

Cheyly Reyes

IB English

4th period

In the play The Crucible by Arthur Miller and The Zoo Story by Edward Albee both playwrights choose to expose certain information to the audience, but withhold from the characters ~~and the other way around~~, creating a gap between what the audience knows and what the characters know, ^{which} (with) creates effects ^{which?} for both characters and audience. Miller's play is about a small town in Massachusetts, called Salem, the town is controlled by the Puritan church and when some individuals are accused of calling the devil, the town is plagued by hysteria where a small group of young girls accuse many which leads to their trials, where they are hung. Albee's play centers two middle aged men, in New York's Central Park, where they talk and their conversations ^{wander} (takes many turns) and ^{ultimately} ends with the death of one of the characters.

^{Miller's} ~~In~~ The Crucible by Miller exposes information to the audience about characters that other characters don't know. For example, when John Proctor's affair with Abigail Williams is revealed to the audience but isn't said until scenes later, to the rest of the characters. The effect of this example is that, it takes the audience by surprise when the affair is insinuated by Williams, changing the audience's perspective of both Williams and Proctor. The effect changes Proctor's image of being a loving husband and father, while destroying his perfect image as a man of God. As for Williams, the big reveal shows that her motives in accusing the people of Salem, come from her own personal vengeance to win Proctor over, ending his wife's life.

Williams turns into the "bad guy" of the play and the information about the affair turns the audience against ^{her} and shows what she is capable of. When the information is revealed scenes later, in the courthouse, confessed by Proctor in order to show the judges that Williams is an unreliable source, the audience is already aware of the affair, therefore the audience is unaffected while the other characters are in complete shock.

Another example, from The Crucible is the lies of Abigail Williams and the girls she forces into going along with the plot against Proctor's wife, Elizabeth Proctor. In the beginning of the play, the whole devil situation comes to the attention of the Puritan Church after Williams brings other young girls (such as Susan, Betty, Mercy, etc.) to the woods, to call forward the devil for her benefit, into finding a twisted way to make Proctor love only her. The audience knows that Williams' is the one who tried to cast the devil, the audience also knows that Williams pressured and scared the girls into playing along in personal vengeance. When other major characters such as Danforth, Hale, Parris, and Hathorne are unaware of how Williams and "the girls" are only pretending to be tortured and harassed by "spirits" or "devils", it effects the audience because they see through the acting and lies but other characters do not, making them seem blind to the obvious games. ^{and as a result} ~~Continuing with Williams being~~ ^{is the antagonist} (the "bad guy") of the play, the audience feels anger, hatred, and animosity for Williams because of the extent and the harm her lies have caused, including many deaths of innocent people, tearing families apart, and embarrassing the Puritan Church. All this harm in the name of personal vengeance and to win over Proctor. This technique is used to help Miller sway and manipulate the audience and their feelings as well as their thoughts towards (certain characters.)?

On the other hand in Edward Albee's The Zoo Story does the opposite of which Miller does in his drama. Albee chooses to vary in both, audience knows more than the characters and characters know more than the audience, differing from Miller's technique of the audience always knowing more. For example, the one act play is surrounded by two central characters by name of Jerry and Peter. In the last lines of the play, Jerry, the older of the two married with two daughters and owner of parakeets, he finally somewhat reveals his "zoo story" which was the whole reason why Jerry even approached Peter to being with. In this particular scene or play, Jerry knows that he only intends to reveal the story to Peter towards the end of their encounter, not immediately as he tells Peter. Jerry instead goes off topic many times, to keep Peter confused of Jerry's true motives. This also creates a gap between the audience and the characters, because the audience doesn't know Jerry's thoughts, actions, and motives when he first approaches Peter, which is used to keep the audience aware and interested. Then creating an element of surprise and slight understanding to the audience for Albee this technique of withholding information carries on his main objective, which is to leave the audience confused, hence the genre of the drama being called "theatre of the absurd."

contrast

relate to the dramatic question

nice!

Another example in The Zoo Story is Jerry's death. Also, in the last lines of the play Jerry commands Peter to fight with him, giving him a knife, and leading Peter to accidentally stab Jerry. By Peter's reaction, which included many "oh my god's" it was obvious that Peter wasn't expecting this encounter to end this way. Which was the complete opposite for Jerry, who was completely calm, collected, and content with their situation, even though he was bleeding to death, he showed no sorrow nor fear. Albee choose to withhold the fact that Jerry went to Central Park with the idea that he would approach some random guy in the park, push him to

his limits by questioning the man's honor and dignity in order to achieve his goal, which was be murdered. This was Jerry's main objective probably because he wasn't happy living in a lie, as he shares information about his miserable life to Peter, indicating he lived in a horrible place where the landlady would harass him, his many encounters with woman that had no real meaning behind them, and his inability to accept his homosexuality. This can be inferred ✓ because Jerry talks to Peter about a sexual relationship he had with a boy next door and how they only has sex a couple of times, then he talks about his sexual life with woman and how they can only please him for no more than an hour, which can implicate how he's unable to have more than a physical attraction to woman and how even that attraction is only present during their sexual encounters because it pleases him, but nothing more. His inability to have serious connection with a female shows how he is not emotionally attracted to woman, but he does not admit this to himself which causes his unhappiness and unwillingness to accept his homosexuality. All these ~~things~~ lead up to Jerry wanting to end his life, which is why he went to Central Park to see if he could find someone he could manipulate into killing him. Hence why he even brought a knife to the park in the first place, because he knew all along what his true motives were. This is not revealed to the audience, ✓ creating a gap with the effect of surprising the audience with Jerry's odd death, but is revealed when Jerry thanks Peter after he is stabbed. This technique is to again confuse the audience but give some clarity as Albee chooses to have Jerry say "thank you", and also give the reason behinds Jerry's odd way of acting. ✓

• great analysis!

As for the audience knowing more than the characters, Albee chooses to subliminally reveal information about the characters personality. The main example in this would be Jerry's

sexuality, although Albee chooses not to show his sexuality immediately, he instead reveals his sexual activity with males later, but then states his female lovers as well, trying to throw the audience off, but thanks to the hints and clues of Jerry's sexuality the audience is able to somewhat understand Jerry's acts of randomness and sense of odd behavior is understood, for example when Jerry tickles Peter it doesn't strike the audience as odd because they are informed of Jerry's sexual orientation. Another example would be the fact that Peter brushes off Jerry's "secret", ^{which} creates a gap between characters and the audience.

What both playwrights do may differ in some specific ways, they both use the technique of creating gaps between the knowledge of the characters and the audience to effect to audience. In all these examples the main effect the gap has is to either keep an element of surprise or affect how the audience sees certain characters. Miller and Albee both use the same technique but in different ways to persuade of change the audience's thoughts and feelings in the direction they please. The prime example of this would be Williams and how Miller creates her into the "bad guy", then with Albee, Jerry is molded into the character that is unstable and easily triggered. As for Peter, Albee chooses to make Peter ~~the~~ more stable character and shows how Jerry somewhat envies Peter's "boring" life because he has stability unlike Jerry. In Miller's play, his technique is used mostly to impact the audience and also change emotions, were Albee's technique is used strictly to keep his play along his genre, ^{→ tragicomedy} either to cause confusion or to make the play somewhat understandable.

Furthermore, the both plays are extremely different in both topics and time, but were written to have some similarities. The technique of creating a gap between the information shared and the information hidden, also helps with character development, the plot, and

affecting the audience at the same time. The information is also used to foreshadow events, and give clarity. Albee and Miller do not use all the same technique but with this specific technique it helps both playwrights develop the protagonist and antagonist, and give the audience more understanding of the characters and the help develop. For example in The Crucible the revealing of Williams true intentions develop the 'rising action' for the plot and leads to the climax, that is John Proctor admitting the a false accusation of casting the devil, on the other hand, in The Zoo Story Jerry questioning Peter is the one that does the 'rising action' which leads to the climax, that is Jerry's death.

In conclusion, both The Crucible and The Zoo Story have the technique imputed by their playwrights, Edward Albee and Arthur Miller. With the effect of developing characters, developing the plot, foreshadowing events, and lastly bringing clarity to an otherwise incomprehensible scene. Changing the thoughts, feelings, and emotions are the audience, keeping the audience interested and helping the playwright, in the case of Albee, go along with his genre and the specific qualities that the genre possesses. The gap of information leads to all those effects. ✓+ Wow!

- An impressive essay!
- excellent kn. & understanding of both plays
- Subtlety and nuances discussed
- a successful comparison and evaluation of the playwright's techniques.

Word Count: 1,812

Cheyla Reyes

	0	1	2	3	4	5
<p>Criterion A: Knowledge and understanding How much knowledge and understanding has the student shown of the part 3 works studied in relation to the question answered?</p>	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors.	There is some knowledge but virtually no understanding of the part 3 works in relation to the question answered.	There is mostly adequate knowledge and some superficial understanding of the part 3 works in relation to the question answered.	There is adequate knowledge and understanding of the part 3 works in relation to the question answered.	There is good <u>knowledge and understanding</u> of the part 3 works in relation to the question answered.	There is <u>perceptive knowledge and understanding</u> of the part 3 works in relation to the question answered. ★
<p>Criterion B: Response to the question How well has the student understood the specific demands of the question? To what extent has the student responded to these demands? How well have the works been compared and contrasted in relation to the demands of the question?</p>	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors.	The student shows little awareness of the main implications of the question, and ideas are mainly irrelevant and/or insignificant. There is little meaningful comparison of the works used in relation to the question.	The student responds to some of the main implications of the question with some relevant ideas. There is a superficial attempt to compare the works used in relation to the question.	The student responds to most of the main implications of the question with consistently relevant ideas. There is adequate comparison of the works used in relation to the question.	The student responds to the main implications and some subtleties of the question, with relevant and carefully explored ideas. The comparison makes some evaluation of the works used in relation to the question.	The student responds to all the implications, as well as the subtleties of the question, with convincing and thoughtful ideas. <u>The comparison includes an effective evaluation</u> of the works in relation to the question. ★
<p>Criterion C: Appreciation of the literary conventions of the genre To what extent does the student identify and appreciate the use of literary conventions in relation to the question and the works used?</p>	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors.	Some literary conventions are identified but there is limited development relevant to the question and/or the works used.	Examples of literary conventions are sometimes correctly identified and developed, with some relevance to the question and the works used.	Examples of literary conventions are satisfactorily identified and developed, with relevance to the question and the works used.	Examples of <u>literary conventions are clearly identified and effectively developed, with relevance to the question and the works used.</u> ★	Examples of literary conventions are perceptively identified and persuasively developed, with clear relevance to the question and the works used.
<p>Criterion D: Organization and development How well organized, coherent and developed is the presentation of ideas?</p>	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors.	Ideas have little organization; there may be a superficial structure, but coherence and/or development are lacking.	Ideas have some organization, with a recognizable structure, but coherence and development are often lacking.	Ideas are adequately organized, with a suitable structure and attention paid to coherence and development.	Ideas are effectively organized, with a very good structure, coherence and development.	Ideas are persuasively organized, with excellent structure, coherence and development. ★
<p>Criterion E: Language How clear, varied and accurate is the language? How appropriate is the choice of register, style and terminology? ("Register" refers, in this context, to the student's use of elements such as vocabulary, tone, sentence structure and terminology appropriate to the task.)</p>	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors.	Language is rarely clear and appropriate; there are many errors in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction, and little sense of register and style.	Language is sometimes clear and carefully chosen; grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction are fairly accurate, although errors and inconsistencies are apparent; the register and style are to some extent appropriate to the task.	Language is clear and carefully chosen, with an adequate degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction despite some lapses; register and style are mostly appropriate to the task.	Language is clear and carefully chosen, with a good degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are consistently appropriate to the task. ★	Language is very clear, effective, carefully chosen and precise, with a high degree of accuracy in grammar, vocabulary and sentence construction; register and style are effective and appropriate to the task.

23/25