

PEARSON EDEXCEL LEVEL 3

ADVANCED GCE in ENGLISH LITERATURE

9ET0 04

COURSEWORK EXEMPLARS

Introduction	2
SCRIPT A	3
SCRIPT B	8
SCRIPT C	13
SCRIPT D	17
SCRIPT E	22
SCRIPT F	26
SCRIPT G	29
SCRIPT H	33
Commentaries and Marks	37

Introduction

In this pack you will find marked examples of real students' coursework, produced in order to support teachers in their first teaching and assessment of the 9ET0 04 coursework component on the 2015 A level GCE in English Literature.

We have adapted coursework produced for the legacy 2008 GCE English Literature specification, and the Principal Moderator has remarked it against the new coursework mark criteria, which can be found on pages 26-28 of the [A Level GCE English Literature specification](#) document.

For exemplar purposes, we have retained the students' own spelling and grammatical errors. However, we have not included footnotes, bibliographies or references which were included in the original coursework.

The original essay titles have been retained and are not necessarily being provided as model titles, but rather as exemplar folders to support your application of the new mark scheme. Support on coursework title setting can be found in the [Getting Started](#) guide. If you have any queries regarding your students' coursework titles or text choices, please do not hesitate to use the [Coursework Advisory Service](#). Guidance on this service is available [here](#).

Further support for the marking of coursework is available at our free GCE English Literature coursework marking training in February and March. You can book your place [here](#).

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Eva McManamon".

Eva McManamon

Product Manager, GCE English

SCRIPT A

According to Linda Alcoff in her essay *Cultural Feminism Versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory*, a woman in society ‘...is always the Object, a conglomeration of attributes to be predicted and controlled...’

To what extent can this theory be applied to the presentation of woman in feminist literature? With reference to ‘The Handmaid’s Tale’ by Margaret Atwood and ‘The Bell Jar’ by Sylvia Plath.

Stein suggests that the preliminary and concluding material of, ‘The Handmaid’s Tale’, namely Atwood’s two dedications, three epigraphs and the pseudo-factual ‘Historical Notes’, act as a frame to Offred’s narrative, much like the way in which, ‘a frame around a painting tells us to read an enclosed space in a certain way, as an art object re-presented’. As such Atwood makes Offred the object, defined by the patriarchal society in which she finds herself; a phenomenon also manifest in the female protagonists’ struggles against expectations of feminine passivity in Plath’s ‘The Bell Jar’. By examining these texts, it will be possible to explore the ways in which women are conveyed as strictly defined and controlled objects in literature and speculate as to the cultural and contextual influences on these authors.

In ‘The Handmaid’s Tale’, female biology is a fundamental aspect in the underpinning and restriction of the female, stemming perhaps from the cultural phenomenon theorised by Adrienne Rich, whereby, ‘patriarchal thought has limited female biology to its own narrow specifications. In ‘The Handmaid’s Tale’ the feminine physicality dictates the female representation as an object of male sexual desire and gratification, an idea which reaches its climax in the scene at Jezebel’s, in which women are dressed to enhance the physical assets fetishistically valued by men, ‘cut high up the thighs, low over the breasts... olden-days lingerie, shortie nightgowns, baby-doll pyjamas’. Here, Atwood’s use of a syndetic listing provides a fleeting glimpse of each figure, reducing them to solely their physical appearance, whilst such an abrupt syntax projects onto these women an impression of numbed intellect, further acting to streamline their identity into one that consists wholly of sexual attributes. Indeed, these women all serve as prostitutes to the Gileadean commanders, a device which holds a painful relevance to the 21st century reader, familiar as they are with a recent blight of sexual slavery, imposed by dissident military leaders in the Middle East.

This portrayal of women as sexual commodities is echoed by Offred herself in the disintegration of her language in this scene. Base and crude words such as ‘tits’ suggest Offred’s submission to a misogynistic attitude of female objectification. Indeed, Offred also succumbs through her role as mistress to a succession of men. Atwood constructs parallels between Offred’s affair with Luke, the body of which is contemplated at the beginning, and her liaison with Nick at the novel’s close to impress a kind of cyclicity upon its structure. The clandestine late night meetings, the illicit escape with a male protector, and the elaborate recollections of sexual encounters that both relationships share serve to emphasise the inevitability of female subjugation due to biology, an idea which reaches its climax when Offred sleeps with the Commander. Here, Offred’s fabricated physical appearance, ‘bad makeup, someone else’s clothes’ renders her an object constructed for the fulfilment of the commander’s sexual pleasure. This is confirmed in the contradiction between Offred’s lack of dialogue and the ‘scream[ing]’ of her internal monologue, which evidences the

repression of her voice in the moment of sexual encounter. As such, she is deprived both of the ability to consent as an equal, and of the essential human right to expression.

As such, 'The Handmaid's Tale' supports Rich's assertion as to the 'radical implications' of female biology, however such implications are sordid and negative, focusing on patriarchal exploitation of the female for sexual gratification as opposed to the reverence Rich suggests. This is confirmed in 'The Bell Jar' in Plath's starkly depicted scene of Marco's attempted rape of Esther, wherein Marco's insistent repetition of the word, 'slut', like Offred's use of the word 'tits', communicates to the reader an exclusive focus on female promiscuity and sexuality. The derogatory implications of this word are made explicit in Plath's use of the word 'hissed' – allusive to the snake in the Garden of Eden – as a descriptor for his dialogue, thus associating female sexuality with evil on a biblical plane.

However, feminist literature simultaneously depicts an antithetic view to sex, whereby female asexuality is deemed desirable and even obligatory. Such imposition of purity upon the female is made explicit in 'The Bell Jar', when Buddy reveals to Esther that he has lost his virginity, in the context of a prevailing expectation that Esther remain chaste, a hypocritical attitude made universal through Plath's use of media motif. Upon reading an article entitled 'In Defence of Chastity', Esther reflects, 'I couldn't stand the idea of a woman having to have a single pure life, and a man being able to have a double life, one pure and one not'.

As such, in both the texts and the cultures of which they are products, sexuality is an attribute that defines women. From another perspective, 'The Handmaid's Tale' is perhaps the most traditional of both texts, advocating a return to conventional femininity, the cornerstone of which is motherhood. Stein suggests that, in light of declining birth rates, Gileadean babies have a 'commodity value', a concept applied by extension to the handmaids that mother them, as confirmed in Howell's deeming Offred a 'breeding machine serving the state'. This contradicts Rich's proposal that 'Feminist vision will... come to view our physicality as a resource'. In 'The Handmaid's Tale', it is men who exploit the female 'physicality' as a resource for perpetuation of the male commanding class.

The resulting nature of fertility as a yardstick of individual value is evident in its being embedded within the novel Stein, for example, suggests that even the foods the handmaids eat can be considered as 'representations of wombs and fertility'. This valid, albeit discrete, illumination of the relationship between fertility and symbolism can be extended in the concept that the novel in its entirety is a symbol for the menstrual cycle; the fragmented chapters being separated as they are into defined sections, among which the title 'Night' rhythmically occurs, a technique made all the more elemental by Atwood's use of archaised roman numerals. The value of motherhood is also evident in Atwood's religious imagery. When Offred encounters the pregnant Janine, for example, words such as 'martyr' 'hilltop' and 'saved', convey the reverential idolatry that Gileadean society bestows upon those who are fertile.

As such, maternity is perhaps the defining trait of Gileadean women, fundamental to others' perception of them, and to their sense of self-worth. It is arguable that Atwood exaggerates elements such as fertility within the novel due to its didactic stance as a form of predictive fiction which aims to inspire change. However, 'The Bell Jar' also suggests the reduction of the female to the maternal role, despite its entirely different autobiographical genre. This is evident in Plath's fig tree allegory, in which Esther's inability to attain multiple fruits conveys, in a way perhaps more explicit than Atwood's use of embedded symbolism, her perception that motherhood is mutually

exclusive to all other elements of the female identity. Indeed, motherhood is indirectly enforced by the novel's 50's context, in which both the contraceptive pill and abortion were unavailable to women, an idea substantiated in the 'baby boom' of the 1950's.

Bonds suggests that Plath also uses the baby, deemed a symbol of the self in crisis by Jung, as a motif to convey Esther's fear that, 'each of the various paths open to her will require that she dispense with, leave undeveloped, some important part of herself'. The use of the baby as a vehicle for this idea identifies explicitly with motherhood, aligning with the fig tree allegory to convey the strict restriction of the female to the maternal role. However, Bond's assertion that the baby carries entirely negative implications is contradicted at the novel's beginning, where Esther fleetingly alludes to her 'baby'. The measured narrative tone that envelops this reference, elicited by intimate parenthesis, 'later, when I was alright again, I bought them out' and a considered, evaluative use of the past tense, 'for a long time afterwards I hid them away' contributes to an effect of stability, pronounced in its contrast to the frenzied, breathless tone of Esther's descent into mental illness. As such, 'the baby' is not only contributory to Esther's recovery, but it is also a component of Esther as a complete woman of many and complex attributes, as this reference is born out of a testament to Esther's being a successful writer: the form of the novel itself. As such, 'The Bell Jar' depicts motherhood as an element of the feminine, not its entirety.

After having considered two of the most prominent attributes bestowed upon the female in literature, the position of the woman as 'predicted' and 'controlled' will now be contemplated in terms of the restriction of female self-expression. In, 'The Handmaid's Tale', it is revealed at the novel's end that the narrative has been reconstructed by two male history professors. Consequently, Offred is deprived of narrative initiative on two counts. Not only is her story not composed in the way she intended, but by positioning this revelation at the close of the novel, that part which leaves a lasting impression upon the reader, Atwood radically shifts the novel's *raison d'être* from consideration of female oppression to, 'analysis of how patriarchal imperatives are encoded within the various intellectual methods we bring to bear on history' or, as Howells more simply confirms, Offred's voice is 'drowned out' by that patriarchal tradition. This idea is corroborated in Alcoff's feminist assertion that 'every source of knowledge about women has been contaminated with misogyny and sexism and evidenced in Atwood's use of conditional clauses, 'if the author is telling the truth' and questions, 'Why did she not make her story public...?' which has the effect of diminishing Offred's narrative by provoking the reader's doubt as to its credibility. In this way Offred is rendered passive in her own narrative, subject to male authority and secondary to the ultimate goal of demystifying patriarchal intent.

The concept of passivity is extended by Freibert's critical assertions as to Atwood's employment of a "low-keyed" voice, which acts to 'approximate the limited scope of Offred's life'. Freibert's suggestions of narrative timidity imply Offred's passive submission to patriarchal oppression, an idea directly contradicted by Deer's insistence that Offred is, 'an authoritative storyteller, one who manipulates the reader as she tells her story'. Offred's superiority in the narrator-reader relationship is apparent in Atwood's rhetorical skill. Her use of anadiplosis and anaphora deftly impresses upon the reader the horror of the Gileadean institution of execution and the connections she purposefully employs before guilefully casting aside suggest a concealed narrative intent. This conflict between the innocent, victimized aspect of Offred and the powerful, purposeful aspect that manipulates the narrative embodies the struggle of an intelligent woman to realise self-expression in an oppressive

Despite this depiction of women as controlled elements due to the limitation of their self-expression, defiance of patriarchal control is also evident in both texts. Offred's mother, for example, is a staunch feminist. Her revolutionary act – burning pornography, protesting for abortion – render her a product of the radical feminism of the 70's with which contemporary readers of the 80's novel would have been familiar, thus injecting the novel with potent overtones of resistance and defiance rooted in reality. This feminist mantle is sustained by Moira in the Gileadean era, most prominently in her homosexuality, which flagrantly defies dependence on, and subjugation to, the male. As such even her resignation to sexual slavery at Jezebel's later in the novel becomes subversive in her exploitation of the situation as a "Butch paradise". However in 'The Bell Jar', Joan's homosexuality is yet more defiant as, when the book was first received in 1963, homosexuality was still widely illegal; a contemporary shock depicted by Plath in Esther's confused reaction to Joan's intimacy with Dee Dee. As such, Joan powerfully rebels against male control as a woman who 'can pursue a career and independent life without the benefit of man or marriage'. However, such rebellion is potentially lost on the modern reader, accustomed as they are to a growing acceptance of homosexuality.

Indeed, the defiance of figures such as Moira is undermined by a characterisation that essentially fulfils every facet of the radical feminist stereotype – homosexuality, resistance to authority and a kind of virility, as suggested by her masculine 'overalls' and assertive dialogue, "let's go for a beer". The stereotyping of the female has an overarching presence in 'The Handmaid's Tale' in Atwood's careful stratification of women; ranging from 'unwomen' to 'econowives', 'handmaids' and commander's wives at the top of the female hierarchy, all of whom are explicitly identified by their respective clothing. This categorization of 'the model woman'; a personified fulfilment of the obedient housewifely traits of domesticity and submission is shown in 'The Bell Jar' in the form of Buddy's mother, whose kitchen mat, as a domestic item 'flatten[ed] out underneath' her husband's feet symbolises her position as an acquiescent domestic servant. Juxtaposed against this stereotype is the equally restrictive one of the successful and unappealing career woman, embodied by the 'terrible' JayCee.. These clichés evidence the streamlining of the female into specific attributes, the conglomeration of which constitutes the authors' chosen representation of the female in literature. This is exemplified in 'The Handmaid's Tale' through the merging of various exaggerated and stereotypical figures, such as Aunt Lydia and Moira, into Offred's discourse; achieved through Atwood's neglect of the speech marks that would traditionally differentiate other characters' dialogue from narrative thought, 'Idiot, says Moira'. In this way the various, strictly defined female attributes are melded together in a single, amalgamative narrative voice.

These writers have chosen to present their female protagonists as amalgams; broken and fragmented figures embodied by the fractured structure of all three texts. Whilst Deer asserts Offred's 'integrity', evidenced perhaps in the impenetrability of her anonymity, LeBihan's contradictory assertion as to 'The Handmaid's Tale's', 'problematic relationship with the concept of one single reality, one identity is more substantially supported by Atwood's conspicuous use of the word 'palimpsest' at the beginning of the novel, which resonates throughout in Atwood's employment of 'single words.... like palimpsest' such as 'compucount'. These neologisms, constructed from fragments of pre-existing words, are microcosmic representations of the fractured female. Such fragmentation is typical of the novel's post-modernist style. There is also a temporal fragmentation in both 'The Bell Jar' and 'The Handmaid's Tale' whereby both narratives transition

between a more immediate present, and a distant past tense with the effect of disrupting the chronology of the narrative to communicate the disjointed nature of the female.

This, the conglomerational essence of the female in literature, is perhaps most evident in her construction from both reality and fiction. Both novels possess autobiographical elements; the narrative of 'The Bell Jar' recounts Plath's summer of 1953. Although 'The Handmaid's Tale' is less explicitly autobiographical, Deer's comment that 'Offred's powerful narrative skill conflicts with the powerlessness, the innocence...[that]characterizes her ' suggests not only, as previously considered, the struggle of a woman to realise self-expression in a patriarchal environment, but also the emergence of Atwood's powerful authorial rhetoric from behind the supposedly passive narrative tone of Offred. As such Atwood's Gilead is 'an amalgam of trends', in a way that transcends the mere conglomeration of past and present events that Swale suggests – it is constructed also from its author's being.

To conclude, both female writers considered use various fictional constructs to present the woman as a controlled, passive and incoherent 'conglomeration of attributes'; fragmented by her construction from reality and fiction, and considering wholly of a series of different and at times contradictory characteristics, such as those of sensuality, purity and motherhood. Although overtones of rebellion against these constraints are evident in the controversial characterisation of various female characters, such defiance has been eroded over time by the growing acceptance and even stereotypisation of the traits that make these women subversive. As such, both the contexts in which the texts were written and those in which they are received, reinforce the enduring repression of the female in society; the devastating impact of which these writers act to highlight.

SCRIPT B

Explore the range of control mechanisms employed by totalitarian governments in “Nineteen Eighty–Four” by George Orwell and “Blind Faith” by Ben Elton.

Totalitarianism is a political system in which the state holds total authority over the society and seeks to control all aspects of public and private life whenever necessary. The concept of totalitarianism was first developed in a positive sense in the 1920s by the Italian fascists. The concept became prominent in Western anti-communist political discourse during the Cold War time, which creates similarities between Nazi Germany and the leader of the Spanish conservative movement called the ‘Spanish Confederation of the Autonomous Right’, which declared his view to, “give Spain a true unity, a new spirit, a totalitarian polity...” and “Democracy is not an end but a means to the conquest of the new state. When the time comes, either parliament submits or we eliminate it”.

These governments are very similar to the totalitarian governments in ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ and also ‘Blind Faith’ where they use control mechanisms to create their own ideas of society, as their ideas and policies are similar to those used in Nazi Germany and the Spanish Conservative movement and are shown both novels to the extreme to control a whole population through manipulation and fear.

Sexual mechanisms are used by both governments in both in ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ and also ‘Blind Faith’, to drive the public away from the real problem of the government. In Orwell’s novel sexual control is enforced in Oceania by Big Brother and the Party which both disapprove of sexual feelings. Instead desires are met by an emotional bond between characters engaging in “hate week” where the public’s frustration is vented. In ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ sex is to be a clinical operation whereas in this modern age it is about two people becoming one. Big Brother’s chances of success in controlling people’s sexual activity would have been shocking to a reader today as in the novel they in place the ‘Junior Anti Sex League, which make men like Winston become angry towards these women as he explains them early on as, “narrow scarlet sash... wound several times round the waist of her overalls. This shows Winston’s frustration and almost hatred towards the women, when really he is attracted to the opposite sex. But through Big Brothers mechanisms he has become so paranoid that his feelings have been moulded and corrupted. However Big Brother can not stop peoples’ instinct, but they try to, as we see in the diversion created in the terms of Hate Week. This relates to another of George Orwell’s pieces called ‘*Shooting an Elephant*’ where he explains the crowds influence to shoot an elephant, “*I did not hear the bang or feel the kick-one never does when a shot goes home – but I heard the devilish roar of glee that went up from the crowd*”. This relates to ‘Nineteen Eighty –Four’ as how a majority can influence a person to do whatever the crowd feel right, just how the Party have manipulated the majority to release their frustration on an external figure or figures.

In ‘Blind Faith’ sexual mechanisms are used in the complete opposite way as sex is allowed and promoted. A way that this is enforced is the use of breast enlargement which shows how the government want people to get aroused and focus on sex rather than the bigger political picture. It is enforced that much that woman can be given, “honour enlargements” even if they refuse. This is

seen as an honour in London whereas for a reader of today it would be against the law to force women to have the procedure against their consent. However some cultures still do force their women to uphold certain traditions. This shows how corrupt the government has become and their quest to create an alternative focus to divert from the real issues of the government.

The government also uses the internet as a mechanism to invade privacy and increase sexual activity to make the people more concerned about sex, rather than the politics and the bigger picture. An example of this is Chantoria's breast feeding on the internet, "Chantoria's joy sprang into view on the wall screen". This is such an intimate moment between mother and child and Chantoria must share this with the world to be socially accepted. This shows how the government and their followers have manipulated people to feel obliged to share such special and private experiences. In our society of today this is similar as nothing is a secret due to the media and social networking sites.

Both governments use external factors or bullying to control and manipulate their people. In 'Nineteen Eighty-Four', the Government create a public enemy so people don't think of politics of their own government. The government shift the blame to an external hate figure such as Goldstein. Subliminal messages are used to present Goldstein as a sheep which suggest he is a devil and has a high libido. The Government cleverly use words such as, "venomous", showing he is the enemy and also, "Jewish", which Orwell comments on. By doing this the reader would view Goldstein as a hero because in the time that the book was written Jews were killed (concentration camps) and were the reader would sympathise, however the population in the book have been subjected to similar conditions, but due to the manipulation of history they are clueless to how they should be treated. To stop the Party from getting the blame they have used Goldstein as a mechanism to create the blame on him which again stops people from rebelling. *Hitler's Germany Policies* allowed him to control how people thought, just as in 'Nineteen Eighty-Four'. The '*spin doctor of the public*' conscience, Dr Joseph Gobbles was head of Germany's Ministry of public enlightenment and propaganda. His masterful use of propaganda proved a crucial instrument for acquiring and maintaining power and for the implementation of their policies. It's clear to see that this is a method used in 'Nineteen Eighty-Four' as, "he who controls the past controls the present", therefore the future also. By changing news scripts, media information and documents has allowed Oceania to implant its propaganda. Winston had worked for the Ministry of Truth which was responsible for any necessary falsification of historical events. The word 'Truth' in the 'Ministry of Truth' should warn the characters that the 'Ministry' will serve its own truth as it does in the novel.

In 'Blind Faith' bullying is used by the Government to manipulate the focus onto a minority rather than the big issue, their Government, "Try not to look weirder than we have to ". This shows how scared people such as Chantoria are due to people like Princess Lovebud who homes in on the weak individuals and humiliates people. This is showing how the Love has made people scared of authority figures as these figures (Princess LoveBud) represent power and punishment. Similar to Ken Kesey's novel "one flew over the cuckoo's nest", which shows how a nurse who McMurphy calls "Big Nurse" victimizes the men in the mental institute and therefore controls them completely. How McMurphy shows how one man can try to make a difference but he is still only one man and is a minority compared to the majority.

Orwell uses the characters in 'Nineteen Eighty-Four' to present indoctrination, which goes hand and hand with totalitarianism. He uses a lot of symbols to present indoctrination. One example is Room

101 which symbolises indoctrination but also rebellion. The party also uses “education” to de-educate the population, “who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past”. This statement gives us an insight on how organised they are and how much power they have over the characters in the novel. In ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ the ‘minitruer’ is used to control the people, suiting their own purposes by changing and re-writing the past. By doing this the Party can develop complete control over the people without the characters noticing. Even if the characters did notice, the government have created a symbol of horror “room 101” so the people are in fear of rebelling. This also shows the levels of command and who is more dominant, similar to another novel of Orwell’s, ‘Animal Farm’ where he conveys control and power through animals who feel they are better than others, “ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL, SOME ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS”. This clearly relates to ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ as it implies how people giving commands mostly become the dominant figure and control the majority.

Indoctrination is also essential as having an unintelligent population makes them vulnerable and easy to manipulate as they are too unintelligent to see what the Party is doing. By doing this the Government have complete and utter control over the population.

In both novels privacy and being alone is unacceptable, which shows the reader another control mechanism used by The Party and The Government. In ‘Blind Faith’ the Government have restrained people from being alone as it gives room to think, “isolation was not healthy”, the government forbid this as it may allow people to consider rebellion. As a result members of society become claustrophobic which highlights to the reader society’s entrapment. This stops them from being an individual, as it removes their identity and individuality ensure obedience, society is reminded of the “wrath of the Love” which refers to the Flood; the government have attributed this natural disaster to the wrath of the love, rather than global warming. This shows how the government have used manipulation to intimidate people into order and to obey what ‘the love’ wants. Global warming has been manipulated by the Love to show that disobedience will be punished. This creates fear and conformity.

In Orwell’s novel, the Party uses mechanisms such as the Thought Police and the ban on diary keeping to completely control the people. The Thought Police are used to create paranoia, “Thought crime does not entail death; thought crime is death”. This mechanism is used to strike fear into the people in the novel to create obedience. Another mechanism used in ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ is the ban on diary keeping which stops people from thinking and allows them to be influenced by the Party, as it stops from writing their piece of history, as Winston tells us early on in the novel, “if you want to keep a secret, you must also keep it from yourself”. This shows that no one is safe, and there isn’t even though privacy to think because people are made to believe that the Party will find out and will be punished, which in turn shows the control Big Brother has gained over the years.

Both of the governments in the two novels use technology as a means to control. In ‘Blind Faith’ technology is portrayed through communication screens and the internet to stop people from thinking. News is used to portray god and his rules to the population when in fact it is not god’s rules it is their governments’ demands, “in *Entertainment* news...personal demons...with the help of god,” This shows how god is used as an authority figure for the people to fear rather than respect. This news was structured and put first before the, “*News News*” in other words the real news, this shows how the government has made gossip more important than the real news as a means to control the

people on what to watch and listen to. This control mechanism helps the government to convey what they want and for the people to concentrate on one part of the news and not on the real news. The government have also used “god’s sins” as a way to control, as we see when Trafford has a conversation and his point is rejected as Fiction is not approved of which shows the control that the government has, “You mean...fiction...Yes 1984 is a story about a society where, “this shows us how the government have used god as an authority figure to allow their own input to be included which prevents rebellion.

In ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ the Party uses Newspeak as a beacon to control everyone and everything. “Don’t you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? Has it ever occurred to you, Winston, that by the year 2050, at the very latest, not a single human being will be alive who could understand such a conversation as we are having now?... The whole climate of thought will be different. In fact, there will be no thought, as we understand it now. Orthodoxy means not thinking – not needing to think. Orthodoxy is unconsciousness. “This shows how the government has manipulated the people to control them and their future generations and will limit thought further and uneducated the population. Three years before Orwell formulated the concept of newspeak, he had explored in one of his most influential essays, Politics and the English Language (1946), the decay of language and the ways in which it might be checked...Our civilisation is dependent...Underneath this lies the half-conscious belief that language is a natural growth and not an instrument which we shape for our own purposes. (Taken from George Orwell and Politics and the English Language). George Orwell uses the idea of language being condensed in ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ to show how using mechanisms such as Newspeak, a government can control the population, by manipulating the English Language over a period of time. Also how language can be forgotten/removed from peoples vocabulary over generations.

Another aspect of totalitarianism is the fact that, “BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU”, literally, the eyes move to follow you. This would give the impression of no privacy and would keep the characters always on guard. This therefore stops them from doing the thing they wish and would make them feel cautious. This shows the control and obedience the characters give the government as they are always watching out, which also would make the characters paranoid not just from other people or the government but of themselves.

In both novels, Economical factors play a part in controlling the people. In ‘Blind Faith’ bad food is offered so people are too weak and unhealthy to rebel, “Defrosted two lasagnes and chilled a 3 litre bottle of Pepsi. And shared their meal over the video game table”. Poor diet is featured in both novels which shows poor health which benefits the government as they are less likely to fight back as they are too weak or too fat to physically do anything. This also gives us insight into the crowded conditions in ‘Blind Faith’ where it is an overpopulated society, which benefits the Government as they can keep surveillance on them at all times. Poor health and the prohibition of vaccinations help ensure the problem of overpopulation, this increase poverty and illness. By the increase in death rates the people are too busy grieving or watching pod casts on grieving parents. As masses of grief limits people.

This relates to ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ as all living conditions are cramped and unclean. The people of Oceania live in a cold, dark world full of terror and restrictions. The party of Oceania controls not only the lives of the people through telescreens, spies and Thought Police but also their reality,

“when men are different from one another and do not live alone... to a time when truth exists and...The instinctive feeling that the conditions you lived in were tolerable”. This shows not just how the physical conditions are in Oceania but also the way people are forced to live, such as separately and not with a partner. This would be shocking to a modern reader of today as the conditions that the people are forced to live in are ridiculous and unhealthy. These controlling mechanisms are used to manipulate and control order over the physical nature of the people but also to erase or adjust their emotions, so the Party can control the whole person. Therefore if they control the external and internal physicality’s of there population, this leaves the people as an empty shell that the Party can control and manipulate how they see fit.

The mechanisms used in both ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ and ‘Blind Faith’ were used to control and manipulate the population in the novels. The totalitarian governments in both novels are fully in control and through their mechanisms they have given the idea that they are for the people when evidently we see as readers that it is the complete opposite. We see this through the characters’ journeys presented by both authors to show the methods of the governments and how power gives them complete control.

In ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ Orwell would most likely have had a pessimistic view on totalitarian countries as the book was written just after the second world war so he had most likely a negative perspective. This is shown in his novel as Winston is left isolated and moulded into what the Party want and accept. This leaves the reader feeling unfulfilled on Winston’s behalf, as shown by Ben Pimlott a critic who explains, “At the same time, totalitarianism was a stalking fear. Nazi Germany in the recent past, Russia and China in the present, framed the Western political consciousness. There was a sense of grimly staring into a crystal ball at a just-imaginable near-distance. “This shows that Orwell was inspired by the environment he had been living in and found it difficult to feel hopeful about the future.

However Ben Elton may have a more optimistic view as he is not living through a totalitarianism dictatorship. At the end of “Blind Faith” there is a sense of hope as even though Trafford dies, he is able to send his email to the world so his death wasn’t for nothing. The use of the internet as a mechanism to control has now backfired as Trafford has used it to his benefit and advantage. If the internet had been present in the time of ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’ the outcome of Winston’s fate may have been different.

SCRIPT C

Dystopian novels and social commentary: “The Handmaid’s Tale” and “Nineteen Eighty-Four”.

The social context of the authors has clearly influenced elements of the novels. Margaret Atwood presents a society where women are heavily oppressed by men based on ‘traditional family values’. This is due to the feminist movement in the 1960s and 1970s of North America. North America is where Gilead is situated in the novel. Many women joined the ‘radical feminism’ movement to question society on women’s sexuality, ‘family values’, and the oppression of women. This resulted in women’s liberation in respect to subjects such as the right to choose abortion. In the novel, however, Atwood presents a world where this movement backfires, as women have been turned away from the ambition of becoming a radical feminist as it caused confusion and ‘removed customary protection’ presented to them in the pre-Gilead society. This opportunity gave rise to the society which is found in Gilead in the novel. Arguably, however, it is believed that the oppressive regime found in Gilead was because of ‘the gap created by the shift from radical to cultural feminisms in the early 1980’s’, which occurred in the 1980s. The shift created a gap because of the difference in the forms of feminism. Radical feminism focused on the equality of rights and opportunities whilst cultural feminism was more about the celebration of gender difference. In this gap, women would not know what to believe and in the confusion they would follow the regime which would make sense at the time and not change like the differences in feminism.

We as readers, learn of the feminist movement backfiring when Offred is being made to watch a documentary of ‘Unwomen’, which was a documentary of feminists holding a protest whilst grasping banners stating ‘TAKE BACK THE NIGHT’ and ‘FREEDOM TO CHOOSE. EVERY BABY A WANTED BABY’ which were prominent campaigns that feminists fought for. Atwood makes this documentary personal to Offred by showing her younger mother giving emphasis on her age by the repetition of ‘young’ and the descriptions of her. Atwood may have done this to point blame on Offred’s mother’s previous actions for the oppression that Offred feels at present. Here Atwood is suggesting that women at the time are blaming feminists, but they should be in fact blaming men because they are the people who are in control of this regime and are therefore oppressing women like Offred. Interestingly this part of the novel is presented in a narrative gap, which may be used as a device to obscure how the regime actually came in to place, this is revealed by the mention of how ‘men revile you’ to which Offred’s mind swiftly turns to the narrative gap which poses the idea to the reader that it is Offred’s mother’s fault for what has happened.

The influences on George Orwell to write 1984 were slightly different from the influences of Margaret Atwood. 1984 was written just after the Second World War. The novel acted as a warning to its readers about what the future may be like if the events that happened in Orwell’s lifetime kept happening. An example of these events is of countries such as Spain and Germany keeping an iron fist around their citizens. These countries would restrict their citizens by imposing little or no freedom, hunger, forced labour and mass execution. This mirrors what the ‘The Party’ imposed on the people of Oceania. We as readers see this illustrated when Winston is tortured severely for opposing the ideologies of The Party. O’Brien tortures Winston to the point Winston thinks he has ‘some mortal injury was being done to him’. The extent, to which O’Brien tortures Winston,

symbolises the extent to which 'The Party' will go to change people so that they follow and believe in their regime.

The figure of 'Big Brother' depicted 'of a man about forty-five, with a heavy black moustache and ruggedly handsome features' gives a suggestion of a figure who resembles that of Stalin or Hitler, here Orwell is proposing that 'The Party' which rule over Oceania also resembles the political parties which were found in Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union. Both Stalin and Hitler caused complete repression of human spirit. Stalin did this through building himself into a paternal type figure to the population of his country. 'The Party' correlates with the way in which Stalin controlled his people as Stalin made it policy that his people must show complete devotion to him or else they will be exiled or killed. We learn that this is the attitude of the 'The Party' when Winston speaks of being sent to 'a forced labour camp' for at least 'twenty- five years' for just writing a diary which holds his thoughts about the party. Stalin also eradicated any religious institutions which may become a threat as well as banning any books or music which opposed him. As well as this no one was allowed to speak anything negative of him, especially in regards to media, due to this any deaths or devastation caused by Stalin was never reported to the rest of the country. The correlation between Stalin's Russia and Orwell's party is striking. Orwell has done this to incite fear into his readers, as the comparisons show the potential for society to do this and the potential for it to happen again.

The rule of Hitler in Germany had similar influences on both 1984 and *The Handmaid's Tale*. This is due to how the youth of both novels are shown to resemble the Hitler youth, we learn this with Offred's comment of how 'the young ones are the most dangerous, the most fanatical...' which relates to the 'fanatical adulation' which was encouraged of the Hitler Youth movement. Orwell also creates the same effect with Parson's children 'in the blue shorts, grey shirts and red neckerchiefs which are the uniform of the Spies. The children's vicious demeanour towards Winston, with the boy shouting 'You're a traitor!' and 'I'll shoot you, I'll vaporise you', also emphasises this effect. By creating the youth to be symbolic of that of the Hitler Youth, resembles how the children of each novel are able to devalue the family unit and corrupt it. This is more strongly shown in 1984 because of the direct correlation between the uniforms and the viciousness of the children in the novel and that of the Hitler youth. The vicious tone of the boy also depicts how 'The Party' are emotionally changing the children and brainwashing them to destroy the relationships which hold a family together. Despite this though, the linking with the Hitler youth in *The Handmaid's Tale* does create a sense of irony because of the utopian ideology of returning to 'traditional values' in the Republic of Gilead.

A totalitarian government would want to recruit the youth, so that from a young age children are indoctrinated to be completely faithful to the organisation that controls them. The advantages of this are that they would be so completely brainwashed they would turn against their parents if the were to disobey 'The Party'. The Hitler youth are an example of children who were known to be taught to be racist to' any race other than the 'Aryan race, they were also used to severely interfere in any church movements which may oppose Hitler. Atwood and Orwell have used indoctrinated youth in their novels, to show how easy it is for children to be converted into something that is threatening, as at a young age, people are very impressionable and if not taught anything else, will have to potential to carry on the progression of the organisation.

In both novels, there are prominent political influences. *The Handmaid's Tale* was written shortly after the electing of Ronald Reagan in the US and Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain. In this time there was a revival of the religious conservatives, in both Britain and America, who did not approve of the sexual revolution and criticised it greatly. This caused fear in feminists because they feared that the rise of these religious conservatives would cause a reversal of the 'rights' which they had gained and be replaced with the 'religious rights' of the conservatives. In her novel, Atwood uses exaggeration to show the possible consequences of the sexual revolution being turned on its head by these religious conservatives. Examples of the severe consequences, is the severe oppression which was imposed on the women of Gilead, for example they were not allowed to read, we see this shown when Offred exclaims 'we aren't supposed to be reading' and also how the women react by women altering their intake of breath when they are able to read some of the signs in the Unwomen documentary. Atwood presents their altered intake of breath with the simile 'like wind over grass' which Offred responds to by saying 'have we gotten away with something?'. The use of this simile by Atwood makes the women seem meek and fragile in their surprise, which also reflects on the way oppression has affected them so much they are unable to express themselves openly.

In 1984 the political influences relate also to the political parties who were found before and after the war, this includes Hitler's and especially Stalin's regimes. We as readers learn of this by the limitations which 'The Party' imposes on their people as discussed before. O'Brien even relates 'The Party' to the regimes of the past when conditioning Winston. However he states that the 'German Nazis and Russian Communists came very close to us in their methods, but they never had the courage to recognise their own motives'. He does pick fault with them however by stating that they believed they 'had seized power unwillingly and for a limited time, and that just round the corner there lay a paradise where human beings would be free'. Whilst 'The Party' had acknowledged that 'no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it'. Orwell has done this to bring his readers to the realisation that there is a real possibility that if an organisation came into power and were similar to the Nazis or Stalin, there is a good chance they would be more advanced in their methods and have the possibility to have complete control over a country or a number of countries, as they would eradicate faults which other dictatorships faced.

The Handmaid's Tale presents different types of irony towards particular types of people. Firstly Atwood presents the reader with the irony that even through Offred's struggles to create and mould a reader who understands 'the place of a women's body' in society through her tapings, this will not happen in the future. This is due to the reaction of Pieixoto when he makes a sexual innuendo towards the female professor who introduced him: 'I am sure we all enjoyed our charming Arctic Char last night at dinner, and now we are enjoying an equally charming Arctic Chair. I used the word 'enjoy' in two distinct senses, precluding, of course the obsolete third (laughter)'. Due to the audience's reaction, it shows that even in the future, there will still be people who read for 'their pleasure in and exploitation of the female body'. Furthermore Atwood presents the reader with further belittling and contradiction of the feminist movement found in the novel and the 1960's and 1970's by Pieixoto describing Offred's tapings as his 'little chat' with the audience, this presents the idea of the irrelevance that is felt in regards to the feminist movement in future readers found in the historical notes.

The way that Professor Pieixoto uses the word 'chair' in sexual context of the French word 'Chair' meaning flesh in regards to the enjoyment of the female professor, shows his linguistic control of

the connection between words that he has, this contrasts when previously Offred toys with the word chair in her restrictive surroundings and thinks of the different meanings of the word: 'It can also mean the leader of a meeting. It can also mean a mode of execution' and then she concludes 'None of these facts has any connection with the others'. This represents her 'lack of control'. The contrast which is suggested here could be ironically interpreted that even though the Gileadian society has fallen, men still have control over women, even if it seen as a more passive form of control. This irony can be seen bluntly illustrated in the way that a sexist man is analysing feminist ideas and has control over the way in which they can be interpreted.

In 1984 Orwell uses various types of irony throughout the novel. For instance, the ministries dedicate themselves to the complete opposite of their title, the ministry of truth dedicates itself to destroying the truth. Here Orwell mainly uses irony to create a sense of helplessness caused by the oppression of people in Oceania. One illustration of this is the repetition in Winston's hope of the 'proles' rebelling which reoccurs regularly throughout the novel, his hopes are thwarted however by O'Brien saying 'it is all nonsense. The proletarians will never revolt'. O'Brien's reasoning for this is because the party keep the prole's needs satisfied and masks the truth of 'The Party'. We learn of their needs being satisfied by 'The Party' through various different ways, an example being the 'pornosec', which produces porn for them.

Both novels present a bleak outlook on life and humanity, proposing the idea it is forever doomed and will never be redeemed. *The Handmaid's Tale* and *1984* do this through satirical warnings which are depicted by examples of what the future could be like.

SCRIPT D

'Playwrights explore the plight of individuals in society'. Albee: 'Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?', Miller: 'Death of a Salesman'

Society provides security. There is no doubt that the gathering of people living together creates a somewhat ordered community. Society is defined as 'The community of people living in a particular region and having shared customs, laws and organisations' meaning that an ordered community is achieved due to a 'shared' view on how life should be led. Nowadays, raising a family and becoming wealthy in a material sense, are 'customs' which the masses tend to follow. Having said this, our time may be more liberal than a post World War Two America where these 'customs' were expectations. The 1950's was a prosperous time for America; fuelled by wartime savings and state supported businesses, consumer culture thrived. Encouraged by the economy and media, this new lifestyle contributed to a widespread conformity in America. American conformism meant fear was easily implanted within society, which was done by Joseph McCarthy during the Cold War. McCarthyism was the paranoid hunt for so-called traitors which was extremely difficult on writers, many were considered communist sympathisers, and were unable to continue working; among them was Arthur Miller.

Miller was profoundly influenced by personally witnessing his father's business failures instigated by the Great Depression. He projected his dissatisfaction of the American psyche through his works. His most famous and well respected work, 'Death of a Salesman' explores how a social ethos such as the 'American Dream' can distort an individual's nature through its ideals, displaying that it stirs a desperation within them for what was perceived as, a perfect life. This was a view which writer Edward Albee also felt strongly about. Albee's childhood was a time of 'servants, tutors, riding lessons, winters in Miami', meaning he lived the American Dream yet he has never made any explicit comments about the happiness of his childhood suggesting that Albee felt it was wrongly glorified; his writing scathingly attacks the American Dream. Moreover, his plays commonly revolve around the theme of illusion versus reality and in 'Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf?' he explores how living under the illusion of the American Dream can destroy individual's lives through controlling their reality. Nevertheless, Miller and Albee also portray hope in that, if a man can recognise the forces attempting to dictate his life he need not play the role of a victim of society.

Both plays may be considered tragedies, yet to not follow the traditional Aristotelian tragedy. Three writers from northern Europe revitalised tragedy, defining what it is today. Anton Chekhov, Henrik Ibsen and August Strindberg developed a theatrical naturalism and expressionism which allowed for the common man to be the tragic hero; the regularity of their protagonists was mimicked through the use of realism. Miller and Albee exhibit how society moulds an individual's life and in doing so their works may be regarded as expressionist. I feel Miller and Albee were ahead of their time, in that they were able to observe the value of their society and identify its flaws. They portrayed society to be materialistic and superficial, something which Mathew Kelly feels has only developed in the modern day; 'Superficiality is the curse of the modern world' as people live their lives under the

illusion that material gain brings happiness. Both plays criticise society and the American Dream is directly attacked but how this is done differs.

Being American dramas, the plays thoroughly explore the American Dream. Through characterisation, each playwright exposes how this dream influences one to live up to social expectations. This relates to today's world where Barack Obama declares that 'the basic American promise is that if you work hard, you could do well enough to raise a family, own a home, send your kids to college'. While inspirational to some, others may desire to pursue a different dream. In 'Death of a Salesman' Arthur Miller does not portray the American Dream as a shared one; different characters have different versions of the dream suggesting that Miller wanted to question: what is the American Dream?

In 'Death of a Salesman' Miller utilises the character of Willy 'to set forth what happens when a man does not have a grip on the forces of life', meaning that Willy did not follow his true nature, rather he followed a set of values which was distorted through the expectation of society. Willy is a skilled builder and though he regards it as an essential masculine quality, he favours the life of a salesman. A salesman lives by his ability to engage other people and make them believe him; Willy's American Dream is becoming prosperous through charisma, 'the man who makes an appearance in the business world, the man who creates personal interest, is the man who gets ahead' displaying that Willy felt 'appearance' and popularity resulted in getting 'ahead'. Nevertheless, when he tries to use his personality to ask his boss Howard for a raise, Miller shows the reader how foolish his belief is. Willy attempts to appeal to Howard's emotions, telling the tale of Dave Singleman: 'pick up a phone and be remembered and loved and helped by so many different people? Do you know? When he died... hundreds of salesman and buyers were at his funeral', clearly depicting that Willy prizes the emotional appeal of being 'remembered' and 'loved'; social stature is what motivates him as he defines success in this way. Willy's nostalgia for the days when business involved 'respect, and comradeship, and gratitude' is lost on Howard; he fires Willy. Perhaps Howard symbolises how emotion and compassion have no place in the world of consumerism; similar to the modern day.

Willy despises this aspect of consumer culture, 'I'm always in a race with the junkyard! I just finished paying for the car and it's on its last legs. The refrigerator consumes belts like a goddam maniac. They time those things'. The fact that 'they time those things' means Willy felt frustrated by the greed of others which has shrouded the compassion of the past. This problem is present on a national level, even today. It is not to say that a ruthless attitude cannot drive a man to great things, like Willy's brother Ben, but it can drive a man to devastation – Willy was one of them; it was the greed of others that imprisoned him. This is shown by the developers who brought the shadows, his boss who fired him and his sons who reduced him to a failure. Perhaps if Willy did not shape his entire life around Charley's philosophy that 'The only thing you got in this world is what you can sell', and was true to himself, like Linda says: 'if he finds himself then you'll both be happier', rather than worrying over the image he and his family were portraying to society, he might have realised that true success is measured in the ability to contribute positively to one's environment; success is not, as Willy perceives, measured by the number of acquaintances an individual has acquired or the money one has attained.

To Willy's older brother Ben, the American Dream is the ability to start with nothing and somehow make a fortune: 'William, when I walked into the jungle, I was seventeen. When I walked out I was twenty-one. And, by God, I was rich!' the fact that he refers to the business world as a 'jungle' clearly portrays it to be a world of survival of the fittest. Therefore, Ben's character signifies that only a few people can achieve the 'rags to riches' version of the American Dream which Robert Fulton agrees with: 'the American dream of rags to riches is a dream for a reason – it is hard to achieve'. Miller proposes that one must be ruthless in order to achieve it.

Throughout the play Willy's son Biff is on the road to self-discovery. Willy attempts to imbue his own twisted values and anxieties onto him, 'It's not what you say, It's how you say it because personality always wins', clearly presenting that appearance and image were Willy's criteria for success. Perhaps for Willy to feel successful, Biff had to succeed in following these criteria. He even made Biff feel guilty for not following it: 'What the hell am I doing, playing around with horses, twenty-eight dollars a week! I'm thirty-four years old. I oughta be makin' my future', thus displaying the influence a father has on his son; Biff himself is confused about what his aspirations truly are. However during the funeral of his father, Biff realises that Willy had the wrong dream and pursuing a life of business, sales, and capitalism was what led to his downfall. Biff decides that he will not allow that to happen to himself and will follow his true dream which involves nature, the great outdoors, and working with his hands: 'There's nothing more inspiring or- beautiful than the sight of a mare and a new colt' turning away from Willy's dream.

Family is a privilege that the characters of George and Martha in Albee's 'Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?' were not lucky enough to possess. George and Martha's names purposely represent George and Martha Washington which allow Albee to represent America as a whole through them. Albee utilises their characters to ironically mock the 'sitcom gleam' so many Americans desired to have. Albee does not even attempt to portray George and Martha as happy for trying to encapsulate the American Dream in their lives, 'YOU SATANIC BITCH!' or even as stable in any sense as they totally degrade one another declaring 'TOTAL WAR' on each other. Therefore, what Albee wants his audience to see is that at the heart of the superficial American Dream lies a whole lot of hate and nastiness, which Kenneth Lay supports: 'I've not only pursued the American dream, I've achieved it. I suppose we could say the last few years, I've also achieved the American nightmare' as he refers to the dream as a 'nightmare', much like the relationship George and Martha share. Although Martha has a mothering instinct without a child, she refers to herself a 'earth mother', the fact they both feel the need to invent a son from thin air displays the magnitude of their desperation to possess the American Dream, which is unlike the modern day where there seems to be less worry in possessing a nuclear family. What is odd is that it is their imaginary son provided the most meaningful connection in their twisted relationship. Perhaps Albee is subtly suggesting that, as their son is a lie, so is the American Dream. The word 'dream' even hints to society that this perfect lifestyle is a dream, an illusion.

Albee also exploits the characters of Nick and Honey. They first appear so sweet and innocent; arguably perfect products of the American Dream. Nevertheless, as the play progresses the audience soon realises how corrupt their marriage is; Nick is only married to Honey as he believed her to be pregnant as well as her owning a lot of money. We see him cheat on her with Martha, solely to aid his status within the university Nick's character is cold hearted; is Albee suggesting that this is how one gains success in terms of the American Dream? Miller certainly does through Ben.

Albee shows how if individuals seek a life of success, in terms of the American dream, society left the individual vulnerable to failure. Disputably, George should reach success in writing, yet this is not his fate; 'And Daddy said...Look here, kid, you don't think for a second I'm going to let you publish this crap, do you?' with 'Daddy' undoubtedly devastating him, instigating a low self-esteem in George. It could be said that 'Daddy' is the embodiment of society's restriction over individualistic ideas, his use of 'kid' displays the authority that society had over George; he could not publish his novel as it was too eccentric. The fact Martha constantly seeks 'Daddy's' approval could hint that people within society are dependent on conformism and are fearful about what would happen if they were to live outside of the bounds of conformism, 'Conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth' meaning John F Kennedy felt if you remain under the direction of who you conform to you cannot flourish; Martha, a woman, has no job nor career prospects in somewhat patriarchal America. This proves to be less of a problem in the world of today where we see able women in high job roles. More to the point, Martha's father's control over both Martha and George symbolises society's grasp on individuals George never fulfils his true ambitions, portraying expectations to restrict individuality. It is evident that Albee's opinion is in direct opposition to what was considered mainstream; he has the capability of questioning his society, unlike the characters in his play who live in a distorted illusion just to hide from reality.

The theme of truth versus illusion is associated within all of these domestic dramas, suggesting that American society felt the need to live lives of illusion rather than facing up to the harsh realities. In 'Death of a Salesman' Willy's mind suffers from a psychotic delusion. Miller structures 'Death of a Salesman' to portray this delusion. The first act shows Willy full of dreams and aspirations; illusions. The second act brings truth and reckonings, presenting Willy's distorted view of success destroyed. Willy's interpolated scenes from the past gradually become confused with Willy's present. Switching time zones allows an audience to see how Willy lives an illusion. After being fired, Willy returns to a conversation with Ben when he decided not to go to Alaska, leading on to say 'I am building something with this firm', the cruel irony being that everything he once commercially built has now been destroyed; he is a disrespected salesman yet he calls himself the 'New England man'. Nonetheless, his family still remains. For years, Willy has believed that both he and his boys, particularly Biff, will one day be great successes. Though Biff has done nothing with his life by the age of thirty-four, Willy tells others, and tries to make himself believe, that his son is doing 'big things out west'. Yet it is only Biff ever realises he is 'a dime a dozen' and what his potential really is. 'Dozen' suggests he is a common man. He is the only member of the family to finally escape from the poisonous grasp of illusion, which means Miller portrays hope through him.

Similarly, 'Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf?' questions the modern way of America life and that it surrenders to illusions rather than confronts reality. The creation of George and Martha's son symbolises their desperate need of illusion in a life whose reality is too difficult to deal with, 'Truth and illusion. Who knows the difference, eh, toots?' meaning illusion granted them an artificial happiness. The details that they use for the birth of their son are so complete that this illusion has moved into lunacy. A climactic event is the epiphany made by George that they cannot live in illusion any longer. This meant killing their 'son', who has been a foundation of their marriage. This is suggested by the important metaphor of peeling off the skin, 'When you get down to bone, you haven't got all the way yet. There's something inside the bone...the marrow', once one reaches the 'marrow' of things there is nothing else to be explored. When he manages to bring Martha to face

reality, he is doing it for a greater good. He realises that if they continue to live in this illusion, they will soon not be able to leave it, eventually bringing them to insanity.

The name Virginia Woolf in the title refers to the famous novelist. Virginia Woolf suffered an unbalanced mentality and committed suicide, probably because she could not face life as it was, similar to Willy. In the same way the main characters, George and Martha, resort to illusion as they cannot bear their reality. However, it is George who realises the danger of indulging in such extreme illusions and forces them both into reality. Therefore, this is a play about the shattering of illusions. Another example is when Martha realises that George is not as inadequate as she supposed him to be, when she is dissatisfied with Nick 'you're certainly a flop', she acknowledges that no one can take George's place; he provides her with the physical and emotional comfort that she requires. At the end of the play, Martha is stripped of her fantasy of being a mother, 'Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf...I...am...George', and admits for the first time that the reality scares her.

In essence, Miller and Albee have created masterpieces. They showed that it was not only rock and roll that could rebel against the expectations of society. They all mock consumerism for its lack of morality, as well as how it wrongly implants the idea that material gain brings happiness. Even nowadays John Powell agrees with this; he feels that 'to live fully, we must learn to use things and love people, and not love things and use people' meaning our society has become callous and values the wrong ideals. In this respect, our society has only excavated further down in to the pits of the corporate world, a world in which Willy was immersed. In 'Death of a Salesman', Miller deliberately utilises the name of Loman to represent the everyday man. As the product Willy sells is never specified, audiences are free to imagine Willy as a seller of something linked to a career of their own; Miller then succeeds in connecting with the audience. This left audiences attempting to answer the question posed by Bob Marley who preached: 'Open your eyes, look within. Are you satisfied with the life you're living?' suggesting that expectations almost force you to live a life which is neither your own, or a life you would necessarily want to live and that true happiness lies 'within'. Albee also wanted society to know that living under the illusion of what was perceived as the perfect life is no substitute for reality; no happiness will be found in conforming to expectations. By following the words of Mahatma Gandhi, 'Each one has to find his peace from within. And peace to be real must be unaffected by outside circumstances', characters like Biff and George provide role models to how one may break the chains of limitation that are created by the expectations of society.

SCRIPT E

“He hath ever but slenderly known himself”

Explore the relationship between madness and self-knowledge in Shakespeare’s *King Lear* and *The Wasp Factory*.

There has long been a correlation between insanity and the wisdom of heightened perception. That which society considers insanity can sometimes constitute wisdom and a keener perception. In *King Lear*, madness and self-knowledge are intertwined; as Lear descends into madness, he also experiences an augmentation in his self-awareness. Certainly, the critic Rolf Soellner agrees, stating, “Lear’s descent in to madness gives him a sense of the human condition”.

The structure of the play of *King Lear* is such that Lear does not fully achieve self-recognition until he has become fully mad. The play depicts Lear’s gradual and impending descent in to madness. However, there is a definite climactic point whereby Lear is both fully mad, and fully aware of his current position. Soellner states that Lear’s “lack of self-knowledge is monumental” at the beginning of the play. Here, he is completely self-unaware of not only himself, but also others around him that he lets false declarations of love overpower real ones. He “disclaims all paternal care, propinquity and property of blood” of Cordelia. The semantic field of monetary bargaining and possession is used here, and therefore has connotations of financial relinquishment, and highlights the view of the time that a father owned his daughter. Thus, it is impossible for a father to disclaim what he owns without impoverishing himself. This is therefore an act of undermining the very construction of his identity. It also shows that he has completely misinterpreted the situation, and sees him start to shun any responsibility of not only that of a father, but also responsibility as a ruler. Lear’s lack of self-knowledge is apparent here; he has ostracised the one daughter who actually loves him, and fails to release this. Lear’s lack of self-knowledge is apparent, but so too is the fact that he has not quite reached the pinnacle of his madness. Kent states; “see better Lear”. The imperative command here shows that Lear is already losing his kingly power, which is further heightened by his abandonment of “king” in addressing Lear creating a personal, more urgent tone. Furthermore, here, “seeing” has two layers of meaning; In this circumstance, his failing eyesight, but is also a reference to Lear’s failing perception of the situation at hand, one of which Lear increasingly has less control over as he descends into madness.

For the protagonist of *The Wasp Factory*, at the beginning of the novel, as argued by the critic Berthold Schoene-Harwood, “Frank’s sense of self warped, virtually beyond repair”. Therefore, Schoene-Harwood reasons that it is only through madness that Frank is able to achieve clarity, and truly recognise himself. At the beginning of *The Wasp Factory*, Frank also displays the link between incoherence of identity and madness. Similarly to *King Lear*, Frank has not yet entered the arguably maddest stage. Frank is being dictated what to do by “the factory” but offers the reader no explanation as to what or who it is. Moreover, Frank perceives that he is very self-knowledgeable, stating “I’m me and here’s here”. His explicit direction to the reader implies suggesting at coherent self-knowledge and power, which then erodes as the reader discovers the incoherence and corruption of his identity. Frank’s statement that “of course I was out killing things” seems to add to

the ludicrous perception Frank has of himself, by treating the act of killing as if it were an everyday occurrence.

The incoherence of identity and madness is interconnected in King Lear. Goneril states “’tis the infirmity of his age he hath ever but slenderly known himself”. This suggests that his old age has exacerbated Lear’s instability of mind, and “infirmity” suggests grave illness whilst also being very condescending. The use of the word “ever” perhaps hints at Lear’s past and suggests that he has always been this way, although it is unclear to the audience and subject to directorial decision whether it is heard as trust worthy or a manipulation. Here, Goneril blames Lear’s lack of self-knowledge on his age and that his “infirmity” has exacerbated his madness. However, Soellner states “we cannot but accept Regan’s judgment: he has ever but slenderly known himself”. Here it is the audience who are able to recognize Lear’s lack of perception but not Lear. Goneril uses the words of a humanist rallying cry that demonstrated the relation between “erected wit” or intelligence and “infected will”? In the Sam Mendes production of Lear, his infirmity had exacerbated his madness, he is portrayed as padding around in a hospital gown, without the ability to move, thus suggesting that his madness has been exacerbated by his old age, therefore disagreeing with Soellner.

At the beginning of The Wasp Factory, Frank also displays the link between incoherence of identity and madness. Similarly to King Lear, Frank has not yet entered the arguably maddest stage. Frank is being dictated what to do by “the factory” but offers the reader no explanation as to what or who it is. Moreover, Frank perceives that he is very self-knowledgeable, stating “I’m me and here’s here”. His explicit direction to the reader implies suggesting at coherent self-knowledge and power, which then erodes as the reader discovers the incoherence and corruption of his identity. Frank’s statement that “of course I was out killing things” seems to add to the ludicrous perception Frank has of himself, by treating the act of killing as if it were an everyday occurrence.

As Lear descends into madness, his increasing self-awareness becomes evident to the audience. Lear states “Does any here know me? Why this is not Lear”. Although the lines are ambiguous, and the line is followed by a quick succession of questions, the definite statement “this is not Lear” shows clarity in Lear that the audience have not yet seen. Lear refers to himself in the third person, creating distance from himself, and is reduced to just Lear, rather than King Lear which denotes Lear’s loss of power and his growing recognition of the gap between Lear’s role as a king and his identity as a human being. After this statement, Lear utters the phrase “Who is it who can tell me who I am”. This could reveal Lear’s utter vulnerability, as it did in the Sam Mendes production of the National Theatre. However, in the Guildford Shakespeare Company production, Lear, played by Brian Blessed, was seen laughing the line, but more so in complete and utter confusion, rather than joviality. Both interpretations highlight Lear’s complete instability of mind, and the question he asks cannot be answered. Additionally, he then exclaims “O Lear, Lear, Lear!” The triadic structure of the phrase and the use of expletives give it a sense of desperation, as well as self-deprecation. Again, the reference to Lear in the third person highlights Lear’s separation from himself and his loss of stable identity.

The storm scene in Lear is arguably when he is the maddest, but also when he seems to fully recognise himself, thus demonstrating the link between madness and self-knowledge. The use of pathetic fallacy during the storm Lear marks the climax in Lear’s journey for self-knowledge. The stage directions of “storm and tempest” mark the culmination of his struggle as the internal conflict

is reflected and exacerbated by the external wilderness. The storm here marks the break of things being held back, and Lear's collapse into madness. Perhaps the storm is so poignant because it marks Lear's freedom; once Lear has shunned all responsibility and has fully embraced not only his descent into madness but also his new, lowly position, he is finally able to recognise his true self, something that madness had induced. Lear's newly found self-knowledge, due to his suffering, or *mathos pathel*, can be seen through him referencing himself as a "poor old man". This finally marks Lear's recognition for what he really is, and Lear has been stripped of any power, showing Lear's perception of what he is in his purest form. Lear further acknowledges his madness by stating "O fool, I shall go mad". In the 1971 production by Peter Brook, Lear offers this as a threat, and rather than the old vulnerable Lear seen in both the Sam Mendes and Guildford Shakespeare Company productions, the audience here is able to see a tyrannical Lear. However, in both instances, there is indeed a newly gained sense of self-recognition. If one were to use the Brooks' interpretation, Lear has now realised his power, and is using it to try and garner back some of his lost status. For the vulnerable Lear, it marks a moment of utter self-pity and acknowledgement that the inevitable will happen: Lear will go mad. Lear further highlights his increasing self-knowledge by stating that he is a "poor, infirm, weak and despised old man". Here, Lear acknowledges his own weakness and then rallies against it, thus creating a sort of self-acceptance, one that has been induced by madness. Although this could be portrayed as the weak and vulnerable Lear of the storm, it could be played as scornful and bitter, but either way. It shows that Lear is much more aware of people's perceptions of him, a stark contrast to the beginning of the play. Here, the staging is reflective of the ever-disintegrating world around Lear. In the Guildford Shakespeare Company production, the beginning of the play was set with Lear in the centre of the stage, on an elevated throne, to reflect his elevated and central position. By the end of the play, the disintegration of the natural hierarchical order is evident; the bodies of the deceased characters remain on stage, and so it is clear to the audience the disintegration of madness.

In *The Wasp Factory*, Frank is indifferent to his madness, which displays his lack of self-knowledge. Frank states that his murders were "just a stage I was going through". His casual dismissiveness of murder as being a "stage" already underlines to the reader the sheer lack of any human feeling, especially that of guilt or remorse that Frank is going through. Furthermore, the reader is able to see that it is not just a stage because Frank has just before told us that he has already been out killing animals, and therefore the reader is able to see Frank's complete lack of perception. Frank's infinite belief of the casualness and transitory state of the act of killing even when the reader knows that it is not, displays Frank's lack of self-perception. Although arguably here, he is mad, and he also does not possess self-knowledge, as in *King Lear*, he has not reached the pinnacle of his madness yet, and it is only when he attains this state that he truly aware of himself.

The partial restoration of Lear's power coincides with his newly found self-knowledge, with Lear stating "O, that way madness lies, let me shun that; no more of that". This marks the point of Lear's self-acceptance, with the assertive phrase emphasised by the defiant full stop and the use of the word "no". Here, Lear is on a trajectory to madness he can now recognize but his newly found self-acceptance will help him to overcome it. Ironically, later on in the scene, the stage directions read "enter Lear mad and crowned with wild flowers". The crown of flowers is an inverted real crown and helps to restore Lear's regality. Yet flowers highlight the contrast between an unconscious king of nature in this scene and the angry tyrant the audience are subject to in the opening scene. Here,

embracing madness had led to self-knowledge and now leads Lear to bettering himself, as he is able to rid himself of the constraints placed upon him as ruler and empathise with others.

Towards the end of *King Lear*, Lear ultimately has the most self-recognition, after the disruption and chaos that has previously been seen throughout the play. Indeed, Holly states the disruption of the natural order can “only be rectified by the reasoned will of an individualto act authentically toward self-recognition and acceptance of Self”. Here, Holly is asserting that only through madness can one achieve clarity; it is only when we have nothing can we recognise who we truly are. Lear again asserts his authority, stating, “I am the king”. Although ultimately, this marks Lear’s utter confusion, as he is no longer the king, it marks a return to the strong, assertive king seen in the opening scenes. Furthermore, Lear is no longer separate from himself, and there is no more of the self-pitying and vulnerable Lear that the audience has seen previously. Juxtaposingly, this is the moment where Lear both himself the most, and knows himself at least. He states that he is “a very foolish, fond old man”. Here, he is at the height of his perception; he has spent a large proportion of the play trying to refute this fact, and he now accepts it. Through his madness, Lear has not only gained self-knowledge, but also self –acceptance. Through madness, the characters are not only able to gain self-knowledge, but this is induced by the freedom from responsibility and constraints that madness apparently brings. For *King Lear*, the suffering that he endures is somehow restorative and allows him to accept who he is. . Likewise, in *The Wasp Factory*, Frank states “I’m not Francis Leslie Cauldhame. I’m Frances Lesley Cauldhame”. The definitive statement also highlights the slight difference between Frank the boy, and Frank the girl. It shows self-recognition and acceptance, which is further heightened by the statement “I am still me; I am the same person”. Similarly to Lear, Frank feels that no change has been made, even though the reader may find the information that Frank is a girl to be of monumental importance. However, here, there is a blatant display of self-acceptance, something that Frank has only been able to achieve through embracing his madness or, as Schoene-Harwood states, “what man is conditioned to regard with self-loathing may begin to initiate a process of genuine self-authentication”. This complete parallel to Lear reinforces the link between self-knowledge and madness within the two texts.

Although perhaps Lear is not his “perfect mind”, he is more perceptive than he has ever been, and his realisation of his newly found position in society leads him to eventually come to terms with his situation before his death.

SCRIPT F

Literature is a record of social fears.

Explore in “Dracula” and “The Turn of the Screw”.

Karin once opined that ‘madness does not serve narrative so much as narrative serves madness’; Karin’s key claim, that the theme of madness is one that is not intrinsically simple. Instead, madness, serves to highlight the fears of the time; consequently, it is a social construct rather than merely a Gothic theme. Madness along with other social fears are explored in “Dracula” and “The Turn of the Screw”. Despite being written over different periods, constant societal fear is a theme that features similarly but also in contrasted manner in both these texts. Hence, it could be argued that the Gothic literature in which these social fears were explored is merely a record of these fears.

During the late Victorian era there were an increasing number of women gaining power. However the idea of women becoming powerful was a fear that is shown in the texts. This can be shown by the opposition to the rising group of women identified as the New Woman, some calling them “a mythical, unnatural creature”. It could be argued that both, “Dracula” and “The Turn of the Screw” were a manifestation of this fear against women. In “Dracula” the three vampire women attack Harker; the descriptions of the vampires are highly sexualised. Harker has a “burning desire that they would kiss (him) with those red lips”. The adjective burning, as well as the symbol “red”, reflects the passion he feels but also conveys a sense of danger these women possess. The “red lips” are a hallmark of their gothic beauty which Harker cannot resist, highlighting their power. The colour imagery created can be associated with sexual desire in this novel, but also with blood which adds a more sinister dimension to the women. Similarly, the ghost of Jessel in “The Turn of the Screw” is dangerous like the vampires. Teahan argues that there is a “tainted aura surrounding Jessel (which) reflects the new governess’s awareness of the sexually suspect status of governesses in general”. However Teahan could take into account that the descriptions of Jessel come from the governess. The “tainted aura” that is described could merely be an artificial barrier created by the new governess in order to hide her own sexuality. The new governess sees Jessel as a figure of corruption, the first time she sees her is across from a lake. Perhaps the lake acts as a mirror and is a reflection of herself. Both governesses could be imposing the danger of corrupting the children and could be deemed as dangerous. Not only are the children in danger of being physically hurt by the ghost of Jessel but they are also in danger of being psychologically corrupted. The governess claims that “They know- it’s too monstrous; they know”. The repetition highlights the fear that the governess has of Jessel becoming powerful enough to corrupt the children and makes her seem hysterical. The only monosyllabic word is the adjective “monstrous”, this makes the reader concentrate on it and adds to the reader’s fear of Jessel. Once again this shows that women should be feared as they are compared to monsters.

“Dracula” was written during the era known as the fin de siècle. Ledger and Luckhurst claim that the “fin de siècle enthusiasm for translating all problems into scientific terminology was the product”. They are of the opinion that during times of social angst such as at the end of the century a greater importance is placed on being able to explain everything rationally. Perhaps Stoker has taken the legend of the vampire and used it to explore how societal fears do not really reflect the true picture.

Although women are portrayed as dangerous it could be argued that women are in fact weak, the real societal fear explored may be a fear of emasculated men. In "The Turn of the Screw" the governess is to have no contact at all with the absent male figure. The only male character in the novel is the ghost of the gardener who causes the problems. One again the male has failed to make the women and children feel safe. This could lead to the conclusion that women are not feared because they are weak; they are simply reliant on men and need their help. It is true that Mina is attacked by Dracula; she asks "what have I done to deserve such a fate, I who have tried to walk in meekness...all my days". At first glance it seems as if Mina was truly horrified of Dracula and is a victim. But the word "tried" suggests that she desires to step out of the role of the victim. I agree with Glover who says that Mina is "extremely hard to place". She does show signs of obedience to her husband and learns shorthand in order to "keep up with Jonathan's studies" and so that she can help him. But this also shows that Mina is a strong woman and that the true fear is the fear of emasculated men. Contemporary critic, Spencer claims "that never in western society have gender roles been more rigid of distinct". Mina knows this and assigns herself to organise the notes of the men, therefore she takes an active role in destroying Dracula. Ledger claims that she "(inscribes) herself within the paradigm of ideal Victorian womanhood" and uses her "man's brain" to fit into a role which is neither the uneducated and powerless woman nor the feared New Woman. Instead she creates a modernised version of the angel in the house which is acceptable. Although Mina hints that she did indeed want Dracula to attack her, the men have still failed in their duty to protect her. One interesting point is that in both novels men can also be seen as weak. In "Dracula" the merry band of men who are going to fight Dracula are depleted by blood transfusions, they also need four members to face one monster. And in "The Turn of the Screw" the gardener is a ghost. Perhaps the texts are in fact showing that society fears emasculated and feminine men and were blaming strong women like Mina. Perhaps the actions of men make women weak; if female characters had been allowed to work alongside the men then they would not have been open and vulnerable to attack. If Mina had been allowed to go with the merry band of men then Dracula would not have attacked her. Some women have been portrayed as weak and reliant on men but strong female characters such as Mina can highlight how emasculated men can weaken women and that women need not be feared.

On the other hand the texts show that despite this women should be feared, both texts present women going against maternal behaviour. Since the early 19th century the role of mother had been idealised, Victorian middle class women had more involvement in bringing their children up than their predecessors and motherhood was seen as confirmation of identity. However, these texts show women to contrast to the Victorian ideology. In "Dracula" when Lucy becomes a vampire she feeds on a baby which she "flung to the ground, callous as a devil". The verb flung suggests carelessness and a swift angry motion. She is also likened to the devil, perhaps when women lose their maternal instincts they become pure evil which could be why women are feared. This is similar to the character of Lady Macbeth. In "Macbeth", Lady Macbeth could be seen as one of Shakespeare's powerful female characters because she is manipulative and is able to get her husband to murder people. She is similar to Lucy as she said she would "pluck the toothless gums" and "dash out the brains" of her child. Another fear pertinent to both texts is the fear of foreigners or invasion. The texts show that it is easy for foreigners to invade. The fear of invasion can be shown through Mina in "Dracula". Mina "is one of God's women, fashioned by his own hand". The word "fashioned" suggest that she has been specially crafted by God. At one point Mina says that she "did

not want to hinder him". The use of the word "hinder" suggests that she did not want him to stop; this makes the threat of Dracula even more powerful. If Mina who is the perfect woman in the novel desires Dracula then it would be easy for foreigners to invade. For the Victorian audience this fear would have been very apparent but a modern day audience may not fear foreigners because of the increased globalisation. In "The Turn of the Screw" the invaders are the ghosts who appear to the children. The invaders are feared because they can be seen as the invaders who corrupt Miles. The child is expelled from school and it is suggested that he picked up this behaviour from the "infamous" gardener, who has now died and become a ghost. To be infamous is to have a bad reputation; Miles has had his normal life destroyed by the poor behaviour of the gardener. This could reflect the reputation of foreigners. Both Miles and Flora keep the sighting of the ghosts a secret from their carer. The governess asks "does *he* know?" The pronoun is italicised which draws the reader's attention to it, putting the emphasis on the absent uncle. Perhaps this shows the governesses fear of the invaders is so strong that she wants to raise awareness by breaking the instructions of her employer. He had asked her not to contact him, but she contemplates it showing her fear. Similarly Dracula also wishes to create more vampires and dreams of "teeming millions". The adjective is highly emotive and is usually used to describe large groups or insects. Perhaps Stoker is suggesting that those who are invaded and turned into vampires will be as revolting as insects. The texts show that it is possible and easy for foreigners to invade their lives; this could be why there was a societal fear of invaders.

The animalistic portrayal of madness could show that societies feared those who were labelled as mentally unstable. Roy Porter who wrote a short summary of the history of madness says "inmates...treated as wild beasts in a cage". He suggests that those who were mad were completely dehumanised and treated like animals; not even household pets but "wild beast". This makes them seem even more uncontrollable and seem like a threat. There are numerous examples of animalistic imagery surrounding Renfield in "Dracula". Once he escapes the tower he "fought like a tiger". The use of the simile emphasises the strength and determination to escape and go to Dracula. He is also described as "more like a wild beast than a man". The word "wild" emphasises the power and chaos created, the monosyllabic word could be to reflect how it is a single person that is causing the commotion. The word "beast" suggests danger which is commonly associated with lunatics. Although he has not fully made the transformation from man to "wild beast" he is still dangerous, this makes the reader uncomfortable with him. In "The Turn of the Screw" the characters are isolated from society and therefore placed in a metaphorical cage like animals. The governess is isolated because she is from a different town. She is also an outsider because she is of a different social class. She is caged in the house at Bly like an animal. Characters that show signs of madness are dehumanised, they are described as wild animals which make them dangerous, and perhaps this shows how society feared them.

To conclude these pieces of literature act as a record of social fears. Fears such as the fear of feminine sexuality, the fear of invasion and the fear of madness are constant societal fears that feature in literature over different time periods. Stoker and James have explored societal fears with the outcome of their exploration resulting in a record of the fears.

SCRIPT G

Explore the representation of monstrosity in “Frankenstein (or the Modern Prometheus)” Mary Shelley (1818) and “The Picture of Dorian Gray” Oscar Wilde (1890)

Monstrosity is an idea that is ultimately down to the interpretation of the reader. Their moral compass, upbringing and socio-economic factors can all contribute to what an individual perceives to be monstrous. “Frightful or hideous, especially in appearance; extremely ugly, shocking or revolting; outrageous; monstrous cruelty extraordinarily great; huge; immense”. This definition of monstrosity illustrates the idea that monstrosity is a natural thing, i.e. a creature or person is born monstrous. However, others would argue that it is nurtured and that monstrosity is as a result of an authority figure giving the right and taking away the blame. This supports the psychologist Stanley Milgram’s theory; that very one is capable of monstrous actions when sanctioned by an authority figure as they feel they are absolved of all responsibility. In “*Frankenstein*”, a novella about an ambitious doctor who created then abandoned a creature, Mary Shelley places great importance on letting the reader decide who the monster is by using a frame narrative, showing each character’s point of view and leaving the possible interpretations of the themes found in Gothic texts were of a wide range. In *Dorian Gray*, responsibility for monstrosity is passed from person to person to person, first Lord Henry Wotton, then Basil, but never to the person who actually commits the monstrous acts and neither does he deign to take responsibility for it.

Societal values of family play a very important role in establishing the authenticity of the unnatural, especially monstrosity, in “*Frankenstein*”. From the onset, Frankenstein goes to great pains to assure the reader of the benevolence and respect that abounds in his family, to the modern audience perhaps pressing the issue a little too much. “*Their benevolent disposition often made them enter the cottages of the poor. This, to my mother, was more than a duty; it was a necessity, a passion*”. Victor’s incessant assurance to the reader in these first stages of the novella is an early indicator to the reader of the importance of family in his life. The reasons for his pressing the issue becomes abundantly clear as it is then shown that there is a more sinister importance to family. For Victor Frankenstein, “*family is the counterpart to loneliness, which in turn is the primary impetus for evil*”. This is certainly supported by the creature; the fruits of Victor’s ambitions, unchecked by the foil of his family’s love and guidance. “*My father was not scientific, and I was left to struggle with a child’s blindness, added to a student’s thirst for knowledge*”. Left to his own devices pursuing a chemical career, Victor Frankenstein’s base nature came to the fore, his natural monstrosity. Shelley goes to great lengths to maintain the ambiguity of monstrosity and leave the ultimate decision to the reader. One tool used to present monstrosity in “*Frankenstein*” is a framed narrative. The novella begins from the point of view of an apparently uninvolved party, Captain Walton. He then meets Frankenstein who gives both his and the creature’s version of events. However as blogger Lyndi Conradt points out, Walton has been isolated at sea and seeking companionship, which could be why he paints Frankenstein in such a positive light. This is in complete opposition to the Doctor’s own description of himself. “*When telling his own tale, however, Frankenstein comes off as deeply flawed, selfish, and even cruel.*” When it comes to the turn of the creature, he is portrayed as wholly

evil. The frame narrative serves a dual purpose as it introduces an element of uncertainty to the reader, making it harder to discern who is truly monstrous, while ensuring that “*Frankenstein*” remained as the author had initially intended; a fantasy novel.

It is a similar story in the case of “*The Picture of Dorian Gray*”. The absence of a family in the life of Gray is what seemingly causes his narcissistic and hedonistic tendencies to flourish under the tutelage of Lord Henry, a man who proclaims that “*conscience and cowardice are really the same things...conscience is the trade-name of the firm*”. Oscar Wilde uses alliteration to give the reader a sense of outward uniformity despite the in this gives the (*sic*) This subtle foreshadowing seems to hint to the reader that tragedy that will ensue when Dorian Gray, eschewed and abhorred by his grandfather who raised him eventually meets Lord Henry, a corrupt aristocrat who lives for pleasure, devoid of a conscience, a man who seems ready to take him under his wing. However, although it seems like Lord Henry brings about the decline in Dorian Gray and brings about his monstrous nature, it can be argued that Lord Henry is only playing out his true nature: it is simply how he views life, finding a particular thing to take interest in, be it art, money, objects or people. And at the end, he discards these ‘experiments’ and admires himself for how he has altered them.

As a result of this is impossible to determine, if not Lord Henry, who exactly was the catalyst for Dorian Gray’s unravelling. Critic Jen Costis has a theory on that: “*However, more than meeting Lord Henry, Dorian’s fall was related directly to the creation of the picture and Basil’s constant obsession with beauty. Lord Henry may have been the man to explain the temporality of beauty, but it was Basil that made Dorian feel its importance*”. There is certainly merit to this view as Basil himself claimed to have put too much of himself into the portrait. The book starts with him impressing upon Henry the extent of his worship of Dorian Gray. By creating the portrait and giving him a physical manifestation of the mortality of his beauty, Basil – albeit inadvertently- causes the innocent and hapless Dorian who “*kept himself unspotted from the world*” to fear the loss of his beauty and with it Basil’s worship. To the reader, this shows that monstrosity in the inhabitants of the Victorian society was a multi-faceted beast, a subtle organic entity ingrained in the etiquette of social interaction. This then leads the reader to understand that the Victorian era itself was steeped in monstrosity, a behemoth of social class and standing, muddy with waters so treacherous to traverse that a social recluse and an innocent Adonis unwise to its ways end up leading each other astray. Tellingly, by letting Dorian ignore his own part in his downhill and blaming it wholly on Basil. Wilde implies to the reader that by the end, Dorian Gray himself is now a part of the collective monstrosity of Society. “*I don’t want to be at the mercy of my emotions. I want to use them, to enjoy them, and to dominate them*” says Dorian when confronted by Basil about his indifference over the death of Sybil Vane, completing his transformation from doe-eyed youngster to self-indulgent Victorian.

Another way in which monstrosity is explored in through ambiguity as to where monstrous truly lies: the creature or the creator. “*Enlightenment is man’s emergence from his self-incurred immaturity*” declares Immanuel Kant (1784). If the exploits of Victor Frankenstein were to be regarded from this point of view, then his pursuit of knowledge throughout his education and the eventual fruits of his labour are to be lauded as it aids in the progress of humanity. This could then show that his relentless pursuit of knowledge outside the accepted norm. “*All that had so long engaged my attention suddenly grew despicable...I at once gave up my former occupations... and entertained the greatest disdain for a would-be science, which could never even step within the threshold of real knowledge*”. This quote is one of many littered through the text that shapes to the reader Victor

Frankenstein's determination to overturning the self-incurred immaturity outline by Kant. Mary Shelley uses characterisation to draw for the audience an intellectually driven scientist, hungry for knowledge and aiming to further humanity's understanding of our world. To the reader, Victor has no propensity for monstrosity, only a desire to create life and advance his field, and in doing so advance society as a whole. Upon initial reading, it seems that the creature mirrors his creator in this. Despite being abandoned by Frankenstein, the creature takes it upon itself to learn "*While I improved in speech, I also learned the science of letters, as it was taught to the stranger; and this opened before me a wide field for wonder and delight*". Shelley's use of pronouns serves a dual purpose of making the creature seem more authentic to the reader, humanising it, while also enabling the reader to draw parallels between creation and creator. 'The creature's' almost cloying eagerness to learn is clearly intended to vindicate Frankenstein's experiment: a metaphor for his "*emergence from his self-incurred immaturity*", "However, this doesn't quite ring true with readers at the time. "*But still the expression "Creator", applied to a mere human being gives us the same sort of shock with the phrase, "the Man Almighty", and others of the same kind...*", a Scottish Herald critic in 1818 carps. This shows us that readers at the time didn't buy into Kant's "*self-incurred immaturity*" theory or indeed Shelley's postulation of Victor as "*The Modern Prometheus*". Instead, to readers at the time, Frankenstein is a monster as he has violated the sacredness of religion and created an abomination. Furthermore, the fact that his creation eventually brought about death of those closest to him and, indirectly, Frankenstein himself was seen by readers as Holy vengeance on Frankenstein.

Another theme explored by Mary Shelley when shaping the reader's perception of monstrosity is that of knowledge – chiefly knowledge in the wrong hands. In "*Frankenstein*", the acquisition of knowledge is twice reversed and shown to be, first abhorred and then lauded. Victor Frankenstein's pursuit of knowledge is not that of a man who seeks to use it as a means of helping others as his father and mother before him have done. "*I was capable of a more intense application and was more deeply smitten with the thirst knowledge*". Shelley's use of the word "thirst" connotes to the reader an inherent selfishness in "*Frankenstein*", hoarding knowledge for his own purposes and reasons. He aimed to create a new species that "*would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to me*". The repeated use of pronouns as a literary device throughout this chapter shows that his sole reason even in creating these abominations was to pervert the knowledge he gained to receive adulation. This is in sharp contrast to the Creature, even from its inception. Despite being rejected by its creator almost immediately, its thoughts weren't bent towards revenge but towards the acquisition of knowledge. "*I eagerly seized the prize and returned with it to my hovel...they consisted of "Paradise Lost", a volume of Plutarch's Lives", and the "Sorrows of Werter*". This description of the assorted literary works as prizes brings into sharp relief the discrepancies in Victor's character and shows the reader that he is naturally predisposed towards monstrosity. His Creature's use of "*hovel*", a dirty, squalid, rustic dwelling shows that it –he – is painfully aware that such great works of literature are to be revered. This the attributes that would usually be linked associated with the creature, for example, selfishness, are then foisted on Victor, marring then readers perception of him especially as then Doctors were seen as paragons of society and people to be trusted.

To a Marxist, monstrosity in "*Frankenstein*" is a result of exploitation. "*While oppressed citizens are fighting for their rights, slaves fight for their independence on the other side of the globe. In the novel, an educated scientist fashions a monster that goes out of control*". This view mirrors events

that occurred in Shelley's lifetime and influenced the characters of Victor and his creation. Dr. Frankenstein, the metaphor for capitalism, aims to create a species that "would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to me". From this, it is clear that Frankenstein who had a positively bourgeois upbringing automatically assumed that any being to whom he had contributed something toward – in case literally life – owed something to him and would accede to being exploited by him as it is their role prescribed by capitalists in Industrial Britain. Although predating Marx and Engels' *The Communist Manifesto*, this blasé expectation by Frankenstein would have angered readers as they would have been experiencing the exploitation first hand, especially in Northern England, where coal workers were paid just enough to keep them alive and expected to work the quarry's lowering life expectancy to 28. The reaction of a modern reader wouldn't be much different as nowadays readers are well versed in Marxist ideas. Despite the introduction of measures like minimum wage amongst others, there is still evidence of aristocratic exploitation, which culminated in the recession in 2008, creating a new wave of anger towards capitalism. The Creature signifies the proletariat which might provide an explanation of why Shelley tried her utmost to make it less monstrous: her parents were abolitionists who saw the ruling class and nobles as oppressing the workers. Shelley used the monster to connote the revolution that would eventually result from capitalist exploitation.

In conclusion, both authors make use of various literary devices to present monstrosity while simultaneously commenting on the duality and universality of humanity. It is a testament to the endurance of their collective writing prowess that numerous film adaptations, theatre plays and books have spawned from *Frankenstein* and *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Furthermore, the themes that caused so much controversy at the various publications – perhaps because of how close to home they hit – are still very much prevalent in our society now. However, what makes the presentation of monstrosity in these texts even more effective is the fact that more than a century after they were written, the ambiguity still remains and it is ultimately up to the reader to discern for themselves who the true monsters are.

SCRIPT H

“The authenticity of post–colonial texts relies heavily on the author’s background and personal experiences” – How far do you agree with this statement?” *Small Island* and *A Fat Black Woman’s Poetry Book*.

“Post-colonial; the occurring or existing after effects after the end of colonial rule”

A post-colonial text, in my opinion, does have to relate to an author’s background or past experiences. Although, I feel it is a different matter, whether or not the author’s background has to be one of a post-colonial nature to be authentic. For example, if a white British woman in her thirties wrote a novel with the narrative voice of a black teenage boy who was having trouble with racism; one might question how authentic the novel could really be in relation to his emotions. After all, the author could have possibly have experienced the same racist issues as her character. However the author could have possibly had experiences that connect with discrimination; perhaps with weight, rather than colour. Therefore she can *sympathise*, but not entirely *empathise*. The feelings in the novel may come across as authentic as she has had emotions stirred in her past, similar to those of her character. The post-colonial texts I have explored are “**Small Island** and “**A Fat Black Woman’s Poetry Book**”. Both seem authentic and all have won award, but I am interested to see if their experiences link to their written texts, and if affects the realism within them.

In the novel **Small Island**, Andrea Levy creates four diverse view points; a black male and female and a white male and female. For the novel to be successful, she has to make all of the characters authentic and believable. Most people would say that a view point of a character is only successful when coming from an author who can relate to that character. As Levy is speaking for four different characters, in a different time; there is a question “how can she possibly relate to all of these characters?” Levy’s parents sailed from Jamaica to England 1948, and she was born in London 1956. She had grown up in a place that she felt was home but also felt alienated, outcaste by the colour of her skin. Because of this, she has had quite a complicated perspective on the country of her birth and where she belonged. At the time Levy started writing, there was little written about experiencing Britain from the minority’s standpoint. Her novels look attentively at Britain and its changing population, culture and relationship between Caribbean and British history. The first three novels Levy wrote explored, through different perspectives, issues dealt with by British-born children of Jamaican emigrants.

In *Small Island*, Levy investigates the experiences of RAF recruits of her father’s generation, who returned to Britain after the Second World War. The Second World War was what led to Britain’s multi-cultural society. She also assesses the struggles of two cultures merging together after a terrible war and the strength in which one can show and give to another. For Andrea Levy, acknowledging the role played by all sides in this change is an important part of understanding the process of immigration and colonisation. It has been said by students reviewing *Small Island*, that Levy’s use of dialect was too heavy-handed. However, from my perspective, she captured the tones in ‘Jamaican Patois’ (also called Jamaican Creole) significantly, yet also made the dialect understandable to non-Jamaicans. In an interview with ‘The Guardian’ she said she was “writing as

much for Jamaicans as for a wider audience, and knew the book wouldn't ring true to us if the characters didn't speak patois much of the time".

While all of the characters can be related to, the one that stands out the most for me was Hortense. This is because her voice is so independent, different, and nailed. Levy doesn't actually go into much description of Hortense, she just lets Hortense speak and the readers see her "in the raw". There are many issues Levy has included in the novel regarding discrimination. These events need to also be authentic and believable, because emotions tied to these issues are so fragile and deeply impact our view of ourselves and others. She includes various racial conflicts as well as classism and sexism.

In Mike Phillips's *London Crossings: A Biography of Black Britain* (published by Continuum). He shares his professional view on the way Small Islands deals with these issues; "Levy's authorial platform is balanced squarely in the middle of this conversation. The novel records some of the most un-pleasant racist aspects of the period, without displaying any sense of polemical intent, partly because her reliance on historical fact gives Levy a distance which allows her to be both dispassionate and compassionate".

Because of the alternate viewpoints, the reader has a far clearer picture of what is driving each of the characters; more than the characters themselves. I found it interesting that in terms of racial conflicts Hortense becomes just as prejudiced and opinionated in her way as the English people are racist in theirs. The book also tackled the tough issues of hypocrisy, infidelity and death, all very sensitive matters that are explored in the differing opinions of all four characters. Another thing to remember is that the story deals with the two sets of couples (Queenie and Bernard; Hortense and Gilbert) and highlights the similarities and differences of each. This is important when showing that opinions and opinions of each character isn't dependent on merely their colour. Both women marry for something other than love and, in many ways, the novel is about a married life where neither partner is sure of the other or indeed, for some characters, themselves.

The narration in the novel is vital when concerning authenticity. Each of the characters has differing narrative and speaking style, this helps develop a feature of their character. For example, Gilbert is portrayed as a very stereotypical, traditional Jamaican, using slang such as 'cha man!'. In heavy contrast Hortense is very formal, phrasing her words carefully; 'the bell was not operational' opposed to 'not working'. Her speech reads as if she has learnt it rather than developed it over time and this highlights her as an outsider: She doesn't fit in with Britain, but her dissimilarity with all other Jamaicans in the novel shows how she is also an outsider in her own country too. She tries to escape her Jamaican roots because she sees England as something aspirational and romantic.

Bernard's voice is also traditional, reflecting his dull personality with its brief, brusque phrasing: 'Hundreds of troops' and 'Hands out' (two sentences within first paragraph introducing him to readers) Short sentences are used to emphasise, and in Bernard's example it amplifies how he does not elaborate with poetic language and keeps an emotional detachment (such disconnected behaviour occurs with Bernard sexually interacted with a 'whore' whilst in India).

Lastly, Queenie's narrative voice, her use of dialect is more contemporary, contrasting with the other characters. This style of speech could be related to Queenie's forward-looking attitudes, she

tends to use a lot of indirect speech, mimicking her neighbours; “How many is it now? They’d have said to each other”. The use of ‘they’d’ is quite informal and modern.

Levy has used such stereotypical voices for her characters to become authentic, capturing the people in the era and reflecting them honestly; trying to capture the movement of the 1940s. She did this as opposed to other styles, specifically a third-person ‘omniscient’ narrator. This could be interpreted as Levy wanting to make the novel personal and intimate (dealing with affairs/scandals/racism). In order to fully experience 1948 and what it was like to arrive in Britain at the time, the reader has to be able to understand the characters and to sympathise with them. The best way to do this is to present the novel as a collection of oral, spoken tales rather than a novel that feels as if it was written.

One criticism by reviews on ‘GoodReads.com’ is that Bernard seemed like an afterthought to the central account. Unlike the other three characters, who all have their flaws, there isn’t many ways to relate to him, or sympathise with him within his own personal history- as a product of a particular time/place. Even the choppy language that he used didn’t inform or illuminate his personality. I think this may have been an intellectual decision on Levy’s part, a way to distinguish him from the other three characters. Towards the end of the novel he becomes more appealing, when he shocks a lot of readers in the plot twist and steps up to take the position of a father. Out of the four characters, I found Bernard the hardest to relate to.

The story jumps forward and backward in time. Queenies is a young girl in the prologue, but then during chapter one, we skip to 1948, to Hortense’s point of view in the present, where all four characters are in England. Over the course of the book, we get the opportunity to meet each of the main characters when they are young, and we follow that person until the present time (1948). The structure of the book is such that we follow several of the characters in short chapters in the present before going back to the childhood of the next character. Levy has arranged the novel complexly, but also quite expertly. The way it was constructed didn’t detract from the flow of the story but, in my opinion, enhanced it.

Yet another author of post-colonial texts is Grace Nichols, born in 1950, she grew up in a small village in Guyana. She immigrated to the UK in 1977, which meant she was exposed to the racism on an extreme level due to the growing views in politics on immigration at that time. Much of her poetry is characterised by Caribbean rhythms and culture, and influenced by Guyanese and Amerindian folklore. Personally, when reflecting on her work, I think she writes with honesty on how she views the world and vice versa. In **A Fat Black Woman’s Poetry Book**, Grace Nichols gives us a series of situations in the form of poems; these situations are symbolic of important issues within society and reflect the views of the discriminated.

The words Fat, Black and Woman all have connotations of discrimination, racism and sexism. She’s brave, as dealing with one’s size, colour and gender are all quite heavy issues in today’s society and are considered social taboos.

Whether or not the view point can be considered authentic is difficult due to the fact that Grace Nichols herself could be described as a ‘Fat, Black woman’ but does not admit or refer to herself as being this character. I felt this was clever because if taken as a persona then Grace Nichols herself cannot be argued with for having the fat black woman’s opinions in the poems. Instead whoever

disagrees with the viewpoints expressed has to be careful not to offend this character just by using her name – i.e. fat, black woman., this only providing a brief description of her appearance, can be seen as prejudice, racist or sexist.

In the poem ‘Beauty’, like many of the poems, there is a lexical field of vocabulary relating to nature. It states that “Beauty is a fat black woman” this being an anaphora, it is clear that the concept is a reflection of what beauty could be. To the Fat Black Woman she is beautiful, but when put into the context of the western ‘ideal beauty’, she won’t be placed in that category. In the last stanza it reads “riding the waves, drifting in happy oblivion” giving the readers an insight of how peaceful life can be without worries relating to self-image. A western idea of beauty can never be reached, and in society today women are pressured by the media to change themselves to look a certain way. In the poem, the Fat Black Woman embraces herself and in return so does the Earth; “while the sea turns back, to hug her shape”.

An anonymous reader wrote the following review on an online poetry forum “I loved the self-love, adoration, and pride in these poems as well as the honest eye on history and what that means/has meant to the black woman’s body. These are short poems, like little jabs at perception. Mostly what I felt is love in these poems. This was really nice. These poems have a Caribbean accent, which was also really nice. Her religion is Christianity after she was influenced by the UK’s many religions and multi-cultural society, which I found quite interesting”.

Although I feel the poems are written from a persona, I also feel like the ‘Fat Black Woman’ and Grace Nichols herself, share a mutual understanding and outlook on the world. Grace Nichols has obviously taken aspects of her own experiences and applied them to The Fat Black Woman; perhaps a simpler, stripped down, labelled version of herself. Although I do feel that giving the fat black woman her name, it is almost as if she speaking for all whom fit into each or any of these stereotypes/labels, which I felt is unfair as this can be taken as a generalisation in itself.

In conclusion, I feel all the given post-colonial texts are authentic in their own different ways. *Small Island* in its diverse narrative structure, given that Levy is of mixed-race, has allowed her to empathise as someone both accepted and discriminated against. Her understanding of different types of people has helped her to create four strong viewpoints that intertwine successfully throughout the novel and in my opinion, have not taken any authenticity away from the work. *A Fat Black Woman’s Poetry Book* has been written authentically to, as my theory stands, a persona that could possibly be a reflection of grace Nichols. Only Grace Nichols could tell me how truly authentic her poems are in relation to their subject matter. There is some truth in all of these texts, the authors’ backgrounds connecting or relating to the context. I agree that ‘The authenticity of post-colonial texts relies heavily on the author’s background and personal experiences’; however, I do also feel that authors (who have not directly lived in a colonised society) write at a level close to authenticity if they have experienced situations that lead them to share feelings of those who have lived under colonialism.

Commentaries and Marks

Script A

The task undertaken by this student is challenging because of the theoretical nature of the quotation, but the student clearly understands the quotation and can apply this understanding to a clearly worded and specific task. This is a full and scholarly essay which has contexts at its heart, but it is context which is analysed not merely described or explained. The contextual analysis is detailed and evaluative. The candidate ensures that the response to other views is central because of the prompt in the question which clearly addresses a significant aspect of the chosen texts. Although the student deals with difficult concepts, she understands them, relates them to the texts and controls her argument. The overview of the texts is wide, setting both in historical contexts with possible modern responses and interpretations, but the textual scrutiny is close and detailed. Every assessment objective is met at the highest level.

AOs 1-3: 36

AOs 4-5: 24

Total mark: 60

Script B

The task here is not helpful to the student. It includes the word 'explore' but it is more likely that the outcome will be an explanation since what follows is an invitation to list the 'control mechanisms'. There is no reference to the role of the writers in shaping their content, and therefore no real way for the student to assess their impact. The student's reading of the texts is fairly superficial, and the focus of the argument is often unclear, with many non-sequiturs. There are many errors: possibly some are typos but a careful check would have eliminated these. The elision in some quotations makes their meaning and purpose obscure. The argument is often based on claims and interpretations that do not stand up to scrutiny. The contextual references seem to be included irrespective of their relevance to the texts and the argument, though later in the essay better links are made between the historical context and Orwell's novel. The student does develop links between the texts with clear and developed examples. Although there is some linking comment at the end of the essay, the comparison is largely based on an explanation or description of the content of one text, followed by the content of the second text so that there is little sense of how they might illuminate each other. There is a little close textual scrutiny, and the student is aware of the impact of particular words and repeated phrases. The student quotes the critic Ben Pimlott though this seems a little arbitrary. However, there is an underlying awareness of possible different interpretations.

AOs 1-3: 15

AOs 4-5: 10

Total mark: 25

Script C

The 'social commentary' of the title does lead to a dominating focus on historical events and their possible significance in the novels. This means that there is sometimes broader, even speculative comment at the expense of close textual scrutiny. In the first paragraph the student moves between external context and that of 'The Handmaid's Tale' but the distinction is not always clear. This approach limits the attention to the writer's crafting and shaping: the most sustained discussion concerns the word 'chair' and its different associations and meanings for different characters and situations. The argument is summarised in the last short paragraph which also links the texts, though the 'satire' has generally been implicitly rather than explicitly discussed. The 'irony' which is debated is perhaps seen as satirical. The student does have a clear purpose to the argument which is supported by textual reference, and the texts are linked throughout, though not always overtly. The discussion is controlled, and the student signals throughout that there are other possible readings, considered before arriving at a critical interpretation.

AOs 1-3: 24

AOs 4-5: 16

Total mark: 40

Script D

The student begins with a long paragraph on contexts, referring to one of the texts at the very end. This approach is continued in the essay which focuses on context, though there is a strong argument about people as products of their society, and their acceptance or resistance to the values of the world around them. There is awareness of the theatricality of the presentation of character, and the conflicts between them, with textual evidence supporting ideas and interpretations. The exploration of the dynamics of the plays is detailed, with relationships to some extent evaluated, perhaps more than their presentation. Though the 'American Dream' is an important feature of this piece, it is not clearly and precisely defined. It does, however, underpin the discussion of both texts, and serves as a way of linking them. The student's own critical view emerges from the argument, although many of the references which are used to help formulate this view are sociological rather than literary.

AOs 1-3: 27

AOs 4-5: 17

Total mark: 44

Script E

There is some imbalance in this essay with the focus more on *King Lear* than on *The Wasp Factory*. The student does, however, keep the concept of self-knowledge central in the discussion of both texts, making relevant links between the two, based on ideas and on techniques. The argument is clearly presented and expressed with fluency and conviction, with good textual support, carefully and appropriately selected. Interpretations are considered thoughtfully, and the reference to theatrical performance was relevant and useful. More could have been made of context in the essay as a whole.

AOs 1-3: 31

AOs 4-5: 20

Total mark: 51

Script F

This essay has a generally strong argument which links the two texts throughout. Links are made at different points, sometimes smaller details, and sometimes drawing ideas together with clarity. Supporting textual evidence is judiciously selected, and there is analysis of writers' language and its effects, with specific examples. Symbolism is discussed effectively. The historical and sociological contexts of the texts are explored quite strongly, with an engaged discussion of the concepts of womanhood and motherhood in the 19th century. The student engages with different critical views in order to help form her own argument with explorative interpretations.

AOs 1-3: 32

AOs 4-5: 21

Total mark: 53

Script G

This is an essay that shows real engagement with its subject matter. The student writes fluently and coherently, integrating different aspects of and approaches to the texts within the argument. There is an awareness of the importance of structure in a text, and some exploration of detail. The argument is based on both text and contexts, and is well-supported. The textual analysis is detailed, with comments particularly on Shelley's life and the society around her, though it can be a little overstated at times, assuming, for example, readers' knowledge of exploitation of workers, and the references to Marx and Engels are undermined by the acknowledgement of their lack of direct relevance to Shelley. The awareness of various interpretations is quite strong, and the links between the texts are sometimes subtle but effective.

AOs 1-3: 29

AOs 4-5: 19

Total mark: 48

Script H

The concept of 'authenticity' which is present in the question and is discussed throughout the piece is not very helpful to the student and leads to arguments which seem quite sterile. The texts are largely dealt with separately, with an occasional point of comparison, and the poetry text receives much less attention than the novel. The student tries to address the idea of context, particularly via biographical information which is used in a rather simplistic way at times, linked back to 'authenticity'. The writing is sometimes unclear with a number of grammatical and other errors. Although the student refers consistently to the texts this is often done in a descriptive or explanatory way. Some critical comments are given, though not always identified. The student does try to engage with some ideas, such as post-colonialism and what constitutes authenticity in a piece of literature, though on a fairly basic level. There are also some comments on writers' methods, touching on structure and narrative voice. The language of the piece tends to be colloquial, with limited use of appropriate terminology.

AOs 1-3: 13

AOs 4-5: 5

Total mark: 18