
AEA IN ENGLISH

9910

SPECIMEN ASSESSMENT MATERIALS

These specimen assessment materials are designed to accompany the OCR AEA in English Specification for certification from June 2002.

Centres are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use.

OCR has prepared specifications to incorporate the range of features required AEA's and subject criteria. The specimen assessment material accompanying the specification is provided to give Centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers in advance of the first operational examination.

QAN 100/1573/5

CONTENTS

Reading Booklet
Question Paper
Mark Scheme

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations

Advanced Extension Award

ENGLISH

9910

READING BOOKLET

Contents

Introduction	3
Passage (a): John Keats: 'On Sitting Down to read King Lear Once Again' (1818)	4
Passage (b): Transcript from 'Start the Week' (BBC Radio 4, 16.4.2001)	5
Passage (c): Shakespeare: from <i>3 Henry VI</i> *	6
Passage (d): Shakespeare: from <i>Henry VIII</i> *	8
Passage (e): 'Shakespeare - As You Like It!' (advertisement in <i>The Guardian</i> , 17.10.2000)	10
Passage (f): Germaine Greer: <i>Foreword to Shakespeare's Major Tragedies</i> (2000)	12
Passage (g): Tom Furniss and Michael Bath: 'Dead Metaphor and Poetic Metaphor' from <i>Reading Poetry</i> (1996)	13
Passage (h): Jonathan Bate: from <i>The Genius of Shakespeare</i> (1997)	15
Passage (i): Frank Kermode: from <i>Shakespeare's Language</i> (2000)	17
Passage (j): Sean McEvoy: 'History and Power' from <i>Shakespeare: the Basics</i> (2000)	19
Passage (k): Nick Peim: from 'What Kind of Subject is English?' in <i>Issues in English Teaching</i> (ed. Davidson and Moss, 2000)	20

Introduction

The texts in this Reading Booklet are divided into two linked parts. You are recommended to read all the material through rapidly first, and then concentrate on those items most likely to help you to answer the questions you decide to select.

All the passages deal, directly or indirectly, with 'Language, Shakespeare and power'. Some focus on issues of language arising from studying Shakespeare; some on the power of Shakespeare's plays – particularly his language – over readers and audience; some raise questions about the powerful position that Shakespeare occupies in English Literature. Other passages deal with the representation of power in the plays themselves.

Passages a – f contain the transcript of a discussion about ideas of power and kingship in Shakespeare, two extracts from his plays, and a sonnet by Keats, as well as an advertisement from a newspaper and the Foreword to a book, *Shakespeare's Major Tragedies*, for use in schools.

Passages g – k offer linguistic and literary perspectives on the primary texts or raise related issues about language, about the scope and nature of Shakespeare's achievement, and his role in the curriculum today.

**Passage (a): John Keats: 'On Sitting Down to read King Lear
Once Again' (1818)**

O golden-tongued Romance with serene lute!
Fair plumed Syren! Queen of far away!
Leave melodizing on this wintry day,
Shut up thine olden pages, and be mute.
Adieu! for once again the fierce dispute,
Betwixt damnation and impassion'd clay
Must I burn through; once more humbly assay
The bitter-sweet of this Shakespearian fruit.
Chief Poet! And ye clouds of Albion,
Begetters of our deep eternal theme,
When through the old oak forest I am gone,
Let me not wander in a barren dream,
But when I am consumed in the fire
Give me new Phoenix wings to fly at my desire.

Passage (b): Transcript from 'Start the Week'
(BBC Radio 4, 16.4.2001)

The following is a transcript of the last part of a live radio discussion about Shakespeare's history plays. The speakers are discussing whether the plays show Shakespeare reinforcing or undermining conventional ideas of kingship. There are three participants: S1 is the chairman of the discussion, S2 a male speaker and S3 a female speaker.

S1: but they [Shakespeare's history plays] are working through are they not the id... idea of what constitutes the leg... legit... legitimacy of a monarch/

S2: /yes/

S1: /from the divine right idea to authority exec (.) achieved through action

S2: yes (.) and here I think (.) one one one could safely say that Shakespeare was pretty subversive because he clearly shows that that that there's (speech inaudible) power is about self interest (.) and if that sounds an OBVIOUS thing I think it is still something we (.) something we all enter into with politics(.) we still ENDLESSLY expect somehow our leaders not to operate from a base of self-interest.

S3: I I I do think though about that actually (.) that that that actually it its not so much about the divine right of kings though you are quite right that that is a key line through (.) it is really about LEADERSHIP and what constitutes leading the people and that's/

S2: /yes yes/

S3: /that's what the plays explore over and over

S2: yes well and a proper leader in the play IS Henry the fifth who is a proper MACHIAVEL and again we use Machiavel as a dirty word but Shakespeare is quite realistic if you want to achieve power you must lie and cheat and say one thing and mean another in order to achieve an end THAT is what power is

S1: Fine.

Key to symbols

- | | |
|------------|---|
| (.) | a pause of one second or more |
| / | a point at which one speaker interrupts another |
| UPPER CASE | indicates a word given particular emphasis |

PRINCE:	Methinks a woman of this valiant spirit Should, if a coward heard her speak these words, Infuse his breast with magnanimity And make him, naked, foil a man at arms. I speak not this as doubting any here For did I but suspect a fearful man He should have leave to go away betimes, Lest in our need he might infect another And make him of like spirit to himself. If any such be here (as God forbid!) Let him depart before we need his help.	40 45
OXFORD:	Women and children of so high a courage, And warriors faint? why, 'twere perpetual shame. O brave young prince! thy famous grandfather Doth live again in thee: long mayst thou live To bear his image and renew his glories!	50
SOMERSET:	And he that will not fight for such a hope, Go home to bed, and like the owl by day, If he arise, be mock'd and wonder'd at.	55
QUEEN MARGARET:	Thanks, gentle Somerset; sweet Oxford, thanks.	
PRINCE:	And take his thanks that yet hath nothing else.	

Passage (d): Shakespeare: from *Henry VIII**

*Cardinal Wolsey, the King's most powerful and trusted Minister, discovers that he has over-reached himself.

WOLSEY:	My sovereign, I confess your royal graces, Shower'd on me daily, have been more than could My studied purposes requite; which went Beyond all man's endeavours: my endeavours Have ever come too short of my desires, 5 Yet filed with my abilities: mine own ends Have been mine so that evermore they pointed To the good of your most sacred person and The profit of the state. For your great graces Heap'd upon me, poor undeserver, I 10 Can nothing render but allegiant thanks, My prayers to heaven for you, my loyalty, Which ever has and ever shall be growing, Till death, that winter, kill it.
KING:	Fairly answer'd; A loyal and obedient subject is 15 Therein illustrated: the honour of it Does pay the act of it; as, i' th' contrary, The foulness is the punishment. I presume That, as my hand has open'd bounty to you, My heart dropp'd love, my power rain'd honour, more 20 On you than any; so your hand and heart, Your brain, and every function of your power, Should, notwithstanding that your bond of duty, As 'twere in love's particular, be more To me, your friend, than any. 25
WOLSEY:	I do profess That for your highness' good I ever labour'd More than mine own; that am, have, and will be- Though all the world should crack their duty to you, And throw it from their soul; though perils did Abound, as thick as thought could make 'em, and 30 Appear in forms more horrid, - yet my duty, As doth a rock against the chiding flood, Should the approach of this wild river break, And stand unshaken yours.

KING:	'Tis nobly spoken: Take notice, lords, he has a loyal breast, For you have seen him open't. Read o'er this;	35
	<i>[Giving him papers]</i>	
	And after, this: and then to breakfast with What appetite you have.	
	<i>[Exit KING frowning upon the CARDINAL. The Nobles throng after him, smiling and whispering]</i>	
WOLSEY:	What should this mean? What sudden anger's this? how have I reap'd it? He parted frowning from me, as if ruin Leap'd from his eyes: so looks the chafed lion Upon the daring huntsman that has gall'd him; Then makes him nothing. I must read this paper; I fear, the story of his anger. 'Tis so; This paper has undone me: 'tis the account Of all that world of wealth I have drawn together For mine own ends; indeed, to gain the popedom, And fee my friends in Rome. O negligence! Fit for a fool to fall by: what cross devil Made me put this main secret in the packet I sent the king? Is there no way to cure this? No new device to beat this from his brains? I know 'twill stir him strongly; yet I know A way, if it take right, in spite of fortune Will bring me off again. What's this? 'To th' Pope'? The letter, as I live, with all the business I writ to's holiness. Nay then, farewell! I have touch'd the highest point of all my greatness; And, from that full meridian of my glory, I haste now to my setting: I shall fall Like a bright exhalation in the evening, And no man see me more.	40 45 50 55 60

Passage (e): 'Shakespeare - As You Like It!'
(advertisement in *The Guardian*, 17.10.2000)

ADVERTISEMENT FEATURE

Shakespeare – As You Like It!



New approaches to Shakespeare have revolutionised both teaching methods and pupils' attitudes.

'The play's the thing...' says Hamlet, plotting to unmask his uncle Claudius. It is a line that could stand as the slogan for the revolution in Shakespearean teaching that has occurred in the last 10 years.

Time was that 'Will' was regarded by many children as some undesirable 'other', only for the top sets and 'boffins'. It was a world in which Shakespeare was definitely 'text' - not 'script' - to be discussed and dismantled as if it were a novel.

Go into an English lesson today when Shakespeare is being studied and you are likely to find everyone out of their chairs using a wide range of theatrical techniques in their efforts to explore the meaning of the plays. The classroom has become a rehearsal space. Freeze-frames bring imagery to life, Shakespearean songs are set to contemporary tunes, speeches are cut up, shared, learnt and spoken. 'Experiment, use the language, make it your own,' teachers tell their students.

Of course, there have always been pockets of such practice, but now it has become mainstream, enshrined in a national curriculum that places understanding the plays in dramatic terms as a high-order skill.

We live in a post-modern world. Baz Luhrmann's *Romeo and Juliet* and other lively screen versions of Shakespeare's plays have done much to allay students' suspicions. Studying him has become something desirable, a rite of passage, an entitlement. Of course, barriers still remain. Shakespeare is not immediately accessible. The language is hard and often teachers are daunted by the prospect, real or imagined, of their students' resistance.

This is why the drama element of the £3 million Lloyds TSB Live! programme is so important. By concentrating on active approaches to teaching Shakespeare, it has given schools access to something invaluable – actors. Now students can see real people exploring their parts, teasing out the meaning of difficult lines, demonstrating and sharing the rehearsal techniques that bring their characters to life. It is an insight into a world in which what Shakespeare 'means' is negotiable,

and how he is performed is a matter of interpretation.

This year actors from the Royal National Theatre will bring a performance of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* to secondary schools across the country. The visits include workshops for up to 120 Key Stage 3 and 4 students at a time and the use of a bus adapted to allow classes access to a new interactive Shakespeare CD-Rom. The latter, which will also go out to all schools expressing interest in the tour, allows students to take on the roles of director and designer of up to three Shakespeare plays. Film sequences help them to explore the mysteries of auditioning and rehearsing actors, while detailed work on the language and rhythm of specific speeches culminates in their devising set designs and a promotional trailer.

The Lloyds TSB Live! drama programme is based on a philosophy of Shakespeare teaching which puts it at the core of modern education. In using actors to explore 'some necessary question of the play', you can bet that Hamlet would also have approved.

www.guardianunlimited.co.uk/lloydstsb
Lloyds TSB
www.lloydstsb.com/live

Passage (f): Germaine Greer: *Foreword to Shakespeare's Major Tragedies* (2000)

Foreword

Far too many people maintain that Shakespeare was ruined for them at school. Hours and hours of sorting out difficult words and references, identifying figures of speech and doing amateur psychoanalysis on the characters, turned them off. The same people can be astonished by Shakespeare in the playhouse, fascinated by the wonderfulness of what Shakespeare characters say. Kids to whose hearts the name 'Shakespeare' used to strike dread were thrilled to the point of unbearableness by Baz Luhrmann's film of *Romeo and Juliet*. When the picture had gone dark in their heads Shakespeare's words still shone like neon. They realised that Shakespeare wrote rap. Blank verse is just that, rap, spoken in a five times 1-2 beat, against a double heart stroke, in the time of a breath.

The first task of any teacher is to gift Shakespeare to his new millennial audience, with their short attention span, their over-stimulated minds, and their deep uncertainties about loving and harming, about innocence and guilt, about truth to self, to one's word and to others. The first thing they need to know is that they have the right both to understand Shakespeare and to misunderstand him, to make new meanings, to reapply the charms of Shakespeare's wonderfully ambiguous words to their own psychic wounds.

Shakespeare can be unlocked in any of a thousand ways; the key is the language that we share with him. The words have accumulated new overtones and lost some old ones since he used them, but our language shares their DNA. Even the newest jargon carries their traits. Shakespeare will help the most inarticulate to exult, to rail, to woo and to grieve. Shakespeare can surprise the most bigoted with the revelation that the least pretentious varieties of human existence have their own kinds of heroism.

Professor Germaine Greer

*Professor of English and Comparative Literary Studies,
University of Warwick*

**Passage (g): Tom Furniss and Michael Bath:
'Dead Metaphor and Poetic Metaphor' from
Reading Poetry (1996)**

We have seen that metaphor is an extremely powerful and flexible device which features in all kinds of language use. The host of dead metaphors which make up a far larger proportion of our language than we generally realize tend to influence and shape the way we perceive the world and the everyday stories we tell about it. In fact, the extent to which language in general is metaphorical raises problems for the straightforward distinction between literal and figurative with which we began this chapter. The late-nineteenth-century German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche suggested that virtually all language is metaphorical, and that the truths which we take to be self-evident are actually dead metaphors:

What, then, is truth? A mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms – in short, a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and obligatory to people: truths are illusions about which one has forgotten that this is what they are; metaphors which are worn out and without sensuous power; coins which have lost their pictures and now matter only as metal, no longer as coins.

Here Nietzsche is pointing out the ideological power which dead metaphors have over society and over our thoughts – they seem 'obligatory' truths to a people precisely because they are no longer recognized as metaphors. If this is the case, if the dead metaphors of our language do a great deal of our thinking for us without our knowing it, then it would seem urgent to become as alert as possible to the metaphorical undercurrents of our language, and to 'coin' new metaphors which tell alternative stories and resist the process of 'defacement' which Nietzsche's own metaphors describe. If the distinction between literal and figurative is a problematic one, that between dead and living metaphor is none the less crucial.

Metaphor, then, may be radical or conservative – it may either reaffirm conventional ways of thought (through dead metaphors, idiomatic phrases) or challenge such conventions by inviting us to look at something in a new way. The role poetry is assumed to play in this struggle is influentially described by Shelley in the passage we have already quoted from his *A Defence of Poetry* (1821). Shelley stresses the importance of original metaphor in poetry, anticipating the Russian Formalists' concept of defamiliarization by claiming that 'Poetry lifts the veil from the hidden beauty of the world, and makes familiar objects be as if they were not familiar' (*Shelley's Poetry and Prose*, p. 487). One of the ways poetry does this is through a special use of metaphor. The language of poets, he claims,

is vitally metaphorical; that is, it marks the before unapprehended relations of things and perpetuates their apprehension, until words, which represent them, become, through time, signs for portions or classes of thought, instead of pictures of integral thoughts; and then, if no new poets should arise to create afresh the associations which have been thus disorganised, language will be dead to all the nobler purposes of human intercourse. (p.482)

Shelley is claiming here that the 'vital' metaphors of poets point out relations between things which no one had ever recognized before, and he assumes that new metaphors produce new thoughts (or new connections between thoughts). In time, however, our sense of these relations gets lost (perhaps by degenerating into dead metaphors) and new poets are needed to 'revitalize' the language through creating new poetic metaphors. For Shelley, then, poetic metaphor keeps the language 'alive'. He even suggests that the ability of poetic metaphor continually to generate new ways of thinking is crucial to social and political renovation, and even revolution. This allows him to claim that 'All the authors of revolutions in opinion are ... necessarily poets' (p. 485) and hence that 'Poets are unacknowledged legislators of the World' (p. 508).

Passage (h): Jonathan Bate: from *The Genius of Shakespeare* (1997)

Consider the statement 'Shakespeare was a genius'. Is this a fact or an opinion?

Judgements about the quality of works of art begin in opinion. But for the last two hundred years only the wilfully perverse (and Tolstoy) have denied the validity of the opinion that Shakespeare was a genius. It has become as close to a fact as we are ever likely to get in aesthetics. Why has the opinion become so fixed? What would an argument against it sound like? And what exactly do we mean by the statement?

Presumably we mean that there is something out of the ordinary about Shakespeare's plays. That his powers of invention were astonishing wide and quick. We think of the range of his vocabulary – over fifteen thousand different words. We find memorable quotations flashing into our minds – 'To be or not to be', 'Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow', 'All the world's a stage', 'Our revels now are ended'. We marvel at the process whereby the characters have taken on lives of their own: even someone who has never seen or read a Shakespeare play will almost certainly have images of Hamlet, Cleopatra, Romeo and Juliet, and may well have conceptions of Falstaff, Lady Macbeth, Othello, and Caliban. The plays have held the stage, the poetry is held in our minds, the characters have become archetypes. These phenomena, we will say, are proof of Shakespeare's genius.

The origins of Shakespeare's art are to be found in the rhetorical training he received at school, in his reading, his reshaping of inherited materials and traditions, above all in his theatrical environment, his creative engagement with the tragedies of Marlowe and the comedies of John Lyly. But to explain the origins of his art cannot fully account for his genius. Other dramatists – the prolific Thomas Heywood, for instance – had very much the same inheritance. Though Heywood wrote some very serviceable plays, he was not Shakespeare. His *Woman Killed with Kindness* is a moving tragedy of marital breakdown, but no one would rank it on the level of *Othello*. Shakespeare's environment did much to make his plays, but in the end what made Shakespeare uniquely Shakespeare was something indefinable, some peculiar alchemy of genes and circumstances. 'Genius' is the word we reach for in order to connote this alchemy.

How do we decide whether or not a work of art is 'good' or even 'great'? The question has been debated ever since Western art took shape in ancient Greece. Among the traditional answers are the following:

- 1 A great work of art is true to nature.
- 2 A great work of art stirs strong emotions in us.
- 3 A great work of art is wise; it makes us think.
- 4 A great work of art has formal beauty.

The greatness of a work of art may be judged by the extent to which it measures up to the standards of the universally acknowledged great works of the past.

The last of these answers is the least likely to be given today, but it has a venerable pedigree. For the ancient Greeks, Homer was the father of poetry, so later poetry could be judged by means of comparison with Homer. Homer was true to nature; truth to nature must therefore be commensurate with truth to Homer. Since the Homeric corpus provided the Greek tragedians with most of their source material, this argument from commensurability worked well in classical times, despite the formal differences between Homer's epic and the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides.

Passage (i): Frank Kermode: from *Shakespeare's Language* (2000)

As a consequence of all this knowledge it has become a commonplace that only in performance can the sense of Shakespeare's plays be fully apprehended. It is also maintained on high authority that every production must 'mine' something new from the text: 'The life of a theatre,' says the distinguished English director Richard Eyre, 'should always be in the present tense.' This is true, and the work of a modern director must always be to fuse the horizons of past and present; to read well and faithfully is always to read anew, but without introducing distortion. Eyre adds, 'The life of the plays is in the language, not alongside it, or underneath it. Feelings and thoughts are released at the moment of speech. An Elizabethan audience would have responded to the pulse, the rhythms, the shapes, sounds, and above all meanings, within the consistent ten-syllable, five stress lines of blank verse. They were an audience who *listened*.'

'The life of the plays is in the language.' Yet the language can admittedly be difficult, even baffling. This is obviously so for audiences coming in four hundred years after the event, but it must often have been true also of the original audiences, less because the language itself was unfamiliar (though much more so to us) than because of the strange and original uses an individual writer might put it to. It is true that the audience, many of them oral rather than literate, were trained, as we are not, to listen to long, structured discourses, and must have been rather good at it, with better memories and more patience than we can boast. If you could follow a sermon by John Donne, which might mean standing in St. Paul's Churchyard and concentrating intensely for at least a couple of hours, you might not consider even *Coriolanus* impossibly strenuous. And although Donne wasn't taking down to them, much of his language was familiar to his congregation.

We also need to remember how quickly the language of quite ordinary people grows strange, recedes into the past, along with other social practices and assumptions taken for granted in one age yet hard for a later age to understand. If you read or watch a Jacobean city comedy, say, for instance, Middleton's masterly play *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, you soon discover that for all the manifest life of the dialogue and the characters you are an outsider, missing jokes and implications – as perhaps, in the course of a generation or two, the allusions and jokes in the dialogue of modern soap operas will baffle the student and have to be looked up in a commentary. But the first audience could presumably follow most of it with ease and pleasure and without the effort it imposes on us. It is true that now and again Shakespeare uses a word neither the original nor the modern audience had ever heard before, which yet remains intelligible to both, as when Goneril (*King Lear*, I. iv.249) advises her father 'A little to disquantity' his train. The dictionary records no earlier use of this word, and it did not catch on, but to the modern ear it has a disturbingly bureaucratic ring, rather like the euphemisms produced by government departments, and it must have surely struck the first audience also as a cold and official-sounding word for a daughter to use in conversation with her father.

But this coincidence of response must be thought unusual, and we have often to deal with dramatic language that was almost certainly difficult even to the audiences for whose pleasure it was originally written. So we need to ask what 'following' entails. It is simply inconceivable that anybody at the Globe, even those described by Shakespeare's contemporary, the critic Gabriel Harvey, as 'the wiser sort', could have followed every sentence of *Coriolanus*.

**Passage (j): Sean McEvoy: ‘History and Power’ from
Shakespeare: the Basics (2000)**

Power in the history plays comes down to one of three things: first, having the military force to take what you want; second, being able to persuade people; or, third, being able to put on a convincing performance which makes effective use of the most powerful beliefs of the time. Talk of ‘divine right’, ‘just claims’ and ‘providence’ mystifies these unattractive alternatives; but the dramatic structures of main plot and sub-plot in these plays hint perceptively at the bald truths of power in medieval and early modern England.

Many writings about politics in Shakespeare’s time use theatrical metaphors. It was widely recognised that a monarch’s actions and demeanour should be such as to inspire belief and obedience. The monarch’s speech and costume must have what writers called ‘decorum’: appropriateness to the circumstances in which he found himself. This is at the heart of what Machiavelli wrote about politics (see pp. 200f.). Public events – like the entry of King James I into London for the first time as monarch in 1604 – were intricately staged, with painted triumphal arches, specially written poetry and carefully costumed courtiers. King James’ court mounted expensive dramatic entertainments – masques – extolling a particular royal virtue or teaching some lesson about loyal obedience. Members of the royal family and the court themselves acted in these plays.

Prince Hal and Henry IV are very aware of the theatrical element of kingship in the world in which they live. They talk openly about the king having to be a performer (actually, of course, performers playing kings and princes talking about kings and princes having to be performers). Theatricality was very much at the cultural and political heart of early modern England. Power and the theatre interact closely.

Passage (k): Nick Peim: from ‘What Kind of Subject is English?’ in *Issues in English Teaching* (ed. Davidson and Moss, 2000)

Why read *The Tempest*? For its undying human truth? For its narrative structure? For the insight it gives us into Shakespeare’s mind? Or maybe to deconstruct its colonial, patriarchal and ultimately sexist ideology? These questions, raised by Hawkes (1992), Holderness (1985) and Dollimore and Sinfield (1988), lead to others.

Is *The Tempest* intrinsically worthy of study? Is it just as ideologically loaded and questionable as *Coronation Street* or *Who Wants to be a Millionaire*? Does Shakespeare automatically claim a place at the centre of the English curriculum by natural authority? If not, what’s it doing there at all? In other words, why does English in the National Curriculum remain so much dominated by literature, by Shakespeare, and why, by the same token, does it neglect to deal with so much textual material beyond the limits of literature?

This series of questions raises the fundamental issue of the purpose and range of English in education. Is the centrality of literature in English acceptable, given contemporary cultural conditions? Are the reading practices of English in accord with contemporary thinking on meaning? Are the ideas that inform language work in English teaching, especially language assessment, compatible with current knowledge about language and how it works in education? Is English teaching intent on teaching specific texts, rather than intent on teaching certain kinds of critical reading practices? How are such reading practices formulated? What reading techniques do they deploy? What theoretical frameworks support them?

English in its current dominant form has been unconcerned with important developments in cultural theory. According to theorists of the post-modern, contemporary culture is characterised by *hybridity*. In this new world order of mingling experiences and identity, our cultural bearings are likely to be many and varied. Post-modernism might be described as a flattening of hierarchies and undermining of canonical foundations. Cultural objects, processes and experiences are seen as mingling and merging and losing the distinct differences that might have given them a singular identity in a world gone by. We now seem to inhabit a multicultural supermarket where we might eat Vietnamese food, listen to Jamaican music while wearing American clothes, and so on.

Post-modernism is a theory of cultural relativity. It speaks of the cultural diversity of the world and keeps a wary eye on the imperialist tendencies of Western cultural forms and products. Some may celebrate this relativity and some may lament the loss of traditional values that at least seemed to give our thinking about cultural matters some sense of direction. The category of literature, though, surely poses problems, both in terms of contemporary cultural conditions – and in terms of who is already well placed to access and respond appropriately to it. Literature – whether strictly defined as canonical literature or liberally defined as stories, drama and poems – remains theoretically questionable in terms of definition and limits. Nobody knows where it begins and ends. We know what's likely to be included, like Shakespeare, and what's likely to be excluded – like *Eric Cantona: My Story* and *Diana: Her True Story*. However, can we say for sure that either one of these popular texts is less worthy of attention, less susceptible to critical reading or less culturally significant than *The Tempest*?

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations

Advanced Extension Award

ENGLISH

9910

Specimen Paper

Additional materials: Reading Booklet
Answer booklet.

TIME 3 hours including reading time.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Write your name, Centre number and candidate number in the spaces provided on the answer booklet.
- Write your answers, in blue or black ink, in the separate answer booklet provided.
- You must answer **Question 1** in **Section A** and **one question from Section B**. You should not need to spend more than about an hour on either answer.
- Read each question carefully and make sure you know what you have to do before starting your answer.
- No texts, dictionaries or sources of reference other than the material in the *Reading Booklet* may be brought into the examination. However, in your answers you may refer to any texts or material you have studied for Advanced GCE English, or to your wider reading and study.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- Up to 60 minutes is allowed for reading and annotating the material in the *Reading Booklet*.
- The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.
- Each question is worth 30 marks. The total number of marks for this paper is 60.

Answer Question 1 in Section A and ONE question from Section B.

Section A

- 1** Compare any two or more texts from items **(a)** to **(f)** to explore literary and/or linguistic issues arising from discussion of Shakespeare in the material you have chosen.

In your opening paragraph explain the approach you are adopting in your answer.

In your conclusion, assess the usefulness and/or limitations of your approach.

[30]

Section B

Answer ONE question from this section.

In answering any of the following questions, you should make use of the material in both sections of the *Reading Booklet*, as appropriate, as well as other material drawn from your own studies in literature and/or language.

- 2** 'Virtually all language is metaphorical' (passage **g**).

Referring closely in your answer to one or more passages from **(a)** to **(f)**, discuss the ideas about language and metaphor presented in passage **(g)**.

[30]

- 3** 'The life of the plays is in the language' (Kermode, passage **i**).

'Shakespeare can be unlocked in any of a thousand ways; the key is the language that we share with him' (Greer, passage **f**).

Either:

- (a)** In what senses is it possible, or impossible, to say that 'we' share the same language with Shakespeare?

Or:

- (b)** How far do you agree that 'the life of the plays is in the language'?

(You may discuss Shakespeare's work only, or drama more widely, as you wish.) **[30]**

- 4** The book from which passage **(h)** is taken is called *The Genius of Shakespeare*.

Do you think 'genius' is a helpful term to use of art or artists?

Who should decide, and using what criteria, that a work of art is a work of genius?

[30]

- 5** *Either:*

- (a)** What new insights, if any, about representations of power in Shakespeare have you gained from the discussions in passages **(b)** and **(j)**?

Or:

- (b)** 'Is the centrality of literature acceptable, given contemporary cultural conditions?' (Peim, in passage **k**).

Explore the contrasting points of view about English in the curriculum today as expressed in passages **(e)** and **(k)**.

[30]

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations

Advanced Extension Award

ENGLISH

9910

GENERIC MARK SCHEME

The paper specific markschemes will be based on the following levels of achievement:

Band	Markscheme Band Descriptor
1	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse unfamiliar texts in ways that demonstrate critical understanding and insight, drawing on appropriate conceptual frameworks, analytical approaches and knowledge of contextual factors to express secure personal judgements; establish complex connections and comparisons between texts, exploring relations between language, ideas, viewpoints and contexts; discuss literary/linguistic issues rigorously, elucidating debates with knowledge and evidence, and arguing a coherent, personal point of view; write with an individuality of approach and maturity of style, making fluent, effective use of the language of the subject.
2	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse unfamiliar texts perceptively and cogently, with some reference to relevant conceptual frameworks, analytical approaches and contextual factors; make thoughtful connections and comparisons between texts, considering relations between language, ideas, viewpoints and contexts; discuss literary/linguistic issues in developed, coherent argument informed by knowledge of debates and supported by appropriate evidence; write in a cogent and convincing style, drawing appropriately on the language of the subject.
3	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse unfamiliar texts in ways that demonstrate competent understanding of their concerns, with some awareness of conceptual frameworks, analytical approaches and contextual factors; make relevant connections and comparisons between texts, exploring the arguments/positions they embody and the means by which they are presented; demonstrate awareness of literary/linguistic issues and debates, with evidence of a personal point of view; write coherently and accurately, showing some awareness of the language of the subject.
4	<p>Candidates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> attempt some analysis of the concerns of unfamiliar texts; make few relevant connections and comparisons between texts, with limited development of argument or exploration of methods of presentation; show little awareness of literary/linguistic issues and debates; display problems of expression and organisation and limited familiarity with the language of the subject.