss overture useful for some but to Shakespeare also uses them to show how, in reality, sex work is their job, a move to make men. When wisenss overture liberates that she does not know what to do. After Angelo answers he "closure of the Suburban House" Shakespeare is able to resonate with the audience the idea that profession such as wisenss overture needs set work in order to live. This may resonate with a modern audience especially due to the new feminist ideas of the decriminalisation of sex work in order to protect professionals from violence and death due to one less of men.
Whilst as previously mentioned, some
characters put out audiences
could be horrified at this,
Shakespeare also would have
been able to connect with
many whose lives simply depended
of prosperity. Something that many
hundreds of numerous and men
would have rebelled as due to
the extreme divide and between
themselves and everyone and the
very little social mobility that
there was.

However, unlike Shakespeare does
use his comedy to develop deeper
meanings. It is clear that
Shakespeare does not forget the
ironies on off and airy side of
Vienna. In particular with the
use of sexual innuendos with
the character Isabella. Even
though Isabella is presented
as a virtuous character
who even wished to often have
"shrieker represent" upon her,
Shakespeare always enjoys using
comic statements within through
Angelo and Isabella's disapproval.
Examiner commentary

3a: This fairly detailed response looks at ‘how the power dynamic in Vienna appears to be reversed’. Some relevant examples address the dominant AO2 (effects), for example Pompey’s ‘You must rise and be hang’d’ ‘appearing like a request and not an order’, the offstage rustling of straw suggesting ‘animalistic’ qualities, or Barnardine’s ‘casual manner’. Further detail would often be possible here and the mark stays in the lower part of Level 5 also because argument and expression (AO1) are often rather lacking in clarity and concision. Discussion of the ‘animalistic’ impression is somewhat laboured and the ‘sense of satire and irony’ concerning the Duke’s intentions could be more clearly explained. There are also a few errors: Pompey as ‘Angelo’s advisor’ (sic), ‘machiate’ for ‘Machiavellian’. Level 5, 11 marks

3b: Good elements in this answer place it just above ‘competent’, into Level 5. Its argument (AO1) is clear, exploring both some of the comic characters and the irony of an Isabella who ‘may not be all she seems’. The main AO5 element is an awareness of changing perspectives through time, especially ‘a modern audience’s more liberal attitude to sex’. A wider range of different interpretations would be necessary for a higher mark, probably including some critical or stage views to support the argument. Level 5, 11 marks
Question 4a and 4b, *Richard III*

4  *Richard III*

Answer both parts (a) and (b).

(a) Discuss the following passage from Act 1 Scene 4, exploring Shakespeare's use of language and its dramatic effects.

(b) 'Evil ambition inspires all the major events of the play.'

Using your knowledge of the play as a whole, show how far you agree with this view of the play *Richard III*.

Remember to support your answer with reference to different interpretations.
The extract comes from the last scene of the first act of "Richard III". Here, Shakespeare creates a complex scene full of comedy and tension. The religious symbolism emphasizes the absurdity of the scene, for while the England of the time is highly religious, the characters often prefer curses and politics.

The extract begins with Clarence, asking the murderers to go back to Richard and ask for a greater reward than the king could give for killing him. The dramatic irony along with juxtapositions of "love" and "hate" both increase the tension and the comic element of the scene. The murderers do not tell Clarence about Richard's nature as they say "your brother Gloucester hates you", yet Clarence, the first to be fooled by Richard's acting, refuses to believe them.

Clarence dominates the lines of the scene, with murderers only replying with laconically and rarely longer than two lines. Yet Clarence is powerless, all his words have a second meaning, which he does not yet know. When he asks "Go you to him from me", he predicts the future as the murderers will go back to Richard to report and get their reward. When he asks for "delivery", the murderers respond with promising him "the joys of heaven".
which Richard also promised previously in Act 1. Scene I.

Finally, Clarence uses the language of semantic fields of religion to persuade the murderers. He talks of their “souls” and “God.” Yet in the most blasphemous way, there is a religious element to his death. Like Richard promises, Clarence is “christened in the Tower” as the murderer goes to “frown” him in “the mansion-hall.” The more empathetic murderer even likens himself to “Pilate” who allows the murder of Jesus Christ. While throughout the extract the murderers resembled Richard and spoke as he “lesson’d” in the end the murderer acknowledges this as a “bloody deed.” The comic element of the scene, which almost resembles the clowns from Commedia dell’Arte, in fact makes this scene both funny to the audience, who in Shakespearean times would not be sympathetic to Clarence for his actions during the War of Roses, and uncomfortable as a blasphemous murder occurs on a stage with the audience fully aware of the irony, yet as powerless, as Clarence, to prevent it.

*Ironically the murderers previously state to Richard that “sages are no good doers” which becomes true in Clarence’s case.*
In Richard III the major events are the murders, the wooing of women, and the battle of Bosworth. Yet what is evil in this play? Of course, Richard’s Machiavellian plots can be seen as evil, as he is blasphemous, treacherous to both his family and his king, and lacks any conscience. But what about other ambitions, and Margaret’s desire for revenge, Buckingham’s corruption, Elizabeth’s wish for safety, and Elizabeth’s attraction and desire for Richard? All of these also surely inspire major events of the play but not all of these ambitions are evil at least simultaneously.

Richard is seen as the “epitome of evil” in the play, as the “incarnation of evil” (Shipley Chalmondy) in the play and becomes a symbol of the moral decay of the country. Shakespeare’s prototype for Richard was the vice character from Morality plays, and Sir Thomas Moore’s history which was highly inaccurate and written for in favour of the Tudors, the Elizabeth I’s family, which began with Richmond or Henry III. According to Tiliard and other critics of Tudor myth, Richard was created to be so evil in order so that Richmond could lead the nation into a “haven” that is Tudor England.
Even within the play, Richard is frequently called the "devil" or "con-demon". Richard himself states that he is "determined to prove a villain", suggesting his greatest ambition is just that "to prove villain".

Through the use of aside, the audience is constantly aware of Richard's two faces. Such major events as murder of Clarence or the princes, or marrying Anne and later wooing young Elizabeth are all done to feed Richard's evil ambition for absolute power.

This ambition is accurately portrayed by Benedict Cumberbatch in the Hollow Crown, where a key symbol is a chess board from which Richard removes pieces, the same way he removes opponents. Therefore clearly Richard's evil ambitions inspire the major events of the play.

A different character with evil ambitions is Buckingham, while he is often a simple sidekick or an appendage to Richard, his greed makes him a Machiavellian politician. He lies and plots, as can be seen in the end of Act 5, Scene of Act 3. He even promises to fight for the "golden piece" as if it was for him. While Buckingham by himself, does not cause many major events, his ability to remove and impose moral limits, as he refuses to participate in the unnecessary murder of the prince,
Richard's biggest downfall, yet here it is not his evil ambition for land or for power that inspires this event. It is his Machiavellian ability to stop his ambition and his remorse that he has sired Richard II. Therefore, in Buckingham we see that major events are not always caused by evil ambition.

Margaret is another character who causes major events of the play, albeit through curses. According to Shirley Galloway, women in Richard II are the voice of "morality and protest" and Margaret's voice is the loudest. In Act I Scene 3, Margaret curses the entire court, as revenge for the death of her family and loss of her crown. While Margaret is often omitted from the play, like in Cibber's or Olivier's version, or is merged with the Duchess of York, as in T. S. McKellen's version, she does play an important role of a "prophetess" and the only equal and opposite to Richard. After all, and both were considered the "domestic other" at some point in Shakespearean histories (Besley and Newnham). If the audience believes that supernatural powers are real then clearly Margaret has caused many
Examiner commentary

4a: This is a well-developed and coherent response. The candidate is particularly alert to ironies and double meanings in the passage. Other material which addresses aptly the dominant AO2 requirement includes the discussion of the imbalance in the dialogue between Clarence and the murderers, who reply ‘laconically’ (leading to further ironies.) Such sensitivity is rewarded by the high mark; for the top mark more, and more detailed, analysis of language and/or stage effects would be desirable. Level 6, 14 marks

4b: In this impressive answer the candidate ably fulfils A05 – different interpretations – with references to the views of Tillyard, Galloway and others and to productions including those with Cumberbatch and McKellen in the title-role. These interpretations are well integrated into the argument (A01), and coherent argument and consistently fluent writing are among the main virtues of this response. Having marshalled evidence for the importance of Richard’s ‘evil ambition,’ the candidate then considers the evidence as to whether Buckingham’s ambition or Margaret’s desire for revenge can be said to have the same effect: the structure is simple but very clear. Level 6, 15 marks
Exemplar 2

24 marks

---

4 a

This passage is piltry and dramatic. Through Shakespeare’s use of dramatic irony, Cleopatra is warning the audience to guard the body of her husband, Caesar. The audience is aware that they want to fully answer the question: What will happen to Caesar’s body? The audience is left to guess whether Cleopatra is1
duplicitous and betrayed Caesar. In the play, we can imagine Caesar’s words from Act I, Scene I: “I will return in the2
afternoon.” We return to “Thy first entry, Phoebe. There is a name, some business or other to attend to.” Indeed, the
imagination of “Knew the first entry” adds to the drama because it explains the4
absence of Caesar.

---

Moreover, the theme of “power” pervades this scene, contributing to the drama of the scene. Caesar is dealing with the frightened
soft spars. At one is the type face of the balance. For example, Caesar’s question: “Have you that holy presence in your
room?” and “I am necessarily very urgent because one can search the mere gathering for depictions of this point
in time. Moreover, the presence of power and good is

---

Mercury, the messenger of the gods, enters. The audience perceives the presence of Mercury. To add to this,
Cleon’s argument: “Sure you could.” It is also possible
pierced because despite him. Even though he is what to be
railed it be it holy how to hard words and the sympathy: he has for
the matter matters is difficult for some to circumstances.
The year of the 2nd murder adds to the drunk

effect of the scene by indirectly using the unhealthiness

Conscience. The reader seems helpless against the

big question, ‘What shall we do?’ is present in its entirety.

Furthermore, the quick, sudden metaphor of ham of pork, which

vomiting to, can be seen as the most piercing

add to the dynamic effect by highlighting the dynamic

given. The additional use of the context helps to

murderer adds to the drama as it murder of cold case.

While the metaphor of kilt does or to death linked as the

now it looks like it's the true full murder

the other nature of Richard to the audience.

In conclusion, the passage is made clear in several

ways, particularly the use of parallel lines and the

dynamic language which dominates the passage.
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The One of Shakespeare's great history plays, Richard III is acted around the evil ultimate villain - Richard, and his ambition for the crown. He burns his eyes through the plot to the crown by securing that those around him aid and prepare to kill brothers and his sister. This, in many ways occurs, it is evil ambition that propels the action. However, the ambition especially of Richard may not necessarily fully衍生 from his evil nature. As we witness more of his ambition because of his exclusion by others from succession but it is his deformed nature that your him on. Moreover, the evil Richard is a foil to a character that is not as evil within a similar situation is acted through other characters such as Hastings, Henry and Elizabeth or characters watching the play. Richard is not just a greedy evil. Ultimately though, it is this never-ending pursuit of killing that drives Richard to the play and beyond the action.

The stage Machinist is the name of J.M. Neary, with the stage Machinist as the control or director of every element, scene and every moment and duplication. Richard fulfills the role perfectly and the actors receive those directions perfectly and the other audience than his evil ambition throughout the play. For example, in Act 1 Scene 1 he makes his brother-in-law Clarence hate him for not being a loyal paternal figure by charging that with Clarence having been imprisoned that this deep disgrace to brother- in-law and brother in law. How you can imagine, this dramatic irony is perfectly played to the audience because he is Richard in the kitchen or to true Clarence killed and the ear, though the other characters may not be aware of his evil nature. It other characters may not be aware of his evil nature, the audience are fully aware, perhaps inwardly war against such
The most memorable scene - Richard was the 'fear itself.'

Lady Anne and those jutting and hairy killed her husband and
his father. Richard was the man of secrets like an 'orderly play'
with a pitch - 'Nuttall.' and Richard to Anne according to marry
him. Even the ear Laurence Oliver's Richard is only
work as he redemption most nothing to the comfort. Then she came
in a day to perfectly receive the evil son of Richard.

However it may be, perhaps too simplistic to call
the ambition in the play 'evil.' for Richard is about to 'depose'
Queen. He is certainly faced by Richard's enthralled fort
there would him, labelled a 'good bad,' a large and dignified
'up for my place but tell.' even his own mother tells
with 'told him in 116 to save 6 that the witch she could die.' In the
no longer had to look at him. His Richard is only observation
partly involved as clearly that he had not before my time:
and 'kept for parted lady.' leads him to conclude that for
since I am determined to cease a certain name a later
I am determined to pose a villain. Thus it will come any
subly, Shakespeare is perhaps suggested that Richard is ambitious
it much more complex than being simply 'evil.' but it too.

A 2004 Broadway production of Richard III saw the Foot o' the
Peter O'Toole's play is not of Richard. The director, Peter O'Toole
claimed it that putting him out to beggary. The idea was made
Richard goes from 1st to the most isolated. Thus A the
Old master of his gate. Thus it is perhaps fair to argue
that Richard's misjudgments of the two princes for example in
down to him worthy to find revenge and yet back at the reach.
Examiner commentary

4a: This is again a good, developed response. The candidate meets the dominant AO2 (effects) with good material on dramatic irony, religious lexis, the poignant brevity of 'What shall we do?', and the first murderer's 'cold, coarse simile … “as snow in harvest”.' There is awareness both of the immediate interaction between the murderers and Clarence and of what the scene suggests about the absent Richard, and there are some good observations on the likely effects of the scene on an audience. Level 5, 12 marks

4b: This is a good, developed response to the question. AO5 (different interpretations) is addressed by pertinent references to the critical views of Nuttall, Holderness and others and to two productions. Argument (AO1) moves clearly from looking at Richard's ambition to asking whether ambition is necessarily evil or, rather, a product of difference and isolation, to considering how Richmond inspires 'major events' without evil intention. There are some good examples from the text but the argument would benefit from the inclusion of a few more. Level 5, 12 marks
Shakespeare uses this scene to show the level at which Richard is able to manipulate people. He is able to make people do his bidding. However, in comparison to Clarence, Shakespeare portrays Clarence as a weak character as well as innocent. Clarence displays the act of naïvety, as he finds it hard to believe that Richard ordered his death. Some critical interpretations suggest that Clarence has no political knowledge and he lives in a world of fantasies. Clarence loves Richard but he doesn’t seem to know the type of person Richard is or maybe he does know but he is too blinded by Richard’s words and promises that he claims Richard is “kind.” Richard promises Clarence that he will “Labour this delivery,” suggesting he will do anything in his power to get Clarence out of prison. However, this was a scheme by Richard to make cover his tracks. The Murderers try to convince Clarence that Richard is behind all this (his death) but “you are deceived,” your brother Gloucester hates you. Clarence’s inability to comprehend and understand the situation at hand proves him to be naive and easily manipulated. Critics say he is a “loyal” character however maybe to loyal.
The method by which the murders kill Clarence according to Cricio is a made-up story. However, Shakespeare has used this 'excuse' to be symapathetic. Clarence begs the murders to 'relent and save your other goods' but they claim it's cowardly and womanish. This suggests the idea of how women were seen at the time, as weak or rather they had a conscience, they are like 'passive angels' (Pilkington and Pilkington).

The murders and murderer uses say to Clarence to 'look behind (him) you' and he does, Shakespeare could be using this to show that till death he was still naive as easy to be manipulated. However, it is real murderer 2 feels guilty and he therefore he says he 'would wash my hands of this most grievous murder' and it suggests that they didn't want to kill Clarence but because of the price that Richard has promised, they were willing to kill Clarence.

In conclusion, Shakespeare was able to explore Richard's ability to manipulate people even in his absence, as Clarence still believes his words even when he isn't there. He also portrays the idea of guilt and the biblical reference to 'washing hands' through Herold, who cut off his hand to clean of the blood of Jesus.
4 b. ‘Evil ambition inspires all of the major events of the play.’

Richard’s evil ambitions and plots are the cause and inspiration to all that major events of the play.

Richard’s opening soliloquy gives the audience a hint of what Richard’s plans are. Richard uses his deformity to get sympathy ‘defocuss’d ugly,’ ‘limp’. Critical interpretation suggests that Richard’s ‘curve helps him gain sympathy and trust from the people around him’. Richard also claims to be a villain in the opening of the play and he shares his plots to kill his brother Claudio. Richard is very politically driven that he is able to have ‘several tongues’ and ‘multiple fears’, and manipulate everyone just to get what he desires.

‘The death of Clancer was cause and inspired by Richard’s plot to tell Edward that ‘some one with the name that starts with the letter A’ will bring you alive’. This was Richard’s plan from the beginning and he caused Clancer to be imprisoned as his name is “George”. If Richard had not lied about a person that didn’t exist, Clancer couldn’t have gone to prison. Not only did he cause lies
Examiner commentary

4a: This response shows generally developed understanding of Clarence’s situation, his interaction with the murderers, and what the scene suggests about Richard. It is mostly lacking in detailed comment on language or stage effects (A02) and this is the main reason for awarding a fairly low mark. Sometimes discussion has an element of narrative, and critical references, while not necessarily wholly irrelevant here, are better deployed in the b) part of the question. Level 4, 8 marks.

4b: The response provides straightforward examples of how Richard’s evil ambition may be considered the cause of the major events of the play, showing some competence, but does little to consider different interpretations (A05). The few critical references are generalised and there is no attempt to consider alternative explanations. Level 4, 8 marks.
Question 5a and 5b, *The Tempest*

5  *The Tempest*

Answer both parts (a) and (b).

(a) Discuss the following passage from Act 5 Scene 1, exploring Shakespeare's use of language and its dramatic effects.  

(b) 'Prospero is right to give up his magic.'

Using your knowledge of the play as a whole, show how far you agree with this view of *The Tempest*.

Remember to support your answer with reference to different interpretations.
This moment comes at the beginning of Act 5 Scene in which it is revealed that Prospero's promise of revenge will not be realised but instead he has come to the decision to forgive due to Ariel convincing. Shakespeare presents the idea that forgiveness is an essential feature of human nature. He does this through the presentation of Ariel's role in Prospero's eventual forgiveness and by presenting the significance of Prospero's magic.

Shakespeare explores the effect Ariel has on Prospero's decision to forgive. Prospero refers to Ariel as 'spirit' and 'air'. These abstract nouns serve to highlight the fact that Ariel is not in fact human which in turn conveys the idea that Prospero as a human should recognise the hardship that he is causing. Ariel describes Gonzalo's tears 'like winter's drops from eaves of reeds'. This simile connotes the purity of Gonzalo and presents the crueltly of Prospero's actions as he is having such a, great and negative impact on the only good character within the play. When Ariel tells Prospero that he would forgive 'were I human' Prospero finishes of his iambic pentameter by saying 'and mine shall'. In doing this Shakespeare is exploring the idea that Ariel has had a significant impact on Prospero and has served to reminded him of his humanity and so influence his decision to forgive. When Prospero states that 'the rarer action is in virtue than in vengeance' Shakespeare is employing the use of parrellism. This has the effect of foregrounding the importance of Ariels impact on his decision to forgive as it highlight the surety of Prospero's decision.

Shakespeare presents the importance of Prospero's magic in order to highlight the significane of his decision to forgive. Shakespeare employs the use of lists when referring to 'hills, brooks, standing lakes, and groves'. This has the effect of conveying the vastness and far reaching nature of Prospero's magical ability. Prospero mentions the 'roaring war' and the 'rattling thunder'. The use of the verbs 'roaring' and 'rattling' serves to build upon this picture of Prospero's power and it serves to show how great and impactful it is. When Prospero states 'But this rough magic I here abjure' it starts and ends with a caesura which presents the idea that Prospero is speaking in a measured tone, this is reflected throughout the whole monologue and this has the effect of presenting the idea that Prospero is saying a final farewell to his power as he must let go of his magic, however vast or powerful, in order to forgive. Prospero states 'I'll break my staff' and 'I'll drown my book'. Shakespeare uses the 'staff' and the 'book' as symbols of Prospero's magic and in their total destruction it has the effect of conveying Prospero's decisive move to reject his magical ability in favour of his humanity.

5b
This moment explores Prospero’s decision to reject his magical ability in favour of his humanity and in doing so Shakespeare is conveying the idea that forgiveness is a far more essential part of human nature than revenge. Whilst this decision to give up his magic is right the interpretation surrounding the justifications for why Prospero is right differ. From a Jacobean perspective Prospero is right in his decision to give up his magic as it restores power to the natural order. From a modern perspective Prospero’s decision to give up his magic is justified by the fact that he had been using it as an extension of his tyrannical oppression.

In the Jacobean era there was belief in the divine right of Kings, that the power structure of the monarchy was appointed by God and so Shakespeare presents Prospero’s use of his magic as wrongly challenging authority and so was right to give up his magic. Dikkuian stated that in staging a masque ‘Prospero becomes a type of King’. This serves to highlight the idea that Prospero was operating on the Island as though he were a King thus presenting the idea that he was challenging the natural heirachical order. Shakespeare explores this idea in the moment in which Prospero interupts his masque to which Miranda states ‘Never to this day saw I him touched with anger so distempered’. The anger that Prospero experiences comes as a result of him remembering Caliban’s plot to usurp him and threaten his life. The anger serves to highlight that he recognises that he is indeed not without insecurity and the fact that he is human, not a King of magic as he presents himself. The 1667 The Enchanted Isle adaptation of the play places great signficance of the power and the importance of the monarchy. This serves to highlight the idea that in giving up his power Prospero is doing what is the correct thing to do by restoring absolute power to Alonso, the King. Ultimately in giving up his magic Prospero is restoring the natural power order and so is shown to be right in his decision.

From a modern perspective the divine right of Kings is not a recognised institution and so instead Prospero is perceived as a tyrannical ruler and oppressor and so is presented as being right in giving up his magic as he steps away from this role. Shakespeare presents Prospero as using his magical ability as a tool for his colonial oppression of Caliban and Ariel. For instance when Ariel asks for his ‘liberty’ Prospero threatens him saying he ‘will rend thee an oak’ if he asks again. This presents the idea that Prospero is using his magic as a means for control. Corfield states that Prospero had ‘failed his magic and his magic had failed his humanity and so he will abjure it’. This explores the idea that in using his magic as a tool for evil Prospero has in fact misused it and in that misuse he has become consumed with the power it gave him and so lost his sense of humanity. In a 2011 South African production of the play Caliban is presented as using crutches throughout the play and at the end as Prospero and the others leave the island Caliban stands tall and throws away his crutches. This presentation serves to highlight the way in which
Examiner commentary

5a: This answer shows elements of excellence. AO2 is the dominant objective for this section and is met by such useful details as the effect of Prospero and Ariel sharing a line, of the lists 'conveying vastness', and of the use of caesura to suggest Prospero’s ‘measured tone’. ‘Ariel’s role in Prospero’s eventual forgiveness’ is made clear and argument and expression are clear and coherent (AO1). Level 6, 13 marks

5b: Here there is some mostly well-developed discussion of different interpretations (AO5), including the 1667 and 2011 productions, and a useful awareness of changing views of the text over time. A coherent argument is advanced: from a Jacobean perspective it is clear that Prospero is 'challenging the natural hierarchal [sic] order' and from a modern perspective that he is an oppressor and is right to give up his magic. For a higher mark at this level a greater number and range of critical references would be desirable. Level 6, 13 marks
The use of language in the following extract taken from Act 5, scene 1 illustrates some of the more integral themes associated with the Tempest. The notion of hierarchy is apparent, this is made clear with Prospero entering wearing his magic robe. The irony used by Shakespeare portrays the sense of resignation felt on the part of Ariel is perceptible all throughout the text, this idea is particularly evident when Prospero refers to Ariel as a ‘spirit’ an acknowledgement which although obvious and lacking any controversy, reaffirms in the mind of the spirit that he is fundamentally different than his master. The issue of vengeance and the language used to portray attitudes towards it in this extract serves as a fitting description of the trauma the characters in the play have endured.

At the starting point of this extract, two characters enter: Ariel a spirit who serves as a submissive assistant to more dominant characters and Prospero; Prospero is described as entering ‘in his magic robes’ not only does this inform readers who may not have read the text of the sorcerer’s background, but it also separates the two. One character (Ariel) enters with any special attire, whereas Prospero has a customary robe. Furthermore, the language used by the respective characters captures their respective standings; upon Prospero asking about the welfare of characters who previously betrayed him, which include his own brother, he declares a sense of ownership over Ariel by asking ‘Say, my spirit, How fares the King and’s followers?’ The idea of social class occurs continuously, Ariel uses an emotive simile to describe character Gonzalo who although not active in the extract, plays a vital role in the play. When referring to Gonzalo Ariel mentioned that ‘his tears run down beard, like winter drops from eaves of reeds.’ The idea of comparing Gonzalo’s facial hair to winter captures both his age and also the harshness for that which he has endured.

The transformation of Ariel and Prospero as it pertains to his personality commences in this extract. In the middle portion following Prospero using the word ‘spirit’ to ask Ariel a question, the servant to the magician mentions an obvious reality all readers are aware of ‘mine would, sir, were I human.’ This comment does demonstrate Ariel’s eternal battle over wanting to break free from Prospero yet do so in a way which will not result in any long-term friction or conflict. Prospero expresses a degree of forgiveness, although using controlled language to carefully prevent any ideas that he is not still in charge; The sole drift of my purpose doth extend not a frown further. Go release them, Ariel. The two characters, just in this extract, use language and phrases often associated with the other. Ariel is concise and strong with his words. Prospero contemplative and forgiving, this scene serves a role-reversal portion of the play.
Vengeance is perhaps the most significant issue which arises in Act 5, scene 1. This scene is preceded by a lengthy battle between Prospero and his brother Antonio, who has been aided by associates. Notably, Prospero shows a degree of humility in his language by consulting Ariel over what action to take when establishing what fate their opponents should face. ‘Dost think so, spirit?’ features Prospero seeking answers for the first time in the play; instead of demanding mere reaffirmation, like in this first section of the scene ‘my charms crack not, my spirits obey; and time...’ Prospero seeks the perspective of Ariel almost breaking character in the process. However, Prospero still continues to question the idea of vengeance and whether bestowing innocence upon characters who Intended to kill him is justifiable; ‘yet with my nobler reason against my fury Do I take part; the rarer action is in virtue than in vengeance.’ Although Prospero states his desire for peace and prosperity, it comes in a dramatically ironic manner as his justification for wanting harmony is a result of his superiority, which derives from his Dukedom, a title he inherited prior to his deposition.

Act 5, scene 1 features only two, but arguably the two most important characters in the Elizabethan play: Prospero and Ariel; Ariel finds himself for once wishing he had a fate other than Prospero’s servant whereas the magician conceives that bitterness is no attitude to justify upholding. Shakespeare uses lambic pentameter and blank verse rather than ballads or sonnets in this portion largely to depict the nature of this exchange: a two-way conversation featuring characters who have endured a significant amount of adversity.

5B: Prospero has no option but to loosen his grip on the island by relinquishing his magic for all tragedy and problems on the island derive from him. His daughter’s peculiar with a relationship with a man ‘I am a prince, perhaps a King.’ is the result of magical influence. Furthermore, his desire to reign supreme over characters who are different such as Caliban has profound consequences as it inspires Caliban to lead a revolt against his former master. Additionally, if it were not for Prospero opting to disable his use of magic, no other character in the play performed in front James 1 of England in 1610, would ever have the opportunity to shine.

Perhaps the single biggest criticism Prospero receives as it pertains to his use of magic involves his use of magic; his daughter Miranda is arguably the biggest victim over the abuse. The magician who refers to Caliban’s mother Sycorax as a ‘blue-eyed hag’ puts his daughter to sleep upon thinking she is not paying enough attention to him. Such behaviour prompts feminist critic Ann Thompson to believe that ‘Miranda has internalised the patriarchal assumption that a woman’s only function is to provide legitimate succession’—thus treating Miranda like a baby-making machine. The misogyny which appears to be celebrated by Shakespeare is unusual if one acknowledges the man born in 1564 who read Ovid and Montaigne was alive during Elizabeth I who ruled from 1558 through until 1603. However, Prospero’s affinity for magic would have an impact on his daughter, because through his magic she met the only man she would ever love, Ferdinand. One could argue, like Frank Kermode, that Prospero ‘leads a double life between that of a magician and a philosopher.’
Examiner commentary

5a: This is a good, detailed response, including helpful fulfilment of the dominant AO2 requirement. The candidate notices the effect of Prospero's robe and of his calling Ariel 'spirit' and is especially good on Prospero's tone: 'using controlled language to carefully prevent any ideas that he is not still in charge' and later 'seeking answers for the first time … instead of demanding mere reaffirmation.' The answer is good, rather than competent, but stays at this level rather than higher because argument and expression sometimes lack clarity and there is an occasional lack of precision: it is not quite accurate, for instance, to say that Gonzalo's facial hair is compared 'to winter.' Level 5, 12 marks

5b: Relevant ideas are presented in response to the question – whether Prospero uses his magic to abuse others including Miranda and Ferdinand or whether it brings about good – and are supported by some good critical references (AO5). The mark is kept down, however, by the often unclear structure and expression. The last paragraph, for example, remains rather puzzling with its reference to 'ballads and sonets'[sic] and concludes 'Despite the moments of peace, seeing Prospero's yield come to a conclusion in any ways represented the turbulence and chaos that England was enduring at the time, and so was the case in a play, written by a Stratford native.' Level 5, 11 marks
Exemplar 3

21 marks

A) 25% Argument / 75% Language analysis

In this passage from Act 1 of The Tempest we see Shakespeare make use of language and dramatic effects in order to establish Prospero’s role in the play as a powerful and godlike figure with Ariel as his servant and all other characters at his mercy. This scene takes place immediately after the Tempest where the ship and its passengers have been thrown into disarray and the social hierarchy disrupted; this scene presents the new hierarchy that guides the rest of the play.

The 1st line of the passage begins, ‘Now close my project gather to a head’. This line immediately asserts Prospero’s control over the play. The line is short and possessive and occurs when Prospero has just entered the room making it seem dramatic and authoritative; this could be presented on stage by having a brief period of silence and then the first line of the scene pronounced loudly with a pause afterwards (signalled by the use of the semi-colon) for impact. Use of the possessive pronoun ‘my’ is a clear demonstration of ownership and control and by saying it gathers to a head Shakespeare reiterates this idea of control because the head of a body is what controls it and makes the decisions signifying that Prospero controls and decides what happens in the play. To call the events of the play his ‘project’ has two possible connotations. On the one hand it could mean something he has worked hard on or on the other hand it could be meant to diminish the importance of it as many people have projects that are pastimes, almost inconsequential in the grand scheme of things. Either interpretation paints Prospero as a godlike figure in his authority over all those involved in his ‘project’.
This scene is important in outlining Ariel's role as Prospero's servant. Prospero uses language such as 'my spirits obey;' to assert ownership over Ariel and words like 'obey' signify an obedient and servitude based relationship. The use of the semi-colon directly after creates a break in the speech adding drama to the command and ensuring the audience is aware of Prospero's role as master. However, although Prospero is seen to have influence over Ariel their interactions show Ariel to be invaluable to Prospero. Examples of this include Prospero's many questions ('how's the day?' 'How fares the King and his followers?') Dost thou think so, spirit?') To which only Ariel has the answers, Ariel therefore is presented not only as a servant but also a vital informant.

When Prospero asks Ariel 'How fares the King and his followers?' he exemplifies his ability to find out anything on the island through his spirits such as Ariel, Ariel is instantly able to tell him what is going on which shows how Prospero can know everything going on in the play - this adds to his god-like imagery because he appears omniscient.

Once Ariel exits Prospero enters into his most revealing monologue of the scene, he talks of how he 'call'd forth mutinous winds' and 'roaring war'. These are important images as war and mutiny are topics which separate Prospero from the Gods and highlight his flawed character, taken in by human loyalties and constructs and power struggles. By using the word 'roaring' Shakespeare almost suggests this is the more animalistic side of man. Roar is a particularly onomatopoeic word and so this line on stage would really exemplify the image of Prospero's animalistic side.

Prospero reveals also his magic in this scene, calling it his 'potent art' and 'rough magic' these evoke images of omnipotence further encouraged when he says he
requires ‘some heavenly music’. This image of Prospero as a God on the island are a powerful sign post in the play of how we are meant to perceive Prospero and could be portrayed on stage by him standing on a balcony above everyone else throughout the whole play in order to reinforce his godly image as omnipotent and omniscient.

Overall the scene utilises key words and punctuation to emphasise the relevance of characters such as Prospero and Ariel in order to showcase their role and relationships form the beginning of the play through this early scene.

B) 50% Argument / 50% Critics

‘Prospero is right to give up his magic’

Using your knowledge of the play as a whole, show how far you agree with this view of The Tempest.

Throughout the course of Shakespeare’s The Tempest we see the character of Prospero assert his power and control over the other characters using his magic. This consistent control is exemplified in productions like the Globe Theatre production of the Tempest by having Prospero constantly on stage watching from above (showing his powerful status). Prospero’s magic allows him to control the island and the other characters ultimately leading to the resolution of the play where he relinquishes his powers and returns to Milan with his daughter Miranda and the rest of the court. But is Prospero right to give up his magic? In this essay I will argue that Prospero is indeed to give up his magic, primarily because it’s time and place have come to an end and it is no longer something which is needed or should be used, I will also explain how Prospero’s magic signifies more than just his magic but
also colonialist attitudes which have also run their course and should ultimately be
discarded as well.

One key reason I think it is important that Prospero relinquishes his magic is
because he vows to do it in the play's first act. To the audience Prospero reveals
once he has achieved his goal he will 'break my staff' (his magic staff) and 'drown my
book' (magic book). This reveal suggests that the purpose of the magic is to set the
play in motion but also that it has no place outside the storyline of the play. In Julie
Taymor's film production of The Tempest props such as the staff are particularly
focused upon as emblems of Prospero's (in this production Prospero is portrayed as
a woman) power and in the first scene the staff is shown raised above her head as
she controls the storm. It is an emblem of magic, of power and control and is used to
distinguish Prospero as a user of magic. As the critic Hebron comments 'Prospero is
a renaissance magus' (a magus is a user of magic and a wise man). This suggests
that Prospero has a greater vision for the play and has the power through his magic
to carry it out. Ultimately it makes sense to suggest that the point of Prospero's
magic is to restore the social hierarchy to what it should be. The ship as we discover
throughout the play is filled with Prospero's former peers, including his brother who
usurped his dukedom. In the Taymor production we see Prospera use her staff to
whisk up the storm and in the RSC production we see the ship physically break in
two depictions suggesting that the aim of Prospero's magic is purely to re-distribute
and reorder the disrupted social hierarchy. As the critic Bowen the scene on the ship
where the passenger are thrown into chaos represents the social hierarchy being
disrupted and thrown into disarray. Prospero's magic helps to restore the hierarchy
throughout the play, and by the end of the play it is back to it's rightful order with
Prospero's Dukedom restored. Because the hierarchy has been restored it seems
right that the magic should have run its course because it has achieved what it needs to. Indeed Jacobean audiences would certainly be satisfied by this rectification of social order.

Prospero's magic is also a symbol of control. Indeed he used it to free Ariel and therefore make Ariel indebted to him, the only time we see Prospero angered at Ariel he calls him 'malignant thing' and accuses him 'thou forgetst'. We also see Prospero's magic used to control Caliban, Caliban reveals that Prospero uses his control over the spirits of the isle to 'pinch' him when he is disobedient. Both Caliban and Ariel are examples of characters which are indigenous to the island (they were there before Prospero and Miranda) and as Caliban assures the audience 'this isle is mine, by Sycorax (his mother)'. When Prospero makes Caliban his slave and Ariel his servant using his magic his magic becomes synonymous with colonialist power. As he critic Young comments the Tempest is one the first plays to portray a discourse between 'colonialist attitudes'. By giving up his magic at the end of the play Prospero is also giving up his control over Caliban and Ariel, in essence he is giving up his colonialist power. This interpretation of the play would be especially apappalling to modern audiences who would agree that it is right that Prospero gives up his power because colonialist attitudes and power have run their course and are no longer acceptable in society so they should be left behind.

When Prospero finally relinquishes control over Ariel and removes his magic cloak it signifies his relinquishing of his magic. Before he does this Ariel asks Prospero 'Do you love me master?' and Prospero replies 'I love thee my delicate Ariel'. Ariel is the character that exemplifies Prospero's magic in the play, he carries out tasks for Prospero such as the storm and pretending to be a harpie and so freeing Ariel is freeing his power and Prospero expressing his attachment to Ariel is effectively him
expressing his attachment to his power. This is the only scene in which I believe it seems more difficult to say it is right for Prospero to give up his magic as he is so attached to it. However, when Prospero removes his magic cloak and puts on his Duke's clothes we understand that he is really only trading one type of power for another. Indeed the critic Bowen suggests that 'clothing during the Jacobean era was used to show status' and indeed power so here it would not be a stretch to say that Prospero reverting back to his Duke's clothing shows him going back to his rightful status and level of power.

Ultimately we can suggest that Prospero's magic was an unnatural sort of power existent only because of the unnatural disruption of the natural order when Prospero was usurped. In which case it feels apt to conclude that it was indeed wholly right for Prospero to give up his magic once the correct social order was restored and leave it behind like the colonialist attitudes of the past, leading to a resolution of the play that is satisfying to both Jacobean and modern audiences.

Examiner commentary

5a: This is a highly competent response to the passage. In terms of AO2, which is dominant in this part of the paper, the candidate shows a competent awareness of possible stage effects – 'a brief period of silence, Prospero on a balcony' – as well as language such as 'the possessive pronoun "my" as a clear demonstration of ownership and control'. Argument (AO1) is straightforward. Analysis remains, on the whole, generally developed; for a higher mark, somewhat more detailed discussion of effects and of the relationship between Prospero and Ariel would be desirable. Level 4, 10 marks

5b: The level of this answer is 'good' – clearly above 'competent'. It fulfils the AO5 requirement for different interpretations with relevant references to several productions and to the critical views of Hebron, Bowen and Young, and shows also some awareness of the changing perspectives of Jacobean and modern audiences. Argument (AO1) is clear and there are some good points about the idea of magic signifying colonialism and Prospero 'really only trading one type of power for another'. Level 5, 11 marks
Question 6a and 6b, *Twelfth Night*

6  *Twelfth Night*

Answer both parts (a) and (b).

(a) Discuss the following passage from Act 4 Scene 2, exploring Shakespeare’s use of language and its dramatic effects.

(b) ‘Appearances in the play often hide a very different reality.’

Using your knowledge of the play as a whole, show how far you agree with this view of *Twelfth Night*.

Remember to support your answer with reference to different interpretations.
Exemplar 1

30 marks

A)

Within the scene of Act 4 Scene 2, there is a clear focus on the theme of deception that runs through William Shakespeare's 'Twelfth Night'. The scene focuses on a range of different types of deception, such as the deception of clothes, language and the society of a play that is seemingly to do with celebration and festivity.

Through the use of a lexical field of physical attributes and clothing such as Feste changing into a 'gown' and 'this beard', connotations of deception and disguise arise. The use of the dynamic verb 'dissemble' represents how characters such as Feste are able to manipulate themselves, and this is no surprise as he says that he is 'for all waters'. Feste is arguably the wisest character, thus he is able to manipulate his appearance to deceive Malvolio. Once Feste changes into the clothes of Sir Topaz, he automatically has more power within society. He guarantees within the play that 'I wear not motley in my brain', and once he changes into the disguise of Sir Topaz, he is able to manipulate and mock Malvolio as the status roles have switched. This further introduces the juxtaposing and topsy-turvy world of Illyria where everything and anything can be manipulated; it is a society liable to manipulation through deception.

Language is vital within 'Twelfth Night', as it is how the characters woo and deceive one another. Within this scene, Malvolio has been stripped of all power and prestige, and the only thing that remains is his language for him to regain his dignity. Malvolio previously uses extensive figurative language of describing 'some rich jewel' to portray his desires and his wants for romance, but this is something that he can no longer do since he remains in 'hideous darkness'. Malvolio asks for 'pen, ink and some light' but Feste as Sir Topaz refuses, thus Malvolio is stripped of all ability to defend for himself within this scene. Feste's use of third person narrative ensures that Malvolio remains as an outsider, and reinforces to Malvolio that he is mad, although through asking for 'pen and ink', he presents that he still has reason. Feste says that he is 'Sir Topaz the curate, who comes to visit Malvolio the lunatic'. Through using the third person narrative, Malvolio is automatically alienated and reinforced to be mad. In this way, he is not worthy of being referred to directly, only as a 'dishonest Satan'. Through deceiving Malvolio through language, Feste reinforces his own power of words but also highlights the cruelty of deception.

The lexical field and concrete nouns used within Feste's description of the setting imply barriers and confinement. The 'bay windows' and 'ebony' reinforce hard and solid structures that portray images of strength. Ironically, this is something that neither the society of Illyria or Malvolio has. Malvolio's last cry of 'I'll be revenged on the whole pack of you' reinforce the arbitrary rules of Illyria, where the lady's servant can be outed from society with little sympathy. Alternatively, Malvolio describes his setting as 'dark as ignorance', which juxtaposes with Feste's description. The oxymoronic use of 'windows' connecting clarity and light and 'darkness' connecting confusion reveal that Illyria lies within the liminal middle ground where nothing is ever certain. The society of Illyria within itself is deceiving, as is the setting.
Furthermore, Feste uses iambic pantometer when using the persona of Sir Topas, revealing a disguise of status and role in society through the use of manipulating metre. The use of verse allows Feste to gain status and allows him to say to Malvolio that 'I say there is no darkness but ignorance; in which thou art more puzzled than the Egyptians in their fog'. The narrative voice of this extract forces Malvolio into submission, as he is given prose within this scene where his language has no rhythm or structure, much like his persona in this part of the play. Metre is used to deceive characters as Feste believes he has gained power through the use of prose, and Malvolio becomes less significant as his words have no structure. In comparison to his figurative language earlier in the play of his 'velvet robe' and 'jewels', the use of prose highlights the true nature of a Malvolio in fear. Malvolio's honest and literal description of 'this house is dark' implies he sees the room as it is rather than using metaphor or simile in comparison to earlier in the play, and Feste's disguise brings out in Malvolio the side of a victim that differs from the cold and stern servant that the audience saw beforehand.

Overall, this scene depicts many forms of deception and their effects on the character of Malvolio. Disguise brings out the victim within Malvolio that may have never been considered and it causes the malice in Feste to arise. From this scene, it can be concluded that disguise within Twelfth Night brings out the worst within characters.

B)

Within William Shakespeare's 'Twelfth Night', appearance plays a huge role in how the characters present themselves to others. Appearance is used to hide truths, to show vanity and narcissism but to also deceive, and once examined, a different reality is revealed.

The disguise of Viola reveals the subordination of women in society. Despite the fact that Viola manages to gain status and a role beneath the power of Orsino, the hidden reality is that she wouldn't be able to do this without her male persona of Cesario. Greenblatt describes Viola as 'the secret charm of the play'; she brings characters together through weaving elements of the sub-plot into the main plot, but it is worth questioning whether she would have ever been able to do so as the woman she arrives as. As a man, Viola is given respect and status by the other characters within the play, but this disguise also confines her. Once she has fallen in love with Orsino, her disguise encases her in the role of a man, meaning that she cannot explain her love. She then resorts to hinting at her gender, saying that she is 'all the daughters of my father's house', revealing that her disguise confines her as a character. It further emphasises that her disguise gives her power within society, revealing the imbalance of equality within Illyria between men and women.

Moreover, Joseph Summers states that 'every character has their masks', and this is quite literally true for the character of Feste. Appearances within the play bring about a change of persona, and arguably bring out the darkness of certain characters. This is shown within Act 4 Scene 2 where he disguises himself as Sir Topas to gull and mock Malvolio. His line, 'nay, I am for all waters' is often used to positively portray Feste as a character of fluidity and a god-like character, but instead it could be interpreted that he is a character capable of
manipulation through his fluidity in language, as this is what he uses to gull Malvolio into thinking he is a 'devil'. White argues that Feste is 'the cruellest of Shakespeare's jesters', which serves to be true within this scene. Feste abuses the power gained through his appearance to mock Malvolio, and this portrays Feste as abusive, bullying and cold. In Nunn's 1996 production, Feste is shown to look down upon a mountain at the end of the play and in many productions he has remained on stage the whole time, demonstrating his character as omniscient and God-like. Arguably, his ability to watch and remain unseen is the reason why he is able to manipulate characters such as Malvolio as he knows his weaknesses, such as taking away his ability to write language with 'pen and ink'. Within his 'motley' clothing he is unable to portray his power, but within the disguise of Sir Topas he is able to, and he abuses it.

Once Malvolio's persona and appearance is taken away from him, the play reveals a Malvolio that is far from the stern, controlling and cold Malvolio that we are introduced to at the start of the play. In Branagh's 1996 production, Malvolio is shown to wear his jewels and the items of clothing that give him status in his night clothes. This shows Malvolio to be full of pride, narcissism and self-love to the point where it is these items of clothing that give him a sense of power within the household. This is further emphasised through Malvolio describing how 'I will extend my hand to him thus, with an austere regard to control', where he fantasises about having more power within the household. Malvolio is often associated with narcissism so much, since Olivia argues that he is 'sick of self-love'. In the USA in the 1990’s, a production of Twelfth Night used a backdrop of Narcissus staring at his own reflection, which reinforces Malvolio's sense of pride and self-obsession. In all of these ways, Malvolio is portrayed as self-obsessed due to what he presents himself as to others; he wears his jewels, he takes pride in his appearance and his role as Olivia's servant. This all changes within Branagh's 1988 production that portrays one of the most sinister gulling scenes of Malvolio. Malvolio is literally stripped of his dignity as he is put in a cell in dirty clothes, and confined by ropes and chains. The confident Malvolio is seen to be small and crying in comparison to the large, dark room. It is here when the audience view Malvolio as the most mad, and this may be due to the fact that he is physically stripped from his status. Once all of these things are taken away, we see Malvolio as a victim. The Globe 2012 production, in comparison, entraps Malvolio in a large and open box where he remains in his clothes from before, and this is seen as more comedic and less sympathy is evoked from this scene. The only difference is their clothes and how they are presented, revealing that appearance hides a lot more than what is initially thought.

The members of the sub-plot are limited through their appearance. For instance, Maria's class is shown through her maid's outfit; Feste's low status is shown through his jester's clothes; Toby's slobby nature is shown through his alcohol-stained overalls and Andrew's posh and mockable nature is revealed through his meticulously perfect suits and combed back hair in the Regent's Park 2008 production. It is their appearance that keeps them in the role that they are set in within Illyria. Interestingly, in the box tree scene by RSC 2018, the members of the sub-plot hide behind stone statues in the scene of the garden. As Malvolio falls for the letter from Maria and turns around within the scene, the characters switch.
manipulating different shapes and taking different forms behind the statues. Despite the fact that the characters remain in their outfits revealing their role in Illyria, they are still able to manipulate what they do with them. For instance, Feste is able to manipulate Malvolio through his skill of slippery language and Maria is able to forge Maria’s signature to deceive Malvolio. Baldinetti states that ‘it is comedy that gives the characters power’ within the play, and this is correct for the characters of the comedic sub-plot as they use their appearance and role to their advantage to deceive others.

Overall, appearances within 'Twelfth Night' hide an array of hidden features of characters. The dark, the secret and the hidden elements are revealed of characters that outwardly seem to be comedic and wise. Once characters gain or lose their appearance, a different character is presented to the world of theatre entirely.

Examiner commentary

6a: The answer is controlled, articulate and well expressed (AO1), integrating quotations smoothly into argument. AO2 (effects) is aptly addressed, with language a theme as well as a focus in the third paragraph in particular. The candidate is often attentive to the wider implications of effects: the ‘bay windows’ and ‘ebony’ suggest a solidity and strength which ‘Ironically … is something that neither the society of Illyria or Malvolio has’; oxymoronic descriptions point to the ‘liminal middle ground’ of Illyria ‘where nothing is ever certain’. Unfortunately the penultimate paragraph misidentifies some of the prose as verse; but this error detracts only slightly from the quality of this excellent and consistently detailed response. Level 6, 15 marks

6b: Argument (AO1) is excellently managed. A lucid opening is followed by exploration of how Viola is both enabled and confined by her disguise and the candidate goes on to look at some other characters with similar subtlety. AO5 (different interpretations) is well met by discussion of the critical perspectives of Greenblatt, Summers and Bakhtin and richly detailed use of a range of productions of the play. Level 6, 15 marks
6a. This scene is taken after Malvolio threatens Sir Toby, Maria and Feste with telling Lady Olivia about their loud and baseful behaviour that he encountered in the late hours of the night. In this scene, Maria decides that it will be a good idea to trick Malvolio into thinking that 'Sir Topas' has come to visit him, by dressing Feste as 'the curate', and convincing him that he is a madman.

This scene is delivered in prose, as it involves the use of many short sentences and quick responses that are delivered between Feste, Maria and Sir Toby. Prose is a form of language that used in Shakespeare's plays by many of the lower class individuals in society, as this was how Shakespeare represented their social class. Shakespeare uses a lot of hyperbolic language at the beginning of the scene, "What ho, I say! Peace in this prison," as it builds a lot of tension and suspense towards the upcoming moment when Malvolio arrives to be tricked by Feste. This therefore makes the audience very captivated and engaged, drawing much attention to the text. When Malvolio finally arrives, Feste addresses him by the name of "Malvolio the lunatic", however due to Malvolio's sarcastic attitude, he believes that he is not mad, calling out and crying "they have laid me here in hideous darkness." His response displays how he has been deceived by himself into believing that he is not mad, when in fact, his egotistical mannerisms have proved otherwise. However, this passage conveys a sense of sadness for Malvolio as one cannot help but sympathise for him, as he is punished for flaws that many other people share in Illyria, as he declares that, "I am no more mad than you are", furthermore showing that Sir Toby and Maria should not punish Malvolio because they hold exactly the same flaws as he does. For example, Sir Toby holds the sin of greed, as he constantly tries to steal more money off of Sir Andrew, presenting him to be a character with multiple flaws.

The passage also presents Feste as the 'villain', which is very ironic as he plays the role of the Jester in 'Twelfth Night, mainly present for comedic purpose. Shakespeare uses violently powerful language to express Feste's raw emotions towards Malvolio. "Fie, thou dishonest Satan!" signifies how Feste compares Malvolio to the devil in hell, making him come across as a much more powerful figure in the text than what his role depicts as the fool. Shakespeare also uses many similies to enable Feste to put his point across to Malvolio on how he believes that he is mad. "Windows transparent as barricades" and "celestial rays towards the north are as lustrous as ebony", display ironic language as windows that are transparent are clear and can be looked through, however barricades cannot be broken and remain strong and unbreakable, showing Shakespeare's use of irony in Feste's speech.

This scene uses many different forms of hyperbolic and powerful language forms as Feste has to become the very persuasive figure of 'Sir Topas' that symbolises a 'heavenly' figure that has come to Malvolio to convince him that he is mad, and make him aware of the mistakes and upset he has caused amongst everyone within Olivia's house.

6b. "Appearances fluctuate between what is real and illusionary", (Grief) and in Twelfth Night this can be examined as many different characters are portrayed in a certain light, which is very far from what they truly are, making appearances become a disillusion.
In the beginning of the play, Viola dresses as her brother Sebastian in order to receive entry the the court of Orsino, however her disguise gets her caught up in many complicated situations that involve people believing that she is a man, when she is in fact a woman. When she goes to deliver Orsino’s letter of undying love to Lady Olivia, Orsino’s plan backfires and Olivia ends up falling helplessly in love with Viola instead of reading the letter from Orsino. Viola reassures Olivia, "I am not what I play", as Olivia wishes to be courted by her. The Trevor Hunn film, displays Olivia removing her veil flirtishly in order for Cesario to gaze upon her attractive features, however, because Viola is infact a woman, this scene creates a great comedic effect, as Olivia is unaware of Viola’s true identity. Yet, this encounter with Olivia acts as only the first of many uncomfortable situations Viola has to involve herself in, trapped in her identity of Sebastian. When Sir Andrew discovers that Lady Olivia wishes to marry Cesario (Viola), Sir Toby convinces Andrew to challenge Viola to a duel. As Viola is a woman she does not wish to fight, and this is displayed in the Kenneth Branagh film, where he uses an intelligent technique of slapstick comedy to create a humorous scene for the audience to watch, as Sir Toby and Fabien work together at pushing both Viola and Sir Andrew closer together in order to produce a fight between them. Viola shouts, "Tell them how much I lack of a man", which is ironic as she is a woman, so therefore she would lack of a man’s fiery fighting skills, because she does not know how to fight and believes that she is going to get killed by Sir Andrew, as he is a real man fighting against her. Both encounters signify how "Shakespeare uses mistaken identity and disguise to establish humour" (Tolliver), as both scenes involve Viola having to ironically state that "Nothing is so, that is so", hinting that her character's appearance, as Cesario, has an underlying different reality, as she is really a woman.

However, it is not just physical appearance, such as Viola's disguise, that hides a different reality. Characters such as Malvolio, portray themselves as noble and respectable individuals, when infact they hide a dark truth about themselves that lies underneath the surface. Malvolio lives in the same household as Lady Olivia, so therefore he sees himself as a very prestigious person and looks down on anybody else in a lower class than he. For example, Kenneth Branagh’s film version shows Malvolio glance over at Feste very harshly, as he cannot understand why his Lady has hired such a ‘fool’ to entertain her, presenting the idea that they are not very fond of each other, as they are from different classes. However, his little fondness of Feste comes after he realises that "Feste speaks the truth that nobody else wants to hear" (Bloom), and because he realises that Malvolio is not all the ‘Puritan’ that he portrays himself to be, Malvolio despises him. Branagh's film version portrays Malvolio's narcissistic attitude perfectly, as Richard Briars, who plays the role of Malvolio, pears down at the floor admiring his own shadow, displaying his egotistical nature. Puritan's were supposed to be religious, kind and giving people, however Malvolio does not hold one Puritanical trait, therefore making him appear a completley different person to what he dictates that he is. Also, when he finally reads the letter that Maria has forged in Olivia’s handwriting he is so blinded by his own self-deception that he unveils his true character. When he comes running with “yellow stockings and cross-garters", she informs him that he must be ill, declaring, "Wilt thou go to bed Malvolio?", however due to his hideous self-deception he believes that Olivia is offering herself to him in bed. His reaction immediately signifies that he is not the Puritan he pretends to be, and displays how his role in a Lady’s household dissolutions his true identity.
Examiner commentary

6a: This clear and fairly detailed response discusses some relevant AO2 effects in the passage – ‘hyperbolic’ and ‘violently powerful’ language, for instance – while exploring the roles of, and interaction between, Feste and Malvolio. Some lack of exactness and facility in AO1 keeps the mark low in Level 5: there is uncertainty at the beginning about when in the play the scene takes place, the comments on the use of prose do not advance the analysis very far, and inaccurate expression sometimes hinders clear communication: ‘Sir Toby and Maria … hold exactly the same flaws as [Malvolio] does. For example, Sir Toby holds the sin of greed.’ Level 5, 11 marks

6b: The candidate answers the question clearly (AO1), focusing on ways in which Viola, Malvolio and Feste are not what they seem. AO5 (different interpretations) is addressed by references to critics such as Tolliver and Bloom and to two productions of the play. Occasionally, mainly towards the beginning, there is a slight element of narrative rather than analysis. On the whole, however, this is a good, clear account. The candidate writes especially convincingly about Malvolio. Level 5, 12 marks.
6 A

The language and dramatic effects created within this scene in Twelfth Night by Shakespeare have a comedic effect on the audience watching. Another effect that may be felt by the audience could be sympathy towards the character Malvolio who is ultimately bullied and humiliated within this passage.

The fool Feste and Olivia's chamber maid Maria, have plotted to trick Malvolio even more when he is isolated within a dungeon. Maria believes if Feste disguises himself with a, "Gown and this beard" he will be concealed and not recognized by Malvolio. The disguise of, "Sir Topes the curate" is believed to be fitting for Feste. The way Feste says, "the first that ever dissembled in such a gown" will give the impression that this is the first real item of wealth he has ever worn and could cause comical effect. The fool was not ever supposed to be a wealthy man or woman and was the critically a funny servant who was allowed to mock and take the mick out of his/her lords and lady's. This also highlights the difference in class between characters in the play. If the actor uses his facial expressions and body language to show his enthusiasm in wearing this gown given to him by Maria, the audience will understand the comedy Shakespeare is showing here. Whilst in this guise he compares himself to looking like a, "good housekeeper", or a "great scholar". After Sir Toby and Maria enter, Feste has a short speech. Some of the things he says within this speech such as, "The old hermit of Pragues" and, "niece of King Gorboduc" show of his intense knowledge of the world. He is showing his intelligence by saying these things towards the audience to create confusing or dramatic effect.

The distressed calling from Malvolio within his prison, "Who calls there?" really shows his fear and confusion. Feste now begins the tormentation of Malvolio. He goes ahead in calling him "Malvolio the lunatic" which shows what little respect Feste has for Malvolio which is not uncommon. Malvolio is a very shallow and pompous individual. The language device hyperbole is used when Feste raises his voice when saying "out hyperbolical fiend!". This over exaggeration within this insult thrown at Malvolio again shows off Feste's knowledge for using such a complicated word as an insult. When Feste mentions where Malvolio is being held captive and that is bursting full of light, he exclaims "Say'st thou that house is dark?". This really frustrates and worries him as he is given the impression by Feste that he is going mad. To back up this comment Feste says, "It hath bay windows transparent as barricades" (which are equivalent to church stained windows). This clever wording from Feste will help the audience understand his manipulative characteristics as the fool of the play.

6 B

The view "Appearances in the play often hide a very different reality" is an important discussion topic for the Shakespearean play Twelfth Night. Certain characters such as Viola and Feste hide the different reality from other characters to create the solid sense of confusion within the play. Whether it be to trick or fool other characters into believing false actions or to protect ones original image, appearances in the play are used to the greatest
Examiner commentary

6a: This response is just generally developed enough to enter Level 4. Although there is some misunderstanding – for example the candidate misses the point of 'the first that ever dissembled in such a gown' – there is a broad sense of the power dynamic between the characters; of Feste's 'manipulative characteristics' and 'showing his intelligence ... to create confusing or dramatic effect'. AO2 (effects) is addressed in the awareness of tone and of 'The language device hyperbole'. Discussion is sometimes more expository than analytical. Level 4, 8 marks

6b: This brief, straightforward response considers appearance and reality with reference to Viola, Olivia and Feste. AO5 (different interpretations) is met through mention of a critic, a stage production and a film. (The material on male players, however, rather distracts from the argument.) There is just enough substance here for a mark on the border between 'some attempt' and 'competent'. Level 4, 8 marks
Question 7

7 ‘Love brings difficulties as well as pleasures.’

In the light of this view, consider ways in which writers explore love relationships. In your answer, compare one drama text and one poetry text from the above lists.

Exemplar 1: *A Doll’s House* and Rossetti: *Selected Poems*

Henrik Ibsen and Christina Rossetti both display ways in which an individual’s drive and acceptance of love can be compromised for the difficulties that are brought alongside those desires. With Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House* and Rossetti’s *Selected Poems* being products of literature in the 19th century, patriarchal norms play to burden the pleasures of love for the protagonists/narrators in their works.

With Nora written as the stereotypical nineteenth century daughter and wife, Torvald, too, is displayed as the epitome of the respectable nineteenth century husband. Their relationship could be viewed as endearing as he refers to her as “my little Skylark”. However, the label does nothing but demean Nora as he reduces her to his own winsome little creature. This reduction instantly introduces viewers to the confinement of Nora in her subordinate role. The pleasure she gains from loving Torvald is at wrangle with his pomposity in which he prides himself over his power over Nora. We quickly learn that, to save Torvald’s life, she took a loan out from the bank, illegally forging her father’s signature in order to do so. The audience is made aware that Nora sees inequality as a difficulty of love when she exposes “it was like being a man”. Being able to provide herself with financial security instilled a sense of power she wishes Torvald would allow her to have.

Similarly, in *From the Antique*, Rossetti sheds light on the limitations that accompany love in the 19th century. We are introduced to a woman’s desire to take on the dominant gender role with the line: “I wish and I wish I were a man”. The repetition of “I wish” exudes the futility of the narrator’s desires. With the narrator trapped as a subordinate woman we are able to perceive the “wearying” life of being a women
affiliates difficulty with love. The poem’s syndetic structure also reflects the tone of “A Doll’s House”. Nora’s desire to make money and maintain agency is conveyed as something that society at the time would have perceived to be a fairy tale. A modern day interpretation would view Nora as powerful just for having the courage to voice such a notion during such a prejudiced era.

The single location, short time-span and limited characters within the play are what define its naturalism. By using such a structure, Ibsen makes it unable for the audience to overlook the difficulties that Nora, and many other women during the time, had to endure in order to experience what they believed to be ‘love’. The setting helped trap and highlight the difficulties women face.

The title of the play acts as an agent for the events proceeding within it. As Torvald brings attention to Nora’s beauty, pleading her to “dress up for” him, she becomes pressured with the fear that one day when her “looks” age, Torvald will no longer love her. It is these beauty expectations of women that were perceived mandatory order to love your wife. This ideal of women was referred to as the Angel in the House by Patmore Coventry. A woman that was meek powerless and subdued herself to the preferences of her husband were perceived as ideal. Rossetti herself worked to resolve such issues in her private life. She set up sessions in St. Mary Magdelene’s Penitentiary to offer support to prostitutes and ‘fallen women’. Although she didn’t claim herself to be a feminist, she believed that women had the right to take power of their sexuality. This was a refuge that could have even helped Nora – within that moment she allowed her ageing beauty to dictate the worth of love she deserved.

However, in From the Round Tower at Jhansi, it could be argued that Rossetti opposes the concept of a relationship limited by inequality. As Captain Skene “closed his arm around” his wife and “closed her cheek to his”, Rossetti displays the equal sides in their marriage. Both parties act in comforting one another and Skene goes on to shield her with his own body. To escape being captured and imprisoned by the India Rebels, they face the reality that they’re only outlet is to commit suicide. The exclamation “God forgive them” reminds us that suicide is a sin and Skene values his wife’s life so much more than his own that he shoots her before shooting himself to “bear the pain for [them] both”. By doing so, Rossetti portrays to us a relationship that is so contrary to that in A Doll’s House, that Skene sacrifices his chances of an afterlife in heaven so that his wife isn’t faced with Sin and is therefore able to enter. It is this true love that Nora makes evident she wishes to receive from Torvald: her “miracle” – but never does.

Ibsen introduces Mrs. Linde symbolically as a conscience for Nora to follow. Christine once conformed to society by marrying a man she didn’t love for financial security, but after he passed away and she gained a job at the bank, she becomes the model
Examiner commentary

This well-developed answer clearly meets the requirements of the dominant AO3 (context) with discussion of gender inequality, naturalism, *The Angel in the House*, and Rossetti’s work with ‘fallen women’. Links between texts (AO4) are apt and satisfyingly frequent. A good example is the contrast between Skene’s love and Torvald’s failure to deliver Nora’s ‘miracle’. Argument (AO1) is clear and measured and there are interesting insights like Nora’s opting ‘to build a loving relationship with herself through her independence’. This is a fairly concise response; for a mark further into Level 6 detailed discussion of a few more of Rossetti’s poems would be needed.
Exemplar 2: *An Ideal Husband* and *Paradise Lost* Books 9 and 10

Level 6, 27 marks

As both Milton and Wilde experienced difficulties with love in their real lives, it only stands to reason that this would be reflected in their works of *Paradise Lost* and *An Ideal Husband*. Wilde as a homosexual in late Victorian society found himself ostracised by his peers and subjected to hard labour after his affair with Lord Alfred Douglas was exposed, giving him an understandably complex relationship with love and marriage, as he married in order to avoid arousing suspicion, which is reflected in the somewhat dysfunctional marriage of Robert and Gertrude Chiltern. Similarly Miltons complicated relationship history seems to have influenced his work, as the poet experienced both an unsuccessful first marriage to a much younger woman, and a second, that he described as a ‘union of minds’, to Katherine Woodbeck. As a result of this history of turmoil for both writers, their work expresses many representations of the difficulties and pleasures that marriage can present.

In the case of Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*, the love that each of them feel seems to be the root of many their problems. From the first introduction to Adam and Eve in Book 9, it is evident that there is a considerable amount of love from one other. They work in harmony together to tend to the garden, yet their marriage is perhaps not the paradise it first seems as Eve desires to leave Adam’s side, supposedly as they would work more effectively apart. However this and the inequality that Eve feels seems to suggest that their are issues in their partnership that Adam seems oblivious to. Until they have both eaten the fruit his devotion to Eve does not waver and this is perhaps what causes their difficulties. His desire for her to be free means that he decides to let her go, despite his reservations to the idea, as he would rather she “go” than “stay, not free”. This not only, in many critics eyes, means that he takes some of the blame for the following actions of Eve, but also suggests a contemporary belief on Miltons part for a womans right to individual freedom, something that was perhaps not considered in the patriarchal society at the time. This is an idea that contrasts to 17th century critics, such as Samuel Johnson, who interpreted the text as displaying Milton’s “Turkish hatred” for women.

Not only does Adam’s love for Eve allow her to give in to temptation and eat the fruit, he also eats out his love for her, as in the face of her possible death without him, he cannot bare the thought of living without her, meaning that “he swooped not to eat against his better judgement, not declined, but overcome by feminine charm”. This causes the “completion of sin original”, and is an act which directly betrays the authority of god. His love for Eve is greater than that of his love for god, and this is what causes the difficulties of not only Adam and Eve, but those of their offspring. Perhaps similarly Robert Chiltern, in *An Ideal Husband*, risks public exposure of his past as he is unable to tell her the truth. This seems a toxic symptom of the idealism which the play discusses, as Lady Chilterns encapsulates by saying “women worship when they love”. The unrealistic standards that she possesses create an unhealthy and unsustainable relationship that feels at any moment in the play that it might shatter. Her pleading with Robert not to “kill [her] love for” him makes him unable to tell her the truth, and as a result, as a critic of the 1996 Peter Hall production states, “she becomes more dangerous than Mrs Cheveley”, forcing Robert to write a letter that may cause an end to his “stainess” political career.
in both texts the male characters’ actions to save their unstable relationships lead to further difficulties and the near collapse of their relationships, and in the case of Paradise Lost, the Garden of Eden itself. For Adam his actions out of love lead him to form a resentment for Eve, as expressed when he spitefully calls her a “serpent and a “crooked rib”. The actions of both have led them to a stage where the world has been permanently altered and there is no longer “love in their looks”. However after many “fruitless hours” of argument and both wishing to “return to dust” they repair their love and together seek redemption. Although their love may have been what originally caused their displeasure, Book 10 finishes with the couple reunited, leaving the reader with a positive sentiment that they will overcome their difficulties. An image that is perhaps a reflection of Milton’s own evolving views of marriage.

This idea is perhaps even more prominent in An Ideal Husband, as the play finishes with Lady Chiltern assuring Robert that “it is love” that she feels for him, not the “nay” that he expects. However in the Prowse’s production in 1980, he cut the last line, leaving the audience unsure of Lady Chiltern’s true feelings and questioning the stability of their relationship. The huge change this small adjustment had on the tone of the play’s conclusion perhaps further emphasises the fragility of love relationships in Wilde’s work and adds an extra layer of scepticism to the play. Yet despite the troublesome relationship of the Chilterns, a successful love relationship is shown in the play through the characters of Lord Goring and Mabel Chiltern. This perhaps shows the potential for successful love relationships when it is created on a foundation of honesty, respect and realism over idealism.

In this way both texts depict not only examples of toxic relationships, but also the ways in which they can have positive impacts and in the end be redeemable, despite any difficulties caused by the intense emotions and high expectations which come with love.

Examiner commentary

This thoughtful and well-developed response includes some interesting links between the texts (AO4): ‘the male characters’ actions to save their unstable relationships lead to further difficulties and the near collapse of their relationships’. Argument (AO1) is clear and the candidate quotes from the texts appositely. She addresses the dominant AO3 mainly through the biographical contexts for Milton and Wilde outlined in the opening paragraph and, later, two productions of An Ideal Husband. A higher mark could be achieved by the inclusion of more such contextual material and particularly for more of it to be integrated into the main body of discussion.
Exemplar 3: *A Doll’s House* and Rossetti: *Selected Poems*

Level 6, 27 marks

Love will always cause difficulties as well as pleasures. Rossetti and Ibsen were writing in the later half of the 19th century in England and Norway respectively. Whilst writing in different countries the context is very similar. These were patriarchally run societies in which men and women operated in separate spheres, women in the domestic sphere and men in the wider working world. Both texts explore the difficulties this imbalance within society brought to heterosexual relationships. However, they differ in that Ibsen sees the potential for pleasure as only being obtainable when the individual has been self actualised. Whereas Rossetti explores the pleasure that comes from sisterly and religious love.

Both authors present the idea that difficulty in male, female relationships stems from the lack of gender equality. Women were expected to be an, as stated in the Patmore poem, ‘angel in the house’, subservient and submissive towards their male counterparts. However, for men it was socially acceptable for them to engage in sexual relations with Prostitutes and so this created an imbalance within society. In *A Doll’s House* Helmer consistently refers to Nora using nicknames such as ‘squanderbird’, ‘skylark’ and ‘songbird’. This has the effect of infantilising Nora and positioning her in a weaker and subservient position to Helmer. Furthering this when Nora is questioned about eating the macaroons she informs him that she ‘could never act against [his] wishes’. This presents the idea that Nora is somewhat entrapped by Helmer rules. Worrall presents the argument that Helmer is ‘as much a victim as Nora’. This presents the idea that the difficulties in love that gender inequality causes is felt by both parties as Helmer is simply acting out of his social conditioning. This is indicated by his complete shock at the end of the play when Nora informs him that she ‘hasn’t ever been happy’. Her unhappiness comes as a result of him forcing her into this subservient position which limits her individualism yet Helmer is simply acting out of what he has been taught to do. In his presentation of male female love Ibsen presents inequality in a relationship as being the source of difficulties.

Similarly Rossetti explores the idea that the lack of gender equality is the root of problems in heterosexual relationships. Queen Victoria once stated that ‘Men and women are created different and so should remain in those roles’. This is representative of how constraining gender roles were in this era. In the poem *Maud Clare Rossetti* explores the idea of female subservience. Maud Clare is described as ‘like a queen’ where as Nell is described as a ‘village maid’. Nell fulfills the Victorian expectation of women being subdued unsexualised beings and so when despite the revelation of his affair to Maud Clare, she decides to ‘love him till he love me best’ despite him being ‘pale with inward strife’. The difficulty in this love relationship lies in that Nell fulfills social expectations by not raising issue at her husbands infidelity yet this presents the idea that she is chasing social expectation over her own happiness. This is similar to Nora’s experience yet unlike Nell Nora ultimately defies convention in pursuit of happiness. In the poem ‘When I am Dead My Dearest’ the speaker states that her love told her ‘of the future that [he] planned’ thus highlighting the lack of autonomy the female speaker has.
Subsequently the poem goes on to state that the speaker wishes he 'sings no sad songs for [her]’ preceding her death. This ambivalence presents the idea that her death is almost some form of escape from her very constrained position as a woman. Simon Avery stated that in Rossetti’s poetry 'the female figure is often presented as constrained'. This is reflected in both Rossetti portrayal of Nell and the speaker in When I am Dead as they are both constrained by social convention. Rossetti, like Ibsen sees the gender imbalance as a cause for difficulties in love.

Ibsen presents the idea that pleasure from love relationship is only achievable when both sides of the relationship are individually fulfilled. Ibsen was humanist didactic writer who believed in individualism above all else. His beliefs are reflected in his presentation of Mrs Linde and Krogstad's relationship. At the end of the play when they decide to embark on a relationship together Mrs Linde informs Krogstad that she 'must work if [she] is to find a life worth living' which Krogstad happily accepts. This defies social convention as women were meant to tend to the house whilst men worked and served to present the idea that with equality in a relationship there can be a chance at pleasure or happiness in a relationship. Nora and Helmer’s relationship cannot be experience this same chance at pleasure as Nora ‘simply took [Helmer’s] taste in everything’. Presenting the idea that she lacks an understanding of herself and so her ultimate decision to leave him is the only way for her to be happy and enjoy life. Ibsen once wrote 'what is a man’s first duty? The answer is brief - to be himself.' This view is reflected in his presentation of love relationships as he presents the opportunity for happiness in love relationship as only being obtainable when there is equality and individual happiness.

However Rossetti completely rejects the idea that pleasure can come from a heterosexual relationship. Instead she presents the idea that pleasure from love can only be found through godly love and sisterly love. Rossetti was a devout Tractarian, whilst she did experiences moments of religious doubt, her poetry is reflective of her religious beliefs. In the poem ‘Twice the speaker’s hearts been broken (as you set it down it broke)’ by a man. God then ‘refines with fire (the speaker’s heart) its gold’. This serves to present the idea that Rossetti had more faith in God being able to bring her salvation and joy than any man. This rejection of men in favour of a different kind of love is further reflective in Goblin Market a poem reflective of Rossetti’s own work at St Mary Magdalene house for fallen women in which she worked to restore the lives of fallen women. Laura, who feasted on the fruit of goblin men, is 'life out of death' following her sister Lizzie’s resistance to the chants of the goblin men. In saving her sisters life Lizzie and Laura are both able to ‘be wives with children of their own’. However, this is only achieved as a result of sisterly love as Lizzie’s self sacrifices allows them to grow together. Guber commented that through the poem Rossetti created an ‘effectively matriarchal and matriarchal world’. This presents the idea that Rossetti favoured female relationships. Rossetti presents the only opportunity for pleasurable love as coming from a sisterly love or a relationship with god.
Examiner commentary

Context, the dominant AO here, is fulfilled by references to separate spheres and the double standard, Ibsen’s beliefs, and Rossetti’s work with ‘fallen women’; although for a higher mark a greater level of detail would be useful. Links between the texts (AO4) are managed effectively, illustrating the argument that both authors explore ‘the lack of gender equality [as] the root of problems in heterosexual relationships’. It would be helpful, however – and would raise the mark slightly - to have more of the specific comparisons the candidate does sometimes manage, for example ‘This is similar to Nora’s experience yet unlike Nell Nora ultimately defies convention in pursuit of happiness.’
Exemplar 4: A Doll’s House and The Merchant’s Prologue and Tale

Level 5, 25 marks

S. Geoffrey Chaucer and Henrik Ibsen explore love in relationships in both poem and play, "The Merchant's Prologue and Tale", and "A Doll's House." Love is examined as something that does not hold central value in relationships and marriages as both texts were written in very patriarchal societies, where men were left in charge of all financial incomes, whilst women remained at home to look after their children and take care of the household, so therefore 'love' did not act as the most important part of a marriage or relationship during both the 14th century and 19th century.

Ibsen was a playwright, who was considered to be "the father of realism" as he constructed many plays based on realism and the social problems that were occurring at the time, during the 1800's. He wrote "A Doll's House", just after the Economic Boom making people more obsessed with the concept of earning money, later resulting in families showing less concern and attention toward their personal lives at home. The first scene of "A Doll's House" begins when Nora asks Torvald, "Can I borrow some money Torvald?", displaying how families were obsessed with the idea of earning lots of money and spending it on ravishing things. However, Torvald addresses Nora with the name of "little spendthrift" and "my little squirrel", displaying how Torvald does not see Nora as equal to him because she is a "little spendthrift" and depends on him for his money, and without him, she would not be able to survive. Immediately, one can identify that "Torvald's love isn't for the love of Nora, but the love of possessing her". (Long) He seems to enjoy the fact that Nora depends on him for her financial needs, because it makes him feel superior to her, showing his love of power, rather than his love of his wife.

Likewise, this idea of a husband seeing his wife as a possession, rather than someone to love and adore, can be displayed in Chaucer's "The Merchant's Prologue and Tale". Januarie, who is described as a knoble, yet old knight, longs to find a wife, as he worries that there will be no heir to leave his wealth and belongings to when he dies. Therefore, he finds a "lady of the toone", who is May. During the Medieval period, marriage acted as more of a financial contract, as it allowed a daughter's father to save more money to spend on his family, by having one less person to look after, therefore suggesting that there was no love in marriage, as it was looked upon as more of a business deal. Furthermore showing that "Januarie shops for his bride". (Tolleiver) However, Januarie later describes his wife, as "the fruit of his treaze",
signifying that she is his property and nobody else’s. His use of language, where he compares her to a fruit, displays that he simply sees her as his possession, rather than a human being to love and look after in his marriage.

Chaucer also displays how women seemed to deceive their husband’s because they were unhappy in their marriages, due to their lack of freedom to choose who they would marry, therefore resulting in them marrying someone whom they didn’t love. Januarie creates a garden that is used to for sexual purposes only, as "The Garden is a representation of May’s body" (Way), signifying May’s value to Januarie, and how she acts as something that is just present to satisfy Januarie’s everyday sexual needs. However, when May chooses to use the garden to defy Januarie by choosing to have sex with Dayman, his “servant traitor”, up the tree, one can argue that she chooses to does this because she was never given the freedom of choice to decide who she wanted to marry, therefore proving that she doesn’t love Januarie, because if this were true, she would not have been disloyal towards him. “With warm wax hath emprinted the chicklet”, symbolises how May has defied Januarie and taken the power away from him, and used it to her own advantage, in order to gain what she wants because Januarie has been in control of her, throughout her entire marriage towards him.

When evaluating the concept of love in relationships, in both "The Merchant’s Prologue and Tale", and "A Doll’s House", it is evident that due to both writers having lived in such patriarchal societies, where men controlled the lives of most women, alot of people did not marry for love, and neither did many women have a choice to do so, but instead, for financial stability, because this was what they needed, however it is very clear in both texts that “Marriage was far from a divine institution.” (Neeley)

Examiner commentary

This good, mostly developed answer provides some useful contexts to meet the dominant AO3, including the Norwegian economic boom and mediaeval marriage as a ‘business deal’. The argument is informed by this contextual awareness but a few more specific examples would help raise the mark. There are such relevant AO4 comparisons as Torvald and Januarie seeing their wives as possessions; again this could be developed a little further. There are some helpful references to different interpretations (AO5).
Exemplar 5: *The Duchess of Malfi* and *Paradise Lost* Books 9 and 10

**Level 5, 23 marks**

In both Webster's *Duchess of Malfi* and Milton's *Paradise Lost* the authors explore the erotic and emotional pleasures that love marriages can bring whilst also exploring the difficulties these love marriages can face often as a result of the decisions they make based on love.

In Webster's *Duchess of Malfi* the Duchess appears almost ignorant as she proclaims 'Let old wives report, I wink'd and chose a husband.' She seems careless and silly especially in light of her dangerous brothers having forbid her from marrying. Similarly Eve seems careless and silly when she suggests that she and Adam go off to different parts of the garden 'divide the labours between us' especially when she knows that there is an 'enemy' in the garden. Both women's awareness of possible dangers seem secondary to the love haze which they find themselves in and this ignorance is one of the key factors to the difficulties they later find themselves in. In particular the Duchess' marriage would have appeared foolhardy to Jacobean audiences as it parallels the case of Lady Arabella Stuart which was still fresh in public memory. Lady Arabella Stuart was a noble woman who married a nobleman by the name of Seymour without the permission and against the wishes of her cousin and King James. Ultimately she and Seymour were separated, the marriage annulled and Lady Arabella Stuart was locked away for the rest of her short life because she refused to eat. Lady Arabella Stuart like the Duchess was aware that her secret marriage would not be supported and thus was aware of the potential consequences. Similarly the Duchess was aware that when she made the decision to marry Antonio her brothers would be angry and she would face consequences if they found out, but she chose to do it anyway as the critic Roinder comments 'That society and literature pararrel one another is evident here'. Eve's character can also be seen to make a foolish decision in seperating from Adam even when she was aware of the potential consequences of running into the enemy. These misguided decisions can all be seen to be a direct result of the love haze that Eve and the Duchess find themselves in, they are experiencing the pleasurable
safety of love and being loved and thus seem to be rendered ignorant which ultimately leads The difficulties they face later on in their stories.

The love relationships between characters in both Milton's poem and Webster's play can be seen to bring about very distinct pleasures, often erotic in nature. In The Duchess of Malfi the Duchess is painted to be a very sexual woman and with the arrival of their three children it is alluded to that enjoy many sexual pleasures although perversely it is often her brother Ferdinand who describes her sexual character, calling her a 'lusty widow' and later claiming a 'saucy devil (the duchess) dares in the circle'. The Duchess herself also comes across as such, especially on the night of her marriage when she suggests a 'sword' lie between them in the bed, the fateful imagery not lost on the audience as they lie in their marriage bed. As they find pleasure in their marriage it is clear that she is doing everything which will get her in trouble. Similarly Adam and Eve are described as finding a 'shady bank' and also that 'they burned in lust', Adam is also described as being 'overcome with female charm'. This occurs after they have fallen, by eating from the 'precious tree', in particular it is noted that Adam as fallen because he cannot bear to be without Eve as they are 'one flesh' and Eve believes they can 'endure death' with each other but not live without. We can see how in both love marriages the actions which bring them most pleasure are the ones which will ultimately bring them the most difficulty.

The Duchess to a Jacobean society would not be looked upon favourably because as a noble woman she would be expected to put body politic (i.e. her political duties like marrying advantageously) over her body natural (i.e. her personal desires, lust and love) which she flounces by falling for, marrying and sleeping with a steward (a man who is beneath her socially) as critics such as Morrison suggest the love marriage and relationship portrayed in the Duchess of Malfi could be viewed as a
'critique if Jacobean society'. Similarly by eating of the tree which god had instructed them not to Adam and Eve have disobeyed god and therefore not adhered to the great chain of being (where God is at the top) and ultimately this would not have been looked at favourably by christian England. Milton's England was an Englan that had gone through tremendous turmoil, Milton and fellow supporters of the commonwealth had risen up against Chaires the 1st and for a short period england had become a republic, no longer under the control of a tiranical king who perceived himself to be above everyone else (almost as if he was aspiring to godhead) by disobeying God Adam and Eve have committed a similar crime, and in an england that had just returned to monarchy Milton like Webster might be seen to be doing as Morrison suggested and critiquing society and the new king who could potentially be just like the last.

Ultimately both Webster and Milton portray love relationships as ending in more than just difficulty, in both texts the difficulties faced as a result of their love unions ultimately end in death. In the Duchess of Malfi the angry brothers act as judges of the marriage and order Bosola to murder the Duchess and Antonio. Ferdinand asks Bosola under 'whose authority' he killed the Duchess and Bosola replies 'yours'. Ferdinand then says 'am I her judge.' In this scene we see that the persecution the Duchess receives from her brothers is a result of their corruptness and in particular Ferdinands 'pervarse and turbulent nature'. This exemplifies the Jacobean attitudes towards Catholicism (Italy is catholic) and the perception that their actions and their justice are corrupt. As Underdown comments it signifies the 'Protestant paranoia' england felt towards Catholic states. This corrupt justice is also similar to the corrupt courts in england, one particular case of this is the Overbury scandal. In the Overbury scandal Robert Carr was after an advantageous marriage, his sights were
set on Frances Howard but as she was already married Overbury objected, as one of the Kings favourites Carr had Overbury thrown in jail where Frances' people then had him poisoned. The case went unknown for two years before being discovered. In the trial many of Carr and Howard’s servants were hung whilst Carr and Frances faced only exile. This corrupt justice is reminiscent of the Duchess of Malfi where the real sinners (Carr and Howard like the Cardinal and Ferdinand) do not receive as harsh a punishment as those more innocent. As Bellany comments, ‘A net to catch small fish and let the big ones swim free’. On the other hand God sends his ‘Vicergent son’ down to be the ‘judge’ of Adam and Eve so they get a fair judge. As a result they receive punishment such as Eve having to ‘suffer pangs in childbirth’ these judgement is more fair becuase although they will eventually die they are given a chance of redemption, their love has difficulties but is redeemable.

Ultimately though as Erskine comments ‘Death is the inevitable result of Sin’. And in the the societies of Webster and Milton the indulgent decisions that come with love relationships are accompanied by acts that past societies would deem sinful. Finally we must conclude that although love brings pleasures it both texts suggest that it brings more than just difficulty but infact death.

Examiner commentary
In this good, fairly detailed response the candidate makes effective use of a number of contexts (AO3), among them Arabella Stuart, the body politic and the body natural, the Civil War and republic, and the Overbury scandal. There are good links between texts (AO4), including comparisons between Eve and the Duchess and an account – focusing well on the terms of the question (AO1) – of how in both Milton and Webster ‘the actions which bring [the protagonists] most pleasure are the ones which will ultimately bring them the most difficulty’. Expression (AO1) is sometimes rather lacking in fluency.
Exemplar 6: *A Doll's House* and Rossetti: *Selected Poems*

**Level 4, 17 marks**

Examiner commentary

There is some awareness of context (AO3) here – Rossetti’s ‘failed engagements’, Ibsen’s ‘naturalism’ – and some generally developed contrasts and comparisons (AO4) between the two authors’ approaches to love and creation of ‘strong female characters’. For a higher mark these would need to be extended and developed. The response covers Rossetti’s poems in rather more detail than *A Doll's House*. 

Love is crucial to many of Rossetti’s poems and is a major part of *A Doll’s House*, both Ibsen and Rossetti show the positives and negatives of love. For example the poem *Maude Clare* is about a scorned partner looking to ruin her former lovers wedding day. Within the poem the title character *Maude Clare* encapsulates many of the difficulties that come with love, Rossetti does this by having her return tokens of their love to her former partner and remind him of the times they had together, this paints Maude as scornful and cruel, reminding him of the time they looked for "lillies in the beak" and other metaphors for sexual activities. However Rossetti still makes an effort to have *Maude Clare* appear as the hero of the poem as she is described as "a queen" and Nell the new wife of her former lover is described as "a village maid", in the end though both Maude Clare and Nell appear to be strong characters, as Nell stands up to Maude Clare because of her love showing therefore within the poem Rossetti creates two strong female characters and shows the difficulties and pleasures of love. The decision to have Maude Clare scorn the couple on their wedding day may come from the fact that Rossetti herself had 3 failed engagements during her life, and therefore may have had some negative connotations around weddings. Ibsen similarly creates strong female characters through the difficulties of love, for example within *A Doll's House* the main character *Nora* evolves and becomes stronger as her relationship worsens, at the early stages of the play it is clear that her relationship with *Torvald* is flawed and that it is negative for her, he constantly talks down to her referring to her as "his little Skylark" the use of the possessive pronoun "his" shows that he has control of the relationship. By the end of the play *Nora’s strength* as a female character comes from her ability to reject *Torvald*.

Within *A Doll’s House* we don’t really see a true loving relationship which brings happiness and pleasure to both partners. This is most likely because Ibsen’s plays are within a genre called naturalism, and he made an effort to go against the common ideals of what a good play was at that time, as most plays were idealistic and had happy endings, Ibsen’s were instead far more realistic and thus represented love in a far more realistic way showing the negative side of love. Rossetti on the other hand has quite a few poems which feature unwavering love between the two characters, for example within her poem *The Round Tower at Jhansi*, the relationship shared between the two main characters is one of true love, this is further exemplified by the situation they are both placed in, being minutes away from their death. Rossetti juxtaposes the man kissing her forehead whilst holding a gun, to show that their love remains even though the situation is incredibly dangerous. Remember is another poem in which Rossetti explores unwavering love, this time looking at the difficulties which come with that. The poem is written like a note left by a loved one for their partner after they have died, it shows the difficulties of their love as the poem reads "better to forget me, than remember and be sad" showing that their love has become a burden on the partner who is alive as they can’t move on with their life.

It is clear that both Ibsen and Rossetti explore love in many ways, Ibsen presenting love as a burden within *A Doll’s House* compared to Rossetti who shows both the pleasures and the difficulties of love.
Question 8

8 ‘We live in a world of constant change.’

In the light of this view, consider ways in which writers explore change. In your answer, compare one drama text and one poetry text from the above lists.

Exemplar 1: A Doll’s House and Rossetti: Selected Poems

Level 4, 20 marks

We live in a world of constant change. Change is an ongoing thing that occurs in everyday life. Change happens to all individuals including Rossetti and Ibsen. Rossetti, as a woman of the 1800s, went through personal, emotional and even relationship changes. Growing up Rossetti watched family members die from diseases and health issues, these things were very normal as medications were not available for all health conditions. However Rossetti had to wonder that change happened and people went through emotional change. Rossetti herself had relationship changes. She was engaged as a teenager but due to her religious beliefs she called off the wedding and decided she was going to ‘marry God’. Rossetti is described as a woman who was of God and desire.

Ibsen as well went through changes just like everyone else. There is a young man, who had a tough time as he watched his family change from rich to poor to the extent that they had to survive on potatoes. There was a huge change for Thoreau and his family.

In Ibsen’s ‘A Doll’s House’, the idea of change is explored in so many ways, one of which is the character Nora. Nora begins her story as the character, Nora. Nora, from the beginning...
Of the play, goes through personality change.

Critical interpretations say Nora is 'a woman who knows what she wants, but sticks with what she doesn't want'. This idea suggests that Nora is aware that the life she lives is that of a 'doll' who is locked up in a 'doll house', however, she believes that a woman has duties to remain loyal to her husband and children.

When Nora eats 'macaroons', she slightly begins to change as she didn't used to take them because Thirved wouldn't let her. Nora's change is more like growth 'like a butterfly breaking free'. Nora's personality arguably doesn't change rather she is able to open up now that she believes her relationship is over anyways. She wants 'more for herself' as has 'duties to herself'. Nora changes from being a 'doll' to being a freedom free from 'bondage.'

Nora's change in personality can easily be compared to Russetti's poem 'Maudlin Nora' 'Goblin Market'. Laura and Lizzie are two sisters who are being tempted by 'goblin men'. They both start of not being tempted, 'we can not give into their temptation'. Russetti uses this poem to recreate the 'falling of Eve' as she eats the forbidden fruit. Just like Laura when you're innocent and knew that the fruit was forbidden to be touch, she changes from being
Innocent to ‘wanting more’: Biblically, Eve only began to open her eyes after she had ‘the fruit’. Similar to Laura, soon after taking the fruit, she feels both for more and claims it to be ‘better’, and she desires more. Nora and Laura have one thing in common which is ‘wanting more’, they both change from being innocent and unaware to ‘wanting more’ from life and society.

Both writers also explore change in relationships. Ibsen explores change in relationships between Nora and Torvald, Nora and Dr Rank, and Mrs Linde and Kristian. Nora and Torvald having the most significant relationship go through changes. 19th century audiences would be determined upon the fact that Nora left Torvald to better herself; however, a 21st century audience would have an entirely different reaction. This shows the change in times and in people over the centuries.

Nora and Torvald start off as a happy couple with no problems. However, Torvald as a typical 19th century man believed that there were no problems but Nora being more open-minded, according to critical interpretation Nora’s desire to ‘start a new act’. This shows that the relationship was bound to change and end. Torvald and Nora both have different ideas of a perfect life. To Torvald a perfect life
Consist a wife, husband (who works) and children but Nora's idea of a perfect life is an educated woman who can do more for herself. In the 1860s 19th century, women were paid less because they worked less than men and if they were paid the same as men they would be overpaying them. This suggests that Torvald tells Nora that her duties are to be "a wife and a mother" but Nora claims she has "duties to myself". At this point Nora helps us understand that both parties have different views and the relationship requires some changes. Torvald and Nora's relationship, arguably has been ruined from the beginning as she goes against his wishes by eating macaroni.

"Torvald and Nora's relationship could be compared to Rossetti's poem "No, thank you, Jim." Rossetti uses this poem to describe a scenario whereby a woman rejects a man because of her beliefs. This can easily be related to Rossetti's personal life and the called of her engagement because the man couldn't be affectionate and fellow her beliefs. The title of the poem itself suggests rejection and a change of mind. For a woman of the 1860s England, it was frowned upon by many people, for a woman to not be married. This is because they believed that a woman should only rely on a man."
However, the persona in 'No, thank you, Mr.', shows no interest in this man and doesn't want anything to do with him. Nora rejects Torvald at the end even after he found out his reputation wasn't at stake anymore. This is all men knew and thought about in the 1800s as it meant a lot for them and their families.

Rosen believed in equality however he would not be a 'feminist' rather he was a 'humanist' which suggests he believed in human equality which included women. Rosen therefore believed in change that was why his play 'A Doll's House' portrays issues of today which deserve change. Rossetti also believed in the equality of humans especially women.

Mrs. Linde's relationship with Brøigard ended because he had no money and she had to marry a rich man to lends for her family. This was because she wasn't able to work. But after her rich husband's death she changed her mind and like Nora and she decided that she could earn money with Brøigard.

Mrs. Linde is used by Rossetti to portray a 1800s woman who is fully fully tolerance in the methods of living but later changes and also becomes more.
Rossetti and Ibsen are also able to explore change in societal views of life. In the 1800s, society was programmed to believe certain things that seem absurd now-a-days. From the 1800s, till now, the difference is clear and both writers have predicted how society will change.

 Critics, according to critics, Ibsen was able to ‘open the minds of closed minds’, by creating a play which would be set flaimed upon. Most of Rossetti’s poems portray the idea of change in the way people see life and their views towards certain issues.

In Ibsen’s ‘A Doll’s House’, the societal issues and the ideas on women in the 1800s as well as marriage. In 1800s England, women were seen as properties they were owned either by their fathers or their husbands. This explains the like of the play as women were made to be like dolls, they were told how to do, say, even wear. Nora is an example of a woman who was treated nice property as well as like a doll. Torvald describes Nora as a ‘thing’ and ‘a Squirrel’, these childish pet names suggests that Torvald may love Nora’s look more as decorated according to Torvald’s tastes, this suggests that Torvald means everything in context her.
However, as time has gone by, life has changed and women have become more independent and able to work to earn equal money as men. Nora realises that she is nothing but “Torvald’s Toy”. According to critics, Nora is described as a “pet doll” which suggests that she does what she is told but still has to look pretty. It is the character of “a pretty little fool”, that indicates a woman in those days couldn’t be smart, and if they were it was seen as a crime or for as she was expected to be quiet and look pretty.

Nora’s decision to leave Torvald shows that women should be equal to men and should be allowed to do what they want instead of a man telling them what to do.

The idea of societal change is seen in Ibsen’s poem ‘Maudie Clare’. ‘Maudie Clare’ is described as a ‘Queen’ whereas the bride is a maid. This suggests the societal issues of the 19th Century as well as the 21st Century. A woman like ‘Maudie Clare’ who had to before marry all in the name of love, could be forced upon but now-a-days change has occurred and it is not so much of an
Examiner commentary

The essay opens with consideration of the authors’ personal contexts (AO3) for the theme of change and later there are a number of other relevant contextual references, especially to the changing position of women. Competent comparisons between texts are made (AO4), for instance between Nora and Laura as ‘wanting more’ and between the relationships in *A Doll’s House* and ‘No Thank You, John’. Argument (AO1) is mostly straightforward. Overall this is a highly competent, fairly substantial piece of work.
Question 9

9  ‘Foolish acts and their consequences are an important part of literature.’

In the light of this view, consider ways in which writers explore human folly and its effects. In your answer, compare one drama text and one poetry text from the above lists.

Exemplar 1: An Ideal Husband and Coleridge: Selected Poems

Level 6, 29 marks

| 9 | Both Coleridge and Wilde write about foolish mistakes and their consequences. In fact, more often than not they write more about the consequences of mistakes than the actual deed itself. Possibly since both authors were plagued by guilt for their mistakes in life, it is the other which is far more important for them. But even so, their foolishness often takes different forms. While for Coleridge, foolishness can often be synonymous to innocence, for Wilde, foolishness often comes from arrogance.

The best example of a foolish act in Coleridge’s poetry is the killing of the Albatross in “The Rime of the Ancient Mariner”. As critics pointed out about Keats’s Coleridge’s other poem “The Lime Tree Bower My Prison”, he had a great “rapport with nature”. Therefore such an act as the bird’s murder is of great significance to the poet. Yet, in the entire seven-part ballad Coleridge only gives one line to describe the act (‘Island the Albatross’). This is similar to the way Wilde approaches Robert Chiltern’s crime in “An Ideal Husband”. Eighteen years ago, Chiltern had sold state secrets for profit and with the money he earned, became the man he is now, a respected philanthropist and a politician. Richard Ellmann argues that this crime is a metaphor for Oscar Wilde’s similars which he also achieved eighteen years prior to the |
creation of the play. However, Robert Chiltern argues that he has no regrets for his actions, as they made him the man he is now.

Similarly, Oscar Wilde stated that "a man who makes war is a hypocrite," demonstrating that he sees Chiltern's actions as foolish, rather than immoral or criminal. Here we have a great contrast between the two authors. Coleridge, who sees a small act and arguably insignificant act of killing a bird as immoral and worthy of greatest punishment, and Wilde, who sees a treasonous crime as insignificant and foolish at most.

An important factor of how moral an action is, part is the morality of the time. The authors lived in. Coleridge's foolishness can be seen in his willingness to share his imagination, which was pantheistic and somewhat heretical, with his "weak" fiancée Sarah Fricke in the "Adonis Hoop." Ironically, Oswald Doughty considers this as Chiltern's "one of Coleridge's happiest poems," yet here we can see how such innocent and imaginative vision can be seen as "vain Philosophy" by Sarah. It seems the consequence of such foolishness, which is stopped by "Red" and a new stanza, is to be misunderstood by your future wife (Coleridge was persuaded to marry Sarah by his friend Robert Southey, who was married to her sister Edith), and to have to conform.
In the strict puritanism, which is plain, and the crucial consequence of Chiltern’s action is the conflict between him and his wife, Lady Chiltern, whom Richard Ellmann describes as a “stupidly good wife”, Lady Chiltern, similar to Lady Windermere. From “Lady Windermere’s Fan” is also a puritan, with a strict moral code. While Wilde’s society and his plays have social morality, where if a crime has not been discovered it is fine, Chiltern and Lord Goring must fight with Lady Chiltern so that she can accept her husband even if he is no longer the “ideal” she saw. While Wilde argues that the play is for “ridiculous puppets to play”, he also states that there is a lot of “real” Oscar in the play. He has shared understanding from his wife, Constance Lloyd after his affair with Sir Arthur Douglas, in Oasis, was discovered. Foolish acts often lead to conflict and misunderstanding from the families, something for that both Celridge and Wilde felt guilty for.

Finally, the difference in the genre affects the way foolishness is dealt with in the piece of literature. For Wilde’s “An Ideal Husband” is a comedy, created for an audience to enjoy and acted according to Peter Polonoff for “commercial reasons. It had to be funny and goldhearted,
yet while being successful, the crime and deception in this play are more severe than those in "Lady Windermeres Fan" or "An Importance of Being Earnest" and are more similar to the crimes of Dorian Gray or Arthur Sheriiff or the Canterbury Ghost. Yet they are dealt with in the same lighthearted manner as usual. There are many epigrams and paro auspices, although they are unusually serious. For a comedy, "Lord Goring's" and Robert Chiltern's friendships became drink. On the other hand, poetry allows a poet to be more honest and expressive. Although "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" started out as a poem "profitless which would never Wordsworth's and Coleridge's November Tour, it became an epic poem. And although a central theme of it is the consequences of a foolish act, according to Richard Holmes breaking the rules of "hospitality", Coleridge was not as concerned about the plot as he was about the imagery and the poem. Instead, the majority of the plot was suggested by Wordsworth, but even he thought it would be "presumptious" to finish it. Coleridge's writing is full of fragments, such as "Christabel" or "Knight's Tomb" or " KublaKhan" and he is far more concerned with the atmosphere than the plot or the morality. After all, even the "Recluse Hymn" was praised for its aesthetic and imagery, not its philosophy.
To conclude, foolish acts and their consequences are, in fact, an important part of literature. Yet the two authors tackle these very differently. Coleridge describes the consequences of small and hardly immoral, although often foolish acts, with extensive imagery and emphasis on the environment, such as the sea in "The Ancient Mariner," and Wilde concentrates on the social consequences of a foolish act, often immoral, as in "An Ideal Husband" but deemed rather insignificant, such as misunderstanding of the families.

(End of line)

1. Similarly, misunderstanding from a father occurs in "Christabel" whose actions of welcoming Geraldine, a stranger, into her room were foolish but arguably innocent.

2. When Goring talks about Lady Chiltern, assuming she is in the next room, but instead there is Mrs. Cheveson.

3. Similar to other Romantic poets, such as John Keats, who "La Belle Dame Sans Merci" is also fragmented and is more concerned about the emotions and atmosphere than the particular off the night.

Examiner commentary

This response scores highly for its attention to the dominant AO3: Wilde's syphilis, his views on his play, its genre, his other work: Coleridge's pantheism and marriage, the context of 'The Ancient Mariner,' Keats. There are such useful links between texts (AO4) as the comparison between marriage in 'The Folian Harp' and An Ideal Husband, or the contrast between 'Coleridge, who sees a small ... act of killing a bird as immoral and worthy of greatest punishment, and Wilde, who sees a treasonous crime as insignificant and foolish at most'. Ideally, for an even higher mark, these qualities might be supplemented by rather more textual examples.
Humans and there "foolish acts" is of central importance to the text. A synonym for "foolish acts" is human folly. This is applicable to these texts and can be defined as "the failings, either practically or morally, of people in attempting to gain something". In failing this allows for the consequences which, in part, are predominant drivers of the narrative of many pieces of literature so can be seen as significant generally in that sense. In The Merchant’s Tale (shortened to TMT) and She Stoops to Conquer (shortened to SSTC) both highly emphasise the failings of their characters and also use their consequences to drive the narrative but in both to a happy conclusion.

In SSTC this idea is of primary importance, so much so that the play at one point was to be called "The Mistakes of the Night", mistakes being another way of saying "foolish acts", this title was scrapped but still can be seen placed in primary position in Mr Hardcastle’s final lines as he says all should "forgive the mistakes of the night". This context then shows this text’s emphasis on "mistakes" and more specifically, follies. TMT also has this in central position as it has a series of characters all of which can arguably be characterised by the repeated moral, and occasionally literal, failings. Some critics interpret this as Chaucer’s means of "creating a world entirely devoid of morality". This showing that mistakes and failings on a moral degree is of central importance in both these texts.

Both these texts belong to the genre of Comedy, Aristotle for example interprets comedy as focusing heavily upon the "inferior peoples" that is not to say bad people just those who are not "high" meaning of nobility, thus have not so "far to fall". For example in Hamlet the fate and ownership of the kingdom of Denmark is at stake, but in SSTC merely Marlow’s honour and Mr Hardcastle and Sir Charles’s "happiness" is. This is likely a conscious choice as Goldsmith can be seen as taking an Aristetan-like view even can be quoted as saying his play, but comedy more generally, involves "low people". Secondly in TMT there are only stakes right at the end as May commits to her "Pare tree" sex despite January saying that he will sign over all of the "scrists and bonds" to her the next day, here the stakes are higher. Yet in saying this the gods "Pluto" and "Prosipenia" are seen overlooking
the "garden" and specifically the events within the divine presence removes some tension. Moreover, when the Fabliaux tradition of the Cuckold and cheat is getting away by some lucky escape is taken into account truly the tale ending with the execution of Daymen and the exile of May seems increasing unlikely. Some may also argue that it is not a happy ending as Januarie has still been cheated on but it is the predominant view (that he has his vision back, in his eyes a faithful wife and possibly a child on the way so it seems likely that he is still likely happy. This being said it then can be argued that the texts allowing for the "foolish acts" to occur and not then have their consequences ruin the comedy of the piece is a most important part of literature and specially the Comedic genre as it prevents the piece from falling into the realms of tragedy.

Furthermore, in both these texts, the failings/ follies are resolved though arguably implausible occurrences. Examples in TMT come in the form of Januarie's "blindness" being dispelled as Pluto gifts him "sight" followed Proserpina's gift to May that "[no woman should want for an excuse]". This is also present in SSTC despite Goldsmith deliberately trying to limit implausibly the idea one may mistake a "house for an inn" or that someone should be so overcome with "modesty"/shyness they entirely forget a persons face and voice rather implausible at the core of the ideas. Goldsmith was criticised by critics of his time for this reason, however, these are present as implausibility is inherent to comedy. It is inherent and "important" as it will allow for those who do make "foolish acts" to avoid their potential punishments. This then allowing for both these texts to have less tension if/when the characters inevitably fail. Comedies are renowned as usually ending with a marriage a conclusion that could not be reached if there was none of this implausibility. Implausibly then further can be seen as an integral aspect as with out it again comedy could not occur, specifically in comedic literature "foolish acts" and their consequences being avoided is of most primary importance.

In saying this some may critics may argue that there are other, more important facets to literature and that in fact "foolish[ness]" may not be that important. Some may argue that the political messages and effectiveness of the work at achieving its desired emotional reactions is the most important aspect of a piece of literature, furthermore one could even
assert that it is so important that it makes "foolish acts and their consequences" an almost irrelevant minute part of literature. This could be seen in these pieces. In SSTC for instance its creation was primarily to do with, as W.D. Taylor put it, to create a "Humorous protest against the moral and sentimental comedy". The Prologue and Epilogue of the piece highlights this as it asks that the audience "give" Goldsmith, taking on the role of "doctor", "his degree or proclaim him quack" and save the laughing comedy. This was his plea to bring theatre back more to Restoration-like times and away from the Sentimental Comedy, something which was characterised by its lack of, as Goldsmith himself put it, "full laughs". In TMT it is less apparent the message but many critics see Chaucer as woman's friend and the piece as criticising the church and generally male abuse of poor women/women generally. These pieces are also very funny and the comedy of farcical moments such as May "climbing" on Januarys back to get up the tree to have sex and Tony and Mrs Hardcastle "battling" are in part why these texts have lasted so long. It can then be seen that these Aspects of interpretation such as these as well as less obvious messages and their prolonged funniness are in large part the reason that these texts are still studied today thus can be argued as a hugely important part of literature.

This and other unmentioned elements, in evaluation, whilst significant actually do not seem to be as large of a facet as to completely invalidate or even really lessen the significant and important that "foolish acts and their consequences" play in "literature". Moreover that this seems of special importance here in these texts as "acts and their consequences", and specifically the avoidance of them, is a huge part these texts and then it seems due to this that motion is correct and they are highly important.

Examiner commentary

This fairly good response addresses AO3 (context) with points about the genre of comedy, Goldsmith's rebellion against Sentimental Comedy, and fabliau. (The following assertion, however, seems self-contradictory: 'when the Fabliaux [sic] tradition of the Cuckold and cheater getting away by some lucky escape is taken into account truly the tale ending with the execution of Daymen [sic] and the exile of May seems increasing [sic] likely') There are some valid comparisons between the two texts (AO4). The essay starts from a useful further definition of 'foolish actions' but argument (AO1) is often rather unclear, as in the comment about fabliau already quoted. In the penultimate paragraph, argument moves away from a direct response to the question. Here and earlier, insecure expression hampers communication: 'This and other unmentioned aspects, in evaluation, whilst significant actually do not seem to be as large of a facet as to completely invalidate … the significant and important that …'
Question 10

10 ‘Literature is very good at exploring intense emotion.’

In the light of this view, consider ways in which writers explore intense feelings and emotions. In your answer, compare one drama text and one poetry text from the above lists.

Exemplar 1: The Duchess of Malfi and Rossetti: Selected Poems

Level 6, 30 marks

Intense emotion is what drives the characters within the poems of Christina Rossetti and John Webster’s ‘The Duchess of Malfi’. T.S Eliot described that Webster ‘saw the skull beneath the skin’, and this is what proved to be his inspiration underlying the tragedy. The Poetry Foundation labelled Rossetti as a woman who chose ‘death over love’ due to her strong Anglo-Catholicism and love for God. Intense emotion is what drives the narrative of literature also, as it is what leads the Duchess to her heroic death and it is also what encourages female characters within Rossetti’s poems to finding their own inner strength. None of this would be possible if it weren’t for the intense emotion that is everpresent within both texts.

Both Rossetti and Webster use intense emotion to show women standing up for their own beliefs, which gives females a sense of power and control that was not present within Rossetti’s society of the Victorian era or the Elizabethan era of the Duchess where strict gender roles were enforced. The Duchess of Malfi gains her power through developing her body politic and her body natural throughout the play. Alluding to the monarch of Elizabeth the first, she retains her own opinions despite being abused by her brothers, and through this, she dies heroically by stating that ‘I can do both like a prince’ in regard to dying and living. In this way, she combines the true persona of her body natural and the status of her body politic to retain that she is in control of her own choices. If it wasn’t for her intense emotions and standing by them, the Duchess would have allowed herself to be manipulated by the men in her life and may have died with less status and less recognition. Billington argues that ‘the radiant spirit of the Duchess cannot be killed’, and this is true for her, even in death.

Women in Webster and Rossetti’s work cohesively take on male roles which display their over-bearing power. For instance, Maude Clare loses her social status after expressing her true opinion on the marriage between her ex-lover and Nell and bellows that ‘I wash my hands thereof’. In Victorian society, marriage was seen to form a stable society in the light of the monarchs Victoria and Albert, who reinforced that marriage was key to the life of a woman otherwise they were perceived as ‘fallen’. Rossetti volunteered at Mary
Magdelene’s state penitentary for fallen women where she worked closely with women who would have been outed by society, similar to the character of Maude Clare. Maude Clare and the Duchess retain their own power through standing up for their opinions which differ to the expected society. Although contemporary readers may have disliked and disagreed with the choices of these powerful women, it is now far more likely that in the 21st century that their actions can be celebrated and praised. This is supported by Bliss who argues that ‘prosperity has done best for Christina Rossetti’, as her work can now be appreciated from the perspective of independent women.

Intense emotion towards death is what keeps the characters sane throughout their horrific ordeals. In Antonio’s death scene, he cries that ‘there is nothing between heaven and Earth’ that will give him reason to stay alive, after finding out that the Duchess has died. In the Greenwich production of 2010, the Duchess and Antonio meet in heaven, revealing the happy ending that they arguably deserved. It is the thought of a better life in death that keeps the Duchess strong; Antonio’s description of the Duchess as ‘three medals in one figure’ alludes to the Holy Trinity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Her description implies that she is already at one with death through the depiction of the Holy Trinity, and this is what ensures that she dies with power, as even in death, she is ‘the Duchess of Malfi still’. This is also shown in the RSC 2018 production, where the Duchess’ spirit remains on stage the whole time after her death. Just before the Cardinal dies at her feet, she touches his head which leads him to his last breath, showing that her motivation to death led to the best outcome where she maintained her body politic and her body natural.

Rossetti’s life was ridden with hardships and death. Her father suffered a mental breakdown when she was a teenager and her strong religious beliefs contributed to her never being able to get married due to conflicting religious beliefs which lead to the rejection of three engagements. As a child, Rossetti stopped playing chess due to the fact she felt that winning gave her too much pleasure, therefore she limited herself from earthly pleasures such as love and joy and believed that these things would all come in death. This is also influenced by her religion, as Catholics believe in the eschatological destination of the soul returning to God in death, and this is arguably where Rossetti believed she would end. In ‘Up-Hill’, the narrator asks, ‘will I find comfort? will I find shelter?’ revealing that she lacks these things within her life. The boundary of life and death is also reinforced within the poem ‘Shut out’ where the gates are ‘black iron bars’ patrolled by ‘a shadowless spirit’. Behind the bars are colourful ‘flowers blooming’ and the juxtaposition reveals that existence is more pleasurable in death to Rossetti.

Imagery of birds are used within both texts to reveal freedom, and the Duchess and Rossetti both hope for freedom from life into death. Rossetti’s description of a ‘singing bird’ in ‘A Birthday’ alludes to the Duchess’ comment on the fact that it is too late to have ‘clipped the bird’s wings that has already flown’. This may refer to the Duchess’ acceptance of death, describing how she has already flown towards heaven where she will be happier. This is reflected within the RSC 2018 production, where the Duchess harmonises in a haunting lament with the madmen. In this way, she has succumbed to her destiny and she takes it
within her control, and thus dies a heroic death. Woolf argues that 'Rossetti never grew or developed' within her poetry, but in death, she has received more appreciation for her poetry depicting the sadness and misery of everyday life which ironically shows that she has grown greatly as time passes. In death, the Duchess and Rossetti are more powerful and this is emphasised through their intense emotion towards death as their motivation.

Madness is also shown through the intense emotion depicted through the language of Ferdinand and the Goblins within Rossetti's most famous poem, 'Goblin Market'. It is arguably Ferdinand's vivid and incestual imagination that drives him to paranoia, taking the form of a madman scared of his own shadow. The intense emotion arguably brings out the 'shadow' which could be interpreted as his conscience which he chooses never to step into as it is unrecognisable to him. Within Dromgoole's 2014 production, Ferdinand cruelly dries humps the bed to re-enact the Duchess with 'some strong-thighed bargeman', which further angers Ferdinand into his final frenzy, as his intense emotion leads to his downfall. The irony lies in Rosola's line that he begins to see reason when he is 'so near the bottom', but by that point he is too late to be saved. Rossetti's fear of temptation is shown through the embodiment of the Goblins who melodically chant, 'come buy, come buy with a golden curl'. This alludes to Alexander Pope's 'Rape of the Lock' where temptation leads to downfall, and it is arguably the fear of such temptation that lead Rossetti to living such a confined life away from happiness and love. In this way, intense emotion is also shown to lead to downfall as well as liberation.

Overall, both texts explore intense emotion to drive the narratives and development of characters. Ferdinand's vivid and uncontrollable emotion is what drives him to his downfall, but it is Rossetti's love for death which guarantees her a comforting and sheltered end and it is the Duchess' self-control and vivid power that ensures she dies a heroic death, despite all of the hardships they endured within their short lives. The different effects of intense emotion are explored in both texts, as it brings out the best and the worst outcomes.

Examiner commentary

This excellent comparative response focuses clearly on the process by which 'intense emotion ... leads the Duchess to her heroic death and ... encourages female characters within Rossetti's poems to [find] their own inner strength'. The work of both authors is kept in play (AO4) and there is much useful contextual material (AO3): 'strict gender roles', Elizabeth I, several productions of The Duchess of Malfi, Victorian marriage, Rossetti's religion and her work with 'fallen' women, The Rape of the Lock. Such references are well used in support of a mostly very clear argument (AO1).
Question 12

12 ‘Literature proves that human beings are intent on deceiving one another.’

In the light of this view, consider ways in which writers explore deceit and delusion. In your answer, compare one drama text and one poetry text from the above lists.

[30]

Exemplar 1: She Stoops to Conquer and The Merchant’s Prologue and Tale

Level 6, 28 marks

| 12 | Central to the plots of both Chaucer’s “The Monk’s Tale” and
|    | Goldsmith’s “The
century, “The Merchant’s Prologue and Tale” and Goldsmith’s “The
|    | 18th century comedy, are Mariana’s, “She Stoops to Conquer,”
|    | in the arch of deceit and delusion that character. Perhaps most
|    | relevant is the duplicitous, foolish flight, possibly by his young
|    | bride, Mary, in Chaucer’s work, as well as the equally duplicitous
|    | deceit of Morton by his love interest, Kate Hardcastle. It is given
|    | that both characters, the contexts, society in particular and possibly
|    | reputation and gender, it is perfectly likely that the women are
|    | the duplicitous characters; deceitfully charming and if the men who are
|    | expected for their delusional personas.
|    | Both Mary and Miss Hardcastle are highly determined
|    | in their deceit, though for very different reasons. This is because
|    | whilst both are deceived in their search for love, Kate’s deceit is
|    | driven by her desire to be true to the true personality of her Morton
|    | so that she can decide whether to mingle the genuine him. Mary’s
decent is more from her hurt pride,
|    | lest as she longs to consummate her love with January, it is
draggy. The problem for Kate is that Morton is a friend in
|    | point of women of reputation and thus when he meets Kate for
|    | the first time, he cannot look her in the eye or rate substained
|    | conversation. Thus, because Kate is determined that is she’ll know him
the 'maids' to fits badly because it is unkind to
it poor. In the presence of her plans, Mary is led to believe
a far more open, warmer character. Mary is approached for a drink
until married to the 'gorgeous' Gordon. Mary are to the hand in
despite being oppressed by the bad. To say is,
Mr. Gordon, the young and to present his apply and
'brandy' host, as claimed by T. Katy Cee Mary
and the 'tender' host' host and then to about clearly Tuấn and so
that she can have her way with the young woman. In both
the early or myself
the power is oppressed because of the power of power and were devoted
society, for example, the legal authority or content or related to
English common law said that having to was effectively being
left open. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that there opposed
society was conducive to classified actions with more not as may and
Kteo so intent or decent to escape the power and

However, both Chaucer and Goldsmith also suggest
are to suggest that Mary and Peter that's not human.

However, despite in both scenarios that is not only of a
brother but also of one self. Tuấn is self-deception and clothing
is necessary - Chaucer - emblematic of the medieval 'tenor',
the old man whom used his power in society to rob as his pleasures with
young woman. He is mocked by Sharrow for his futile attempt to
regain his lost youth, constant epileptic and 'excuse his
reign' and adding idly. It is thinking that he is still young and
healthy, wise or poem, but (7, 11) introduced the figure
of King Arthur - a symbol of nobility. Thus, Chaucer's
reversal of his 'wicked' and presenting of him as a 'wickedly
preventing of him as a repentant 'southern' whose 'southern' idyl
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Examiner commentary

The answer is lively and well developed. Apt AO3 material includes English common law, the Senex, ‘the pressures of male dominated society’ in both periods, and the rise of the middle class in the eighteenth century. The relevance of Wace’s Brut needs indicating more precisely, however, and for a higher mark rather more contextual discussion would be necessary; on Goldsmith in particular it remains rather sparse. The candidate provides useful links between the texts (AO4): May and Kate as deceivers, Januarie and Marlow as self-deceivers, a contrast between the openness of Constance Neville and Hastings and the ‘less virtuous’ conduct of May and Damyan. There is consistently detailed reference to the texts, structure (AO1) is very clear and there are some useful critical views (AO5) from Pearsall and others.
Exemplar 2: *The Duchess of Malfi* and *Paradise Lost* Books 9 and 10

**Level 6, 26 marks**

John Milton's epic poem 'Paradise Lost' (1667) and John Webster's play 'The Duchess of Malfi' (1612) is permeated with deceit and delusion. Within Milton's attempt to 'justify the ways of God to man', the portrayal of Satanic rule, attempting overturning God's authority, demonstrates the theocacy is saturates with deceit and delusion. Book 9 and 10 sought Satan's Machiavellian tendencies, deceiving Adam and Eve, precipitate the fall, evoking 'lust' and 'sin' to enter the world. In comparison, Webster's Bosola projects delusion in order to obtain power, utilising his malcontent tendencies to bolster the corrupt Ferdinand and Cardinal. The brothers also are deceitul and conniving in their condemnation of the stoic Duchess. However, not all characters are subject to deceit and delusion - it is the convulsions of the human character that rebuke the suggestion literature demonstrates all 'human beings are intent on deceiving one another'.

As Satan 'involved in a rising mist' and Bosola disguised himself in order to spy on the Duchess, Milton and Webster bolster the suggestion of deceit permeating the text. Satan's serpentine disguise in order to trick Eve, demonstrates his Machiavellian tendencies. As he enters into the serpent, manipulating his shape in order to trick the 'innocent' Eve, he projects delusion and deceit. It is his conniving and manipulative ways that precipitate the fall, as he blindly leads Eve into 'lust' and 'incarnal' burning flames. He is bent on 'mediated fraud and malice' and 'destruction', bolstering his reliance on delusion. Through entering the serpent and offering Eve the fruit her falls her into a sense of hope and security, that precipitates 'death and sin' into the world. His delusion is a product of wanting power, a want to overthrow Godly authority - a shocking contrast against the Orthodox society Milton was writing within. Satan's attempt to overthrow Godly authority, through the use of delusion, is Milton's Puritanical disgust for Catholicism. During the 1600s, the Puritan and Catholic debate intensified with Catholic-leaning Kings, especially during Charles I period of Personal rule (1629-1640). Satan's inversion of the Godly trinity, is Milton's critique of the 'deceitful' nature of Catholicism. Satan encapsulates the deceitful nature of 'hell' and supposedly Catholicism, and whilst he is not a 'human being' his actions support the suggestion that deceit is the driving force behind
characters' behaviours. Just alike to Satan's deceitful nature, Bosola is reliant on disguise and delusion in order to achieve what he desires. Whilst Satan tricks Eve with the 'forbidden fruit', Bosola utilises 'apricots' in order to establish if the Duchess is pregnant. His manipulative behaviours, hiding and spying on the innocent and stoical Duchess, demonstrates the delusion he upholds. For Bosola, he yearns social power. Whilst the brothers, the Cardinal and Ferdinand, uphold a higher standing, Bosola is a social climber. He is deceitful and aligns himself to the brothers, in order to achieve social power - something his, from a Marxist perspective, 'proleteriat' position bars him from. He becomes Machiavellian and deceitful, deceiving the Duchess into submission, in order to obtain a bourgeois standing - bolstering the suggestion humans are inherently deceitful.

Both Satan and Bosola are attempting to climb a hierarchy - Satan a religious reformation, and Bosola towards the a borglouse top. Their deceitful tactics are correlated to James I's favourites, who utilised sexuality and submission in order to achieve financial and political reward. Just as Bosola aligns himself to the delusion of the Cardinal and Ferdinand and Satan moulded himself into a serpentine trick, Earl of Buckingham manipulated himself in order to benefit from the corrupt court of James I (1603-1625). Buckingham's financial desires precipitated a potential homoerotic affair with the King, utilising deceit in order to push away from the 'proleteriat standing'. With this, Buckingham, Bosola, and Satan all utilised deception in order to achieve their own personal greatness.

Whilst Bosola deceptively moulds himself in order to climb the social hierarchy, Ferdinand deceives those around him in order to sustain his position. His deteriorating sanity results in his lycanthropic state, his imagined wolf claws clawing away at the Duchess' stoicism. Through projecting the focus on the 'lusty' Duchess, Ferdinand placates others' concern for his deteriorating sanity. However, his incestuous desires emerge within his suppression and alignment to a 'sane' Italian courtier, demonstrating his failing duality. Within the Samwamker Playhouse production 2014 production of 'The Duchess of Malfi', starring Gemma Arterton, sought Ferdinand grabbing and kissing the Duchess
when she confessed she was married. This visceral sexual aggression is a glimpse at Ferdinand's falttering deception - he attempts to hide his inner sabetsours, but his 'id driven' desires overrule his deceit. In comparison, Satan's deception never faulters. His serpentine manipulation permeates book 9 and 10, he sustains his position as 'of guile and hate', and never faulters in hiding and deceiving those around him.

It could be argued that both the Duchess and Eve project deception and delusion. The Duchess' marriage to 'base law' Antonio, demonstrates her deception against her brothers. Whilst the Cardinal and Ferdinand dictates the Duchess remains a 'young widow', the Duchess lies to them, and marries behind their back. She marries beneath her, without the authority of her brothers, and the blessing of church, deluding people into believing she is still a 'widow'. Along with this, many critics argue Eve was deceptive in her beguiling of Adam with the 'forbidden fruit'. As she asked to 'divide' the 'labours', she desired independence - and therefore wanted to deceive her husband and act on her own accord. With this, the Duchess and Eve project their deceptive qualities, through beguiling the men into submission to their 'wayward ways'.

Whilst many suggest the Duchess and Eve are inherently deceitful, their virtue and gendered constraints prohibits such. Eve's 'face value' acceptance her actions that preemted the fall, utilising no excuses to God for biting the 'fatal fruit', polarises deception. She tells Adam and the son of her fall, juxtaposing the suggested deception that permeates literature. However, the views of Milton prohibit such feminist perspective - as his 'Turkish contempt for women' dictated women as below even deceit. From Milton's perspective, women are not even capable of 'deceiving' another. As the poet believed 'one tongue was enough for a woman', abiding to stereotypical, oppressive tropes of women during the 1600, his oppressive portrayal of Eve demonstrates his patriarchal beliefs. C.S Lewis suggests 'through giving Adam the 'forbidden fruit, Eve commits murder', however it is Milton's oppressive views of femininity that bars Eve's 'deceptive' qualities. Adam is the character who is blamed for the fall, for not controlling his wife, and therefore Eve is incapable to deceit due to
the constraints of her sex. For Milton, Eve is a just another 'rib' of Adam, and she is unable to
deceive those around her. In comparison, Webster projects 'proto-feminism' within his illustration
of the Duchess. Whilst Eve is condemned to her position as a wife, the Duchess is remembered
through her stoicism and heroic actions. She is incapable of deception, not because of her sex, but
because of her purity and 'goodness'. Webster utilises the corrupt brothers in order to herald the
Duchess. He contrasts the source for the play William Painter's 'Palace of Pleasure' which dictates
the Duchess as a 'lusty widow of noble blood' and deceptive women due to her 'overt' sexuality.
Webster's Duchess polarises Painter's depiction, as she remains 'Duchess of Malfi, still', even when
faced with death. She is stoical and courageous in the face of malcontent Bosola and the
Machiavellian brothers, sustaining her sexual autonomy and position against patriarchal authority.
The Duchess is anything but deceitful.

Both Webster and Milton both abide to and polarise the suggestion humans are inherently deceitful.
The projection of Satanic power in 'Paradise Lost', along with the corruption of Bosola and
Ferdinand, evokes the delusion and deception of humanity. However, both authors project the
complexity to the human nature - the suggestion all beings are subject to deceptive qualities
juxtaposes reality, as many, such as the Duchess, are stoical and pure. Deception is subjective, for a
1600 reader female sexuality equates deception, but for a contemporary reader, equates liberation.
Both authors contemplate the complexity of deceit, projecting the convulsions and complications of
the human race.

Examiner commentary

This response contains elements of 'excellence'. The candidate provides such apt contexts (AO3) as Milton's attitude to Catholicism, Buckingham's advancement, and Painter's 'Palace of Pleasure'. (For a higher mark more such material could profitably be explored.)

There are suitable links between the texts (AO4): Satan and Bosola as deceivers, the deceptive qualities (and the argument against them) of Eve and the Duchess. Argument (AO1) is generally well developed, providing clear evidence, for example, for the conclusion that 'the Duchess is anything but deceitful'. Too often, however, the reader must work to understand the exact point that is being made, as for example in the sentence 'However, his incestuous desires emerge within his suppression and alignment to a "sane" Italian courtier, demonstrating his failing duality'. Quality of writing is not always secure - 'it is the convulsions of the human character that rebuke the suggestion …'; 'lycothropic'; 'juxtaposes for 'opposes' – and this also influences the decision to award a mark on the border between Levels 5 and 6.
The play of the Duchess of Malfi has its roots deeply entwined in the taboo subject of deceit, which is most prevalent in the relationship between the Duchess and Antonio, and Bosola and the court. Deceit is also the bedrock of the "original sin" which as Milton was aiming to 'explain the ways of god to man' is explicitly exemplified in Books IX and X of Paradise Lost, especially when surrounding the deceit of Satan to Eve and Eve to Adam, both consequently causing the fall of mankind. In the Duchess of Malfi the form of deceit that is exemplified is through a political platform, as the hiding of the marriage has large political implications and Bosola's deceit in trying to climb the "greased pole" of the court results in extreme political consequences. Similarly, the original sin and Satan's deceit of Eve does have what can be argued as political consequences, although is more evident in having personal effects. Nevertheless both literary pieces exemplify what may be referred to humans in the post-lapsarian state aiming to deceit each other for their own gains.

In the Duchess of Malfi, the Duchess, who is considered the purest character performs deceit on multiple levels in having a secret marriage with Antonio in act I scene III, she
deceives the people of Malif that she is not married, she deceives the court and most fatally she deceives her brothers will. It can be argued that, as Ferdinand calls her "lusty widow", the Duchess has this private marriage in order to fulfill her personal, and what would have been considered by the 17th century audience as Immoral lust. There is little evident regard for pure love like that love which is evident between of Adam and Eve in book 9 of paradise lost, after act I scene III, the most significant time the audience see's Antonio and the Duchess on stage together is when she is tempting him into bed in act III which is where Ferdinand views the "sinful act" he had imagined himself. Eve similarly aims to deceive God and Adam after eating the "forbidden fruit". Arguably, similarly to the Duchess, Eve deceives Adam into eating the apple at the end of Book IX in order to fulfill her personal fear of being cast out of Eden alone and in part due to for her lust for Adam. In doing this action Eve essentially causes the fall of mankind which as the Son tells them in book X will make their "children be born with sin" and from this we can infer that a product of this sin will forever be deceit, as Eve did not try and deceive Adam before eating the forbidden fruit.

The next most prominent place of comparison in the two texts is the nature of deceit provided
to the audience in the malcontent characters of Bosola and Satan. Bosola aims to "hang on the
court like a horseleech" to drain the court for his benefit. The manner in which
this is performed
by Bosola is through working in underhand roles by for the Aragonian Brothers
as can be seen
when he is given money by Ferdinand and he says "showers like this do not come
unaccompanied by thunder/ whose throat must I cut", this level of deciet is
part of his nature
and he is willing to do it in order to climb the "greased pole of the court". Similarly to Bosola,
the most promenant malcontent in Paradise Lost, Satan works in underhand
ways, taking the
form of a serpent through the "bestial slime" in order to decieve Eve, and in
doing so lying to
her about the effects of the apple making him as clever as God, and making
him in the serpent
incarnate be able to talk, ultimately causing the pre-lapsarian Eve to dissent all
because he
believed that Paradise was a "seat worthy of Gods". The significance in this is
that the
Malcontent characters usually are characters in which the audience or the
reader often must
relate to, especially in time of political hardship as can be seen was the case
in 1616 when the
Duchess of Malfi was published and 1667 when the first edition of Paradise lost
was published
when there had just been the change over to two unpopular Monarchs, James I
and Charles II
respectively. If the audience or the reader is most likely to empathise with the malcontent, for
both authors to put in the characteristic of deceit as a prominent feature in both of their
malcontents may allow us to infer that literature does prove that it is in human nature to
decieve one another,

As TS Eliot describes Webster as "seeing the skull beneath the skin" it may be strongly
considered that the by Webster putting deceit at the forefront as the most pure character in his
play and arguably one of the most evil, that Webster considers it to be a human trait to
decieve one another and arguably a human flaw. In comparison, while Milton represents the
characteristic of Deciet being passed from Satan's malcontent nature through to Eve by
spreading sin, it can be seen that Milton is trying to convey that due to the original sin, deceit
will forever be a feature of the post-lapsarian human state. Therefore it can be argued that

Literature proves that human beings are intent on decieving one another.

Examiner commentary
This is a good, clear response to the question. There are some good links between the texts (AO4): in both, 'humans in the post-lapsarian state aiming to deceit [sic] each other for their own gains'; the contrasting nature of Ferdinand's feelings for his sister and those of Adam and Eve; Bosola and Satan as malcontents. An awareness of the idea of original sin helps meet the dominant AO3, but often the contexts lack detail, as in the rather general reference to the 'time of political hardship' after 'the change over to two unpopular Monarchs'. Slight inaccuracies in ideas or expression (AO1) - 'the taboo subject of deceit,' the inappropriate use of 'political platform,' the misuse of 'to dissent' - also keep the mark down a little.
Exemplar 4: *The Duchess of Malfi* and Rossetti: *Selected Poems*

**Level 5, 23 marks**

Webster presents a view of women as deceitful and deceptive, especially in connection to the character of the Duchess. A presentation of a # upright woman who promises to obey her husband's wishes but not “nearly” is seen in the first act; however, his quickly changes for the worse as the Duchess quickly remarries Antonio. During the 17th Century, widows were often pressured to remain widows due to the scandal of remarriage, especially due to the loss of their virginity. Webster may have been influenced by the frequent Howard scandal, a woman presented to society as a

*Colloque de l'Abbaye)* as a 'doctrinal cuckoo' (also manipulated the king into allowing the amount of her first marriage end now quickly
He marrying Robert Carse. This idea
of women as deceivers would not
have been lost in this novel
unless could have been character
of the female. Could easily
be the reflection on society’s view
on women as a machines who lies and cheats
in order to achieve their own goals.

This is rejected in the character of
Ferdinando’s speech, which ends the
comparison the character as a “villain”
and like a “precious diamond” that
“loses” name with base hand it
becomes. This was paradigmatic view may
have resonated with many theatregenics
who banned women from performing
in plays and certainly did not
Support the idea of a female hero (Ganimedes).
The female sexuality and society are often
painted together and Rossetti furnishes
this in her poem, ‘Golden Margery’ when
Lizzie declares Laura’s wishes to “not
talk to the Golden Man.” Rossetti
writes of how many people during
the latter part of 19th century still
believed in the idea of female
sexuality being associated with
decay. Lizzie lies to her sister
and gives into her sexual desires,
just like the Duchess, believing

Any consideration of the consequences that it was for other situations, fevers or feversils ill at regular to act upon from each of them.

Broken promises, both writers present the idea of delusion and untrustworthiness in women. Bosola WEBSTER also uses Bosola as a representation of male characters at the time when he borrows the ‘old woman’ for her skills in disguise. Bosola states later in the play that females are selfish beings who only do things to gain ‘wellwoods’. This is an especially ironic notion, mainly due to Bosola’s sympathetic nature to achieve his means by completing the task. Even alone with, but also because the ‘old woman’ is secretly the Duchess’ puppet. This irony

Lover shows the ‘fame of loathing vs. being in both worlds’

However, it is relevant to argue that the motives for the Duchess may not be as they appear. For so long the Duchess had led to constantly condemn her lordy maternal or body part (theatre jaunty). Never after the death of her husband, she wishes to remain as she still does as wished to be ‘locked up like a lady red’. Never to enjoy family life. The same
Feminist critics may believe that the
vulnerability is simply trying to survive in
such a male-dominated patriarchal society. This could also
be seen in Rossetti’s poem where she refers to a ‘nurse maid’
whose name suggests her “given” role as a women and
“stated” due to her innate duty as a women. Rossetti clearly influenced by Lewis Rivis
who wishes Vena decided to leave Union and
became a nurse. Both Walter and Rossetti may
regret his decision seen in both their works
as a yes selfless, but ultimately unnecessary
more. Showing that actually the patriarch
view of women being deceptive is not
also true.

Alternatively Rossetti presents humans as deceiving
in ‘Maude Clare’ when Maude Clare
Conforts Thoreau regarding her new
wedding by “tell” all he can do is
“hide” his face. By not showing
this constantly and deceptive charity,
Rossetti does reveal the beliefs that
humans simply manipulate and deceive
others. A clear reflection of the
deceptive nature of Thomas is seen
in the characters of both central and the
Cardinal who clearly cheat but pretense
Bristol power. This highlights he
outdated aristocratic roles in
which men thought they were
often entitled to use others.
Examiner commentary

This is a good, clear response, showing secure understanding of texts and question. Context (AO3) is addressed by material on seventeenth-century attitudes to remarriage, Frances Howard, the association of female sexuality and deceit, and the Duchess’s ‘body natural and body politic’. (Rather fewer specific contexts for Rossetti’s work than for Webster’s are presented, however.) Relevant links between texts (AO4) include sexual desire in ‘Goblin Market’ and The Duchess of Malfi and Thomas in ‘Maude Clare’ as a deceiver like Ferdinand and the Cardinal.
Exemplar 5: Edward II and The Merchant’s Prologue and Tale

Level 5, 22 marks

Literature fails to inarguably prove many ideas true, but one exception which can merge two texts – Edward II and Merchant’s Tale and Prologue - from totally different time spans is the notion that humans are naturally gifted in the art of self-deception. Will Summers views Isabella in Edward II as a purposeful Machiavelli whereas her husband Edward II, leaves his sexual orientation up for interpretation. Plantagenet text Merchant’s tale and prologue is a fabliau which is saturated with men obsessed over the idea of obtaining wives solely to feed their archaic sexual desires. However, despite all good intent no-one character in the texts lives up to expectations, largely because of deception.

J.S. Hamilton has taken the view that ‘the relationship between the real-life King Edward II and Piers Gaveston of Gascony was not of a homosexual nature, but rather that of an adoptive brotherhood.’ However, different opinions exist, perhaps made possible because of Benet college alumni Christopher Marlowe who created the sixteenth century Elizabathan play to remain ambiguous as it pertains to orientation. One thing remains unequivocal: the marriage between Isabella and Edward was plagued by lack of understanding. John Milton famously stated views on marriage which may now be taken for granted ‘Love and marriage cannot exist unless they be mutual’ a sentiment which ironically rings true in Merchant’s tale and prologue where a wealthy man January marries a young woman named May in order to have a son who can inherit his estates. Chaucer created a character who resembles himself to a large extent. Chaucer was a wealthy man who was a member of the privy council and parliamentary representative for Kent yet had one issue: an alleged troubled marriage. His character too had issues: he never married. The issues in Edward II have some historical basis; his father Edward I purposefully expelled Gaveston in order for his son to flourish as king, but upon his death in the fourteenth century, he quickly returned. In the play, consisting of entirely blank verse, and thus ‘defying the Elizabethan standards of poetry according to Stephen Anderson.’ The marriage between Elizabeth and Edward was devoid of love and destined to spawn problems, which it did. Similarly the issues with January and May were less profound in the 14th century fabliau written during King Richard’s era, but both individuals still accrued problems by virtue of being deceitful.

Shortly before January married May, he disclosed his real desire to friend Justinus regarding his motivations – ‘I want a son who will inherit my estates’ January disagreed, out of principle citing Theonstrasus and Saint Jeroma – opposing figures who both opposed the process of marriage. Instead of January being occupied with intense feelings of love and emotion and love Stephen A.Tiliver simply thinks he ‘shopped for his bride’ killing off any emotion he may have had toward May. After Isabella had been neglected for some time, she encountered a man who was angry with Edward, but not over love, but over power: Mortimer Jr. The nobleman would engage in the most audacious usurping since perhaps the days of the Merchant’s Tale and Prologue. Mortimer professed love for Elizabeth, and as a consequence of being neglected, she fell victim to his deceit. Mortimer wanted to be king – not a husband. May and January’s marriage was one massive act of deception. January married may to have sex, since relations outside of marriage in an era which still celebrated Thomas Becket was looked down upon. May who January described as being of ‘small stock’ wanted to improve her financial prospects. King Edward appeared to want Gaveston, even though Marlowe, a man also accused of being homosexual (and a say) never explicitly illustrated same-sex feelings. Isabella was more concerned with attention and love – ironically appearing as a real romantic despite her future behaviour showing herself to be a calculating emotionless woman.
Examiner commentary

This essay is fairly developed and detailed and delivers some good comparisons between the texts (AO4), mainly on the parallels between May and Isabella. There is much contextual material (AO3), some of it illuminating, but at times, especially in the second paragraph, it needs to be tied more closely to the question. (The relevance of a later reference to Thomas Becket is also somewhat unclear.)
Exemplar 6: *An Ideal Husband* and Rossetti: *Selected Poems*  
Level 4, 16 marks

Christina Rossetti's poetry collection and Oscar Wilde's 'An Ideal Husband' both can be compared on the theme of delusion and deceit. With the view 'Literature proves that human beings are intent on deceiving one another' these two texts fit in nicely with the theme to be compared.

The poem Goblin Market is full of deceit and delusion. The goblin men are masters of delusion when it comes to luring the two innocent "golden haired" girls to "suck their goblin fruits". Although these goblin men are not human they still have the mindset and characteristics of one. "all men are animalistic when it comes to courting women", a common saying during the Victorian era as men within the upper classes fought viscous mind games with one another in order to marry the "Ideal wife". The sexual connotations in this poem are very strong but at the same time subtle to those younger readers. Rossetti's brother Dante who was high up in the social circle of the Pre Raphaelite brotherhood influenced her works alot especially in her poem Goblin Market. Other things such as the theme of death and love influenced her as well. The imagery of the goblin men being "rat like", "snake eyed", "moving like a wombat" and "squaking like a parrot" are all animalistic references like the men when courting woman in the Victorian era. The imagery for goblins could of come from the Pre Raphaelite brotherhood paintings of mythical beings such as the paintings of a fairy garden with a naked lady, or the oil painting of a mermaid. Could this of influenced Rossetti's imagery of goblin men?

Comparing this argument to the play "An Ideal Husband", Sir Robert Chiltern deceits to his wife and the upper class society could end up in disaster for him. His androcentric view point on life gets him caught in affairs he does not want to be found in. The privileged elite within Victoria Society would be disgusted with Robert if they found out about his deceit and delusion in acquiring his immense wealth from selling state secrets to the Baron Arnoehm. Who, unfortunately for Robert was in an intimate relationship with Mrs Cheveley. Sir Robert asks "did you know the Baron well" Mrs Cheveley replies "intimately". The idea that humans are intent on deceiving one another is very apparent within an Ideal Husband. In act 1 we hear Lady Basildon say "men are grossly material, grossly material". In other words the Lady Basildon belives the materialistic lifestyle of certain men can lead them to deceiving their wives and not being the "Ideal Husband" they want.

Within Christina Rossetti's poem "Shut out" we have the imagery of deception when we see this woman being "shut out" of her, "beautiful" garden in which she calls "my own, mine". The true meaning of this poem is actually very disturbing. This woman is ultimately being locked away behind "iron bars" that have the symbolism of cold hard metal as well as the theme of restraint and isolation. She is being deceived by the "unchanging, shadowless spirit that stood unchanging like the grave", that is blocking her view from her garden with harsh "mortar and stone". The dark reality of this poem is that this woman will be locked up for eternity whilst knowing her untouched, organic garden will be behind the wall that is between the garden and her prison.

The character Mrs Cheveley is a spatifil, deceiving character. She is well known by the elite upper classes for being a thief and a liar. To compare this character to the woman in 'Shut Out' the similarities they have is they snuffly end up being locked out or shunned from what they love. Mrs Cheveley wants to be a part of the London society and wants to marry a perfect husband. A woman with no husband at the age of forty or fifty in Victorian times was seen as an outcast or a widower. The view was that if she did not have a man to rely on then forget about her. Mrs Cheveley after being found out for stealing the "snake headed brouche/bracelet" and stealing a series of letters ultimately was shunned out of society and never seen again. With the comparison Within the interpretation of "An Ideal Husband" by Jonathon Church that was on at the westend in London, Mrs Cheveley is interpreted in an interesting way. She is portrayed differently within this version as she is played by a much older actor and is much more devious and evil in her ways. This gave the impression to the audience who the protagonist of the
Examiner commentary

This response shows some elements of competence, mainly in its presentation of Mrs Cheveley as deceiver. It discusses contexts (AO3) in ‘Pre-Raphaelite brotherhood paintings of mythical beings’, the status of unmarried women, and two productions of An Ideal Husband. (Victorian men ‘fighting vicious [sic] mind games with one another in order to marry the “Ideal wife” needs some explanation, however.) A few AO4 links between the texts are made, for instance a comparison between Mrs Cheveley and the speaker of ‘Shut Out’. Argument and expression (AO1) are not always clear. It is not fully evident in what sense ‘Shut Out’ is about deception, there are errors like ‘subtle’ for ‘suitable’ and ‘pneultimately’ [sic] for ‘ultimately’, and the last sentence is rather confused. Consideration of more than two Rossetti poems would also help to increase the mark.
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