English Literature Exemplar Responses Unit 2 – 6ET02 June 2014

Candidate A

'The discords of Faustus' final lines cannot be easily resolved, but when Richard dies the tragedy is ended with a harmonious chord'

With close reference to the impact of the endings of Marlowe's Dr. Faustus and Shakespeare's Richard III, explore the extent to which you support this view.

Hell is defined as 'a place of suffering and punishment in the afterlife, often in the underworld' [1]. However, who says where hell is located? Who says what happens after people die and go to hell? As time goes by and science outruns religion, more and more people came to believe that hell is not a place within geographical limits, but a state of mind instead, or hell can even be defined as the soul who cannot find peace because of the sins that person has committed while he/she was still alive. Hell is something that is becoming vividly illustrated in Dr. Faustus, when the gates open and Mephastophilis ascends to take him. In 'Richard III' however, hell is not something that becomes vividly portrayed, instead, the audience is led to make the correct assumption that this is where Richard ends. It can also be argued that the battle in which Richard dies in the final scene, is in way, hell, in which his soul will spend the rest of eternity. Elizabethan audiences believed that their souls were fated to be eternally burning in a hell within geographical limits. On the other hand, modern audiences are more of the belief that 'hell is a state of mind', hence Faustus and Richard were eternally damned to face the consequences of their actions, and fight with their conscience

As Cash writes: "Marlowe's Dr. Faustus's entertainment value (if that's the phrase) lay originally in its appeal to a medieval audience in whose imagination Lucifer's Hell manifested itself in term of a physical geography"[2]. The play refers to the life and death of the protagonist, or rather tragic hero, Dr. Faustus who signed a contract with the devil of gaining unlimited power and knowledge for 24 years, in return for his soul, spending the rest of eternity in hell. On the other hand, there is

1. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hell
2. Living Hell, Peter Cash, date unknown

311 words

AO1

Wordy introduction, but introduces both plays and makes some link to title.

AO3

Cites a critic but not much more

Shakespeare's 'Richard III' which is all about the tragic hero, Richard, gaining power, ruling England as a villain and then being slaughtered by Richmond in the battle. Both plays end with their 'tragic heroes' dying at the end, and both being damned eternally to hell, although it is more obvious in Dr. Faustus where Mephastophilis himself ascends from hell to escort him to the underworld. However, there is a major difference between the two texts: when Richard dies, the play ends 'with a harmonious chord'; However, Faustu's death is escorted by thundering, lightning, serpents and pleading (by Faustus).

AO1 Focus on title.

Compares the texts AO3

Faustus's end, begins with his countdown of his final hour, i.e. from the time that the clock strikes 11 until it strikes 12, when Mephastophilis comes to get him. On the other hand, Richard is being murdered from the beginning of the final scene of the play, and the glory of the final soliloquy belongs to Richmond.

Sustains comparison

AO4 Shows awareness of context and links to the text.

From the time that the clock strikes eleven, Faustus finds himself in a state of repenting for the dreadful sins he has committed, for his has committed all the seven deadly sins, that Elizabethans saw as a reason to suffer death and consequently, damnation. He wishes 'That time may cease, and midnight never come', which is ironic in a way, considering the certainty with which he signed the pact with the devil, sealing it his own blood.

AO3 Continues to compare texts.

Further on, Faustus wants time to slow down so 'That Faustus may repent and save his soul'. Here, Faustus is asking for time to repent, however even in his last hour, we do not see him repenting, which makes the audiences wonder: 'does he really want to repent? Or is he just trying to avoid death and gain some time?' As we see Faustus wanting to repent numerous times in this ending, we do not see the same in Richard. The only time that conscience comes to Richard is the night before the battle, where the ghosts of all those he had slain visited him and cursed him: 'Despair and die'. A major difference between the two plays is that right before the protagonists die, Faustus is the only one to give thought to repenting. It is ironic how he is talking to God, referring to him and Christ numerous times- much more that any other soliloquy- but he still says 'O, spare me, Lucifer', just like he is praying. G. Sharpe analyses: "Faustus pleads desperately to the 'ever moving spheres of heaven' to stop 'That Faustus may repent and save his soul', but his plea is futile, and divine redemption is snatched from him: 'Where is it now? 'Tis gone'"[3]

AO3 Shaping an argument using a critic.

Whilst Faustus speaks the name of God with fear, Richmond, in his final soliloquy mentions the name of God with respect and love throughout his speech and conducts a prayer: 'And let thy heirs, God, if thy will be so, Enrich the time to come with smooth-faced peace/ With smiling plenty and fair prosperous days'.

3. 'Damnation and Death in Mcbeth and Dr. Faustus', Gillian Sharpe. 'The English Review', 1997

800 words

Faustus seems unable to make up his mind, since on one hand he fears Lucifer and pleads 'O, spare me Lucifer' but on the other hand, he came to fear God and is asking 'mountains and hills, come, come and fall on me' in order to hide him from 'the heavy wrath of God'. This dilemma that Faustus faces scares the Elizabethan audience and troubles them, makes them think: who should we fear more? And making them question their beliefs. On the other hand, there is the modern audience, who understands better, that Faustus's dilemma is in his head, and the only one he is afraid of and struggling with is himself and his conscience. Modern audiences believe that once Faustus feels that his time is coming to an end, he feels the great 'weight' of his sins and conscience hits in, making him understand the mistakes he has made, for he has traded his soul for material goods, but for knowledge and understanding too: 'He is truly a man of the Renaissance, a multi-talented polymath, head and shoulders above his peers, yet nothing can satisfy him' says Glyn Austen.[4] Richard, although in the scene where the ghosts appear has to momentarily face his conscience, does not find himself in a dilemma like Faustus does, and is determined, knowing from the beginning his objective. This scares the Elizabethan audiences too, but in a different way, as it demonstrates what hatred and desire for power can do.

AO4 Exploring contexts

AO3 Uses a critic to develop argument.

Not quite clear.

Once his time is reaching an end, Faustus is trying to bargain with God: 'Let Faustus live in hell a thousand years... and then be saved'. This comes as a shock to Elizabethan audiences that watch Faustus first signing the pact and now trying to bargain himself out of it, hoping that God will show mercy on his soul after all the sins he has committed. Probably the moment of greatest uncertainty in Faustus are his curses: 'Cursed be the parents that engendered me:/ No Faustus, curse thyself, curse Lucifer, that hath deprived thee of the joys of heaven!' the repetition of the word curse in these two lines emphasizes the damnation that is present throughout the play, however, his uncertainty, of first wanting to curse his parents for giving birth to him and then himself and Lucifer emphasizes firstly his fear of dying and secondly his regret of selling his soul to Lucifer. He also says that Lucifer is the one depriving the pleasures of heaven from him, thing that is ironic since he was the one who chose to follow this path.

AO2 Comment on language and structure.

And when the clock strikes twelve, Faustus hopes to disappear into thin air, so that Lucifer will not find him. Even the time when the devils come to get him, Faustus is begging them to spare him. The 'adders and serpents' that come to get him along with Mephastophilis mirror the image of hell that Elizabethans had.

AO2/AO4 Language and context.

4. Gill R. (ed.) 1989, Dr. Faustus, A&C Black

1296 words

rather than a soliloquy. In l.73-76 Faustus makes use of the word 'God' and the word 'Lucifer', at the end of the line, 3 times the word God and Lucifer only once. The continual repetition emphasizes Faustus's uncertainty and fear. His soliloquy follows no set rhyme scheme, however it is by far his lengthiest soliloquy, carried out in 66 lines! This is symbolic, in the sense that this number is representative of Lucifer!

Explores language use.

Unclear point.

AO3

Compares the texts.

On the other hand, Richmond's soliloquy is much smaller than Faustus's, taking up only 26 lines. The tone is encouraging and confident, inspiring happiness and peace to the people of England, e.g. "Enrich the time to come with smooth-faced peace, with smiling plenty and fair prosperous days'.

Sustains focus on question

AO1

The main reason why 'Richard III' ends 'with a harmonious chord' is the fact the Richard is not present to carry out the final soliloquy instead he has been killed and Richmond is now the one to speak, encouraging the people and promising that he will return peace and happiness to England, whilst on the other hand, Faustus did not slain people or made them miserable (as far as the play informs us). However, this play, just like Dr. Faustus employs the use of metaphysical apparitions. The night before Richard is murdered, he sees visions of all the people he has previously killed, and now they come back to haunt him. All the visions curse him: 'despair and die'. This can be compared with Faustus words: 'Thy fatal time draws to a final end; Despair doth drive distrust into my though'. It is interesting how both Shakespeare and Marlowe connected death with despair and damnation and in both plays, these lines reveal the eternal damnation of the tragic heroes.[5]

AO3

Makes links between texts using interpretation by other readers

In contrast with Faustus's final soliloquy, Richmond speaks of peace and love: 'We will unite the white and the red, Smile heaven upon this fair conjunction'. Here Richmond speaks about uniting the two families that have been long in dispute and Richard had made things worse.

Richard's use of adjectives here come in contrast with the adjectives used previously in his speech, i.e. now he uses: 'fair', 'prosperous', 'smiling plenty', whilst before, when he talked of the time that Richard ruled, Richmond used negative adjectives: 'blindly', 'rashly', 'compelled' 'butcher'. This contrast of words, has an effect of emphasizing the contrast between the reigning of the two people: the dreadfulness when Richard was ruling and the happiness now, that Richmond will take over.

AO2

Explores language effects.

So whilst, the villain has been slaughtered, the play ends with happiness and satisfaction and positive messages, hence leaving the audiences with a pleasant final impression. On the other hand, Dr. Faustus leaves the stage escorted by serpents, adders and Mephastophilis and that's where the play ends, leaving the audiences with this image and all the negative messages sourcing from his final soliloquy.

AO2

Comment on structure.

5. http://www.shakespeareismyhomeboy.com/Shakespeare-Paper-Richard-III-Dr-

The supernatural has always been a source of inspiration for many playwrights, film producers and writers simply because this is what people like. A mortal signing a pact with the devil in order to gain unlimited power is more than enough to provoke the audiences, and hence watch it. Elizabethan audiences fear the idea of playing with God and Lucifer and the punishment that mortal is going to suffer. On the other hand, modern audiences are more sensitive to the temptation that mortal went through and the power and knowledge he gained. Richard appeals to the modern audiences in the same way that Faustus does: the longing for power. However, Elizabethan audiences fear the merciless nature of Richard and get satisfied with the happy ending of the play. Shakespeare was one of the first to write about supernatural and succeed. However "No Elizabethan play outside the Shakespeare canon has raised more controversy than Doctor Faustus" say Logan and Smith[6]. People said that through Dr. Faustus Marlowe questions the existence of God – also supported by the fact that he was an atheist. However, most Elizabethan audience thinks of the play as being disrespectful and insulting towards God.

In conclusion, whilst Richard's ending is happy and satisfies both the audience and the whole of England, Faustus ending is complicated, damned and unpleasant, leaving the audience with the 'bitter taste' of the afterlife...

Total Word count: 2000

AO4 Explores context.

6. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doctor_Faustus_%28play%29#cite_ref-0

AO1: logical argument — a few unclear points. (4)

AO2: Some detailed exploration of language and structure - could be further developed. (5)

AO3: Links texts well and uses other readers to further argument. However, there's limited argument (26)

AO4: Good general understanding of context. A few paragraphs

Film Review for 'The Guardian'

Richard III (Ian McKellen version):

Appropriate register AO1

This exceptional adaptation of William Shakespeare's "Richard III" modifies the story's setting from the 1480s to the 1930s and portrays a fascist takeover in England. The movie which is based on a London stage production in which Ian McKellen also stars, keeps the Shakespearean 'script' to the maximum. The first ten minutes of the film set the stage almost without dialogue, as Richard shoots an enemy and then addresses an aristocratic gathering, where he begins his first soliloquy in public glory, and concludes it in private, speaking directly to the camera. In this way enrolling us in his plans. This contrast in the beginning of the speech and its ending clearly effectualizes the passion and adds a certain dynamism to it.

AO1 structure

Critical engagement AO4

Costumes were a core element of the Nazi appeal and a subsequent parallelism of that in the film derives from the leather and tailored wool uniforms in black and red ; mirroring Hitler's army to the maximum.

Back in the 15th century, Shakespeare recorded historical facts - with just a hint of exaggeration- by writing the play in favor of the Tudor family who took over the Plantagenets and hence, being a piece of 'Tudor Propaganda'. However the 1930s context of the film acts as propaganda against Hitler and his totalitarian reign. The anachronism not only demonstrates the timeless nature of the play's themes, but also assists us, as modern audiences to comprehend the intimidating evilness of Richard and therefore made us more able to get enrolled in his schemes. Loncraine's innovative direction promotes the reality of what life was under Richard's reign in the 15th century and gives the audiences a contemporary way to comprehend Richard's wickedness and the ghastly acts that he committed.

Explores Context AO4

Richard's progress to the crown is helped by a series of gruesome murders, following one right after the other, in the most appalling order. As Roger Ebert points out: "That extra measure of repulsive detail scuttled through the entire film, making this "Richard III" not just a seductive telling of Shakespeare's story but also a perversely entertaining one."[1] He finds delight in being a villain; it is his revenge on the world which has made him "Deformed, unfinished, sent before [his] time".

Explores critical context AO4

Ian McKellen is a distorted, serpentine, ominous villain with no positive qualities whatsoever. While McKellen steals the show, the rest of the cast is a cluster of some of the most talented actors of our generation as well. Annete Bening plays Elizabeth firmly, but with a hint exaggeration at times. Maggie Smith (Duchess of York) on the other hand is the perfect fit for the character: a firm woman, who

AO1

finds the courage to curse venomously her son, grieve for the loss of two of her sons and her grandchildren, and at the end finding the strength to call herself: 'mother of all griefs'!

Word count: 472

[1] reference :
http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/19960119/REVIEWS/909249996/1023

Explorative Study	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	5	4
AO2 /08	5	5
AO3 /36	26	26
AO4 /12	8	8

Creative Critical Response	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	4	4
AO4 /12	9	9

TOTAL /80	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
	57	56

Comments:
This is a satisfactory folder. There is, in the Explorative Study, a logical and controlled argument and the candidate makes good use of critical terms, but occasionally points are unclear. There are some instances of detailed exploration of language and structure but some could have been developed further. In terms of AO3, the candidate cites critical views to develop his own argument but he does not analyse these views, so Band 6 has not been reached. The candidate shows a good understanding of contextual issues and there are flashes of perception regarding the effects of context.
The Creative Critical piece has some minor errors in expression but engages quite well with the critical context around the play.

Candidate B

Explore Shakespeare's presentation of love in 'Much Ado About Nothing' and 'Antony and Cleopatra'

"Love" (noun), according to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, is defined as a strong affection for another arising out of kinship or personal ties[1]. This modern notion of "Love" (noun) could be completely alien to the people in the Shakespearean times. However, Shakespeare uses this widespread idea of love as a comic hindrance that is needed to be resolved because *"the medieval love-story is perforce a story of adventure"*.[2] In Much Ado About Nothing, we can see that the love in Messina does not exist as it does today; love is just a luxury that people fall into because women in Shakespearean times are seen as trophies in which to be obtained and displayed; or as dutiful wives abiding to their husband's bidding; or they are put on a pedestal, and can be mistakenly seen as goddesses, giving them a completely different image. And most of the time, they can be seen as whores or witches, perhaps due to the fact that the difference of status which makes men suspicious of them. This important factor of the inequality of gender is partly the reason why love in Messina is different to the modern day love. Claudio and Hero's love, for example, is the typical love that is commonly seen in the Shakespearean times. Claudio puts Hero high up on a pedestal, and sees her as a deity, a "Dian in her orb", or a "Venus" as he describes her in Act 4 Scene 1, and therefore is in love with this conception of her. In a way, he degrades her as a human and doesn't treat her as an individual. Claudio's opinion based on Hero's sexuality instead of perceiving her beauty says more about Claudio than Hero herself. Even her name, is also derived from the Greek mythology of Hero who was the lover of Leander. The story goes that one day, Leander was crossing a river to meet Hero when he accidentally drowned, Hero, filled with grief, flung herself into the river after him and subsequently drowned. Shakespeare knows of this legend and even refers to it in Act 4 Scene 1 when Claudio says,

Claudio "To make you answer truly to your name."

Perhaps Shakespeare chose this name to show the audience that Claudio does see Hero as a goddess and displays it in the namesake itself, and wanted to emphasize that men do see women in this way. And perhaps, the tragedy of Hero in the Greek mythology foretells the denunciation of Hero and warns the audience of this mishap. Another reason why Claudio's love seems so artificial is that in Act 3 Scene 3, the quickness in which he believes Don Juan's accusations of Hero's infidelity without certain cause or proof makes it seem like he is trying to find reason not to marry Hero - which he wouldn't do if he really loves her. His reaction to Don Juan's accusation and his apparent indifference he seem to feel towards that statement also proves that his love is quite artificial, which is seen in the rapid decision he comes to make and the lack of anger in his words when he says,

Claudio "If I see anything tonight, why I should not marry her tomorrow in the congregation, where I should wed, there will I shame her."

Shakespeare didn't use any exclamatory punctuation in this sentence and rather used commas and full stops which makes Claudio's sentence seem emotionless an indifferent, which is odd because if he did love her, his response would be more passionate and shocked. This quick change of mind could also be influenced by the perception of feminine sexuality of the time and that men see them as beings whores and are already suspicious of them. Interestingly, in Act 1 Scene 1, when Claudio first tells the audience of his love for Hero; instead of just saying that he loves her, he questions Benedick of what he thinks of Hero, before affirming that he loves Hero. It seems like he cares more about Benedick's opinion about Hero than Hero herself. This way, he places Hero as a lesser equal than his friends and it also shows that he cares more for her image instead of Hero as a woman. This theory also relates to Paul and Miriam Mueschke's thoughts where they say, and I quote, *"Claudio's susceptibility to suspicion emanating from hearsay indicates that under stress, the immature lover values friendship...above love for Hero."*[3]

Word Count: 740

Through the questions, it seems like he's trying to confirm that Hero is a worthy trophy that he could conquer rather than actually loving her. Also, his quick decision that Hero should be his wife tells us that he does not really care for her feelings because he didn't even ask if she loves him before he decided to marry her. This shows that Hero's judgement is unimportant to him, which is odd because I'm sure he wouldn't act this way if he loves her. Throughout this whole scene, we realize that he had not said a word about 'love' for Hero even after he set his mind on marrying her. It is not until a page later, where he finally says to Benedick and Don Pedro,

Claudio "I love her, I feel."

Again, he didn't say "I love her", but instead he 'feels' that he loves her. In contrast, the love between Benedick and Beatrice is quite different to Claudio and Hero's love; Claudio's love is a very conventional love in Shakespearean times and the audience would expect it from him to act in this way but Benedick's love is more similar to the modern-day love. Benedick didn't need his friends' justifications on Beatrice when he found out that she supposedly loves him and he loves her in Act 2 Scene 3. Instead, he jumps straight into speaking in prose – which, in Shakespearean language, is always used when the character is speaking about love or with love – where he proclaims that he loves her and that he is amazed that she loves him, as if he is unworthy of her love. Shakespeare used repetition of the word 'love' sixteen times in just one speech and describes Benedick with the oxymoron 'horribly in love' which is a big contrast compared to Claudio's speech. Benedick and Beatrice have more equality in each other than Claudio and Hero; this is shown through the witty banter which hints that they are similar in the intellectual wit. Therefore, Benedick doesn't see Beatrice as an object, or put her on a pedestal like Claudio had which degrades her as a human, but sees her as a woman she is and treats her like an equal – an important factor in love. For example, in Act 4 Scene 1, Beatrice tells Benedick to kill Claudio, of course he doesn't do it at first, but he is persuaded by her in an instant when he asks,

Benedick "Is Claudio thine enemy?"

By saying this, Shakespeare proves to the audience that Benedick highly values Beatrice's opinion and is quick to believe her without proof. In this way, he raises her status above his fellow companions and shows that he would do just about anything to fend for Beatrice's honour. In addition, the way Beatrice overreacts to Benedicks' arrival at the beginning shows that they might have had a previous relationship with each other which is why they were so quick to convert from the bantering rivals to being lovers. As opposed to Much Ado About Nothing's brief mention of love, love is mentioned even in the very first lines of Antony and Cleopatra, however, there is a difference of love in Much Ado and Antony and Cleopatra, because it's the men in Messina that seem to have control of the love over who to love as opposed to in Antony and Cleopatra, where Cleopatra is more in control. This is because the women in Messina are in a patriarchal society and they really have no power or control over anything as opposed to Cleopatra, who has the status of being the queen of Egypt and in addition to that, she has a domineering personality and a cunning wit. However, we question Cleopatra's love for Antony rather than Antony's love for Cleopatra because of her *consistent inconsistency*[5]. For example, in Act 1 Scene 3, she says,

Cleopatra "...If you find him sad,
Say I'm dancing; if in mirth, report
That I am sudden sick..."

Through this speech, we can see that she is playing with Antony and his feelings; she also is speaking in verse instead of prose, suggesting that she is speaking with her mind instead of speaking from her heart. On a completely different presentation – and less conventional – type of love, is a more platonic love between Antony and Enobarbus. Only one similarity between the two loves is that both Enobarbus's love and Cleopatra's love for Antony end with their deaths. This relationship between Enobarbus and Antony is based on loyalty instead of

Word Count: 755

love and that Antony needs Enobarbus, because he acts as Antony's conscience and is completely opposite to him in that he thinks rationally and uses his reason rather his emotion.

Actors in Shakespearean times can be inconsistent in acting, and as ~~most~~ female characters are played by boys, Shakespeare makes sure that the love is shown through the language and speech; and in Much Ado About Nothing and Antony and Cleopatra, the women play a greater part than in most of his other plays, so their feelings must be made clear to the audience at the time. Also, as an actor, you have to see what the other characters say about you, because the dialogue tells you what your character is like, so Shakespeare needs to be concise in his writing. Women in Shakespearean times are put on a pedestal or are seen as sinful and mistrustful; there is a stark contrast between these two perceptions so maybe he found it more interesting to portray them instead of men. Or, as Barbara Everett says, *"...certain feelings and attitudes... do tend to be most clearly expressed through the women..."*.[4], and, H.B Charlton, *"Perhaps it was primarily because Shakespeare found women more sensitive to intuition and more responsive to emotion that he first promoted them to dominion in the realm of comedy."*[2] This certainly does seem to be the case, because women express their emotions better than men do – even now – so it seems reasonable that the love would be portrayed more efficiently in women than in men.

Word Count: 255

Bibliography

[1] http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/love[1]
[2] Shakespearean Comedy, H.B. Charlton
[3] Modern Studies: 2. 'Much Ado About Nothing', Paul and Miriam Mueshke
[4] Modern Studies: 2. 'Much Ado About Nothing', Barbara Everett
[5] Critical Reactions before 1900, William Hazlitt

Total Word Count: 1750

Johnathan Miller's tragic 'Antony and Cleopatra'

There are no words to describe this production of 'Antony and Cleopatra'.

Whenever somebody says 'Antony and Cleopatra', people usually of the striking, exotic Egyptian Queen, gilded with jewellery and richness, and the magnificent, brave Antony with his battalion of soldiers following his every command. However, Johnathan Miller takes a different turn in portraying the legendary 'Antony and Cleopatra'. His attempt at recreating the tragic love story of 'Antony and Cleopatra' sans the glamour or sensuality of the traditional interpretations of Cleopatra and without the heroic version of Antony – is a mistake. The images of Cleopatra clad in layers of Victorian clothing have certain similarities between that and the Lady of Shallot in John William Waterhouse's painting of 'The Lady of Shallot'. While watching this I'm sure that at some point, the audience's faces will have the same expression as portrayed by the Lady of Shallot in that painting as well – I'm sure mine was. As John O'Conner rightly said, 'Too much of the romance and glamour is eliminated.'

Jane Lapotaire's portrayal of Cleopatra is played faithfully to the historical context of the character. I respect their decisions in playing Cleopatra according to history but I'm sure it wouldn't really matter if Lapotaire played her character with a little more spark to it. While watching it, the performance of the whole production makes it seem like the characters were having a nice afternoon tea instead of frantically facing the consequences of the Queen of Egypt's dramatic misgivings. As for Antony, he seems more like a befuddled, old soldier wandering about with Cleopatra rather than the heroic triumvir fighting for his men. Again, this is because he was acting him out according to history and as I quote from Michael Brooke, 'Both title roles were cast decisively against both physical and temperamental type.' Johanathan Miller is trying to show the audience that Antony and Cleopatra aren't glamorous gods as we know it, but are middle-aged lovers who almost brought a downfall to their countries.

Overall, this production of Johnathan Miller's is certainly a tragedy indeed.

Word Count: 344

Explorative Study	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	5	5
AO2 /08	6	6
AO3 /36	33	26
AO4 /12	8	11

Creative Critical Response	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	5	5
AO4 /12	10	9

TOTAL /80	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
	69	62

Comments:

A good (if rather brief) folder.

Occasionally there was some lack of fluency in expression, but there was perceptive and detailed analysis of language and structure. There was very little discussion of *Antony and Cleopatra* and so Band 4 is the highest that can be awarded for the first part of AO3. However, the candidate does explore interpretations by other readers, which would take it to Band 6. Thus, a 'best fit' is top Band 5. There is clear evidence of perceptive understanding of generic and social contexts.

The CCR too occasionally lacks fluency and there is not quite enough engagement with the text to merit a higher mark in the band. Really, the piece is too insubstantial.

Candidate C

To modern audiences, the Romantic lovers from Much Ado About Nothing *do little but disappoint. Explore your reaction to this comment comparing these characters to their appropriate equivalents in* Twelfth Night. *Remember to include evaluations from other readers in your discussion.*

Romantic Comedy in Shakespeare's day had a very clear definition and thus in all Shakespearean comedies there is a stage where "disorder prevails and life is turned upside down", while "marriage provides the answer: marriage is the institution in which the force of love [...] can be made to serve the needs of society."[1] Although the romantic couples in *Much Ado About Nothing* and *Twelfth Night* may disappoint as pairs, both plays end with the lovers getting married or betrothed, thus fulfilling their purpose in a Romantic Comedy and they do not disappoint in that respect. Though most couples in these plays do not do enough to assure the modern audience of the sincerity of their relationships, their actions and characters as individuals are rewarding in terms of both a past and present audience's response to them. Claudio, for example, is a disappointing and superficial lover as Cartmell points out when she derides his "view of husband as owner"[2], yet helps give emotional scope to the play; while Viola, whose relationship with Orsino is questionable, greatly provokes and entertains with regards to her challenging of gender roles.

Though every couple, save Beatrice and Benedick, that ends up together is disappointing as a romantic pair, this far from means that the plays as a whole are disappointing. In fact, *the* dramatic high point in *Much Ado*, the denunciation scene and what follows, is directly related to Claudio's relationship with Hero. After calling her a "rotten orange", an Elizabethan term for a prostitute, who seems virtuous on the surface yet is morally corrupt within, he proves how little he understands not only Hero but women in general. Exclaiming, "Behold how like a maid she blushes here!" and following with, "Her blush is guiltiness, not modesty" reflects that it does not cross his mind that she is blushing because she is publicly slandered. The simile "like a maid" proves that he is quick to disbelieve the virtue that he himself says she has in the beginning, thus further expanding on the image of a "rotten orange". McEachern argues that in his "readiness to believe [Don John's] slur against Hero", because of his "assumption that women are by nature prone to inconsistency"[3], Claudio proves his own inconsistency to all audiences. It must be noted here that the name Claudio is derived from the Latin *claudus*, meaning "lame" or "crippled", hence adding to the sense of Claudio being prone to err. By having Claudio denounce Hero, Shakespeare satirizes the Elizabethan notion of women's inconsistency compared to men's. Therefore, far from managing to disappoint, Shakespeare provokes an Elizabethan audience. Their relationship is, as Nevo says, one "of convenience, the substance of which will be [...] found wanting."[4] So it is fair to say Shakespeare intended the Claudio/Hero relationship to be unconvincing even at the end, in order to provide social commentary on the nature of courtly relationships, which, according to contemporary documents, relied heavily on the bride having a "dower"[5] in order to make the union financially advantageous.

Claudio and Hero marry without any evidence of the former having matured. When about to be unknowingly re-introduced to Hero, Claudio says, "Which is the lady I must seize upon?" With the militaristic "seize", Claudio, reminds the audience of his superficiality in I.i. where he claims that "war-thoughts have left their places vacant", thus allowing him to love Hero. The fact that Claudio, at this early stage, implies that he only loves Hero out of lack of anything else to think about, suggests the "lack of certainty"[6] in his love and that he will need to be tested before being rewarded with marriage. A public denunciation of one's loved one under the eye of God is *not* what one would expect in a loving relationship, and the fact that the closest Claudio comes to repentance is when he says that, after visiting Hero's supposed grave, "yearly will [he] do this rite" far from adds to Claudio's image as a changed man. Thus Cartmell argues that "Claudio retains his hostility and violence to the end."[7] In fact, Shakespeare's language in part dispels the notion that Claudio remains violent to the end the play, as is proven in V.i, when, having been challenged to a duel by Leonato, who seeks to avenge his daughter, Claudio replies: "Away! I will not have to do with you."

Running Word Count: 725

This curt response to Leonato's longer speech in which he challenges Claudio shows the audience his unwillingness to fight. However, his use of "seize" and other military imagery are probably what led Cartmell to her conclusion that Claudio remains violent. What is most important though is that Cartmell agrees that Claudio *does not* change.

Even less convincing is the "romantic" ending to *Twelfth Night*. The *only* direct, love-related words Orsino utters to Viola (and, it must be remembered that these two are supposedly the romantic leads) are in his *very last line*, when he possessively calls her "Orsino's mistress, and his fancy's queen!" He has never seen Viola as a woman yet unabashedly calls her his "mistress", reflecting the patriarchal system in Elizabethan times in which it was acceptable for couples to not meet each other until their relationship was sealed by third parties through proxy wooing, just like in *Much Ado About Nothing*, where Don Pedro successfully woos Hero before handing her over to Claudio. Though no proxy wooing occurs to bring Orsino and Viola together, the rashness of his decision (further emphasized by the use of the word "fancy", which suggests that he accepts Viola on a whim) could be Shakespeare giving social commentary on how ridiculous it is that relationships should be formed without the two people concerned knowing each other. In fact, if this is social commentary, the end of *Twelfth Night* epitomises Romanic Comedy – the dramatist continues to "laugh at... human folly"[8] while still providing the social harmony promised by marriage. Meanwhile, this criticism of proxy wooing can also be seen in the volatility of Claudio's relationship with Hero, formed due to proxy wooing by Don Pedro, and the "high comedy"[9] produced by Orsino trying to woo Olivia using Viola/Cesario.

In the case of the former, Shakespeare has Claudio assume that "the Prince woos for himself", and condemns the custom of proxy wooing by having him say, "Friendship is constant in all other things / Save in the office and affairs of love." Despite the fact that Claudio may appeal to audiences by taking this seemingly individualistic stance towards love, his use of the word "office" reminds the audience of the Elizabethan notion of marriage as a business transaction. Meanwhile, in *Twelfth Night*, Shakespeare presents to an Elizabethan audience the risks proxy wooing carry by having Olivia fall for Viola/Cesario, who is in fact wooing her on Orsino's behalf. Shakespeare has a woman fall for another woman, something that would have been scandalous in Elizabethan times had it been presented outside the theatre. He concertedly uses theatre as a medium to satirize conventions of the time.

It is doubtful that any audience would be impressed by a character who, although knowing that his loved one is a woman continues to refer to her as "Cesario". Again though, as Mugford argues, the Bard "goes out of his way to leave her in her men's clothes and hence to disrupt with a delicate comic touch the return"[10] to normal life after the play is over. As in the case of *Much Ado*, where Claudio and Hero marry without any sense of resolution to Claudio's mistakes, it would have also been disappointing had Shakespeare chosen to end *Twelfth Night* without Viola getting married to Orsino, whom she says repeatedly she loves. This is the only saving grace to their relationship. It is doubtful that any audience in any age would feel that Orsino's behaviour alone could lead to a happy relationship between the two. However, due to her being the protagonist, the audience gets to know Viola. Having known Orsino for only "three days", she declares that she "would be his wife." Though this professed love develops over a very short time, it is substantiated by the fact that Orsino has already "unclasped to [Viola/Cesario] the book even of [his] secret soul," and thus, ironically, Viola knows more about him than most. "Unclasped" suggests that Orsino experiences emotional release and the alliteration in "secret soul" reflects Orsino's subconsciously expressed sensuality. Both the trust he places in her and his openness regarding his emotions appeal to Viola. Her love for him perseveres throughout the play, as is the case with the more passive Hero's love for Claudio in *Much Ado*, though Viola knows Orsino is in love with Olivia. Moreover, she tries to get Olivia to marry him, proving her to be selfless and "stoic"[11], making her all the more appealing to audiences both past and present.

Running Word Count: 1473

This perseverance on Viola's behalf can be contrasted with a different perseverance seen in the infamous Beatrice. Her obstinate rejections of men and romance are what need to be resolved so that *Much Ado* can be termed a Romantic Comedy. She declares that she is prepared to "lead his [Satan's] apes into hell" if that is the price of having to marry. Here, Shakespeare uses imagery an Elizabethan audience would have been all too familiar with where marriage was seen as the guarantor of social harmony, and therefore any woman who refused to marry would end up in Hell, where she would be destined to lead a pack of apes.

One cannot look at Beatrice's character and actions as a lover (which, for a long period, she insists she is not) without comparing them to those of her eventual husband, Benedick. Their names would have been an instant signal to an Elizabethan audience that they ultimately end up together, since, respectively, they derive from the Latin for *one who blesses* and *blessed*. Shakespeare hints from the beginning of the play that the two are destined for each other. Their wit is gloriously showcased in I.i. where they pick up on each other's insults, such as when Benedick calls Beatrice "a rare parrot-teacher" for not having previously come up with an original retort, the latter responds by saying "a bird of my tongue is better than a beast of yours." The animal imagery in this scene, can, depending on how it is acted out, imply the suppressed passion and desire the two have for one another.

Shakespeare has been accused of losing "interest in the Claudio-Hero story in order to enjoy creating Benedick and Beatrice,"[12] however, as Brown argues, "*Much Ado* is, in fact, the most articulated of the comedies" - Benedick and Beatrice serve as "purposable contrast[s]"[13] to Claudio and Hero, and thus help establish themselves as benchmarks for what a romantic couple should be. Their wit, sincerity and honour have far from disappointed any audience, and they have in fact established themselves as one of the most popular couples in theatre throughout the ages, serving a inspirations for works of art from Berlioz's opera *Béatrice et Bénédict* to Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*.

Brown talks of the "life-enhancement inherent in this work of art [*Much Ado*]"[14] and with a couple as refreshing and as endearing as Beatrice and Benedick, no audience can go home disappointed. Though Hero's and Claudio's relationship is nowhere near as inspirational, the dominance of Beatrice and Benedick are enough to ensure a satisfied audience. While *Twelfth Night* may be lacking in the romantic supremacy seen in *Much Ado About Nothing*, its comedy and exploration of the way characters interact surely leaves all audiences' expectations of a Romantic Comedy fulfilled.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts Studied:

Much Ado About Nothing *by William Shakespeare*, Penguin, 2005

Twelfth Night, or What You Will *by William Shakespeare*, Penguin, 2005

Critical Sources:

[1, 8] How to Study a Shakespeare Play, John Peck and Martin Coyle, Macmillan 1985

[2, 7] Interpreting Shakespeare on Screen, Deborah Cartmell, Macmillan, 2000

[3] Much Ado About Nothing, McEarchern, Arden, 3rd Edition, 2005

[4] Comic Transformations in Shakespeare, Ruth Nevo, London, Methuen, 1980

[5] The Laws Resolution of Women's Rights, London, 1632

[6, 12, 13, 14] Shakespeare and his Comedies, John Russell Brown, University Paperback, Methuen, 1957

[9, 11] Shakespeare: The Comedies, R.P. Draper, Macmillan, 2000

[10] William Shakespeare: The Role of Masquerade in Shakespeare's Plays, Ian Mugford, http://www.literature-study-online.com/essays/shakespeare-masquerade.html

View Branagh's version of Much Ado About Nothing *(1993). Write your own review in which you take a critical stance and provide a response to the views expressed by other critics.*

Another prime example of an attempt to make Shakespeare more accessible to the masses, Branagh's film basks in crude sexuality as much as it does in the sun. Set in a dream-like Tuscan location, in a villa overlooking rolling hills and ripe fields, Branagh's attempt at converting this most life-enhancing of plays does work as piece of cinema, if not so much as an interpretation of a work of art.

Much Ado oozes sex and ripeness from onset, beginning with Beatrice's (a thoroughly convincing Emma Thompson) tantalizing recitation of "sigh no more, ladies," before moving on to a scene showing men and women lazily mingling under the hot Italian sun. Beatrice is seen enjoying grapes, a symbol of ripeness. The subsequent juxtaposition of the soldiers approaching the villa, caught bouncing up and down on their horses in slow motion (the innuendo needs no further description) and the ladies rushing joyously to get ready to greet them is a clear sign of the anticipation of both parties to meet. Branagh overtly allows the heat of the Tuscan sun to dictate the rest. The sexual opening sequence culminates in the overtly phallic 'V' shaped procession of the soldiers as they enter Leonato's (Richard Briers) villa full of ladies.

Though no self respecting critic can say Shakespeare's plays are devoid of sex – and *Much Ado* is no exception – it seems that in his attempt to appeal to as wide an audience as possible, Branagh over-sexes this already sexed-up romantic comedy to the point where the cultural distinction of this being Shakespeare is so watered down that it becomes as Hollywood as any other movie. The Bard's art form is his language, yet Branagh, who Iain Johnstone claims possesses "a direct line of communication with the Bard", chooses to detract from this, most obviously when he shows Don Pedro and Claudio (an annoyingly stiff Robert Sean Leonard) being shown Margaret (whom they think to be Hero) having intercourse with Borachio. In the play itself, this instance is merely reported, adding to *Much Ado*'s theme of deception. However, Branagh patronises his audience by making it unnecessarily clear what it is that sparks Claudio's wish for revenge against Hero (the sweet Kate Beckinsdale).

The excessive sexuality in *Much Ado* is also evident in the scenes where Benedick (Kenneth Branagh, who gives a solid performance yet whose constant hand movements are mildly nauseating) and Beatrice are duped. The montage in which we see Benedick ecstatically jumping around in the fountain and Beatrice triumphantly swinging up and down in OTT celebration that they are free to love, has sex written all over it. Though Shakespeare's text has these scenes culminating in soliloquies packed with self-realisation, such as Beatrice's rhetorical exclamation "Stand I condemned for pride and scorn so much?" Branagh chooses for them to be giddy expressions of their unleashed sexuality.

It would be wrong to say though, that the film is much ado about nothing more than mankind's lustful nature. The "merry war" of wits between Benedick and Beatrice is glorious, full of warmth, passion and high comedy. It is in these scenes of heartfelt love and compatibility of character that Branagh makes Shakespeare's art resonate the most.

Explorative Study	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	6	6
AO2 /08	8	8
AO3 /36	36	36
AO4 /12	12	12

Creative Critical Response	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	6	6
AO4 /12	12	12

TOTAL /80	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
	80	80

Comments:
A top-scoring folder across all the objectives. Fluent, compelling argument. Detailed analysis of language and structure. Outstanding engagement with interpretations by other readers. Confident, perceptive sense of context. CCR has a very well-sustained register and excellent engagement with the critical context of the play

Candidate D

Compare Shakespeare's treatment of evil in Macbeth and Othello

"Othello" was written between 1602 and 1603 at a time when Queen Elizabeth I was on the throne. "Macbeth" is Shakespeare's shortest tragedy, believed to have been written some time between 1603 and 1606. The play was written for James VI of Scotland who then became King of England after Queen Elizabeth I died. There were many influences in Shakespeare's time that may have prompted him to create evil characters such as Iago and Macbeth in a certain way, for example a play written by Christopher Marlowe in 1604 called "Dr. Faustus", which is a play about a man who defies God by selling his soul to the devil in order to have knowledge and power for twenty – four years. In some ways, although Macbeth and Iago do not sell their souls to the devil, they are firmly associated with him.

Another influence at the time would have been morality and mystery plays containing stereotypical characters such as 'Vice' which often represent the devil, tempt their victim to evil and who seek their victim's soul. Mystery plays especially were still being played from 400 AD to Shakespeare's time in the 1500's. There is evidence to suggest that the evil character, Iago in "Othello", may have been a more sophisticated, elaborate and psychologically real version of the "Vice" character. The characters appearing in these plays often have a defect or fault that the audience can associate with such as a deadly sin. Iago is not a stock character or just one deadly sin; he is perhaps a combination of them, "trimm'd in forms and visages of duty, keep their hearts attending on themselves"[1]. In this quote Iago talks of people who pretend to be loyal and are concerned for themselves, such as himself. A 'Vice' character is very simple and does not possess human traits like that of Iago, who is more psychologically believable. A lot of dramatic irony is used in Iago's speech to make him look honest, "I hold it very stuff o'the conscience to do no contriv'd murder I lack iniquity". He pretends that he could not kill anyone and although the other characters believe him, the audience knows better, such as the audience would have known of a 'Vice' character.

Iago is ambiguous and deceptive "I am not what I am"[2], he says. He is a character who will mislead both the audience and the characters within in the play. In his essay on "Othello", Nevill Coghill describes Iago as, "The living image of a man who is the opposite of what he appears to be"[3]. Iago dissembles to make others think he is "honest". However, he is an amoral character with no conscience, motivated to bring down Othello. He is also unpredictable, spontaneous and very convincing as he even manages to fool his own wife. Although Emilia does not think him honest, she did not think him capable of committing these destructive moral crimes. A C Bradley describes Emilia's reaction in Act V, Scene II, after she finds out what her husband

---

[1] Othello, Act I, Scene I, lines 50 - 51
[2] Othello, Act I, Scene I, line 65

[3] Nevill Coghill, Shakepeare's Professional Skills, p.146

The audience is taken in to Iago's confidence through soliloquies, making the audience aware of his motives. Iago does this many times throughout the play, but although he gives us reasons for justifying his actions, it seems he is actually motiveless. He destroys people. For example, he brings out the worst in Othello and convinces him that his wife is an adulterer, "Yet she must die, else she'll betray more men"[5]. Iago has convinced Othello that his wife has slept with Cassio his lieutenant and Othello thinks the only way out is to kill her.

Unlike Iago, Macbeth is morally aware, when Macbeth speaks "We will proceed no further in this business"[6]. Macbeth appreciates King Duncan's good qualities and that if he were to murder him; it would be a crime against God. He also feels that he has no valid reason to kill Duncan apart from his ambition to become King. Although Macbeth is ambitious, he is also self –reflective and imaginative, which causes him to think about both his actions and their consequences. Macbeth is a good character as he tries to change his destiny, refuses to give in and takes responsibility for his actions, "Accursed be that tongue that tells me so, for it hath cow'd my better part of man; and be these juggling fiends no more believ'd that palter with us in a double sense"[7]. Here at the end of the play, he blames himself for listening to the witches, especially as they have misled him through their double meanings.

Although Macbeth is seen to be good, he does have the potential for evil, when he says, "Stars, hide your fires, let not light see my black and deep desires"[8]. It suggests that there is an underlying evil in Macbeth that makes him kill Duncan if it means that he will become King. However, the audience can sympathize with him as Macbeth appears frightened and unprepared about killing a King. We see this after he murders Duncan, "Had I but died an hour before this chance…There's nothing serious in mortality[9]". The natural reaction for someone in this position is shock, but Macbeth has prepared an unfeeling speech, revealing to the others that he may have known about the death already. Unlike Iago, Macbeth is not very good at pretending to be somewhere else. In the end the audience pities him as he gets himself into circumstances he cannot get out of, "my soul is too much charg'd with blood of thine already"[10]. He feels that he is already in far too deep and cannot go back. However, he still killed King Duncan even though he knew what the consequences might be.

The audience's response to Iago is very different to that of Macbeth. Iago is not an admirable character and is able to manipulate characters into actions they would not normally do. Unlike Macbeth, we do not pity him for his actions as he has no justifiable reason to destroy the characters around him. He lacks the motives and

---

[4] A C Bradley, Shakespearean Tragedy, p.177

[5] Othello, Act V, Scene II, line 6
[6] Macbeth, Act I, Scene VII, line 31
[7] Macbeth, Act V, Scene VIII, lines 17 - 19
[8] Macbeth, Act I, Scene V, lines 50 - 51
[9] Macbeth, Act II, Scene III, lines 87 - 89
[10] Macbeth, Act V, Scene VIII, lines 5 – 6
Word Count – 1, 045

reasons Macbeth has; the one motive we may be able to recognize in Iago is that he has a hatred for anything good. There is also evidence to suggest that he enjoys doing it, when he says, "thou dost thyself a pleasure, me a sport"[11]. He is an unfeeling and morally inept character who feels no guilt, regret or remorse. Iago is also very good at judging other characters and this helps him to undermine them. Although his soliloquies reveal his plans to the audience, we never know whether he is telling the truth or not.

Although the audience judges him for what he has done, Macbeth still has some admirable qualities, unlike Iago. Macbeth defies himself and carries on fighting, knowing that in the end he will die, "I will not yield to kiss the ground before young Malcolm's feet...before my body, I throw my warlike shield[12]". It could be argued that at the end of the play, we see glimpses of the brave and justified warrior before he is corrupted by evil. Macbeth never gives up and this may be why his death is seen to be honourable. However, Macbeth is also humiliated and appears defeated and undignified as he is slain by his enemy Macduff. Iago on the other hand, does not die at the end of the play; he remains quiet and elusive until he is taken away.

In Elizabethan times, evil was thought to be 'the forsaking of God's laws'. By doing evil, one was rejecting the love of God and of fellow humans. This was seen as a sin. Many people at the time would have thought that Macbeth would have to die to expiate his sins. It is strange at the end of Othello when Iago is taken away, he does not actually die. For Elizabethans, the justice was not served. There is no reference to religion in Shakespeare's plays, but the beliefs at the time would have caused the audience to respond in different ways, for example, the 'chain of being'. This was a belief in an hierarchical order with the most important at the top, God, followed by angels, stars, the elements and finally the social order of mankind with the monarch at the top. It was believed that God put the monarch on the throne and a crime against a monarch is a crime against God. Killing a King was one of the greatest sins at the time, so the audience would have been very shocked when Macbeth disturbed this chain. When one link of the chain is interfered with, the whole chain is affected. Shakespeare wants the audience to know the enormity of Macbeth's crime as it upsets the balance of nature. It could be argued that Iago's crime is just as bad as this, as he destroys Othello, who represents goodness.

It is through the witches that Macbeth is associated with evil, as they predict his future and confirm his ambition to be Thane of Cawdor and later King. Their interference causes him to think about his future and discuss their predictions with Lady Macbeth. At first, Macbeth is willing to wait to see if he becomes King naturally, but Lady Macbeth has a strong desire to become Queen. She attempts to corrupt and motivate Macbeth to kill King Duncan by using her sexuality against him. Lady Macbeth knows how much Macbeth is besotted by her and uses this to her advantage. While she tells Macbeth to do the dirty work, she takes control and handles the situation, "Look like th'innocent flower, but be the serpent under't"[13], she says to her husband.

---

[11] Othello, Act I, Scene III, line 361

[12] Macbeth, Act V, Scene VIII, lines 28 - 34

[13] Macbeth, Act I, Scene VI. lines 64 – 65

Lady Macbeth takes control of both the situation and her husband; she even faints to take the attention away from him. However, although Lady Macbeth seems to know what she is doing, she too has a conscience which causes her to suffer afterwards leading to her death. Unlike Iago and his improvised plans, Lady Macbeth plans meticulously. However, Lady Macbeth is destroyed due to her guilty conscience, where as Iago does not care and manages to live until the end of the play.

The witches in "Macbeth" may be seen to be like Iago and the 'Vice' characters of the morality plays as they tempt and aid Macbeth's downfall, just like Iago does to the honest, naïve and innocent Othello. The witches seem to appear and disappear as they see fit, leading the audience to believe that they may not be real, but a figure of imagination in Macbeth's overactive conscience. This could mean that Macbeth brings himself down. As well as the characters within both plays, the environment plays a prominent part in enhancing the atmosphere and helping to represent evil, it is reported that an "owl shrieks" at the time of Duncan's murder[14]. This helps to portray an eerie atmosphere and a sense of wrong doing. In Elizabethan times, the owl was thought to be a bird of ill omen. ✓

The evil in both Macbeth and Iago is evident, but they are two very different characters. Macbeth is more likely to be admired as he worries about the consequences of his actions and takes responsibility for them. He is also corrupted by his wife, Lady Macbeth, the witches and his desire to be King. Iago on the other hand pretends he is honest and good, but he betrays Othello creating emotional and social turmoil. He stirs up existing prejudices for no reason other than to create suspicion. Iago states his motives but none of them appear to be true, unlike Macbeth's ambition to be King. Iago is also always in control of a situation, unlike Macbeth where Lady Macbeth seems to take command over him. As we know what Macbeth's motives are, we are less fearful of him, unlike Iago, who we cannot seem to understand.

Word Count - 2, 021

Bibliography

A C Bradley, Shakespearean Tragedy, p.177

Aidan Chambers - Interview on Shakespeare, Evil, Iago and Macbeth

Arthur Lovejoy: *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea,* (1936)

E. M. W. Tillyard: *The Elizabethan World Picture* (1942)

Internet – Dr. Faustus - http://www.open2.net/drfaustus/abouttheplay.html

Internet – Elizabethan views - http://www.odu.edu/ao/instadv/quest/Shakespeare.html

Internet – Evil - http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evil#Concepts_of_evil

Nevill Coghill, *Shakepeare's Professional Skills*, p.146

Explorative Study	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	5	6
AO2 /08	6	5
AO3 /36	34	25
AO4 /12	10	11

Creative Critical Response	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	5	6
AO4 /12	10	11

TOTAL /80	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
	70	64

Comments:

A good folder, let down by a weak performance on AO3.

Lucid, accurate expression. Could have explored more features of language and structure. Makes useful comparisons between the texts but there is very little engagement with interpretations by other readers. Intelligent appreciation of contextual issues.
The CCR shows lively engagement with the text in its critical contexts and the register is appropriate and well-sustained.

Candidate E

Explorative Study

Compare Marlowe's presentation of the practice of magic in *Doctor Faustus* (main text) with that of Shakespeare in *The Tempest* (second text), making appropriate use of critical material

As Francis Bacon, the Elizabethan Scholar, once said; 'knowledge is power'. In both *Doctor Faustus* and *The Tempest,* it is the knowledge of magic that brings the heroes of these plays power, although they each use this power in different ways, bringing drastically different consequences.

The central figures in both plays are the magicians: Dr. Faustus in *Dr Faustus* and Prospero in *The Tempest.* They are both Renaissance scholars who find solace through learning and expanding their knowledge of the world, which leads to their interest in magic. Faustus's love for learning is first highlighted in the opening soliloquy of the play, as he discusses his previous pursuits of 'physic' and 'divinity'. He says 'magic…hath ravish'd me', which emphasises how the lure of magic has enveloped him, and ignited within him a desire to pursue it, dismissing all other forms of study as 'for pety wits' and thus beneath him. Prospero is also similarly involved in magic, and as he was so 'rapt in secret studies' that he failed to be a good Duke, thus losing his dukedom. Magic for both men is a natural extension of their already extensive knowledge. However, as the critic J.S Mebane observes, 'Faustus possesses…the same mixture…of genuine desire for knowledge…and desire for the power to serve one's own selfish ends which Marlowe had observed in…Dee'. John Dee was an Elizabethan Scholar, who according to the critic Mangan was 'a man at the height of his mental powers…but desirous to know more about the universe' by integrating 'the powers of the spirit world'. Dee was widely believed to have dabbled with the occult, as spirits and magic were believed to be very real by the Elizabethans. Marlowe is thought to have based Faustus upon Dee, and an Elizabethan audience may have been able to draw parallels between the two figures, allowing the magic of Faustus to appear more realistic.

Faustus exhibits hubristic elements in his magic. As a typical Renaissance scholar, he wants to use it to help him climb to new heights and soar above normal humanity. Faustus' use of increasingly elevated language in his opening soliloquy emphasises his desire to rise above his station, as he aspires to be first an 'artisan' then a 'king' and finally a 'demi-god', through the power of magic. The prologue's reference to the myth of Icarus in 'his waxen wings did mount above his reach' illustrates that those who soar, often fall. 'Falling to a devilish exercise' is the next line by the Chorus, foreshadowing the fall that magic will inevitably cause Faustus to take. Faustus' greed and love of power are evident in his desire to be more than a mortal, to be a 'demi-god', and it contrasts greatly with Prospero who claims 'my library was Dukedom enough'. His study of magic is much more scholarly, and his studying of it placates him far more then using it to aspire to any epic levels of greatness.

The two magicians also use their magic contrastingly. Faustus uses it primarily for the gain of power, and principally for selfish means. His wish to 'wall all Germany with brass' reflects a typical Renaissance patriotism, and a positive use of his magic. However, he also desires to 'reign sole king of all our provinces', and obtain 'woman or unwedded maids' through magic. As the critic, J.S Mebane says, Faustus aspires to 'attain a godlike status and…is…corrupted by selfish desires for wealth, sensual indulgence and…power', whereas Prospero, as the critic Hebron says, 'uses his arts for the ends of justice'. He is much more benevolent in his nature, and primarily uses his magic for good: 'but are they, Arial, safe?' shows his concern for the crew of the ship after causing the Tempest that brings them to the island, as he wishes to do no harm to anyone unjustly. Faustus, by contrast, commands the devils to 'break the villain's bones' and 'hurl him in some lake of mud' after the character of Benvolio merely insults him, revealing a much more darker streak in Faustus' character, that surfaces through his magic.

This darker side could be interpreted as presenting magic as a way of inflicting punishment on people, which is something that the heroes of both plays indulge in. Faustus, however, often inflicts punishment where it is not merited whereas the benign Prospero tends to use it only when it is strictly necessary. 'Beat the beads about the friars'

737 words

pates' is an example of the often crude pain enforced on others by Faustus through his magic. He punishes the Friars for his own amusement, contrasting to Prospero. 'Tonight thou shalt have cramps' is a punishment inflicted upon Caliban by Prospero, but it is induced by Caliban's treacherous curses towards Prospero, such as 'blister you all o'er'. Magic is presented here as a way of settling any animosity towards oneself, by threatening anyone who acts in a vengeful manner with punishment.

Magic is also shown to be a 'show' in both of the plays. Faustus uses his powers to summon the illusions of spirits from the dead, and is also presented with a 'show' of the 'Seven deadly sins' by Beelzebub. The show of the spirits is a typical element of necromancy, and is a much darker magic than anything conjured by Prospero, who presents the characters in *The Tempest* with the illusion of a 'banquet'. Both the shows of the 'Seven deadly sins' and the 'banquet' are used as a means to entice other characters, highlighting the force of the temptation of magic. This temptation is further shown at the end of *Dr. Faustus,* when Faustus summons the spirit of Helen of Troy, in order to commit demoniality with her. Helen would have been seen as the epitome of classical beauty and therefore particularly appealing to a Renaissance figure like Faustus. 'Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a kiss' shows his desire for her, but immortality is ironically the opposite of what he will achieve by sleeping with her, as demoniality is a sin so it will in fact seal his damnation. Faustus' language about Helen's beauty as having 'launch'd a thousand ships' but also 'burnt the...towers of Ilium' is symbolic, as the launching reflects his desire to soar, but the burning is an image of destruction and also has connotations of hell, thus the language here could be shown to illustrate well the journey that magic has taken Faustus on, from a desire to reach new heights to eternal damnation. As his last act of magic, it is also particularly significant as it highlights his total lack of aspirations and desire to do good anymore. Magic has drained the humanity from him, and is presented here in a very negative light.

In both plays, the magicians have assistants who aid them in their practice of magic. However, the roles which these assistants play vary greatly. In *Dr. Faustus,* Mephostophilis, a devil, serves Faustus. However, Faustus must 'buy [Mephostophilis']

service with his soul'. He effectively signs away the very thing that gives him his humanity in doing this, showing the extent to which he will go in order to obtain magical powers. Faustus' powers are therefore satanic origin, and thus goetia, or evil magic, which contrasts directly to the benign magic of Prospero in *The Tempest*. His assistant is Arial, a free spirit, with whom he enjoys a close relationship. He frequently refers to Arial using endearments such as 'dear' and 'chick', and Prospero won the service of Arial by freeing him from the 'cloven pine' in which he was entrapped, not through any self-damning contract. Their relationship is much more natural and endearing then that of Faustus and Mephostophilis. Although Faustus does refer to Mephostophilis as 'sweet' at certain points, this could be seen as ironic as there is nothing sweet or good about the magic he performs and the source it derives from, thus Faustus' magic here is presented in a much darker light.

Marlowe also presents magic in *Dr. Faustus* with an explicitly religious context. The Chorus in the play refers to it as 'cursed necromancy', reflecting the orthodox views of an Elizabethan audience. Faustus acts in a blaspheming way, ironically using language such as 'heavenly' to describe magic, which the audience would see as using God's name in vain, as something deriving from such a dark source could never have the positive connotations of a heaven. Faustus' soul is also a powerful religious image used within the play, and reoccurs frequently, especially as he tries to redeem himself and find solace at the play's end. 'I'll leap up to my God' reflects his desire to return to God. However, his corrupt magic has 'damned both body and soul' and pushed him beyond redemption, and he must now 'remain in hell' for eternity. Faustus sells his soul to the devil for magic, and we see here he must now bear the consequences of that action. Magic has caused him to meet the fall that was initially prophesized in the Prologue. The ending Epilogue reflects this imagery, describing his 'hellish fall', and thus bringing the play full circle and presenting the tragic effects of magic.

Books are used in both plays to particular effect. Books would have been seen by an Elizabethan audience as a traditional symbol of magic; as the critic Hebron states, they were big believers in 'the dangerous power of books'. At the end of both plays, the

magicians dispose of their magic powers. Prospero chooses to do this as he has completed his good deeds, and promised to kindly 'deliver all' his companions safely home, in a selfless last act of magic. In order to be free from magic, he wishes to 'drown' his books, to be away from their influence. Drowning is an effective means of disposing of them, but also a soft and peaceful method of killing something, reflecting the benevolent nature of Prospero's magic. Faustus' choice of language is contrasting, as he cries out in desperation that he will 'burn' his books, which is far more symbolic of a hellish end, and is aligned to Faustus' fate.

As a final language point, perhaps an important thing to note is Prospero almost always refers to his conjuring as his 'art'; this makes his magic seem more elevated, and illustrates the life-affirming style of magic he produces. One of his rare uses of the word magic is at the end of the play when he says 'this rough magic / I her abjure'. He uses the word magic primarily only when condemning this lifestyle, showing his distaste for darker magic and conjuring. Faustus, however, always refers to his spells as 'magic', which is a word which would have had much darker and foreboding connotations to an Elizabethan audience, and shows how magic in this play is presented in a much more sinister light, showing the tragic consequences of practising more then 'heavenly power permits'.

Bibliography

Explorative Study:

Bacon, Francis: *'Meditationes Sacrae'*

Mebane, J.S: *'Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age'*

Mangan (on Dr. John Dee):

'a man at the height of his mental powers...but desirous to know more about the universe' by intergrading 'the powers if the spirit world'

Hebron: *'Key Concepts in Renaissance Literature'*

Creative Critical Response:

Hobson, Harold: *'All this and Helen, too'*
Source: Sunday Times, 20th February 1966.

Creative Critical Response

Write a Conversation between two A level students in response to the Burton and Coghill film of *Dr Faustus*

So, what did you think of that?

I thought certain aspects were well done, for example the character of Mephostophilis. Andreas Tueber portrayed him brilliantly. It's just as Harold Hobson said from that article we read in class, 'Tueber's imaginatively melancholy and ambiguous Mephostophilis', especially in the scene where he reminisced about heaven.

I know the one you mean, where he says he's being 'tormented with ten thousand hells/In being depriv'd of everlasting bliss'. Personally, I didn't like his portrayal of Mephostophilis – he's a devil, he shouldn't be sensitive!

Yes, but that's the point. Mephostophilis is surprisingly emotionally complex for a devil character, as in shown in the way he perceives hell as a state of mind, rather than a physical place: 'Why, this is hell, nor am I out of it'. Besides, the film did show him as an evil devil at one point, when he appeared as that rotting corpse.

Oh, that was disgusting, although the effects on that were pretty vulgar by modern day standards.

1,988 words

That's the 60's for you. A lot of new technology was developed then; you can see it throughout the film, like whenever Elizabeth Taylor appears in visions to Faustus.

You mean Helen of Troy? She featured much more in the film then in the play! Maybe it's because she has 'the face that launch'd a thousand ships', and the film company felt she was beautiful, so might increase the film's appeal. I thought that in general there was a more focus on sex and women in the film than then play – typical 1960's emphasis on sex, after the relaxation of censorship rules.

Yes, I noticed that to. In the play Faustus does say that 'Women or unwedded maids, shadowing more beauty in their airy brows' can be his through magic, but it's only the end scene where the demoniality with Helen occurs that he really puts this into effect.

That scene was really well done, though, in the film, I thought. The way he was shaking when he kissed Helen.I thought it showed well how he was almost afraid of his actions; he knew this demoniality was wrong but by then magic had dehumanised him to a point where he had nothing, and this gratification was the only pleasure left in his life.

Good point. The film stayed faithful to the text here too, with Faustus' great speech: 'Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a kiss'. Taylor was a good casting choice, she really captured Helen's classical beauty – perfect for a Renaissance scholar like Faustus, with his love of the ancient world.

That's true. Also, did you see how superbly done it was when Faustus met his fate at the end of the film? The trap door in his study opening, revealing the burning pit of hell. It reflected Faustus' cries of 'Ugly hell, gape not!'

2,294 words

Yes, I thought that hell was symbolised well in the film, and the trap door was the same one he got the magic books out of at the start; it was like he'd come full circle, emphasising how the same door that opened magic to him would also lead him to his doom. The trapdoor was also authentic for the Elizabethan stage; remember how we said in class that the trapdoor on the stage would symbolise hell to an Elizabethan audience?

Yes. Also, the effects used in the film for hell, whilst garish, were good. The screeching figures symbolising the doomed souls, the fiery red light like the burning pit and the way that Helen of Troy was also there, dragging Faustus down. It showed how beauty and his want for great things led to this.

The ending was a good summary of how magic had promised him such greatness but led to his untimely end, which is straight out of the medieval morality play tradition which taught how wrong it was to dabble with forbidden things such as magic.

Yes, that's well shown in that line from the Epilogue at the end of the play: 'Faustus is gone: regard his hellish fall'.

Explorative Study	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	5	5
AO2 /08	6	6
AO3 /36	33	33
AO4 /12	9	9

Creative Critical Response	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
AO1 /6	6	5
AO4 /12	11	11

TOTAL /80	Centre Marks	Standardised Marks
	70	69

Comments:

This folder sits on the A/B borderline and has been accurately assessed by the centre. The candidate could have done a little more analysis of language and structure. There is excellent linking of the two plays but sometime there could have been fuller engagement with interpretations by other readers. The CCR is well- sustained, although the register is slightly stilted for a conversation.