

**IGCSE English Literature
Exemplar scripts and
commentaries**

**June 2018
Paper 2**

Paper 2: Modern Drama

Question 1: A View from The Bridge

Script 1 – Full marks

1. In the play 'A View From The Bridge', Differing ideas of law and justice posed by different kinds of people and the laws that have been integrated into their lives are explored and contrasted, In showing the conflict between the traditional upholding one's own justice presented by the Italian immigrants and Sicilians, and the American Law which contrasts with their idea of what is right and wrong, forbidding actions such as murder even if it is in the name of honour, portrayed through the character of Marco and his desire to get justice for the injustice which Eddie has dealt him.

The very first ideas and concepts of law, justice and how they contrast one another is established by Miller in the play is through the character of Alfieri, an Italian lawyer Having connections to both Italy and the law, Alfieri is able to understand and comment on both sides of law and justice upheld by both lawyers and Italian immigrants. This allows him to maintain a relatively neutral perspective and commentate passively on events happening in the play from above the action, hence his role in the play as a narrator, and the play's title itself, 'a view from the bridge', representing the way in which Alfieri unfolds the actions in the play whilst looking down upon them from a higher perspective. Through Alfieri's speech, the concepts of personal Italian honour and strict American law are established through his position as an Italian lawyer. Such statements by Alfieri in this speech as 'I often think that behind That suspicious little nod of theirs lies three thousand years of distrust.' aid Miller in exploring the notions of justice and law upheld by Italian immigrants in Red Hook, creating the idea of distrust towards lawyers having been typical of Italian immigrants for many generations due to lawyers being a representation of the law, which often contrasts with traditional Italian concepts of justice and what is right or wrong. Miller's earlier statement of 'We're only thought of in connection with disasters' helps him further this point, as if lawyers were seen by Italian immigrants only to be significant in accordance with the most extreme circumstances, implying that other matters of less severity were dealt with by the Italians themselves, without having to involve the law as their own ideas contrast with the strict regulations of what the law will and will not allow regardless of circumstance. Through the words spoken by Alfieri in this speech Miller is able to establish the themes of two different kinds of 'law', official American law and that upheld by individuals to themselves and their honour immediately in the play and begin foreshadowing the future events of the play occurring due to a lack of ability of first generation Italian immigrants being unable to compromise.

The second way in which Alfieri represents the ideas of law and justice in his speech is through the way in which many immigrants have matured and evolved to better conform to American society and expectations. 'And now we are quite civilized, quite American. Now we settle for half, and I like it better.' This allows Miller to create another concept about law and justice through the idea of them having been compromised by those having lived in America for longer and having had more time to get used to American society and law which contrasts so heavily with ideas about law in Sicily and Italy. Alfieri establishes the point that many have been able to compromise between obeying the law and upholding ones own honour, making the immigrants 'more civilized' and 'more American' as he says, having been able to adapt to a more modern way of living. This compromise is developed into the idea of there being a strong community spirit between those living in Red Hook, many of them having originally come from Italy, and leads to the dishonourable treatment of those who betray the community by reporting immigrants, as Eddie does. With consideration given to the context of the time at which this play was set, during a time at which there was a surge of Italian

immigrants coming to America for better employment and payment from Italy, Italian immigrant communities such as Red Hook received new immigrants fairly regularly. It was highly dishonourable to report one to the authorities as Eddie ultimately does to try and rid himself of Rodolpho. The compromise between law and justice established by Alfieri at the beginning of the play being upheld strongly as a value by all members of the closely-knit Red Hook community, Eddie's betrayal is met not with direct violence as a typical Italian would respond with but with more of a shunning, as Louis and Mike do: 'Louis barely turns, then walks off and exits down right with Mike.' The ignoring and shunning of Eddie by Mike and Louis who are typical people within the community symbolise the entire community's response to Eddie's actions. The compromise originally established by Alfieri and held by all Red Hook inhabitants is what results in their shameful and dishonourable treatment of Eddie, ultimately catalysing his own actions in attacking Marco and dying, making the play a tragedy as a whole. Through this idea of a compromise between traditional Italian honour and American law held by the Italian immigrants of Red Hook Miller is able to show the ability of the immigrants to adapt to new circumstances and establish another idea of law versus justice, as well as acting as one of the catalysts for the play's events; the open and public disgust and disappointment felt towards Eddie's actions by the community is what drives him so far in an attempt to regain his respect, his reputation and 'his name' as he puts it from Marco resulting in the play with more of a shunning, as Louis and Mike do: 'Louis barely turns, then walks off and exits down right with Mike.' The ignoring and shunning of Eddie by Mike and Louis who are typical people within the community symbolise the entire community's response to Eddie's actions. The compromise originally established by Alfieri and held by all Red Hook inhabitants is what results in their shameful and dishonourable treatment of Eddie, ultimately catalysing his own actions in attacking Marco and dying, making the play a tragedy as a whole. Through this idea of a compromise between traditional Italian honour and American law held by the Italian immigrants of Red Hook Miller is able to show the ability of the immigrants to adapt to new circumstances and establish another idea of law versus justice, as well as acting as one of the catalysts for the play's events; the open and public disgust and disappointment felt towards Eddie's actions by the community is what drives him so far in an attempt to regain his respect, his reputation and 'his name' as he puts it from Marco resulting in the play's events. This makes it a very significant type of law within the play.

Finally is the devout, traditional and strongly felt idea of committing actions which one must do held by Marco in the play. Marco is a traditional Italian man in every way, holding very extreme views of what is the right thing to do when someone has dishonoured him the way Eddie has in reporting him to the authorities. Marco's near hyperbolic response to Eddie's betrayal is a perfect example of how strongly he feels about his views of justice 'That one! He killed my children!' Marco refuses to even give Eddie the slight honour of calling him by name, referring to him as 'that one', expressing his powerful hatred of Eddie and how little respect he holds for him now. He also accuses Eddie of killing his children, which is somewhat hyperbolic and also serves to emphasize his anger towards Eddie. Later in the play, when his Rodolpho tries to get him to leave jail for his wedding, and Marco shows his outrage at legally being able to do nothing about Eddie's betrayal of him and how he has doomed his family, saying 'There is no law for that? Where is the law for that?' This displays perfectly Marco's inability to compromise with the law, portraying his shock and horror at the fact that he cannot do anything legally in the name of his own justice for what Eddie has done to him. Marco is able to follow only his own laws, the ones that he decides; he is unable to 'settle for half' as many others have done. Marco's strict Italian concepts of justice and law are what result in his killing of Eddie, completely unable to respect the power of American law as a fresh immigrant. Therefore, this type of law and justice displayed through Marco's character is massively significant to the play

as the main catalyst of its most important events and making up a large part of his own character as a typical Italian immigrant that would have been seen during the time at which the play was written.

In conclusion I believe that law is explored in several different forms and contexts between different communities and people with context of the mass movement of Italian immigrants and contrasting moral values between Italy and America at the time being considered. In 'A View From The Bridge', law is a heavily significant theme throughout as its contrast with the theme of justice and the way they collide is what results in many of the play's key events and characterizes many characters in the play.

Question 4: An Inspector Calls

Script 2 – Full marks

Sheila Birling, in the play, provides one of the two examples of the younger generation, as opposed to Mr and Mrs Birling - and Gerald, who, though younger, still presents the older generation's viewpoints. At first we, the audience, see Sheila as somewhat immature, distinctly childish, even described as "Petulant". She uses slang, and most of what she says is not serious of nature, whether it's teasing Gerald for not being present throughout the summer, or her father for being near becoming like the, as she refers to them, purple faced men who know a lot about port. She frequently uses slang and colloquial language, accusing Eric in saying "you're squiffy", meaning drunk. In her relationship with her parents she is still very much treated as child, even though she would soon be married, had she not discovered later of Gerald's infidelity. When Inspector Goole's investigation continues to take a dark path, Sheila is told to leave the room, this suggesting that her parents still view her as too fragile to hear of such matters as suicide, and while she is quite effected by the case of Eva Smith, it transpires that Sheila herself is involved.

And as the play progresses from this point the audience sees Sheila take on a more responsible tone, effected not just by the young woman's suicide, but her part in driving Eva Smith to this point. We see then, a contrast in the actions of the Birling parents, and the younger generation, such as Sheila. As Arthur Birling, and later his wife, are outraged at the accusations made against them, and try in vain to justify their actions, or in some way bribe or influence the Inspector, Sheila's most distinct reaction is remorse. She, unlike her parents, for once takes a more responsible path, and is seen to regret her actions.

As the events take a more serious note we see character of Sheila show capacity for seriousness, and, contrasting with her previous colloquial terms and teasing, use more mature and concise language, if not still somewhat informal. We even see her suspicions of both Gerald and Eric prove themselves to be a reality, as Eric is later shown to be a drunk, and Gerald is shown to have kept a mistress during the summer that Sheila teases him about. This contrasts with the statements that Mr Birling, an example of the older generation, was more assertive of, using language such as "We hard-headed, practical businessmen", that are still woefully inaccurate, as he even refers to the Titanic as "unsinkable, absolutely unsinkable", and dismisses the possibility of the upcoming war. Thus we see that Sheila, the younger generation, though at first presented as childish and petulant, seems to know more about the ways of the world than the older generation, Birling, though he ought to have seen more of it. We see Sheila's newfound responsibility come into play in the aftermath of Inspector Goole's investigations, when, between Gerald and the older Birling's attempts to assign blame and avoid responsibility, Sheila and Eric maintain a position as voices of reason, trying to explain that it does not matter whether or not Goole was an Inspector, for, as Sheila says, "he inspected us alright". Sheila sees that their actions lead to the death of an innocent person, and thus objects, with Eric, to the idea of just continuing as they were before, because the way they were before had significant negative consequences.

We also see that Sheila has gained newfound agency, and is no longer merely a child, because she talks back to her parents in ways, which are suggested by her parent's reactions, she had not before. She also alludes to the fact that her and Gerald would likely not continue with their engagement in light of recent events. Thus we see that Sheila develops from childish and immature, to among the more responsible members of the family.

Question 4: An Inspector Calls

Script 3 – full marks

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒
Question 4 ☒ Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒
Question 7 ☒ Question 8 ☒ Question 9 ☒
Question 10 ☒

Sheila Birling, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Birling is presented by J.B. Priestley as one of the most significant roles in the play. She develops significantly in maturity, morality and intuitiveness as she learns from the Inspector the pivotal part she played in the death of Eva Smith. Through the changes which Sheila undergoes, Priestley portrays how the younger generation provide hope for change in the future, so that society does not slip into old habits of social class division and irresponsibility for each other. "Sheila is immediately presented as immature to the audience as she ~~states in Act 1~~ retorts to Eric in Act 1 that 'You're squiffy' (163). This wicid phrase and use of colloquial language ~~shows~~ depicts her childish nature ^{at} the beginning of the play. moreover, Sheila is acceptant of how her parents treat her despite the stage directions showing how she is

'in her early twenties' (161). She allows her father to exclude her from discussions due to her being a woman, highlighting how at this time were considered to be inferior to men. Her father tells her that the information inspector is ~~share~~ sharing is 'nothing to do with [her]', ordering her to 'Run along' (174). The ~~use~~ use of a patronising tone and imperative statement 'Run along' highlight how Sheila lacked maturity by not standing up for herself. However, as Sheila learns of how she affected the life of Eva Smith leading up to her suicide, she grows in confidence. She later claims defiantly 'I'm staying' (183) when Gerald suggests she should leave the conversation. This lucid statement portrays her newfound conviction and confidence in herself, as she has grown in maturity.

Sheila also develops significantly in terms of her morality and responsibility as she ~~learns~~ becomes ~~of~~ aware of how she was involved in Eva Smith's death. Sheila explains how she had been prejudiced against the girl due to her appearance. She shares with the inspector how 'if [Eva had] been some miserable plain little creature' (180-181)

she wouldn't have treated her so poorly as to get her fired. Priestley's use of lexis connoting inferiority emphasises how Sheila would previously treat others differently because of how they looked. Moreover, Sheila explains how 'it didn't seem to be anything very terrible at the time' (181). However, she grows significantly as she tells her mother of how she thought her actions were 'cruel and vile' (198). Priestley's use of tautology highlights Sheila's newly empathetic nature. In addition, Sheila ~~is~~ adopts a heavily sarcastic tone in saying that 'so there' 'so nothing really happened. So there's nothing to be sorry for, nothing to learn' (220). Priestley uses anaphora to convey Sheila's adamant feeling that they all still bear responsibility. His placement of this at the end of the play depicts the immense growth of Sheila as a character, evoking the hope which Priestley believes young people provide. Sheila is similar to the Inspector himself, who believes that 'we are all members of one body'. We are responsible for each other' (207). In this way, Sheila develops to possess qualities comparable

to the Inspector.

Sheila also grows in intuitiveness. The perceptive nature of the Inspector, who mysteriously appears to know everything, is translated to Sheila. When Gerald confesses to having kept ~~the~~ Eva Smith / Daisy Renton as his mistress, Sheila states that 'It was obvious from the start' (191). Moreover, Sheila questions her mother, saying 'don't you see -' (201) as her mother is seemingly unaware that her son was the one who impregnated Eva Smith, as she claims to 'blame the young man who was the father of the child' (200). In this way, Priestley conveys the foolish nature of the adult generation, as in the beginning of the play Mr. Birling also makes naive comments such as the Titanic being 'absolutely ~~the~~ unsinkable' (166). The use of the adverb 'absolutely' highlights how obvious he is to his own stupidity. Contrastingly, Sheila is very in ~~the~~ tune with the Inspector and possesses an understanding of moral values which her parents lack. In this way, Sheila developed into a particularly intuitive character.

→ PTO

In conclusion, J.B Priestley effectively displays the change which Sheila Birling undergoes, from a character tainted by materialistic attributes and childish remarks, to someone who exudes confidence, morality and an intuitiveness which makes her comparable to Inspector Goole. In this way, Priestley conveys how the impressionable minds of young people allow them to be more susceptible to changes in social views. Through this, Sheila Birling is wholly representatory of the younger generation.

Paper 2: Literary Heritage texts

Question 11: Romeo and Juliet

Script 4 – 28 marks

Chosen question number: Question 11 ☒ Question 12 ☒ Question 13 ☒
Question 14 ☒ Question 15 ☒ Question 16 ☒
Question 17 ☒ Question 18 ☒ Question 19 ☒
Question 20 ☒ Question 21 ☒ Question 22 ☒ 28 SecB

'Paris is a more suitable husband than Romeo than Juliet'. I believe that although Romeo and Juliet show ~~us~~ so called true love, Paris may ~~be~~ be the better choice out of the bachelors for Juliet.

Paris is a rich and handsome court, and technically he knows to disfigure for Romeo aside from his age, him being slightly older than Romeo. However, Romeo and Juliet's counter show love at first sight, beating Paris' slow of earthly love. I believe love Paris has done a better ~~of~~ representation of love ~~at~~ at Shakespeare's time. Petrarcha love, where the girl ignores the boy, is played often by knights, ~~and~~ wooing those who are uninterested, resulting in a tragic love. Paris seems to have followed ~~the~~ the traditions of Verona, ~~by~~ asking Lord Capulet for Juliet's hand in marriage, 'What say you to my suit?' and attempting to woo Juliet, 'Happy

see, my lady and my wife!' & This shows
although his love may not be as passionate
as that of Romeo & Juliet, Paris is the actual
one who deserves more respect for following
the traditional method of gaining a marriage.

Although this is the case I understood
that Romeo and Juliet shows true love,
as shown by their singing a sonnet on the
balcony, 'holy paler kiss... have not sat
lips...' Their connection in completing the
other's lines shows they are in a form of ^{true} love,
and unlike the ~~typical~~ ~~sexual~~ relationship, they
seem to show a more passionate and pure
love, shown by their use of religious
imagery, 'pilgrims', ~~saints~~, 'saints' and
'purg'd'. Nevertheless, although ~~the~~
the two youngsters ~~seem~~ seem to show
strong love, Paris seems to be the more
rules abiding one, rather than Romeo.
~~This is because the relationship of Romeo~~
~~and Juliet~~ Paris' lines however, are not
as emotional, merely blank verses showing
nobility, but none of the passionate
emotions shown by a sonnet.

However, I still believe Paris is the better choice of husband. ~~because~~ This is because the relationship between Paris and Juliet must stay in the dark, their families' feud between each other forces them to hide the relationship, to ~~as~~ be only be able to meet when it is the ~~the~~ 'nighttime' and not part when it is the 'day'. On the contrary, Paris ~~is~~ could be able to have a proper and proud relationship with Juliet, and it would not cause as many problems and ~~tragedies~~ tragedies.

Another reason why Paris is the more suitable husband is because ~~of~~ Juliet's own father, Lord Capulet wishes so. ~~As Shakespeare wrote the play,~~ Shakespeare set his story in a patriarchal society, thus ~~of~~ whatever Lord Capulet desires, Juliet, as his daughter, should try her best to fulfill it. Although his pressing the marriage onto her may be to forget Tybalt's death, it ended up helping her on her death. However, it should be noted that her death was merely, and realistically, due to chance.

and fate working against her. This could only be blamed on Juliet herself, who did not follow the traditions of her society, and chose to disobey her parents and marry on her own in secret. This is also why Lord Capulet becomes enraged when she refuses the marriage, 'Get thee to church a' Thursday, or never after look we in the face!', suggesting she would either obey him, or be disinherited. His rage could not be blamed only on the norms of the Shakespearean era requires absolute obedience for children, and parents should be the ones arranging the marriages, thus ~~Paris~~ Juliet marrying Paris could not only be the more suitable choice, but the right one!

~~Juliet's argument that Paris and Juliet are both young and should be allowed to choose their own partners.~~
In addition, Paris' marriage to Juliet could have the possibility of amending the relationships between the Montagues and Capulets. Paris, as kinsman to Mercutio, has the chance of picking up the two

households as well. Friar Lawrence, who only
wishes to unite the two households, 'To turn
your households' rancor to pure love's, perhaps
is unfair on Paris, as he is closer to Romeo
than he is to Paris. Paris could also be
the catalyst to ~~give~~ peace in Verona!
However, I do understand after all that,
Romeo and Juliet might just ~~be~~ be
destined to be together. As stated by the
Prologue, 'A pair of star-crossed loves take
their ~~life~~ life', suggesting that it might have
been fate, that they would meet and fall
in love, and die to end the two
households' rage. ~~How~~ ~~Not~~ Fate
seems to be working its way by delaying
Friar John to deliver Lawrence's message to
Romeo, and hastening Lord Capulet's
choice of the day of marriage. Perhaps they
are destined to be husband and wife after
all. ~~However~~, However, it must be remembered
that if Juliet, and Romeo, had been more
thoughtful, or Friar Lawrence and the Nurse,
had ~~too~~ been more thoughtful, they would
perhaps realise Paris is the better and
more reasonable option. Even so, just like
Boethius ~~the~~ the philosopher suggests, :

the stars are the conductors of human destiny, and God draws the star's paths. This relates to Romeo and Juliet's frequent use of light and heaven, 'bright angel', but also ~~stars~~ references to astrology, 'cut him out in little stars.'

In conclusion, ~~although~~ I believe Paris is the more suitable husband than Romeo because he is ~~the more~~ the more following traditions. Even at Juliet's fake death, he brings flowers to her tomb, ~~so~~ fulfilling his role as the victim of fate, but also evoking sympathy for her, as he says 'weep'. Although it may be just fate, and that Romeo and Juliet are just destined to be together, ~~the~~ Paris could still be the better choice of a husband, as though Lord Capulet's own wishes in a patriarchal society, and the feud between the Montagues and the Capulets, Paris may just be able to prevent all these ~~young~~ ~~young~~ ~~dear~~ deaths, and can live with Juliet in ~~brod~~ broad daylight, perhaps even ending the 'mating' and bring peace to Verona.

Question 13: Macbeth

Script 5 – 30 marks

Chosen question number: Question 11 ☒

Question 12 ☒

Question 13 ☒

Question 14 ☒

Question 15 ☒

Question 16 ☒

Question 17 ☒

Question 18 ☒

Question 19 ☒

Question 20 ☒

Question 21 ☒

Question 22 ☒

30 sec

Evil is presented as a pivotal concept in the tragedy Macbeth. The witches were believed to be the primary source of evil in the Jacobean era, and in this way incited their own ways on Macbeth. Lady Macbeth, a heavily duplicitous character, ^{further} spurs on the machiavellian nature of Macbeth. As a result, evil is the hamartia of the protagonist, Macbeth.

In the Jacobean era, witches were believed to be workers of the devil, sent to carry out his evil biddings. In this way, William Shakespeare highlights their evil by depicting their first meeting at the opening of the play in a battlefield amidst 'thunder and lightning'. In Act 1 Shakespeare uses Stichomythia in the witches' speech of 'where the place? ... upon the heath' (1). This alludes to their evil nature. Moreover, the witches are referred to as the 'weird sisters'. The word 'weird' is derived from the Old English 'wyrd' which literally means evil. This highlights their machiavellian intent. In

addition, Banquo describes them as possessing a 'choppy finger... skinny lips... And... beards' (6). This vivid use of vivid imagery illustrates the witches' horrific appearance as a result of their cruel ^{practices} ~~ways~~. Furthermore, in the opening of the play the witches chant 'Fair is foul, and foul is fair' (1), this paradox is later mirrored by Macbeth when he says 'So foul and fair a day I have not seen' (6). This anaphoric reference highlights the witches' manipulative influence over Macbeth. ~~when~~ As the witches prepare to haunt Macbeth with the apparitions, they speak in rhyming couplets as they describe such things as 'snake... bake... frog... dog' (61) to be used in the spell. Shakespeare, in this way, emphasises the evil nature of the witches.

Shakespeare portrays the development of Macbeth's evil nature in order to create a dramatic plot to the play. Initially, Banquo describes him as his 'noble partner' (6). This pre-modified noun phrase foreshadows Macbeth's development into a villainous role who has such a capacity of evil that he kills his own friend. From the beginning, Macbeth is alluded to have underlying machiavelian qualities as he is with the

witches very early on. In this way, Shakespeare depicts to the audience how he is intrinsically linked to evil. Furthermore, as Macbeth's ambition grows, so does his evil. He shares how he has 'vaulting ambition which o'erleaps itself' (19). This alludes to how Macbeth is aware that his actions may produce dire consequences, but he has such strong ambition that he cannot stop. Moreover, his Machiavellian intent grows as in his soliloquy he shares how he has a 'heart-appressed brain' (24), this use of synecdoche highlights his growing desires to commit evil deeds in order to pursue his ambitions. Before going to kill Duncan he declares 'I go, and it is done' (25). This monosyllabic and ~~too~~ lucid statement portrays his audacity to be king, and list for Machiavellian actions. Macbeth develops into a ruthless murderer as he commits regicide of King Duncan. Macduff exclaims how 'most sacrilegious murder hath broke ope' (33). This emphasises the sheer evil of murdering a king, as ~~it was~~ society at this time believed in the divine right of kings, hence why the murder of Duncan would

considered as a sin towards God. Macbeth even ~~kills his former friend~~ orders the murder of his former friend Banquo and Macduff's family. Shakespeare evokes pathos ~~insaying how~~ as Macduff refers to them as his 'pretty chickens' (80). Moreover, before Macbeth murders the young Siward he ~~refers~~^{says} to Macbeth that 'the devil himself could not pronounce a title ~~to~~ more hateful to mine ear' (95), to which Macbeth replies 'No, nor more fearful'. This translates the idea which Machiavelli wrote in his book, of how a leader should incite fear and not love in order to be powerful.*

Lady Macbeth is presented as a heavily duplicitous character. Her evil nature is conveyed through her defiance against the expectations of a woman in the Jacobean era. ~~She~~ In her soliloquy she calls to evil spirits telling them to 'unsex [her] And fill [her] from the crown to the toe topfull of direst cruelty' (15). This metaphor and use of the alliterative phrase 'toe topfull' highlight her supreme desire to possess the evil necessary to fulfill her husband's ambitions. Moreover, her ^{own} immense

ambition is shown as she said to Macbeth that, if she had sworn to do so she would 'Have pluck'd [her] nipple from [her baby's] boneless gums' (21). In this way, she rejects the maternal qualities expected of a woman, and depicts her own Machiavellian intent. Furthermore, one could argue that Lady Macbeth is the cause of Macbeth's evil as she encourages him to commit the murders. She says that '[she] may pour [her] spirits in [Macbeth's] ear' (14) in order to give him strength to carry out the deed of Duncan's murder. Moreover, she emasculates him by ~~questioning~~ questioning, employing 'Are you a man?' (53). This spurred Macbeth on to develop into a more Machiavellian presence. However, Lady Macbeth's evil is her own downfall as she takes her own life (92) as a result of the guilt she feels for her wrongdoings.

In conclusion, Shakespeare presents the theme of evil as significant in the tragedy 'Macbeth' through the capacity for evil of Macbeth, Lady Macbeth and the witches, and the death of the protagonist.

→ PTO.

However, death is shown to be Macbeth's
hamartia as he is murdered by Macduff
(98) towards the end of the play.

Question 11: Romeo and Juliet

Script 5 – 30 marks

11. I agree quite little with this statement. With consideration given to Juliet's own feelings about the marriages between herself and Paris as well as the differences in Romeo and Paris' attitudes towards her, I believe more that Romeo is a more suitable husband, giving far greater consideration to her emotions and having immediately fallen in love with her as she did for him, their love being supposedly 'true', whilst Paris is more interested solely in her looks and familial ties and removes himself from her individual emotion.

First of all is the first interactions seen between the characters of Romeo and Paris with Juliet and the great differences in the approaches they take towards her as well as the differing circumstances between them. Instantly upon seeing Juliet for the first time, Romeo is entranced by her, saying things such as 'For I ne'er saw true beauty till this night.' This instantly establishes Romeo's interest in Juliet for her looks and also emphasizes how entranced he is to the audience seeing as how we know of his previous love towards Rosaline, which he seems to have instantly forgotten upon having seen Juliet. When he first speaks to her, they talk in a sonnet of fourteen lines with shared rhyming couplets, such as 'Juliet: Ay, pilgrim, lips that they must use in prayer. Romeo: O then, dear saint, let lips do what hands do: They pray, grant thou, lest faith turn to despair.' The shared rhyme between Romeo and Juliet in this first encounter as well as their speech being in the form of a sonnet symbolises the instant connection and love they feel for one another, portraying their love as being 'true love', as well as showing instantly how close they are as characters. This overall emphasizes how each one is the perfect lover for each other, instantly making a great connection; the important thing to note being that Juliet loves Romeo in return. In contrast, Paris' first approach to Juliet is by asking her father for her hand in marriage 'But now, my lord, what say you to my suit?' And Capulet then replies protesting that she is too young, to which Paris replies 'Younger than she are happy mothers made.' The first important thing to note is that Paris does not approach Juliet for her hand in marriage. This fits in with the context of the time of the 14th century, a time at which society was heavily patriarchal. Women had little to no choice in whom they would marry and were controlled entirely by their fathers up until their marriages, at which point they would be controlled by their new husbands. Women were often married into rich or powerful families to connect strong families and gain riches and wealth for that family. Paris fits into this tradition in asking Capulet to marry Juliet, displaying his likely lack of actual love for her. This coincides with the context of the time of the 14th century, a time at which society was heavily patriarchal. Women had little to no choice in whom they would marry and were controlled entirely by their fathers up until their marriages, at which point they would be controlled by their new husbands. Women were often married into rich or powerful families to connect strong families and gain riches and wealth for that family. Paris fits into this tradition in asking Capulet to marry Juliet, displaying his likely lack of actual empathy for Juliet's feelings and thoughts about the marriage, not having even approached her with the idea.

This heavily contrasts with Romeo's direct approach in his first interaction with Juliet, far more of an emotional moment than Paris asking Capulet for Juliet's hand in marriage. This contrasts Romeo's pure love and emotion felt for Juliet, entirely unrelated to her social standing, which is something ideal for a husband to feel towards their wife with Paris' unemotional approach likely related to the power of her family or her looks.

Secondly is the response given by Juliet to Romeo and Paris, clearly displaying the types of emotions she feels for each of them. Clearly, when considering the traits of an ideal husband for Juliet her own feelings towards the man she is marrying are crucial to deciding how suitable they are as a husband. The audience is clearly shown Juliet's affection and love for Romeo both through the love sonnet of their first meeting and the powerful emotion she presents towards him during her soliloquy on her balcony afterwards, such as in the exclamation 'O Romeo, Romeo, wherefore art thou Romeo?' The repetition of the name Romeo here shows how much he is weighing upon her mind. She is asking him (in a rhetorical question) why his name is Romeo, and goes on to ask him to get rid of it 'Romeo, doff thy name'. The reason for asking Romeo to lose his name is because he is a Montague, the great enemy of her family, being a Capulet. Her strong emotion towards him during this soliloquy which she utters to herself in wishing he could do something as extreme as abandoning his name so they can be together shows her strong love and affection for him despite having known him for such a small amount of time. Juliet also compares their love to lightning 'Too like the lightning, which doth cease to be Ere one can say 'It lightens.' The comparison by Juliet of their love to lightning, whilst emphasizing the brevity and rashness of their love also emphasizes the light it brings to her life and how much she treasures it. This overall shows Juliet's great affection and love for Romeo, contrasting with the way in which she interacts with Paris, for example when she interacts with him prior to their wedding, him having happily met her, his future wife; 'That may be sir, when I may be a wife.' This sharp, fairly cold and cool response portrays Juliet's lack of love and emotion for Paris when compared to the great passion seen between her and Romeo. This is further example of the context of the time having an effect on the play, Juliet's lack of interest in Paris being evident due to her marriage being arranged and out of her control. She then proceeds to speak to Paris in only short, stiff sentences reflect her disinterest in speaking to him, and then she nearly dismisses him, turning to Friar Lawrence 'Are you at leisure, holy father, now'. Her short dismissal of Paris further shows the lack of emotion which she feels for him, once again contrasting with the great passion between her and Romeo and thus furthering the idea that Romeo is a more suitable husband for her with her own emotions and reactions to each of them considered.

However, despite what I have said, there is some actions by Paris suggesting that he truly did care for Juliet, despite his lack of empathy and ability to consider her own emotions about their forced arranged marriage, even if it was a social norm. After her faked 'death', he visits her grave at night: 'Enter Paris and his Page with flowers and sweet water and torch'. Then, 'Paris strews the tomb with flowers.' The stage directions show Paris' intentions to visit Juliet's grave and pay his respects, displaying the fact that Paris does indeed feel some emotion for Juliet and did love her. He then proceeds to say things such as 'The obsequies that I for thee will keep Nightly shall be to strew thy grave and weep.' The rhyme used here emphasizes Paris' sadness at Juliet's death, and he promises to visit the grave nightly. This shows to the audience that Paris did indeed love Juliet despite his unsympathetic approach to marrying her by addressing her father primarily over her and asking him for her hand in marriage, which would suggest that Paris did feel some true love for Juliet and would make a more suitable husband than previously thought in the play Are you at leisure, holy father,

now'. Her short dismissal of Paris further shows the lack of emotion which she feels for him, once again contrasting with the great passion between her and Romeo and thus furthering the idea that Romeo is a more suitable husband for her with her own emotions and reactions to each of them considered.

However, despite what I have said, there is some actions by Paris suggesting that he truly did care for Juliet, despite his lack of empathy and ability to consider her own emotions about their forced arranged marriage, even if it was a social norm. After her faked 'death', he visits her grave at night: 'Enter Paris and his Page with flowers and sweet water and torch'. Then, 'Paris strews the tomb with flowers.' The stage directions show Paris' intentions to visit Juliet's grave and pay his respects, displaying the fact that Paris does indeed feel some emotion for Juliet and did love her. He then proceeds to say things such as 'The obsequies that I for thee will keep Nightly shall be to strew thy grave and weep.' The rhyme used here emphasizes Paris' sadness at Juliet's death, and he promises to visit the grave nightly. This shows to the audience that Paris did indeed love Juliet despite his unsympathetic approach to marrying her by addressing her father primarily over her and asking him for her hand in marriage, which would suggest that Paris did feel some true love for Juliet and would make a more suitable husband for her than previously thought in the play up to that point, showing real affection for her which is a trait which would be ideal in a suitable husband.

In conclusion, overall in the play I believe there is far more evidence to suggest Romeo as the more suitable husband for Juliet than Paris, displaying far more empathy for emotions as well as an ability to instantly form a strong bond with her, however Paris to a degree does show that he loved Juliet and therefore had some suitability as a husband for her, feeling at least some real love for her after all.