Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education
2019

English Literature

Unit 2

The Study of Drama and Poetry

GEL21

[GEL21]
THURSDAY 23 MAY, MORNING

TIME

2 hours.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Write your Centre Number and Candidate Number on the Answer Booklets provided.
Answer **two** questions.
Answer **one** question from each section.
Write your answer to Section A in the Drama Answer Booklet.
Write your answer to Section B in the Poetry Answer Booklet.
Spend 1 hour on Section A and 1 hour on Section B.
You should have with you an unannotated copy of your Drama text and an unannotated copy of your Poetry Anthology.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The total mark for this paper is 80.
All questions in Section A and Section B carry equal marks, i.e. 40 marks for each question.
Quality of written communication will be assessed in all responses.

stemup.co.uk

Page Index to Sections and Questions

Question Number			Page Number
		Section A – Drama	
1	**O'Casey**	*Juno and the Paycock*	3
2	**Priestley**	*An Inspector Calls*	4
3	**Friel**	*Philadelphia, Here I Come!*	5
4	**Russell**	*Blood Brothers*	6
5	**Sherriff**	*Journey's End*	7
6	**Stephens**	*The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*	8
7	**Wilder**	*Our Town*	9
		Section B – Poetry	
8	**Anthology One**	IDENTITY	10
9	**Anthology Two**	RELATIONSHIPS	11
10	**Anthology Three**	CONFLICT	12

stemup.co.uk

Section A – Drama

Answer **one** question from this section.

1 O'Casey: *Juno and the Paycock*

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Drama Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) With reference to the ways O'Casey **presents** the Boyle family, show how far you agree that lack of money is responsible for the **break-up** of the Boyle family.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 1 beginning near the top of page 68 with the stage direction, *Mrs Boyle enters by door on right* and ending on page 71 with Mrs Boyle's words: "There, now; go back an' lie down again, an' I'll bring you in a nice cup o' tay."

With reference to the ways O'Casey **presents** Mrs Boyle in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Mrs Boyle is **admirable**.

stemup.co.uk

2 **Priestley:** *An Inspector Calls*

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Drama Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) With reference to the ways Priestley **presents** reactions to the Inspector's investigation, show how far you agree that Eric and Sheila have **learnt lessons** by the end of the play.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act Two beginning on page 45 with the Inspector's words, "And you've nothing further to tell me, eh?" and ending on page 47 with Mrs Birling's words, "But I accept no blame for it at all".

With reference to the ways Priestley **presents** Mrs Birling in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show that Mrs Birling is **unfeeling** in her treatment of others. Whom does she treat worst? Give reasons for your opinions.

stemup.co.uk

3 **Friel:** *Philadelphia, Here I Come!*

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Drama Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) With reference to the ways Friel **presents** Gareth O'Donnell (Gar), show how far you agree that he is a **good son** to S.B. O'Donnell.

(b) Look again at the extract from Episode 2 beginning on page 79 with the stage direction, *There is a knock at the door* and ending on page 82 with Private's words: "Kate . . . sweet Katie Doogan . . . my darling Kathy Doogan".

(For those using the version which was reset in 2000, the extract begins at the top of page 67 and ends in the middle of page 70.)

With reference to the ways Friel **presents** the relationship between Gar and Kate in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that they are **unable** to reveal their true feelings.

stemup.co.uk

4 Russell: *Blood Brothers*

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Drama Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) With reference to the ways Russell **presents** the difficulties faced by Mrs Johnstone and Mrs Lyons, show how far you agree that they **deserve** sympathy.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 2 beginning at the bottom of page 84 with Mickey's words, "Nothin'. How's University?" and ending at the bottom of page 86 with Mickey's words: "Go on… beat it before I hit y'".

(For those using the "red-backed" edition, the extract begins in the middle of page 91 and ends on page 93.)

With reference to the ways Russell **presents** Mickey in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that he is **powerless** to control his life.

stemup.co.uk

5 Sherriff: *Journey's End*

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Drama Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) With reference to the ways Sherriff **presents** Osborne, show how far you agree that Osborne is a **good officer**.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 2 beginning in the middle of page 45 in the Samuel French edition with Stanhope's words, "Good God! Don't you understand!" and ending on page 48 with Stanhope's words, "That's all right".

(For those using the Penguin edition, the extract begins on page 56 and ends on page 59.)

With reference to the ways Sherriff **presents** fear in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show that the soldiers deal with **fear** in differing ways.

stemup.co.uk

6 **Stephens:** *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Drama Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) With reference to the ways Stephens **presents** Christopher's parents and Siobhan, show how far you agree that it is best to **deceive** Christopher.

(b) Look again at the extract from Part One beginning on page 34 with Ed's words, "What is this?" and ending on page 36 with the stage direction, *They make their fingers and thumbs touch each other*.

With reference to the ways Stephens **presents** Ed in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that he **fails** as a father.

stemup.co.uk

7 Wilder: *Our Town*

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Drama Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) With reference to the ways Wilder **presents** the Gibbs and Webb families, show how far you agree that family relationships are **predictable**.

(b) Look again at the extract beginning on page 60 with the Stage Manager's words, "And Emily's just been elected Secretary and Treasurer" and ending near the top of page 63 with the stage direction, *George speaks to some passers-by*.

(For those using the edition re-issued in 2017, the extract begins at the top of page 40 and ends on page 42.)

With reference to the ways Wilder **presents** Emily in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Emily is **strong**.

stemup.co.uk

Section B – Poetry

Answer **one** question from this section.

8 Anthology One: IDENTITY

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Poetry Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) Look again at *Piano* by D.H. Lawrence which deals with the theme of how childhood memories influence identity, and at one other poem from the IDENTITY anthology which also deals with the theme of how childhood memories influence identity.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about the influence of **childhood memories**. You should include relevant contextual material.

(b) Look again at *Belfast Confetti* by Ciaran Carson which deals with the theme of how place influences identity, and at one other poem from the IDENTITY anthology which also deals with the theme of how place influences identity.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about how **place influences identity**. You should include relevant contextual material.

stemup.co.uk

9 Anthology Two: RELATIONSHIPS

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Poetry Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) Look again at *Remember* by Christina Rossetti which deals with the theme of loss, and at one other poem from the RELATIONSHIPS anthology which also deals with the theme of loss.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **loss**. You should include relevant contextual material.

(b) Look again at *I Carry Your Heart* by EE Cummings which deals with the theme of love, and at one other poem from the RELATIONSHIPS anthology which also deals with the theme of love.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **love**. You should include relevant contextual material.

stemup.co.uk

10 Anthology Three: CONFLICT

Answer **either (a) or (b)**

Use the Poetry Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) Look again at *Anthem for Doomed Youth* by Wilfred Owen which deals with the theme of the impact of conflict, and at one other poem from the CONFLICT anthology which also deals with the theme of the impact of conflict.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about the **impact of conflict**. You should include relevant contextual material.

(b) Look again at *An Irish Airman Foresees his Death* by W B Yeats which deals with the theme of attitudes to conflict, and at one other poem from the CONFLICT anthology which also deals with the theme of attitudes to conflict.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **attitudes to conflict**. You should include relevant contextual material.

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER

stemup.co.uk

Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for.
In some cases, efforts to contact copyright holders may have been unsuccessful and CCEA
will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgement in future if notified.

239933

Surname	StemUp Model Solution
Answer booklet	Write the question number in the left-hand margin at the start of each answer.

Question number

Ia

I agree only partly that lack of money is responsible for the break-up of the Boyle family. O'Casey certainly makes poverty the pressure that runs through every act, and the collapse of the promised inheritance is the trigger for the final disaster. However, he presents money as a test which exposes the weaknesses already inside the family: Boyle's idleness and vanity, Johnny's guilt, and the way the men around Juno and Mary fail them. Lack of money breaks the family's furniture; it is the characters' choices that break the family.

From the opening of the play, O'Casey shows a household living on the edge. The cramped tenement room, with Johnny haunting it and Juno coming and going with the shopping, makes poverty visible on stage. Juno's complaint that Boyle is "struttin' about the town like a paycock" while she works establishes the central tension: the family is poor partly because its father refuses to earn. When news comes that Father Farrell has found him a job, Boyle suddenly develops pains in his legs, a comic routine that is also a damning one. O'Casey suggests that the family's lack of money is not simply bad luck but the result of Boyle's choices, and Johnny later states the case bluntly when he accuses his father of letting them "run into debt" while he "borreyed money from everybody to fill yourself with beer!"

The will is O'Casey's most important structural device. In Act 2 the promise of money transforms the room: the new furniture, the gramophone and the party create a hollow atmosphere of celebration, and Boyle's pompous new manners show how quickly he lives beyond means he does not yet have. Yet even here money does not heal the family. The goods are bought on credit, so the Boyles are simply

Question number

exchanging one kind of debt for a larger one. Juno's willingness to believe Bentham and to welcome him as a suitor for Mary shows that the dream of money tempts even the most sensible member of the family.

In Act 3 the lack of money becomes the visible cause of collapse. Boyle's admission that "the Will's a wash-out!" comes immediately after the news of Mary's pregnancy, and the two disasters are structurally linked, because both are bound up with Bentham. Juno's disbelief, "I don't believe it", and her later desperate line, "Everythin's gone wrong", show the emotional impact of the loss. O'Casey then stages the consequences: Mrs Madigan takes the gramophone, Nugent the tailor reclaims the suit, and the two removal men carry off the furniture piece by piece. These stage directions make the family's ruin physical. The room that was crowded with new possessions is stripped bare, and the audience watches the material basis of the family being dismantled in front of them.

However, O'Casey makes it clear that the deepest wounds are not financial. Boyle's reaction to Mary's pregnancy is selfish and cruel; his threat that "if I lay me eyes on her, I'll lay me hands on her" shows that his concern is his own respectability, not his daughter. Johnny's self-righteous response is equally harsh, and Jerry Devine, who claims to love Mary and to stand for workers' rights, rejects her when he learns she is pregnant. These are moral failures, not economic ones. Even more importantly, Johnny's fate has nothing to do with the will. He has betrayed Robbie Tancred, a fellow Republican, and when the Irregulars drag him away to be shot, the family is broken by the politics of the Civil War. O'Casey's use of the curtain here is powerful: it falls as Johnny is taken, and when it rises the room is empty of furniture, so the loss of a son and the loss of possessions are placed side by side. The juxtaposition invites the audience to judge which matters more, and the

Question number

answer is obvious.

Juno's role reinforces this reading. She is the one who has held the family together through years of poverty, asking "who'll have to bear th' biggest part o' this throuble but me?" Her decision to leave Boyle and take Mary to her sister's is not caused by lack of money but by her recognition that Boyle will never change. Her prayer echoing Mrs Tancred, asking God to take away "our hearts o' stone", widens the blame from money to the hardness of people in a violent society. When she says it will "have two mothers", she imagines a new kind of family built on care rather than on a man's wages.

The final scene completes O'Casey's argument. Boyle and Joxer stagger in drunk, unaware that Johnny is dead and Juno gone, and Boyle's incoherent ramble about the world being in a state of "chassis" is both comic and tragic. His drunkenness, paid for by money he does not have, shows that he has learned nothing. The play ends not with the bailiffs but with the father, so O'Casey leaves the audience with the true cause of the break-up in front of them.

In conclusion, lack of money is responsible for the break-up of the Boyle family only to a limited extent. It is the pressure that exposes the family's flaws and the trigger for its final collapse, and O'Casey dramatises it vividly through the will and the removal of the furniture. But Boyle's fecklessness, the cruelty and hypocrisy of the men in Mary's life, and the violence that destroys Johnny are the deeper causes. Money, in the end, is only what the family loses; what breaks it is what its men are.

1b I largely agree that Mrs Boyle is admirable. In this extract from Act 1 O'Casey

Question number

presents her as the practical, hard-working centre of a household full of idlers and dreamers, and across the play her courage and compassion grow until she becomes its moral heart. She is not flawless: she can be sharp, she is tempted by the promise of money and she tolerates Boyle for too long. Yet these flaws make her more human, and by the end O'Casey invites us to admire her more than anyone else on stage.

O'Casey's stage directions shape our response to Juno before she speaks. She is described with "harassed anxiety, blending with an expression of mechanical resistance", which suggests a woman worn down by years of struggle but still fighting back. The word "mechanical" implies that her resistance has become a habit, something she does to survive. This creates both sympathy and admiration, since she has not given up despite having every reason to. Her entrance with the morning's shopping, in a room where her husband is absent and her son is idle, immediately establishes her as the one who keeps the family going.

Her dialogue in the extract shows that she sees through Boyle completely. Her complaint about him "struttin' about the town like a paycock" gives the play its title and its central image: a vain, showy bird that does nothing useful. The colloquial phrasing captures the authentic voice of a Dublin tenement woman, and her humour is a weapon as well as a release. When she warns that "if that father o' yours doesn't come in soon for his breakfast, he may go without any", her threat is undercut by the fact that she is still preparing the food. O'Casey presents her as someone who grumbles but who will not abandon her duty, and this mixture of frustration and loyalty is admirable because it is so realistic. She is not naive; she knows exactly what Boyle and Joxer Daly are, and her disapproval of Joxer's influence shows that she is not to be underestimated.

Question number

With Mary, Juno shows integrity and down-to-earth common sense. She teases Mary about her ribbons, and the repetition of "wearin'" is humorous but reveals her irritation at her daughter's vanity while she is on strike. Mary's idealistic line, "a principle's a principle", is met by Juno's practical concern about how the family will eat. Some audiences may feel Juno is unfair to Mary here, since the strike is in support of a victimised colleague, but O'Casey seems to present her realism as necessary in a household where she is the only steady earner. She sees principles from the point of view of the woman who has to pay for them.

The extract ends with Juno's tenderness towards Johnny. When he cries out in fear, her tone changes completely from the sharpness she uses with Boyle and Mary, and her promise, "I'll bring you in a nice cup o' tay", is simple and maternal. The domestic detail is deliberately ordinary, yet it is touching because Johnny is so ungrateful and preoccupied. This contrast in tone shows the range of her character: she is tough with those who will not help themselves but gentle with the vulnerable. In this sense the extract presents her as admirable precisely because her harshness is never cruelty.

Elsewhere in the play, Juno's courage grows. She works while Boyle drinks, and she is willing to confront him directly about his failures as a father, telling him that "your fatherly care never throubled the poor girl". This is a bold rebuke in a society where the father is supposed to be head of the household. Her greatest moment comes in Act 3, when Boyle and Johnny turn on the pregnant Mary. Rather than worrying about the family's shame, Juno thinks only of her daughter's future and promises that the child will "have two mothers". O'Casey makes her the only character whose response to the crisis is selfless, and her decision to leave Boyle and take Mary away shows a strength that none of the men possess.

Question number

Her final speech, after Johnny's death, is the emotional climax of the play. She repeats Mrs Tancred's earlier prayer, asking God to take away "our hearts o' stone", and the echo is structurally significant. Earlier she had been dismissive of Mrs Tancred's grief, even remarking that "she deserves all she got", which is one of her least admirable moments. By repeating Mrs Tancred's words she shows that suffering has taught her empathy, and her line "what can God do agen the stupidity o' men!" turns personal grief into a judgement on the violence of the whole society.

On the other hand, O'Casey does not make her a saint. She succumbs to Boyle's flattery, and his romantic "O my darlin' Juno, I will be thrue to thee" shows how easily she softens when money seems to be coming. She is taken in by Bentham and encourages Mary's match with him, and she enjoys the new furniture and gramophone as much as anyone. Some might also argue that staying with Boyle for so long was foolish. Yet these weaknesses arise from hope, not selfishness; she has suffered so long that the promise of comfort is understandably tempting.

Overall, I strongly agree that Mrs Boyle is admirable. In the extract, O'Casey presents her as practical, witty and caring, the one person holding the tenement household together, and elsewhere she shows moral courage, compassion and the ability to learn from suffering. Her flaws only make her achievement greater, because she rises above them when it matters most.

2a

I largely agree that Eric and Sheila have learnt lessons by the end of the play, but Priestley presents their learning differently. Sheila changes most completely and most thoughtfully: by the final act she understands not only her own guilt but the wider idea of shared responsibility. Eric also rejects his parents' values, yet his

Question number

response is more emotional and self-focused, and Priestley leaves some doubt about how deep or lasting his change will be. Through their reactions to the Inspector, Priestley suggests that the younger generation offers hope, while warning that learning a lesson and living by it are not the same thing.

At the start of the play both characters are presented as immature. Sheila is playful and self-absorbed; she teases Gerald with "mock aggressiveness" and her excitement when Gerald produces the ring, "you've got it", shows a girl delighted with possessions and attention. Eric is presented as awkward and a little drunk; Sheila calls him "squiffy", and his outbursts of laughter suggest something hidden. His wish to "drink their health and have done with it" shows his boredom with the family's display. Priestley establishes their starting point so that the audience can measure how far they travel.

Sheila's reaction to the Inspector is the first sign of genuine change. When she learns that her complaint at Milwards cost Eva her job, she admits it at once and says she "felt rotten about it", and she accepts "It was all my fault". She agrees that she was jealous of Eva, "Yes, I suppose so", which is a painfully honest admission. Priestley makes her the first character to confess freely, and her wish that "if I could help her now, I would" shows that her concern has shifted from herself to Eva. From this point she becomes almost an ally of the Inspector. She sees that Gerald's evasions are pointless, telling him bluntly that the Inspector already "knows", and she warns her mother not to "build up a kind of wall between us and that girl". The image of the wall is significant, because it shows Sheila now understands that class barriers are artificial and that the Inspector will break them down.

Eric's reaction comes later, because Priestley holds back his confession until Act 3,

Question number

and this structure builds tension and makes his guilt the climax. Earlier he showed sympathy for the strikers, asking why they should not "try for higher wages", which suggests that his instincts were better than his father's even before the Inspector arrived. When he finally admits that he forced his way into Eva's lodgings and stole money from the office to support her, his shame is real. His accusation that his mother "killed her" and the child, "your own grandchild", is filled with anguish. At the end he insists "the girl's dead and we all helped to kill her", and his shouting, marked in the stage directions, shows how deeply he has been shaken.

After the Inspector leaves, Priestley tests whether the lessons will last. Mr and Mrs Birling, and then Gerald, try to prove the Inspector was a fake, and their relief is a dramatic device that exposes who has truly changed. Sheila is the clearest voice. She tells her parents "you don't seem to have learned anything", and adds "It frightens me the way you talk", which shows that she sees their complacency as dangerous. Her admission "I behaved badly too. I know I did" shows that, for her, the moral truth does not depend on whether the Inspector was real. Stage directions describing her speaking "scornfully" to her parents and looking at them "reflectively" mark a young woman who has lost respect for their values and is thinking for herself. Her refusal of the ring is symbolic: the object that delighted her in Act 1 is now something she will not accept without thought.

Eric joins her. When his father worries about losing his knighthood, Eric mocks him, asking what it matters "whether they give you a knighthood or not", and he tells his parents "I'm ashamed of you as well". He also reminds his father of his speech about a man looking after himself, turning Birling's own words against him. Priestley uses the united stance of brother and sister to suggest that the younger generation can reject the selfish capitalism of their parents.

Question number

However, Priestley also qualifies this hope. Eric never refers to Eva by name, and he avoids the word "responsibility". Two stage directions have him speaking sulkily even while discussing his part in her death, which suggests he still feels sorry for himself. His anger at his mother may be as much about his own pain as about Eva. Similarly, Sheila does not reject Gerald outright but says it is too soon and she must think, which could leave the door open to a return to her old life. Some audiences might feel that the lessons have been learnt in the heat of the moment and may fade.

The final telephone call, announcing that a girl has died and a police inspector is on his way, is Priestley's last test. It forces the family to relive the evening, and the cyclical structure suggests that those who have not learnt will be made to learn again.

In conclusion, I agree to a large extent that Eric and Sheila have learnt lessons. Sheila's change is the most complete and mature, shown through her honesty, her understanding of collective responsibility and her clear-sighted rejection of her parents. Eric has also learnt, but his remorse is more self-centred and less certain. Priestley presents them as the hope for a fairer society while reminding the audience that responsibility must be practised, not simply felt.

2b

Priestley presents Mrs Birling as the most unfeeling member of the family: a woman whose sense of class superiority has replaced compassion, and who refuses to accept any responsibility even when faced with the death of a pregnant girl. In the extract from Act Two her coldness is laid bare, and elsewhere in the play it extends to her servants, her daughter and her son. In my opinion she treats Eva

Question number

Smith worst, because Eva came to her at her most desperate and was turned away, although Priestley shows that in rejecting Eva she also, without realising it, rejects her own son and grandchild.

Priestley prepares us for her coldness from the opening stage directions, which describe her as "a rather cold woman and her husband's social superior". Her first lines show how much she values social form over warmth. When Birling compliments the cook, she reproaches him, "Arthur, you're not supposed to say such things", which reveals the distance she keeps from her servants: they are to be used, not noticed. Her treatment of Sheila is similarly dismissive. When Sheila hints at Gerald's absence the previous summer, Mrs Birling brushes it aside with the advice that men with important work "sometimes have to spend nearly all their time and energy on their business". She expects her daughter to accept neglect as normal, and her correction "What an expression, Sheila!" treats a grown woman like a child in front of her fiance.

The extract shows her unfeeling nature at its starkest. When the Inspector asks whether she has anything further to say, she repeats what she told Eva: "Go and look for the father of the child. It's his responsibility." The imperative is brisk and final, and the abrupt short sentences suggest a woman who considers the matter closed. The irony is crushing: the father is her own son, Eric, so in pushing responsibility away she is unknowingly pointing at her own family. Priestley uses dramatic irony here to make her coldness rebound on herself.

The Inspector's language is deliberately emotive, and it highlights Mrs Birling's lack of response. He describes Eva as "alone, friendless, almost penniless, desperate", a list that builds to a climax of misery, and he reminds her, "You've had children. You must have known what she was feeling." The appeal to motherhood is pointed,

Question number

because it shows that her failure is not ignorance but a refusal to feel. His accusation that she "slammed the door in her face" turns her committee decision into a vivid physical act of rejection.

Mrs Birling's justifications reveal the depth of her class prejudice. She complains that Eva was "giving herself ridiculous airs", claiming "elaborate fine feelings and scruples", and the repetition of "ridiculous" shows that she simply cannot believe a working-class girl could have integrity. Her sneer, "As if a girl of that sort would ever refuse money", reduces Eva to a type rather than a person, and the phrase "a girl of that sort" is chilling in its contempt. She calls Eva's account "a lot of silly nonsense" and refers to it repeatedly as a "story", so even the girl's suffering is treated as a lie. Her prejudice was sharpened because Eva had used the name "Mrs Birling", which she regarded as impertinence; Priestley suggests that wounded social pride, not reason, decided Eva's fate.

Priestley uses Sheila as a contrast. Speaking "with feeling", she tells her mother that what she did was "cruel and vile". The stage direction emphasises Sheila's emotional response, which throws her mother's composure into relief. Mrs Birling's final insistence that she was "justified" and that she accepts "no blame for it at all" ends the extract on a note of absolute refusal.

Elsewhere in the play her lack of feeling extends to her family in a more damaging way. She is unaware of Eric's drinking and denies it when Sheila points it out, which suggests she has never really looked at her son's life. When she learns the truth about Eric, she is "very distressed", and Priestley allows a brief moment in which her composure breaks. Yet once the Inspector leaves she quickly recovers, calling the evening "this wretched business" and telling her children she is "absolutely ashamed" of them. She is relieved to discover the Inspector may not be

Question number

real and congratulates herself that she was the one who did not give in to him. Her concern is for reputation, not for the dead girl.

Who does she treat worst? A case can be made for Eric. She condemns the father of Eva's child without knowing he is her son, and Eric's anguished accusation that she killed "your own grandchild" shows how deeply she has wounded him. Her failure to notice his problems, and her return to scolding him after his confession, show a mother who has never understood her son. However, I believe she treats Eva worst. Eva came to the Brumley Women's Charity Organization pregnant, abandoned and without money, asking for the help the organisation existed to give, and Mrs Birling used her influence to have her refused. Of all the family's actions, hers was the last before Eva's death, and she did it knowingly, out of prejudice. Her treatment of Eric is a consequence of that cruelty; her treatment of Eva is the cruelty itself.

In conclusion, Priestley presents Mrs Birling as consistently unfeeling: cold to her servants, dismissive of her daughter, blind to her son and merciless to Eva. Through emotive dialogue, dramatic irony and contrasting stage directions, he exposes how class prejudice can kill compassion. She treats Eva Smith worst, because she turned away a desperate girl who asked for help, and then refused to accept any blame for what followed.

3a

I agree only partly that Gar is a good son to S.B. O'Donnell. In public, Friel presents a sullen, silent young man who mocks his father in his head and is about to leave him alone in Ballybeg. Yet through the device of Private Gar, Friel lets the audience see beneath that surface to a son who longs for his father's love and recognition and who keeps trying, clumsily, to reach him. Gar is not always a good

Question number

son, but he is a loving one, and the tragedy of the play is that neither father nor son can show the other what he feels.

Friel's most important dramatic technique is the division of Gar into two characters, Public and Private, played by two actors. Public Gar is what S.B. and the town see; Private Gar, invisible to everyone else, is his inner self. This split allows Friel to dramatise the gap between how Gar behaves towards his father and how he feels about him. In S.B.'s presence the stage directions tell us that Gar assumes in speech and gesture a "surly, taciturn gruffness". This suggests that his coldness is something he puts on, a defensive performance rather than his true nature.

There is plenty of evidence that Gar is not a good son. In the opening episode he is stubborn and hostile, insisting that if S.B. wants to speak to him "he knows where to find me" and that he is "damned" if he will speak first. Private Gar's nickname for his father, "Screwballs", is repeated throughout the play and communicates contempt, and his outbursts, "Skinflint! Skittery Face!", turn S.B. into a figure of ridicule. Friel uses Private's parodies of their silent mealtime, where he provides a running commentary on his father's routine, to create comedy, but the comedy is cruel. Gar is also secretive, hinting at "a source of income" that S.B. knows nothing about, and above all he is leaving. Private's line, "Screwballs, I'm leaving you forever", sounds triumphant and vindictive. An elderly widower with no other child is about to be left alone, and Gar seems more concerned with his escape than with his father's future.

Gar also fails to see his father's suffering. S.B.'s inability to sleep on the last night, when he comes downstairs and makes awkward conversation, is clearly linked to his anxiety about losing his son, yet Gar does not recognise it. As the

Question number

moment of parting approaches, Gar is quick to anger, cutting off a conversation with "It doesn't matter. Forget it". From S.B.'s point of view, Gar must seem impatient and ungrateful.

However, Friel balances this with evidence that Gar is a far better son than he appears. His resentment comes from hurt rather than hatred. He is twenty-five, works in his father's shop and is still treated like a boy, and Private's bitter joke, "But no obscenities, Father dear; the child is only twenty-five", shows how much he resents not being accepted as an adult. It is hard to blame Gar entirely for wanting to escape a life in which his father's routine of rosary, draughts with the Canon and shop business never changes, and in which no one speaks about feelings.

Most movingly, Gar repeatedly tries to make contact. In the final episode he attempts to share a cherished memory, asking "What ever happened to that aul boat on Lough na Cloc", and describes a day when he and his father went fishing in a blue boat, when S.B. was happy and sang. Friel structures this moment as a test: if S.B. remembers, Gar might feel loved. But S.B. cannot recall the day, and the moment fails. Friel then shows S.B. telling Madge his own memory of a small Gar in a sailor suit who wanted to stay with his father in the shop. The audience realises that both men treasure a memory of closeness, but they are different memories, and neither can share his with the other. This structural irony shows that Gar's failure as a son is matched by his father's failure to communicate, and that both are victims of a culture of silence.

Gar also shows practical care. He asks Madge, "you'd let me know if" his father got sick, which reveals real concern beneath the bravado. He reminds S.B. about "the fencing posts for McGuire next Wednesday", a small, ordinary detail, but one that

Question number

shows him trying to make sure the business will run after he has gone. It is almost as if he is speaking his love in the only language the shop allows. Some audiences may also argue that leaving to make something of his life is not a betrayal; Gar wants a future in which his father might be proud of him.

The ending of the play leaves the question open. Private asks, "Boy, why do you have to leave? Why? Why?", and Public can only answer that he does not know. The repeated question suggests that part of Gar would stay if his father offered even a sign of affection. Friel does not condemn Gar but presents a son caught between the need to escape and the pull of love.

In conclusion, I agree only to a limited extent that Gar is a good son. His public behaviour is often surly, his private mockery is harsh and his departure will leave S.B. alone. Yet Friel's use of Private Gar reveals a son who longs for connection, worries about his father and repeatedly tries to reach him. Gar may not always behave like a good son, but he loves his father deeply, and the play's sadness lies in the fact that S.B. never finds out.

3b

I largely agree that Gar and Kate are unable to reveal their true feelings. In this extract from Episode 2, Friel presents a painfully stilted meeting in which Gar hides his love behind aggression and sarcasm, while only Private Gar tells the audience what he really feels. Elsewhere, even in their happier first conversation, neither of them communicates honestly: Gar hides behind fantasy and boasting, and Kate hides behind practical questions and her father's expectations. Friel suggests that this failure is not simply personal but part of a society in which people find it almost impossible to say what matters.

Question number

The extract begins with a knock at the door, and the awkward opening exchange establishes the breakdown between them. Kate's "What are you doing here?" is answered by Gar's "I hear you're off to America", and the short, snappy lines create a stilted rhythm, as though both are reading from a script neither believes in. Friel deliberately contrasts this with their first, friendlier conversation, so the audience is aware of how much has been lost. The stage direction that Gar speaks "a shade louder than necessary" is revealing: his loudness is a cover for discomfort, a way of keeping control of a situation that threatens to expose him.

As Kate asks about his plans, Gar's answers become increasingly unrealistic. He claims he will "do law or medicine or something", and Private immediately deflates him: "Like hell! First Arts stumped you!" Friel's use of the two Gars creates comedy, but it also shows the conflict between the image Gar wants Kate to see and the truth he knows about himself. He wants to appear successful in front of the woman who married someone else, so he performs ambition rather than admitting his hurt.

His bitterness surfaces in his attack on Ballybeg, which he calls "a bloody quagmire". The expletive and the exclamatory repetition of "Hate it!" show his anger rising. Yet the audience senses that the anger is not really about the town. Ballybeg is the place where he lost Kate, and his hatred is a displacement of his grief. When he declares, "I'll make sure life's good to me from now on", the line is cruel, because it implies that Kate has made life bad for him and that he will no longer depend on anyone. Private's rebuke, "That'll do", acts as his conscience, recognising that he has gone too far. Friel's use of ellipsis as Gar's voice breaks into "Kate...Kathy" suggests the feelings he cannot finish expressing.

The most powerful moment in the extract is Private Gar's speech, the one

Question number

extended passage of private dialogue, in which he describes Kate in romantic, almost fairy-tale terms as the "Dauphiness of Versailles", a "more delightful vision". The elevated vocabulary contrasts sharply with Public Gar's bluntness, and the effect is tragic: the audience hears the love that Kate never will. The extract ends with Private's "sweet Katie Doogan...my darling Kathy Doogan", and the ellipses and tender variations on her name show that his feelings are unchanged. Friel stages the gap between inner and outer self so that the audience feels the full weight of everything Gar cannot say.

Kate, too, is unable to be fully open. She comes to say goodbye, which suggests she still cares, yet she stays within polite questions about his future and does not speak about the past. As a married woman, now Mrs King, she cannot say more, and Friel leaves her feelings ambiguous. The audience may wonder whether her visit is an act of friendship, guilt or lingering love, and the fact that we cannot be sure is itself proof of the play's central idea.

Elsewhere, Friel shows that even when they were together they did not truly communicate. In the remembered first conversation, Gar gets carried away with hyperbole, telling Kate he will "bloody-well burst", and fantasises about their future: "our daughters'll all be gentle and frail". When Kate asks practical questions, he is obviously not listening and replies only "Mmmm", while Private mocks her question "How will we live?" with Public's answer, "Like lords". He boasts that he will get a rise, "I'll get it; don't you worry", and exaggerates how much he will earn from selling eggs. His desire is shown through action rather than words, as he tries to kiss her again and says he "can't wait till Christmas".

Kate's part in that conversation is also revealing. She talks over Gar, seeking answers rather than understanding, and her innocent "Investments? Like Daddy?"

Question number

shows how little she grasps the class difference between them. She insists that he must speak to her parents immediately, "It must be now, Gar, now!", yet she refuses to support him: "Remember, it's up to you, entirely up to you". When Gar faces Senator Doogan and learns that Kate is expected to marry Dr King, he flees without saying what he feels, and Kate later seems unable to tell her father about their relationship, as her broken question "But didn't he" suggests. Neither of them fights for the other, and their silence decides their future.

Some might argue that Gar does reveal his feelings, since his anger in the extract clearly betrays hurt. However, anger is a substitute for honesty rather than a form of it; Kate sees only his bitterness, not his love.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that Gar and Kate are unable to reveal their true feelings. Through stilted dialogue, defensive stage directions and above all the device of Private Gar, Friel shows the distance between what Gar feels and what he can say. Kate's reticence matches his, and their relationship becomes one of the play's clearest examples of a community where love goes unspoken until it is too late.

4a I largely agree that both mothers deserve sympathy, but Russell asks us to feel it in different ways and to different degrees. Mrs Johnstone is a victim of poverty and of a society that offers her no safety net, and our sympathy for her deepens as the play goes on. Mrs Lyons begins as a lonely, desperate woman whose pain is just as real, yet she turns her suffering into manipulation and cruelty, so that by the end our sympathy for her is mixed with fear and disapproval. Russell seems to suggest that both women are trapped by forces beyond their control, but that only one of them responds with love.

Question number

From her very first entrance Russell presents Mrs Johnstone as worn down by her circumstances. The stage direction that she is "aged thirty but looks more like fifty" is a stark visual signal to the audience: poverty has aged her before her time. In the "Marilyn Monroe" song she remembers being young, admired and taken dancing, before marriage and constant pregnancies changed everything and her husband abandoned her for a younger woman. The structure of the song, moving from romance to hardship, makes her decline seem almost inevitable, and the closing image of "seven hungry mouths to feed" turns her life into a set of grim numbers. We cannot blame her for a husband who leaves, or for a cleaning job that barely pays, so our sympathy is immediate.

Russell does not, however, present her as faultless. The Milkman and the Catalogue Man who confront her about unpaid bills show that she has slipped into debt, and the song about buying things "On Easy Terms" suggests a woman who cannot resist small comforts even when she knows she cannot afford them. Her attempts to control her children are perfunctory; a weary "Don't swear" is about as far as her discipline goes. Yet even these faults draw sympathy rather than condemnation, because they come from a wish to give her family something better. The comic, lively music of these scenes makes her warm and likeable, and the audience laughs with her rather than at her.

Her greatest difficulty is the decision to give away one of her twins. Russell makes it clear that she is persuaded rather than willing. When she believes the child "wouldn't have to worry where his next meal was comin' from", she is thinking of him, not herself, and her agreement is an act of painful love. Mrs Lyons then exploits her superstition, making her swear on the Bible and inventing the warning that if either twin learns he was one of a pair they will both die. Mrs Johnstone's

Question number

belief in this curse binds her to silence for the rest of the play, and the Narrator's repeated reminders that "the devil's got your number" make her seem hunted by a fate she did not choose. In Act Two her hope that the move to the country will be a fresh start is touching precisely because the audience already knows from the Prologue how the story ends. The tragic structure, which opens with the twins' deaths, means that every hopeful moment she has is shadowed by dramatic irony, and this intensifies our sympathy enormously.

Mrs Lyons also begins as a figure of pity. Her confession, "We've been trying for such a long time now", reveals the private grief of infertility, and her loneliness in a large, empty house bought "for the children" is quietly sad. Her husband is absent for most of the play, and when he does appear he is dismissive, complaining that she has brought him "home from work in the middle of the day". Russell uses this to show that she, too, lacks support. When she shares her dream of the baby with Mrs Johnstone in song, the two women sing together, which briefly makes them equals bound by the same longing.

Yet Russell quickly shifts our response. Mrs Lyons persuades, then pressures, then threatens. Once she has Edward, her jealousy of the real mother grows, and she sacks Mrs Johnstone to keep her away from the baby, even offering money as if a child's love could be bought. The Narrator's ominous song about "gypsies in the wood" accompanies her growing paranoia, and her nervous attempts to stop Edward playing with Mickey show a woman consumed by fear of losing him. Her decline reaches its peak when she attacks Mrs Johnstone with a knife, crying "I curse the day I met you". This moment may still provoke some pity, because she has clearly been destroyed by anxiety, but it is hard to forgive. Most damaging of all, she tells Mickey about Linda's meetings with Edward, which directly sets in motion the final catastrophe. Her suffering becomes cruelty towards others, and Russell

Question number

withdraws much of our sympathy as a result.

In conclusion, I agree that both women deserve sympathy, but not equally. Mrs Johnstone's difficulties come from poverty, abandonment and superstition, and she responds to them with humour, warmth and love, so that her final plea for the truth to be untrue is heartbreaking. Mrs Lyons's difficulties are equally real, yet her response is possessive and manipulative. Russell uses the contrast to suggest that both mothers are victims of a class-divided world, but that the woman with money uses her power to harm, while the woman without it is left to grieve.

4b

I largely agree that Mickey is powerless to control his life. Russell presents him as a character shaped from birth by class, poverty and chance, and this extract captures the moment when he fully realises it. However, Russell also shows that Mickey makes choices, some of them disastrous, so the play suggests that while he has very little power, he is not entirely without responsibility. His tragedy is that the few decisions he does make are made from despair.

The extract is built on contrast. Edward returns from university full of energy, while Mickey's answers are flat and short. His opening "Nothin'. How's University?" deflects attention away from himself, as if he has nothing worth saying about his own life. Edward's chatter about friends and parties, with its listing of names, makes Mickey's world seem empty by comparison; Edward has a crowd while Mickey stands alone. Russell even shows Edward trying to lift the mood when he is slightly unsure but laughs anyway, a stage direction that reveals how wide the gap between them has become. They are the same age, the same blood, yet they now speak different languages.

Question number

The turning point of the extract comes after a pause, when Mickey reveals that he has lost his job. The silence before this admission is dramatically powerful: it suggests shame and a struggle to put his humiliation into words. Mickey's job in the factory, which he once accepted without enthusiasm, was his only foothold in adult life, and its loss through redundancy is something he could do nothing to prevent. Russell uses repeated ellipses and short, dismissive sentences as Mickey lists everything that is missing from his life, so that his speech sounds broken and hopeless.

Mickey's bitterness is focused in the line "I don't wear a hat that I could tilt at the world." The hat is an image of carefree confidence, something Edward can afford and Mickey cannot. Russell suggests that optimism itself is a privilege of the middle class. When Edward tries to help by offering money, Mickey's response, "stuff it", rejects charity that would only underline his dependence. The prop of the banknotes is significant: it makes the class difference visible on stage, and Mickey's refusal is perhaps the only form of control left to him, the control to say no.

His rejection of their friendship is even more painful. When Edward appeals to their bond, Mickey dismisses it: "That was kids' stuff, Eddie." The blood brother oath, which in Act One symbolised equality, is now treated as a childish fantasy, and the title of the play becomes bitterly ironic. Mickey explains, in effect, that he has had to grow up while Edward has been allowed to stay young. His language turns harsh, from "You're a dick head!" to "piss off, will ye?", and the extract ends with the threat "beat it before I hit y'". The aggression is a sign of helplessness, not strength. Unable to fight the system that has failed him, he turns on the one person within reach. The stage direction in which he is simply looking at him reinforces the distance between them.

Question number

Elsewhere, Russell makes Mickey's powerlessness clear from the start. As a seven year old he says "I wish I was our Sammy", longing for the freedoms of an older brother who is already heading for trouble. He has no father and no positive male role model. He is treated with suspicion by the police and teachers, whereas Edward's misbehaviour is excused because of his background. The scene in which the policeman visits both homes is a clear example: Mrs Johnstone is threatened, while Mr Lyons is treated as a friend. Mickey has no control over any of this.

In Act Two his decisions become more significant, but they are made under pressure. He allows Sammy to persuade him into the robbery because he needs money for Linda, and Sammy's shooting of the petrol station attendant lands Mickey in prison. There, his depression takes hold, and his dependence on antidepressants after his release shows a man who has lost the ability to feel in control even of his own mind. Ironically, the house and job that Linda gets through Edward are a further humiliation, as Mickey discovers that even his recovery has been arranged by the twin he envies. When Mrs Lyons tells him about Linda and Edward, he takes Sammy's gun and goes to confront Edward. In this sequence he appears to act, but he is driven by forces outside himself, and he loses control of the situation completely, as the police arrive and the gun goes off.

Mickey's final cry, that he could have been Edward, captures the central idea: his life was decided by which twin Mrs Johnstone kept. The Narrator's closing question about whether class or superstition is to blame reminds the audience that Mickey was never really free. The tragic structure, which opens with the deaths we are about to watch, reinforces the sense of inevitability.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that Mickey is powerless to control his life. Russell

Question number

allows him moments of choice, but each is shaped by poverty, unemployment and the manipulation of others. The extract is the point at which Mickey sees this clearly, and it is his awareness of his own powerlessness that makes him such a tragic figure.

Sa

I strongly agree that Osborne is a good officer, and Sherriff seems to present him as the moral centre of the play. His goodness, however, is of a particular kind. He is not the driven, brilliant leader that Stanhope is; he is calm, humane and fatherly, and his greatest contribution is the way he holds the other men together. Whether he is a "good officer" therefore depends on what we think an officer is for, and Sherriff seems to suggest that in the trenches of 1918, compassion and steadiness are as valuable as command.

Sherriff establishes Osborne's qualities from his first appearance. The stage directions describe him as "physically as hard as nails", which prevents the audience from seeing his gentleness as weakness. In the opening scene with Hardy he is efficient and businesslike, insisting, "Come along, let's do this handing over." Hardy's chatter about earwigs and his casual approach contrast with Osborne's interest in the state of the trench, the stores and the dug-out, so we see immediately that Osborne takes his duties seriously. Hardy even remarks that Osborne "ought to be commanding this company", which tells the audience that his reputation among other officers is high.

What is striking is how Osborne responds to this. When Hardy talks about Stanhope's drinking, Osborne defends his commander loyally: "He's a long way the best company commander we've got." This loyalty is one of his defining qualities. Later he tells Raleigh that Stanhope has been in the line for years without a

Question number

break, explaining his drinking as the result of strain rather than weakness. Sherriff expresses this loyalty through the hyperbolic line "I love that fellow. I'd go to hell with him", which shows a depth of feeling unusual in the restrained, public school language of the officers.

Osborne's role as a father figure is shown through his nickname, "Uncle". It is affectionate but also revealing: he is older than the others, a former schoolmaster, and he treats them with patience and care. The most moving example comes at the end of Act One, when he helps an exhausted, drunken Stanhope to bed. Stanhope's "Dear old Uncle. Tuck me up" is almost childlike, and Sherriff uses Osborne to show the vulnerable young man beneath the commander. In this sense Osborne is a good officer because he protects his commanding officer's ability to keep going.

He is also a good officer to the newcomer, Raleigh. He explains the routines of trench life, such as the fact that officers do not undress in the line, and he gently prepares Raleigh for the change in Stanhope, whom Raleigh hero-worshipped at school. When Stanhope decides to censor Raleigh's letter, Osborne challenges him in private: "Why can't you treat him like any other youngster?" This shows moral courage. He is willing to question his superior, but he does so discreetly, without undermining Stanhope's authority in front of the men.

Osborne is equally considerate towards others in the company. He shows concern for Hibbert, wondering whether he is really ill because "He looks rotten", and he humours Trotter, who comes from a different social background, joining in his good-natured talk about food and the circles he draws to pass the time. Sherriff presents him as someone who can relate to everyone, and this ability to keep morale high is arguably the most important skill an officer could have in a dug-out

Question number

where fear and tension are always present.

His goodness is shown most powerfully before the raid. When he learns that he and Raleigh are to lead it, his first concern is for the boy, and his question "Why Raleigh?" shows that he thinks of others before himself. In the tense minutes before they go over, he keeps Raleigh calm by talking about walks in the New Forest, recalling that he "used to walk a lot around Lyndhurst", and by quoting "Alice in Wonderland". This conversation is a deliberate act of kindness, a way of distracting a frightened young officer. Quietly, he also gives Stanhope his ring and letters to send home in case he does not return, which shows a calm acceptance of his duty and the risk it carries.

Some might argue that Osborne is too gentle to be a truly effective officer. He never fully confronts Stanhope about his drinking, and he cannot prevent Stanhope's harsh treatment of Hibbert. It could also be said that he lacks Stanhope's obsessive attention to detail. Yet Sherriff seems to suggest that Osborne's quieter strengths are what make Stanhope's leadership possible.

Sherriff structures the play so that Osborne's death becomes its emotional turning point. He is killed in the raid, and the empty space he leaves is felt immediately. Stanhope's grief, when he calls him "The one man I could trust", confirms how much the company depended on him. The meal of chicken and champagne that follows feels grotesque precisely because Osborne is absent.

In conclusion, I agree that Osborne is a good officer. He is professional, loyal, brave and, above all, humane. Sherriff uses him to show that the best leadership in war is not only about command, but about care for the men who must face the danger together.

Question number

Sb

Fear runs through every scene of "Journey's End", but Sherriff's interest lies less in the fear itself than in how each man copes with it. In the claustrophobic dug-out, waiting for the German attack, no one is free from terror. What distinguishes the characters is their method of survival: Stanhope drinks, Osborne retreats into calm memories of home, Trotter hides behind food and jokes, Raleigh's enthusiasm slowly wears away, and Hibbert tries to escape altogether. The extract is the clearest moment in the play where two of these strategies collide.

At the start of the extract Hibbert's fear has reached breaking point. He claims to be suffering from neuralgia and begs to be sent down the line, describing how "Every sound up there makes me all" cold and sick. The broken syntax and the dash in this line show that he can barely articulate what he feels, as if fear has disrupted his ability to speak. Sherriff's stage directions reinforce this: Hibbert stands quivering, strikes blindly at Stanhope, and later sits quietly, his eyes roving vacantly in front of him. These directions present fear as a physical illness that takes over the body.

Stanhope's first response is brutal. He calls Hibbert's behaviour a "disgrace" and, when Hibbert tries to leave, threatens to shoot him, giving him "half a minute" to decide. This creates intense dramatic tension; the audience is not sure whether Stanhope will really pull the trigger. Hibbert's hysterical, "high-pitched laugh" and the way he closes his eyes in expectation of the shot show how far fear has pushed him. Yet Stanhope's aggression is itself a response to fear. He cannot allow one man's collapse to spread to the rest of the company, and perhaps he cannot bear to see in Hibbert a mirror of his own feelings.

Question number

The extract then turns, as Stanhope changes tactic completely. Having broken Hibbert's resistance, he praises him, "I liked the way you stuck that", and then makes a startling confession: "I hate and loathe it all". This admission is crucial, because it reveals that the commander whom everyone relies upon feels exactly the same terror. Stanhope then offers a shared solution: "Take the chance, old chap" and "Shall we go on together?" The language here is gentle and inclusive, using the public school slang of comradeship. Sherriff shows that one way to deal with fear is to face it alongside others rather than alone.

Humour also appears as a coping mechanism. Stanhope jokes that they could hold each other's hands and "jump every time a rat squeaks", which briefly breaks the tension and makes fear seem bearable through laughter. Sherriff's careful use of silences and hesitant punctuation in Hibbert's lines, as he stammers that he will try and pleads with Stanhope not to tell anyone, shows how fragile this recovery is. Stanhope ends by telling him to "go and have ten minutes' rest", and his final "That's all right" is quietly reassuring. Yet the stage direction showing Stanhope pouring himself a whisky reminds us that his own fear is only being held off by alcohol.

Elsewhere in the play, Stanhope's drinking is his main defence. He tells Osborne that without whisky he would go mad, explaining, "I couldn't bear being fully conscious all the time." His fear is not only of death but of being exposed. When Raleigh arrives, Stanhope is terrified that the boy will write home to his sister about the drunken wreck he has become, and his violent seizing of Raleigh's letter shows how this fear makes him controlling.

Osborne deals with fear through quiet stoicism. He reads "Alice in Wonderland" and talks about walking in the New Forest, recalling that he "used to walk a lot around

Question number

Lyndhurst". Before the raid he deliberately keeps Raleigh talking about home, using memory as a shield. He hands his ring and letters to Stanhope without fuss, accepting the possibility of death calmly. Sherriff presents this as the most dignified way of coping, and his death makes it all the more poignant.

Trotter, by contrast, relies on routine, food and good humour. His delight in "What a lovely smell of bacon!" and his habit of drawing circles to count off the hours of his watch are ways of passing time and refusing to think too deeply. Sherriff suggests that this ordinary cheerfulness is a form of courage, especially for an officer who has risen from the ranks. Mason, too, shows a quiet acceptance of duty, ready to go up when needed at the end.

Raleigh's arc shows fear growing in an innocent mind. He arrives eager and idealistic, but as the raid approaches he admits it is difficult to talk about anything else, and when he is fatally wounded his line "It's so frightfully dark and cold" expresses a child's fear of the unknown. Even the captured German boy's cry of "Mercy" shows that fear belongs to both sides.

In conclusion, Sherriff shows that every soldier is afraid, but each finds a different way to survive. The extract is central because it reveals that even Stanhope, the apparent hero, is driven by fear, and that the strongest response is not the absence of fear but the decision to go on together.

6a

I disagree that it is best to deceive Christopher. Stephens shows that the adults who lie to him do so out of love, exhaustion or shame, and he invites some understanding of their motives. However, the structure of the play makes it clear that every deception eventually causes Christopher more pain than the truth would

Question number

have done, while the one adult who is consistently honest, Siobhan, is the person who helps him most. For a boy who trusts facts and logic above everything, deception is not protection but betrayal.

Ed is the parent who deceives Christopher most seriously. When Judy leaves, he tells his son that she has gone into hospital and later that she has died of a "heart attack". Stephens uses Siobhan, reading from Christopher's book, to narrate the moment Ed came up to his room to say he had to go out for a while, so that the lie is presented through Christopher's calm, factual voice. The effect is unsettling: the audience realises before Christopher does that he has been given a false version of reality. Ed's short, clipped sentences, such as "She needs rest. She needs to be on her own", and the stage direction that he does not look at Christopher, suggest that he is uncomfortable even as he lies. Stephens also places this brief, painful conversation in the middle of Christopher's investigation into Wellington's death, so the two mysteries become linked.

Ed's reasons for lying are understandable. He later explains, "I didn't know how to explain, it was so complicated", which suggests that he deceived Christopher because he felt unable to give him an account he could cope with, and perhaps because he was humiliated by Judy's affair with Mr Shears. His outburst, "It's bloody hard telling the truth all the time", is one of the most human moments in the play; Stephens allows us to feel the strain of being a lone parent. Yet the consequences of his deception are devastating. When Christopher discovers Judy's letters hidden in a shirt box in Ed's cupboard, he learns that his mother is alive and has been writing to him. The shock makes him physically ill, and he curls up on the bed, unable to respond. Ed then confesses that he killed Wellington, and this second revelation destroys Christopher's trust completely. Reasoning that a man who could kill a dog might kill him, Christopher runs away to London.

Question number

Stephens structures these discoveries so that one lie exposes another, showing how deception multiplies.

Even Ed eventually realises this. He tells Christopher that "if you don't tell the truth now, then later on it hurts even more", which is an admission that his earlier choice was wrong. His slow attempts to rebuild trust, through the timed five minute visits and the gift of the puppy, Sandy, show that honesty and patience, rather than deception, are what finally help him reconnect with his son.

Judy also deceives Christopher, though in a different way. She leaves without telling him the truth about her relationship with Roger Shears, believing, as she says in her letter, that what she was doing was "best for all" of them. Her letters are apologetic and painfully honest about her own failings: "I was not a very good mother, Christopher." She describes how she "just cried and cried and cried", which reveals her suffering. Stephens uses the letters, read aloud while Christopher listens, to give her a voice in the play, and their honesty contrasts with her earlier silence. When she confronts Ed, "So you thought it was OK to tell him his mother was dead?", she condemns his lie even though her own departure was itself a kind of concealment. Stephens seems to suggest that both parents have avoided the truth in order to avoid their own pain.

Siobhan offers the clearest alternative. She speaks to Christopher in simple, literal language and never pretends that the world is neater than it is. When he wants a solution to every mystery, she tells him honestly, "Not all murders are solved, Christopher." She encourages him to be truthful himself, asking "Are you telling the truth, Christopher?", and she gently invites him to explore his feelings, for example whether he was sad to discover his mother's affair. Her role as narrator, reading his book aloud, places her at the centre of the play's structure, as if

Question number

honesty is the frame through which the whole story is told. She is careful about the future too, admitting that she hopes things will be "OK" but that they "can't know for sure".

The ending is particularly significant. Christopher asks repeatedly whether his success means he can do anything, and Siobhan does not answer. The stage direction that the two look at each other for a while creates a powerful, ambiguous silence. Siobhan could easily reassure him with a comforting lie, but she refuses. Stephens leaves the audience with the sense that honesty, even when it is uncertain, is a form of respect.

In conclusion, I largely disagree that it is best to deceive Christopher. Stephens shows us why his parents lie, and their motives draw some sympathy, but the play's structure proves that deception damages him far more than truth. Siobhan's honesty helps him to grow, and it is when Ed finally begins to tell the truth that their relationship can start to heal.

6b

I partly agree that Ed fails as a father. In this extract Stephens shows him at his worst: frightened, furious and violent towards a son who cannot cope with being touched. Elsewhere, his lies about Judy and Wellington are serious betrayals. Yet Stephens refuses to make him a villain. Ed is a lone parent doing a very difficult job, and the extract itself ends with an image of love. I would argue that Ed fails Christopher badly at key moments, but he does not fail as a father overall, because he never stops trying.

The extract opens with Ed discovering Christopher's book, and his question "What is this?" immediately establishes conflict. He has already forbidden Christopher to

Question number

investigate, and his anger comes out in a series of interrogatives: "What the hell did I tell you, Christopher?" The repetition of his instructions beginning "And not" shows how rigidly he has tried to control his son's behaviour, but it also suggests panic, since what Christopher has written threatens to expose the truth about Judy and Mr Shears. His accusation that Christopher will "go around sticking your nose into other people's business" reveals that he is thinking of his own secrets rather than his son's needs.

Ed's language becomes increasingly cruel. "Jesus, Christopher, how stupid are you?" attacks the intelligence that is Christopher's greatest pride, and the sarcastic "you're the memory man" mocks his remarkable gifts. His swearing, "Don't give me that bollocks", shows that he has lost control of his temper. For an audience, this is uncomfortable to watch, because we know that Christopher interprets language literally and cannot easily understand anger aimed at him. Ed's repeated rhetorical question, "What am I going to do with you, Christopher?", might sound like exasperation, but it could also suggest that Ed sees his son as a problem to be solved rather than a person to be understood.

The violence is the clearest sign of his failure. The stage directions show that he grabs Christopher and shakes him before hitting him on the side of the head. Christopher has made clear throughout the play that he hates being touched, so this assault is not only physically harmful but deeply frightening for him. Stephens makes the moment more disturbing when Ed stands over his unconscious son and then leaves the room. He also takes the book with him, knowing how much it matters, which might suggest that protecting his secret matters more to him than his son's feelings.

However, the extract does not end there, and Stephens carefully balances the

Question number

scene. Ed returns and apologises in short, plain sentences: "I'm sorry I hit you" and "I didn't mean to." This simplicity suggests sincerity, as though he is stripped of all excuses. He insists that he does not want Christopher to get hurt, which shows that his anger comes partly from a desire to protect him. Most movingly, he holds his right hand up and spreads his fingers out in a fan, and Christopher does the same with his left hand until they make their fingers and thumbs touch each other. This gesture is their private language of love, a way of connecting without the hugging that Christopher cannot bear. It shows that Ed understands his son's needs better than anyone, even in the aftermath of hurting him.

Elsewhere, Ed's failures are more serious still. He lies to Christopher, telling him that his mother has died of a "heart attack", and hides the letters she sends, which Christopher later finds in a shirt box. He also lies about Wellington, and his eventual confession that he killed the dog with a garden fork leaves Christopher terrified that his father might kill him too. Christopher's flight to London, alone and overwhelmed, is a direct result of Ed's deception. In these moments, Ed fails in the most basic duty of a parent: to make his child feel safe.

On the other hand, Stephens shows Ed's love and commitment throughout. He has cared for Christopher alone since Judy left, maintaining the routines his son relies on. Judy herself admits in her letters that Ed was more patient with Christopher than she was. Ed fights for his son's education, insisting to Mrs Gascoyne that he is "not going to take no for an answer" over the Maths A Level. When Christopher disappears, Ed follows him to London, frantic with worry. After the truth comes out, he works patiently to rebuild trust, offering "Five minutes, OK?" with a timer and giving Christopher the puppy, Sandy. These gestures show a father who has learned from his mistakes and is willing to earn back his son's trust slowly, on Christopher's terms.

Question number

In conclusion, I agree that Ed fails as a father at important moments, especially in this extract and through his lies. Stephens does not excuse his violence or deceit. However, the play presents him as a flawed, loving and struggling man rather than a failure. The fan gesture at the end of the extract, and his patient efforts at the end of the play, suggest that his love for Christopher is never in doubt, even when his judgement is.

7a

I largely agree that Wilder presents the Gibbs and Webb families as predictable, but only on the surface. Through the routines of breakfast, school, homework and marriage, Wilder deliberately shows family life as ordinary and repeated, almost ritualised. Yet beneath this pattern he exposes moments of awkwardness, doubt and sudden loss that nobody can predict. In my view, the predictability is the point Wilder wants to challenge: the families treat their relationships as if they will always be there, and the play reveals how fragile that assumption is.

The structure of Act One makes family life look like clockwork. Wilder places the two households side by side on an almost bare stage, so that the audience watches the Gibbs and Webb kitchens running in parallel. Both mothers call their children in nearly identical words: "Time to get up!" and "George! Rebecca! You'll be late for school". The echo between the two homes suggests that these are not unique families but types, and that the same mornings are happening in every house in Grover's Corners. Even the mothers' advice is gently repetitive, as in "Walk fast, but you don't have to run", a line that sounds as though it has been said a thousand times. Because the actors mime the cooking and the coffee pots, the routine becomes almost abstract, like a ritual rather than a single real morning.

Question number

The quarrels between siblings are just as predictable. The complaint "Mama, George's throwing soap at me" and George's grumbling about his sister, "I don't see how Rebecca comes to have so much money", are the kind of petty squabbles any audience would recognise. Wilder seems to enjoy their ordinariness; these small irritations show that family relationships are built on familiar friction rather than drama. Similarly, the marriages of the parents appear steady and settled. Mrs Gibbs and Dr Gibbs disagree about whether to sell the highboy and go to Paris, yet the stage direction that they "stroll out arm in arm along the footlights" shows that their differences never threaten the bond. The relaxed stage direction "drinking her coffee, meditatively" captures a comfortable, unhurried domestic calm.

The Stage Manager's commentary adds to this sense of pattern. He tells us how the town has grown, who will marry and who will die, and he points to the same family names in the cemetery going back generations. Mrs Gibbs's belief that "People are meant to go through life two by two. 'Tain't natural to be lonesome" turns marriage into a law of nature. When George and Emily marry, they seem simply to be repeating the lives of their parents, which makes the whole cycle feel inevitable.

However, Wilder consistently undercuts this predictability. Even in Act One, Mrs Gibbs worries that Rebecca is crying and refusing breakfast, a small disturbance that hints at private feelings the routine cannot contain. Dr Gibbs's admission that "The relation of father and son is the darndest, awkwardest" thing reveals that, beneath the authority of the doctor and father, he is unsure how to speak to his own son. His gentle talk with George about chopping wood for his mother ends with George in tears, which shows that the most ordinary family moment can carry unexpected emotional weight.

Question number

The courtship and marriage of George and Emily are far less predictable than they first seem. In the drugstore scene Emily attacks George for having changed, saying "I don't like the whole change that's come over you", yet within minutes George has abandoned his plan to go to Agriculture School because he cannot bear to be separated from her. On the wedding morning both young people panic. George cries out "All I want to do is to be a fella", and Emily even says "I hate him. I wish I were dead". Wilder lets the audience see that the most traditional step in family life is full of fear. Then, just as suddenly, they fall into each other's arms. The Stage Manager's interventions, such as when he claps his hands to move the action on, make time lurch forward, so that even the ceremony feels hurried and beyond the characters' control.

Act Three is where predictability finally collapses. We learn that Mrs Gibbs has died and that Emily herself has died in childbirth. The casual remark "Well, I declare!" in the graveyard is shocking because it is so mild; Wilder makes death almost conversational to show how suddenly it removes people from family life. When Emily relives her twelfth birthday and begs her mother to look at her properly, Mrs Webb carries on with the breakfast routine. The very predictability that seemed comforting in Act One now becomes tragic: the family is so absorbed in its habits that its members never truly see one another.

In conclusion, I agree that Wilder presents family relationships as predictable in their routines, rhythms and roles, and he clearly values these everyday acts by turning eating breakfast and feeding chickens into drama. Yet he juxtaposes this flurry of ordinary activity with the characters' inattentiveness to it, and with the unpredictable shocks of doubt and death. Ultimately the predictability is a kind of blindness, and Wilder wants his audience to treasure family relationships precisely because they will not last for ever.

Question number

7b

I agree to a large extent that Wilder presents Emily as strong. She is clever, outspoken and determined, and in the extract she is the one who controls the conversation with George. However, Wilder also shows that her strength is often fragile: it gives way to tears, to self-doubt and to a deep need to be loved. By the end of the play her real strength lies less in confidence than in her painful ability to see the truth about life that others miss.

The extract opens with the Stage Manager announcing that Emily has "just been elected Secretary and Treasurer", adding "I don't have to tell you how important that is". His dry, slightly amused tone may gently mock small-town values, but it also establishes Emily as a respected and capable young woman whom her classmates trust. Before George even speaks to her, her first lines are brisk and decisive. Short exclamations such as "I can't, Louise" and "Ernestine! Ernestine!" and the firm instruction "Tell your mother you have to" give her a commanding tone. Emily is used to organising other people, and Wilder makes her voice ring out across the bare stage.

Her strength is clearest in her treatment of George. The stage direction coolly shows that she is deliberately holding back warmth, and the effect is that George, normally the confident baseball hero, is thrown off balance and has to ask, "Emily, why are you mad at me?" The power in the scene has shifted to her. His stammering, broken replies, marked by dashes and repeated syllables as he asks what she means, contrast with her fluent, deliberate speech. When she finally explains, she is strikingly blunt: "you've got awful conceited and stuck-up". The colloquial adjectives sound like the honest speech of a young girl, yet saying them to a popular boy takes real courage. The ellipsis in her list of complaints, "...and

Question number

you never stopped to speak", suggests a stream of grievances she has stored up and is now releasing, which makes her seem in command of the argument.

Wilder also shows Emily refusing to let George off lightly. When he tries to excuse himself, she replies "There's no reason on earth why you shouldn't be, too", insisting that he should live up to the standard of their fathers. She holds a high, almost idealistic view of what a man should be, and her willingness to judge George by it shows moral strength.

Yet even within the extract, Wilder undermines this strength. The stage direction finding it difficult to say reveals that her outspokenness costs her an effort, and her justification "tell the truth and shame the devil" sounds like a proverb borrowed to give her courage, as though she needs a rule to lean on. Afterwards she backs away, admitting "I don't know what made me say it". When George offers her an ice-cream soda, her reply "Well, thank you" trails into ellipsis, suggesting she is disarmed by his kindness. The direction Emily keeps her face down marks a collapse of her poise as she begins to cry. Wilder makes her strength convincing precisely because it is not superhuman: she is a teenager whose bold words are followed by embarrassment.

Elsewhere in the play, Emily's confidence is equally mixed. She announces "I'm the brightest girl in school for my age. I have a wonderful memory", and boasts that her speech in class was "like silk off a spool", adding that she will make speeches all her life. Her ambition and self-belief are clear, and the simile suggests effortless eloquence. Yet in Act One she also persistently questions her mother about whether she is pretty, revealing an insecurity that her intelligence cannot cover. Wilder seems to suggest that even a strong girl is shaped by the expectations of a society that values looks.

Question number

On her wedding morning her strength deserts her entirely. She pleads with her father, "I'll work for you. I could keep house", desperate not to leave home. At the altar her plea that all she wants is "someone to love me" shows that beneath her sharpness lies vulnerability. Act Three, set in the graveyard after her death in childbirth, shows her at her weakest and strongest. At first she is lost and uneasy, saying "I don't like being new here". Yet she insists, against the advice of the other dead, on returning to relive her twelfth birthday. This is an act of stubborn will. What she sees breaks her: her family are too busy to look at one another, and she asks whether any human beings "ever realize life while they live it". This devastating question is the emotional climax of the play, and Wilder gives it to Emily, not to the Stage Manager.

By her final line, "They don't understand, do they?", Emily has regained a calm, clear-sighted strength. She has accepted her death and understood what the living cannot. In conclusion, Emily is strong in her intelligence, honesty and determination, but Wilder deliberately shows that strength breaking down in moments of love, fear and grief. Her greatest strength is not her confidence in the extract but her courage in facing the truth at the end.

8a

Both D.H. Lawrence's "Piano" and Thomas Hood's "I Remember, I Remember" present childhood memories as powerful forces which shape, and in some ways overwhelm, the adult identity of the speaker. In each poem a grown man looks back to a lost world of security and innocence, and in each the memory brings grief rather than comfort. However, the poems differ in how the memories arrive. For Lawrence, a single song triggers an involuntary flood of feeling that he tries and fails to resist, while Hood's speaker deliberately summons a series of memories

Question number

which lead him to a quieter, more spiritual sense of loss.

Lawrence's poem begins in the present, "Softly, in the dusk, a woman is singing to me", and the soft sibilance and the half-light of "dusk" create a gentle, hypnotic mood. Yet the music immediately pulls him backwards: "Taking me back down the vista of years, till I see". The enjambment carries the reader across the line just as the speaker is carried across time, so that the adult suddenly sees "A child sitting under the piano". By using the third person for his childhood self, Lawrence suggests a split identity: the man looks at the child almost as a stranger, and yet longs to become him again. The auditory imagery of "the boom of the tingling strings" is wonderfully precise, capturing how music would sound from underneath the instrument, while the tender detail of "the small, poised feet of a mother who smiles as she sings" centres the memory on the mother. Lawrence was famously close to his own mother, who died in 1910, and the poem's intimacy may reflect that bond; his identity as a man seems inseparable from his love for her.

Hood's poem, by contrast, opens with deliberate repetition: "I remember, I remember, / The house where I was born". The refrain, repeated at the start of each stanza, makes remembering a conscious act, almost a chant. His memories are a catalogue of places and objects rather than one moment: "The little window where the sun / Came peeping in at morn". The personification of the sun "peeping" gives the childhood home a playful, affectionate quality, and the simple ballad-like rhythm and rhyme mirror the simplicity of childhood. Where Lawrence's memory is focused on a single relationship, Hood's is a whole landscape of innocence, full of flowers, light and birds.

In both poems the memory is set against the present, and this contrast reveals how childhood influences identity. Lawrence fights the memory: "In spite of

Question number

myself, the insidious mastery of song / Betrays me back". The adjective "insidious" and the verb "Betrays" are surprising, because they make a loving memory sound treacherous, as if nostalgia were an enemy undermining his adult self. He longs "to belong / To the old Sunday evenings at home, with winter outside / And hymns in the cosy parlour, the tinkling piano our guide". The contrast between the cold "winter outside" and the warmth of the "cosy parlour" makes childhood a protected space, and the hymns suggest the religious, close-knit family life of a late nineteenth-century household, where music gathered the family together. Hood's speaker also contrasts past and present, but less violently. He remembers swinging and imagining the air rushing "as fresh / To swallows on the wing", and says "My spirit flew in feathers then, / That is so heavy now". The metaphor of flight and weight shows how adulthood has burdened his identity, yet the tone is wistful rather than tormented.

The endings bring out the clearest difference. Lawrence's final stanza dismisses the present singer: "So now it is vain for the singer to burst into clamour / With the great black piano appassionato." The loud, dramatic present music is reduced to "clamour" beside the "tinkling" piano of his memory, and the Italian musical term "appassionato" emphasises the heavy passion of adult art compared with childish simplicity. The climax is overwhelming: "my manhood is cast / Down in the flood of remembrance, I weep like a child for the past." The metaphor of a "flood" suggests that his adult identity is drowned, while the simile "like a child" completes the poem's circle, as the man literally becomes the child again in his tears. The rhyming couplets throughout give the poem a musical, lyrical quality, as if the poem itself were a song.

Hood's ending is more reflective and spiritual. He remembers believing that the "fir trees dark and high" had tops "close against the sky", and admits "It was a

Question number

childish ignorance". Yet he then confesses that "now 'tis little joy / To know I'm farther off from heav'n / Than when I was a boy." The pun on "heaven" as both sky and spiritual state is poignant: as a child he was physically small but felt close to God, while as an adult he has gained knowledge but lost innocence. This reflects the Romantic belief, common in the early nineteenth century and seen in Wordsworth, that children are nearer to the divine and that growing up is a fall from grace.

In conclusion, both speakers reveal that childhood memories define who they are, and both feel diminished as adults. Lawrence presents the influence of memory as sudden, emotional and almost humiliating, a force that strips away his "manhood", while Hood presents it as a gentle but sorrowful recognition of spiritual distance. For me, Lawrence's poem is the more powerful because it dramatises the struggle in the moment, yet Hood's simple final image of being "farther off from heav'n" lingers just as strongly.

8b

Ciaran Carson's "Belfast Confetti" and Seamus Heaney's "Docker" both suggest that Belfast, with its sectarian divisions, shapes identity in damaging and restrictive ways. In Carson's poem the city during the Troubles traps and confuses the speaker until he can no longer answer basic questions about who he is. In Heaney's poem the place produces a hard, fixed identity in the docker, whose religion, work and prejudices are all moulded by his environment. Both poets present identity as something imposed by place rather than freely chosen, but where Carson's speaker is destabilised, Heaney's docker is frighteningly certain.

Carson, born in Belfast in 1948 into an Irish-speaking Catholic family, lived through the Troubles, and "Belfast Confetti" recreates the experience of being

Question number

caught in a riot. The title is bitterly ironic. "Confetti" suggests a wedding and celebration, but "Belfast confetti" was local slang for the bolts, rivets and scrap metal thrown in street violence. Immediately the place itself has twisted the meaning of language. The poem opens abruptly with "Suddenly as the riot squad moved in, it was raining exclamation marks", and the long, sprawling lines of free verse mirror the chaos of the scene. The list "Nuts, bolts, nails, car-keys" is made of harsh monosyllables that hit the reader like the missiles themselves, and the inclusion of ordinary "car-keys" shows how everyday objects become weapons in this city.

The extended metaphor of punctuation is central to how Carson presents identity. The explosion is "an asterisk on the map", gunfire is "a burst of rapid fire", and the speaker says "I was trying to complete a sentence in my head but it kept stuttering". As a writer, his identity is bound up with language, yet the violence of the place prevents him from thinking or expressing himself. The streets are "blocked with stops and colons", so that the physical barricades of Belfast become barriers in his mind. Carson suggests that living in such a place fragments the self just as it fragments sentences.

Heaney's "Docker" presents a very different effect of place. Rather than a confused individual, we see a man completely shaped and hardened by industrial, Protestant Belfast. The opening is a static portrait: "There, in the corner, staring at his drink." The demonstrative "There" points at him as if he is a specimen to be examined. Heaney then uses industrial imagery to describe his body: "The cap juts like a gantry's crossbeam", and his "sledgehead jaw" turns him into a piece of shipyard machinery. The metaphor "Speech is clamped in the lips' vice" makes even his silence mechanical. Whereas Carson's speaker struggles to complete a sentence because of chaos, the docker refuses to speak because his identity is rigid and

Question number

closed.

Both poems link place to sectarian identity. In "Belfast Confetti", the street names "Balaclava, Raglan, Inkerman, Odessa Street" refer to battles and figures of the Crimean War, a British imperial conflict. Carson suggests that the city's very geography carries a history of violence and empire, so that even familiar streets are a reminder of division. "I know this labyrinth so well", he says, yet asks "Why can't I escape?" The image of a "labyrinth" conveys entrapment: knowing a place intimately does not mean being free in it. Heaney's docker also carries sectarian hatred, but openly: "That fist would drop a hammer on a Catholic". The violent hypothetical shocks the reader, and the following line, "Oh yes, that kind of thing could start again", sounds chillingly prophetic. "Docker" was published in 1966, a few years before the Troubles broke out, so Heaney, a Catholic from rural County Derry, seems to sense the danger beneath the city's surface. There is a striking link between the poems here: the "rivets" of Heaney's shipyard, "Mosaic imperatives bang home like rivets", are exactly the kind of metal that became the "confetti" of Carson's riots.

Religion is part of the docker's identity in a way that is absent from Carson's speaker. Heaney writes that "God is a foreman with certain definite views", a wry metaphor that shows the docker's faith is shaped by the hierarchy of the workplace, and that "A factory horn will blare the Resurrection". His sense of God, work and order are all products of where he lives. The simile "strong and blunt as a Celtic cross" is ironic, as an ancient Irish symbol is used for a man who would reject Catholic Ireland, perhaps hinting at a shared heritage he denies.

The endings show the clearest contrast. Carson finishes with a rush of questions: "What is / My name? Where am I coming from? Where am I going?" The

Question number

enjambment splitting "What is" from "My name" enacts the fracturing of identity, and the questions echo those asked at security checkpoints, so that the speaker's identity is interrogated by the forces of the state. Being asked "Where am I coming from?" in Belfast is never neutral, as an answer could reveal one's religion. The poem ends with "A fusillade of question-marks", fusing violence and language one final time. Heaney's ending is quieter but equally bleak: the docker's family "will be quiet / At slammed door and smoker's cough in the hall". The harsh sounds of "slammed" and "cough" reveal that his rigid identity extends into domestic fear, so the influence of place passes down to the next generation.

In conclusion, both poets show Belfast shaping identity through conflict, religion and history. Carson presents a self that is shattered and questioning, unable to escape the labyrinth of the city, while Heaney presents a self that is solid, silent and bigoted, fixed by industry and tradition. Together they suggest that in a divided place, identity is either lost in the chaos or hardened into prejudice.

9a

Christina Rossetti's "Remember" and W.H. Auden's "Funeral Blues" both explore the pain of losing a loved one, yet they approach loss from opposite sides of death. Rossetti's speaker anticipates her own death and thinks selflessly about the grief of the lover she will leave behind, finally urging him to forget her if remembering would make him sad. Auden's speaker has already lost the man he loved and is consumed by grief so total that he wants the whole universe to stop. One poem moves towards acceptance and self-sacrifice; the other moves towards despair.

Rossetti's title is a command, and the poem opens with the imperative "Remember me when I am gone away". The repetition of "Remember me" at the start of the poem and again in line five gives the octave an insistent, pleading quality, as if

Question number

the speaker fears being forgotten. Yet the language of death is softened by euphemism: she will be "Gone far away into the silent land". The phrase "silent land" makes death sound like a distant country rather than an ending, which perhaps reflects Rossetti's deep Anglican faith and her belief in an afterlife. Auden, by contrast, also begins with commands, but they are frantic and directed at the world: "Stop all the clocks, cut off the telephone". The brisk, monosyllabic imperatives create an urgent rhythm, and the stopping of "clocks" suggests that for the grieving speaker time itself has ended.

Rossetti presents loss through the small, tender details of the relationship that death will end: "When you can no more hold me by the hand, / Nor I half turn to go yet turning stay." The soft alliteration of "hold" and "hand" softens the commanding tone, and the hesitant movement of "half turn to go yet turning stay" beautifully captures a lover's reluctance to part. She also mourns their shared future: "You tell me of our future that you planned". The loss is not only of a person but of a life together. In the nineteenth century, when mortality rates were high and illness common, such anticipation of an early death would have felt very real, and Rossetti herself suffered long periods of illness and depression.

Auden presents loss on a far larger and more public scale. He demands that "aeroplanes circle moaning overhead / Scribbling on the sky the message He Is Dead". The personification of the "moaning" planes turns the whole sky into a mourner, and the capitalised message is like a headline, as though the death were a national event. The image of "crêpe bows round the white necks of the public doves" and traffic policemen in "black cotton gloves" is deliberately extravagant, even slightly absurd. Interestingly, the poem was first written in the 1930s as a satirical piece for a play by Auden and Christopher Isherwood, mocking a pompous politician's death, before Auden revised it into a sincere lament. Some of that

Question number

over-the-top quality remains, but here it conveys the feeling of a grieving person who cannot understand why the rest of the world carries on as normal.

The heart of each poem lies in how the speaker defines the relationship. Auden's third stanza uses a list of metaphors: "He was my North, my South, my East and West, / My working week and my Sunday rest". The lost lover was the speaker's entire direction, routine and meaning. The anaphora of "my" emphasises possession and dependence, and the rhyming couplets give the lines a heavy, song-like finality. The stanza ends with a devastating simple admission: "I thought that love would last for ever: I was wrong." The colon acts like a sharp pause before the blunt monosyllables of "I was wrong", which shatter the romantic belief in eternal love. Auden was homosexual at a time when same-sex relationships were illegal in Britain, and the use of "He" gives the poem an added poignancy, since such grief could rarely be mourned openly.

Rossetti's poem also turns at a crucial point, but towards selflessness rather than despair. The volta comes with "Yet" in line nine: "Yet if you should forget me for a while / And afterwards remember, do not grieve". The Petrarchan sonnet, traditionally the form of romantic love poetry, is subverted here, as the sestet allows the speaker to change her mind. Her reference to "the darkness and corruption" of the grave is the poem's only stark image of death, yet she hopes some "vestige of the thoughts that once I had" might survive. Her final couplet is generous and moving: "Better by far you should forget and smile / Than that you should remember and be sad." The contrast between "forget and smile" and "remember and be sad" shows love expressed as letting go. Rossetti herself rejected several suitors, including James Collinson and Charles Cayley, largely for religious reasons, and the poem's mixture of love and renunciation may reflect her own experience.

Question number

Auden's ending, in contrast, rejects all comfort. "The stars are not wanted now: put out every one; / Pack up the moon and dismantle the sun". The hyperbole of dismantling the universe suggests that without his lover the speaker's world has no light or purpose. The final line, "For nothing now can ever come to any good", is absolute: the words "nothing" and "ever" leave no room for hope.

In conclusion, both poets present loss as the destruction of a shared life, but they reach very different places. Rossetti's speaker, facing her own death, finds peace in wanting her beloved's happiness above her own memory, while Auden's speaker, left behind, can see only darkness. For me, the contrast is most powerful in their final lines: Rossetti ends with the possibility of a "smile", Auden with "nothing".

9b

E.E. Cummings's "i carry your heart with me" and William Shakespeare's "Sonnet 130" both celebrate love, but they do so in strikingly different ways. Cummings's speaker presents love as total union, a bond so complete that the lovers become one and the beloved becomes the meaning of the whole universe. Shakespeare's speaker, by contrast, refuses to exaggerate, mocking the inflated comparisons of conventional love poetry in order to present a love that is honest and grounded. What makes the pairing fascinating is that Cummings uses exactly the kind of cosmic imagery, the sun, the moon and the stars, that Shakespeare ridicules, yet both speakers arrive at the same conclusion: their love is rare and real.

Cummings opens with the line that becomes his title and refrain: "i carry your heart with me(i carry it in / my heart)". The metaphor of carrying the beloved's heart is a familiar romantic cliché, but Cummings renews it through form. The parenthesis literally encloses one phrase within another, so that the brackets on

Question number

the page act out the idea of one heart held inside another. The lower-case "i" is typical of Cummings, a self-styled linguistic rebel who experimented radically with punctuation and syntax, and here it seems to make the speaker humble, smaller than the love he describes. The missing spaces before the brackets push the words together, mirroring the closeness of the lovers.

Shakespeare's opening is deliberately deflating: "My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun". Where a typical Elizabethan sonneteer, following Petrarch, would compare his lady's eyes to the sun, Shakespeare flatly denies it. He continues with a series of anti-comparisons: "Coral is far more red than her lips' red", and "If hairs be wires, black wires grow on her head." The image of "black wires" is almost comically unflattering, and it parodies the convention of golden hair compared to fine gold thread. Shakespeare's love is presented through negation: he tells us what his mistress is not, in order to show that he loves her as she really is.

The two poems differ greatly in their sense of unity. For Cummings, the lovers are inseparable: "anywhere / i go you go,my dear;and whatever is done / by only me is your doing,my darling". The parallelism of "i go you go" places the two pronouns side by side with no conjunction between them, suggesting they move as one being. The terms of endearment "my dear", "my darling" and later "my sweet" and "my true" create an intimate, tender tone of direct address. He declares "i fear / no fate(for you are my fate,my sweet)", and the repetition of "fate" and "world" in "i want / no world(for beautiful you are my world,my true)" shows that the beloved has replaced everything else. The words inside the brackets act like whispered second thoughts, adding even deeper feeling to each statement.

Shakespeare's speaker, by contrast, remains detached and observational. He notes that "in some perfumes is there more delight / Than in the breath that from my mistress reeks." The verb "reeks" is shockingly blunt, even if in Shakespeare's time

Question number

it may have meant simply to breathe out. There is no merging of selves here, only clear-eyed realism.

The use of nature and the cosmos marks the sharpest contrast. Cummings writes that "you are whatever a moon has always meant / and whatever a sun will always sing is you". The personification of the sun that "will always sing" gives the universe a voice, and that voice praises the beloved. The speaker moves into a near-mystical register: "here is the deepest secret nobody knows". The anaphora of "here is" builds to the image of "the root of the root and the bud of the bud", repetitions which suggest love is the essence beneath all life, "a tree called life" which grows "higher than soul can hope or mind can hide". Finally, love is "the wonder that's keeping the stars apart", a breathtaking idea that love holds the universe in order. Shakespeare refuses all of this. "I grant I never saw a goddess go; / My mistress, when she walks, treads on the ground." The contrast between "goddess" and "treads on the ground" brings love down to earth. Whereas Cummings's beloved is the meaning of the sun and moon, Shakespeare's mistress has nothing to do with them.

The structures of the poems reflect their attitudes. Shakespeare uses the strict form of the English sonnet, three quatrains and a rhyming couplet in iambic pentameter, perhaps ironically using the traditional love-poem form to criticise traditional love poetry. The volta in the final couplet reverses the tone: "And yet, by heaven, I think my love as rare / As any she belied with false compare." The oath "by heaven" adds sincerity, and the word "rare" reveals that his realism was a proof of love all along: he does not need "false compare" because his feeling is genuine. Cummings writes in free verse with unobtrusive rhymes and half rhymes, creating a conversational, intimate rhythm. His poem ends with the isolated line "i carry your heart(i carry it in my heart)", a single-line stanza which repeats the

Question number

opening and gains emphasis by standing alone, as if the speaker returns to the one truth that matters.

In conclusion, both poets present love as precious and lasting, but they express it in opposite ways. Cummings uses unconventional form to present love as a boundless, spiritual union that holds the cosmos together, while Shakespeare uses conventional form to reject exaggeration and present a love rooted in honesty. In a sense Shakespeare would mock Cummings's sun and moon, yet both poems end by asserting that the speaker's love is unique: Cummings through wonder, Shakespeare through truth.

10a

Both Wilfred Owen's "Anthem for Doomed Youth" and Ted Hughes's "Bayonet Charge" insist that the impact of conflict is to strip away the dignity and meaning that society attaches to war. Owen, however, measures that impact in death and grief, mourning young men slaughtered without the rituals they deserve, while Hughes measures it in a single living moment, showing a soldier whose patriotism and humanity collapse into raw terror.

The titles prepare us for these different perspectives. Owen's "Anthem" is a word associated with patriotism and solemn celebration, yet it is immediately soured by "Doomed Youth", so the poem becomes an ironic hymn for a whole generation rather than one individual. Hughes's title is blunt and practical, naming a military manoeuvre, and his soldier is never named either, simply "he".

Owen opens with a bitter rhetorical question: "What passing-bells for these who die as cattle?" The simile is savage. Soldiers are reduced to animals herded to the slaughterhouse, and the demonstrative "these" makes them anonymous and

Question number

countless. Hughes also uses animal imagery, but in a more unsettling way. The "yellow hare that rolled like a flame" and "crawled in a threshing circle, its mouth wide / Open silent" is a mirror of the soldier himself: an innocent creature caught in a landscape it does not understand, suffering in agony without any voice. Where Owen tells us the men die like cattle, Hughes makes us watch something die and lets us realise the soldier is no different.

Sound is central to how both poets convey the violence of battle. Owen's alliteration and onomatopoeia in "stuttering rifles' rapid rattle" mimic machine gun fire, and the verb "patter out" turns the guns into a grotesque priest gabbling "hasty orisons". The personification of "the monstrous anger of the guns" makes the weapons seem more alive than the men. Hughes's sound effects are equally harsh: "Bullets smacking the belly out of the air" uses plosive consonants and a violent, bodily metaphor, as if the air itself is being disembowelled, and the final "blue crackling air" fills the scene with electric noise. Yet the purposes differ. Owen's noise replaces the sounds of a funeral, so the impact he stresses is the absence of respect and mourning, while Hughes's noise surrounds a living man, so the impact is sensory overload and panic.

The poets treat patriotism and the ideals that sent men to war with similar scorn. Owen dismisses religious and national ceremony: "No mockeries now for them". The noun "mockeries" suggests that prayers and bells would be insulting hypocrisy for men killed in such a way, and the "demented choirs of wailing shells" turns the sacred choir into madness. Owen, who had been a devout Christian and who wrote the poem in 1917 while recovering from shell shock at Craiglockhart War Hospital, seems to be questioning whether faith can offer any comfort at all. Hughes attacks patriotism even more directly. "The patriotic tear that had brimmed in his eye" is now "Sweating like molten iron", so the emotion that inspired him to enlist

Question number

has become a source of physical pain. Most memorably, "King, honour, human dignity, etcetera" are "Dropped like luxuries". The dismissive "etcetera" reduces the grand abstract nouns to an afterthought, and the simile of "luxuries" implies that ideals are things a man can afford only when he is not in mortal danger. Hughes, writing in 1957, had the benefit of hindsight about the First World War and was influenced by his father's experiences at Gallipoli, so he can puncture the propaganda of the time with a detached, almost sardonic voice, whereas Owen, writing from inside the war, sounds grief stricken and angry.

Structure reinforces these differences. Owen uses the sonnet, traditionally a form for love, ironically to express love and grief for the dead. The volta into the sestet moves from the noise of the front to the quiet of the "sad shires" at home, and the second rhetorical question, "What candles may be held to speed them all?", introduces a gentler tone. The impact of conflict now falls on the families: the "holy glimmers of goodbyes" are tears in the eyes of boys, and "The pallor of girls' brows shall be their pall", a pun which makes the grief of the living the only shroud the dead receive. The final image, "each slow dusk a drawing-down of blinds", suggests that mourning will be repeated every evening, a permanent impact on the home front. Hughes, by contrast, writes in free verse with heavy enjambment, which recreates the soldier's breathless, stumbling charge. The opening "Suddenly he awoke and was running" plunges us into action, and the middle stanza almost freezes time as his foot hangs "like / Statuary in mid-stride". In this pause he asks "In what cold clockwork of the stars and the nations / Was he the hand pointing that second?", an image that presents him as a tiny mechanical part in a vast, uncaring system. Owen also sees soldiers as victims of forces beyond them, but Hughes focuses on the psychological impact of realising this mid battle.

Question number

Ultimately, both poems present conflict as dehumanising and expose the ideals behind it as empty. Owen's impact is collective and lasting: it reaches from the trenches to the homes of England and leaves a legacy of grief. Hughes's impact is individual and immediate: his soldier survives the poem, but only by becoming "His terror's touchy dynamite", a man reduced to instinct. Owen asks us to mourn; Hughes asks us to feel the fear, and together they suggest that the true cost of war lies both in the dead and in what it does to the living.

10b

W B Yeats's "An Irish Airman Foresees his Death" and Henry Newbolt's "Vitaï Lampada" present almost opposite attitudes to conflict. Newbolt's speaker celebrates war as a noble duty, a continuation of the team spirit learned on the school cricket field, and passes that attitude on to each new generation. Yeats's airman, by contrast, coolly rejects every public reason for fighting: he goes to war not for king, country or honour, but for a private "impulse of delight".

The titles immediately signal this contrast. "Vitaï Lampada", Latin for "the torch of life", suggests a flame handed from one runner to the next, so war is framed as a proud tradition inherited by young men. Yeats's title, on the other hand, is calm and fatalistic. The verb "Foresees" implies that the airman has already accepted his death, and the adjective "Irish" places him outside the British cause he serves. The poem was written in memory of Robert Gregory, the son of Yeats's friend Lady Gregory, who was killed in 1918 while flying for the Royal Flying Corps. Many Irishmen fought for Britain while their own country was struggling for independence, and Yeats, who had no military experience himself, uses the airman's voice to explore how divided such loyalties could be.

The opening lines of each poem reveal their attitudes. Yeats begins with quiet

Question number

certainty: "I know that I shall meet my fate / Somewhere among the clouds above". The word "fate" conveys resignation, while the vague "Somewhere" suggests he is indifferent to the details of his death. Newbolt opens with excitement and tension: "There's a breathless hush in the Close to-night", followed by "Ten to make and the match to win". The adjective "breathless" and the urgent, rolling rhythm build drama around a game of cricket, and the stakes of sport are treated as though they were life and death.

Yeats's airman then dismantles the traditional reasons for fighting. The balanced antithesis of "Those that I fight I do not hate, / Those that I guard I do not love" shows that he feels no hatred for the enemy and no love for the British he protects. Identity is local and personal: "My country is Kiltartan Cross, / My countrymen Kiltartan's poor". The alliteration of the hard "k" sounds gives the place name a certain pride, yet he admits that the war will make no difference to these people. Most strikingly, the repeated "Nor" in "Nor law, nor duty bade me fight, / Nor public men, nor cheering crowds" rejects conscription, moral obligation, politicians and the patriotic fervour of recruitment campaigns, all the forces that persuaded young men to enlist in 1914. Newbolt's poem embodies exactly those forces. Its refrain, "Play up! play up! and play the game!", is an imperative chant, and its exclamation marks and repetition make it sound like a cheer from the crowd that Yeats's airman dismisses.

Both poems present battle itself, but in very different ways. Newbolt's second stanza moves to a desert war, with brutal imagery: "The sand of the desert is sodden red". The alliteration of "sodden" and "sand" and the colour red make the bloodshed vivid, and the details that "The Gatling's jammed and the Colonel dead" show a military disaster. Yet the horror is not allowed to challenge the speaker's attitude. Instead "the voice of a schoolboy rallies the ranks" with the same cricket

Question number

cry, so violence is absorbed into the ideals of courage and selfless loyalty to the team. Writing in the late Victorian period at the height of the British Empire, and drawing on his own schooldays at Clifton College, Newbolt reflects a public school belief that war was a test of character. Yeats, in contrast, hardly describes combat at all. It is merely "this tumult in the clouds", a euphemism that keeps the violence at a distance. The airman's motive is "A lonely impulse of delight", a phrase that makes flying seem almost spiritual and isolates him from any community.

Form and structure reinforce these attitudes. Yeats writes in a dramatic monologue of sixteen lines in iambic tetrameter, with four quatrains of alternating rhyme. The controlled, even pattern mirrors the balance and steadiness required of a pilot, and the poem's argument also depends on balance: "I balanced all, brought all to mind". The chiasmus of "The years to come seemed waste of breath, / A waste of breath the years behind" suggests that his past and future are equally empty, and the final line, "In balance with this life, this death", places life and death in equal weight. This is a disturbing attitude: death is not glorious but simply a fair exchange for one intense moment. Newbolt's structure is cyclical and didactic. His three stanzas move from school to battlefield and back to the school, where the message is passed on "year by year" to "Every one of her sons". Each stanza ends with the same refrain, so the poem itself acts like the torch being handed on, ensuring the attitude survives.

Ultimately, Newbolt presents conflict as a duty rooted in honour, community and tradition, while Yeats presents it as a personal choice cut loose from politics and morality. Newbolt's certainty may seem naive to a modern reader, especially after the slaughter of the First World War, when such public school idealism sent many young men to their deaths. Yet Yeats's poem is not simply anti-war either. His

Question number

airman is not horrified by war but indifferent to its causes, and his calm acceptance of death is perhaps more unsettling than Newbolt's enthusiasm. Together the poems show how differently individuals could justify risking their lives, and how hollow the public reasons could become for someone whose true loyalties lay elsewhere.