Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education

English Literature

Unit 2

The Study of Drama and Poetry

GEL21

[GEL21]
Assessment

Assessment Level of Control:
Tick the relevant box (✓)

Controlled Conditions	
Other	

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** Mary, show how far you agree that Mary **deserves** to be admired.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 3 beginning near the top of page 145 with Mrs Boyle's words, "Johnny, Johnny!" and ending at the bottom of page 146 with Mrs Boyle's words: "Take away this murdherin' hate, an' give us Thine own eternal love!"

With reference to the ways O'Casey **presents** misery in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show that the Boyle family **cannot** escape from misery. Who do you think is most responsible for the family's misery?

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** Sheila, show how far you agree that Sheila is **immature**.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 3 beginning in the middle of page 51 with the Inspector's words, "Don't start on that. I want to get on," and ending near the bottom of page 53 with Eric's words, "Not really."

With reference to the ways Priestley **presents** power in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Eric and Mr Birling use their power in **selfish** ways.

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** S. B. O'Donnell, show how far you agree that S.B. is **not** a good father to Gar.

(b) Look again at the extract from Episode II beginning at the top of page 61 with the stage direction, *Con spreads his hands* and ending on page 63 with the stage direction, *She begins to sob*.

(For those using the 2000 edition, the extract begins near the bottom of page 47 and ends on page 50.)

With reference to the ways Friel **presents** opportunities in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that life in America will offer **better** opportunities than life in Ballybeg.

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** Mrs Johnstone, show how far you agree that Mrs Johnstone is **responsible** for her own sufferings.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 2 beginning towards the top of page 77 with the stage direction, *We see Edward waiting by a street lamp* and ending on page 79 with Linda's word, ''What?''

(For those using the red-backed edition, the extract begins towards the bottom of page 83 and ends on page 85.)

With reference to the ways Russell **presents** friendship in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Edward and Linda are **good friends**.

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** Raleigh, show how far you agree that Raleigh is **immature**.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act III Scene I beginning halfway down page 55 with the stage direction, *There is a pause. The* COLONEL *sucks hard at his pipe.* STANHOPE *roves restlessly* and ending halfway down page 57 with the stage direction, *He pauses, and gives an awkward little laugh*.

(For those using the Penguin edition, the extract begins near the bottom of page 66 and ends on page 68.)

With reference to the ways Sherriff **presents** the soldiers' lives in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that the soldiers are treated in a **brutal** way.

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, show how far you agree that Christopher is **unable to cope** with differences in his life and routine.

(b) Look again at the extract from Part One beginning on page 23 with Ed's words, "Where have you been?" and ending near the top of page 26 with Siobhan's words, "it would be a Dream Come True".

With reference to the ways Stephens **presents** family life in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Christopher's family life is **always** unhappy.

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 Stage Manager, show how far you agree that the Stage Manager **controls** what happens in the play.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 2 beginning halfway down page 64 with George's words, "Emily, if I go away to State Agricultural College" and ending on page 67 with Emily's words, "Yes, thank you, Mr Morgan. It was nothing."

(For those using the 2017 edition, the extract begins on page 43 and ends on page 45.)

With reference to the ways Wilder **presents** ambitions in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that the younger generation do **not achieve** their ambitions.

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 *Dover Beach* by Matthew Arnold which deals with the theme of having doubts, and at one other poem from the IDENTITY anthology which also deals with the theme of having doubts.

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

(b) Look again at *Invictus* by William Ernest Henley which deals with the theme of difficult experiences, and at one other poem from the IDENTITY anthology which also deals with the theme of difficult experiences.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **difficult experiences**. 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 *Funeral Blues* by W H Auden which deals with the theme of the death of a loved one, and at one other poem from the RELATIONSHIPS anthology which also deals with the theme of the death of a loved one.

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

(b) Look again at *Sonnet 130* by William Shakespeare which deals with the theme of strong feelings, and at one other poem from the RELATIONSHIPS anthology which also deals with the theme of strong feelings.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **strong feelings**. 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 *Easter Monday (In Memoriam E.T.) (1917)* by Eleanor Farjeon which deals with the theme of loved ones in a conflict situation, and at one other poem from the CONFLICT anthology which also deals with the theme of loved ones in a conflict situation.

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

(b) Look again at *The Charge of the Light Brigade* by Alfred, Lord Tennyson which deals with the theme of courage, and at one other poem from the CONFLICT anthology which also deals with the theme of courage.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **courage**. 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.

251938

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

Question number

1a

O'Casey presents Mary as a young woman whose ideals are genuinely admirable but whose judgement is repeatedly undermined by the cramped, poverty-stricken world of the tenement. I largely agree that she deserves to be admired, but the admiration is qualified: O'Casey shows her principles, intelligence and final loyalty to her mother alongside a vanity, sharpness and naivety that make her vulnerable. In the end, it is perhaps her capacity to endure and to learn, rather than her early confidence, that earns our respect.

From the opening stage directions O'Casey invites the audience to see Mary as someone striving to rise above her surroundings. She is described as a girl with two forces working in her mind: one pulling her towards the life of the tenement, the other towards self-improvement through books. Her reading of Ibsen marks her out from the rest of the household,. Mary's interest in literature and politics suggests a mind that wants more than the narrow horizons offered to a working-class girl, and this aspiration is surely admirable.

Her principles are presented most clearly through the strike. Mary has walked out of her job in sympathy with a fellow worker, Jennie Claffey, whose dismissal she regards as "a clear case of victimisation". When Juno complains about the loss of wages, Mary's reply, "It doesn't matter what you say, ma, a principle's a principle", is firm and confident. O'Casey gives her a short, almost proverbial phrase that sounds like a slogan, which shows the strength of her conviction. Yet the playwright also makes the audience question it. Juno's practical voice reminds us that the family needs money, and the same phrase is echoed by Johnny about the cause that has left him maimed. This structural echo may suggest that principles,

Question number

however noble, have a cost that the women of the house are left to pay. Mary's stand therefore deserves admiration for its courage, but O'Casey hints that idealism in the tenement is a luxury.

O'Casey also makes Mary hard to like at times, which complicates the key term. Her speech to her family is often clipped and impatient. When Johnny begs her not to leave him alone, she answers, "you can't expect me to be always at your beck an' call, can you?", and the rhetorical question exposes a lack of sympathy for a brother who is frightened and in pain. Her complaint, "Amn't I nicely handicapped with the whole o' yous!", sounds childish and self-pitying. Her treatment of Jerry Devine is harsher still. When he reproaches her, he notes "The bitther word agen, Mary", and her threat to scream so that "the oul' fella" will come out is presented through abrupt, combative dialogue that shows how far she has moved away from him. A reader might argue that her ambition makes her cold to those who genuinely care for her.

Her vanity is presented as a particular weakness. O'Casey shows her fussing over ribbons, and her question to Bentham, "Would you prefer the green or the blue ribbon round me hair, Charlie?", is light and flirtatious, revealing how much she wants to impress a man whose polished manner seems to promise escape. Bentham's education and his theosophical talk dazzle her, but O'Casey makes clear to the audience, through Bentham's prim and self-important dialogue, that he is shallow. Mary's attraction to him therefore shows a naivety which is understandable but not wholly admirable: she mistakes refinement for goodness and abandons Jerry, who, whatever his faults, belongs to her own world.

The consequences of this misjudgement dominate Act 3, where O'Casey uses Mary's pregnancy and desertion to test the other characters as well as her. Jerry's

Question number

offer to return to her collapses when he learns the truth, and Mary's quiet observation that his humanity is just as narrow as that of the others is one of her most perceptive moments. She sees through the gap between his socialist speeches and his private prejudice. Her father's response is even worse: Boyle rages about the disgrace and wants nothing to do with her. By placing Mary at the centre of these rejections, O'Casey turns her from a figure the audience might judge into one they pity, and her dignity in the face of them is admirable.

The ending suggests that Mary grows. In the scene after Johnny's death, the stage direction showing her with her arms round her mother presents a reversal of the earlier impatience: she now offers comfort rather than demanding it. Her cry, "My poor little child that'll have no father!", is full of real anguish, but she accepts Juno's plan that they will leave Boyle and raise the baby together. Some readers might argue that she simply returns to dependency on her mother, and it is true that Juno is the stronger figure. However, O'Casey seems to suggest that this partnership of women is the only hope the play allows, and Mary's willingness to share it shows that she has learned humility.

Overall, I agree that Mary deserves to be admired, though not uncritically. O'Casey presents her principles and aspirations as genuine, and her failings, the sharp tongue, the vanity, the trust in Bentham, as the faults of a young woman trapped in an environment that degrades both her speech and her choices. Her real admirability lies in her endurance: by the final act she has lost her job, her lover and her brother, yet she stands beside Juno to face the future. In this sense O'Casey presents her less as a heroine than as a survivor, and that is perhaps a more honest kind of admiration.

Question number

1b

In Juno and the Paycock O'Casey presents misery as something that closes in on the Boyle family from every side: poverty, false hope, betrayal and violence. This extract, in which Juno and Mary learn that Johnny is dead, is the point at which every strand of that misery meets, and O'Casey's structure makes it clear that there is no way out. Although many forces contribute to their suffering, I would argue that Captain Boyle is the character most responsible, because his fantasy and selfishness turn a hard life into a ruined one.

The extract opens with Juno's repeated cry, "Johnny, Johnny!", and the simple doubling of the name conveys a grief that has gone beyond ordinary speech. O'Casey uses exclamation and repetition throughout this section to show misery as overwhelming: "Oh, it's thrue, then; it's Johnny, it's me son, me own son!" The movement from the formal "Johnny" to the possessive "me own son" narrows the focus from the public news to a mother's private loss. Mary's echo, "Oh, it's thrue, it's thrue", shows the misery spreading between the two women, as though there is not enough language left for either of them to say anything new.

Mary's own suffering is folded into her mother's. Her cry, "My poor little child that'll have no father!", reminds the audience that the misery of the Boyles will pass into the next generation, and the stage direction placing her with her arms round her mother creates a tableau of two women holding one another up because no one else will. O'Casey contrasts this tenderness with the harshness of the world outside. The rough voice offstage of the men who have come for the furniture shows a society that has no sympathy to spare, and Mrs Madigan's comic remarks, which in earlier acts lightened the stage, now sound jarring. O'Casey's mixing of tragedy and humour therefore heightens rather than relieves the misery.

Religion offers Juno words but not escape. She tells Mary that "We'll want all the

Question number

help we can get from God an' His Blessed Mother now!", yet her prayer that closes the extract, beginning "Sacred Heart o' Jesus", is closer to an accusation. Her question about where Christ was when her son was riddled with bullets is the climax of the play. Crucially, O'Casey makes her repeat almost word for word the prayer Mrs Tancred spoke in Act 2: "Mother o' God, Mother o' God, have pity on us all!" and "Take away this murdherin' hate, an' give us Thine own eternal love!" This structural echo is the most powerful sign that misery cannot be escaped. Juno, who admits in this act that she did not feel sorry enough for Mrs Tancred, now inherits her grief exactly. The antithesis between "murdherin' hate" and "eternal love" shows that she finally understands that the violence of the time spares no family. Her line about the pains of carrying Johnny into the world and the pains of carrying him "out o' the world to bring you to your grave" frames his life between two sufferings, as if misery was there from his birth.

Elsewhere, O'Casey shows misery as the permanent condition of the Boyle household long before the will. Juno's opening lines are full of complaint about money, food and her husband's idleness, and her description of Boyle "struttin' about from mornin' till night like a paycock!" sets up the play's central conflict. Johnny is already a figure of misery in Act 1: wounded in the hip and missing an arm, he is nervous, restless and terrified of the dark, and his reaction to the votive light before the Virgin hints at a guilty conscience. His betrayal of Robbie Tancred, revealed in Act 3, explains this fear and makes his death seem inevitable.

The legacy in Act 2 appears to offer escape, and O'Casey deliberately raises the family's hopes. New furniture, the gramophone and the party with Joxer and Mrs Madigan create a brief, noisy happiness. But O'Casey undercuts it with Mrs Tancred's funeral passing below, an interruption that brings the outside world's grief into the room, and with Johnny's growing panic. In Act 3 the hope collapses:

Question number

the will is worthless because of Bentham's careless wording, Bentham has abandoned Mary, and the creditors close in. The stripping of the room of its furniture is a visual symbol of the family being returned, and worse, to where they began.

So who is most responsible? It could be argued that Johnny brings misery on himself by informing on Tancred, and that Bentham is to blame for both the will and Mary's desertion. However, O'Casey seems to place most responsibility on Boyle. He spends money on credit before it exists, he ignores Juno's warnings, he drinks with Joxer while the family suffers, and when Mary's pregnancy is revealed he rages about disgrace rather than comforting her. He is also absent from the extract, and that absence is telling: when his son is identified and his daughter is broken, he is drinking. Juno's decision that she and Mary will leave him shows that she, too, holds him responsible.

O'Casey reinforces this judgement in the final scene, which follows straight after the extract. Boyle and Joxer stagger into the bare room, oblivious to Johnny's death, and Boyle's drunken verdict that the world is in "a terr... ible state o' chassis" is grimly ironic, because much of the chaos is his own making. In conclusion, O'Casey shows that misery surrounds the Boyles from beginning to end, and the extract proves that even prayer cannot remove it. While the hatred of the wider world kills Johnny, it is Boyle's vanity and irresponsibility that ensure the family has nothing left to protect them.

2a Priestley presents Sheila as immature at the start of An Inspector Calls, but the play is structured so that her immaturity is the starting point of a moral journey rather than a fixed trait. I agree that she is immature in Act 1, childish in her

Question number

language, self-absorbed and quick to anger, yet by the end Priestley uses her as the most mature member of the family, someone who sees more clearly than the parents who still call her a "girl". The irony is that the adults, not Sheila, finish the play behaving like children.

In the opening scene Priestley establishes Sheila's youthfulness through her vocabulary and her place in the family. She calls her parents "mummy" and "daddy", and teases Eric that he is "squiffy", language that belongs to the nursery or the schoolroom rather than an engaged woman. Her mother's imperative "Now stop it, you two" treats Sheila and Eric as squabbling children, and Sheila's retort to her brother, "Don't be an ass, Eric", confirms the impression of sibling bickering. Even her playful warning to Gerald, "just you object!", is flirtatious rather than serious,.

The engagement ring is Priestley's clearest symbol of this early immaturity. The stage direction telling us that Sheila is still admiring her ring shows her absorbed by a beautiful object, and her pleasure in it suggests that the engagement is, at this stage, more about possessions and status than love. The later remark that the women have been left talking about clothes again adds to the picture of a sheltered girl whose interests are shallow. Birling's dismissive "Nothing to do with you, Sheila. Run along" shows how she is treated by her father, and perhaps explains why she has had little reason to grow up.

Her role in Eva Smith's story confirms the selfishness of a spoilt child. Sheila admits that she had Eva dismissed from Milward's because she was in a furious temper and saw the girl smile at a shop assistant when Sheila tried on a dress that did not suit her. Jealousy of Eva's prettiness, and a wish to punish her, make Sheila's behaviour look like a tantrum with devastating consequences. Her first

Question number

question about Eva, whether she was "pretty", is revealing, and her initial reaction to the news of her death, "It's a rotten shame", sounds glib. Priestley shows the danger of immaturity when it is combined with privilege: a moment of petulance cost a young woman her livelihood.

However, Priestley complicates this picture even in Act 1. When Birling describes sacking Eva for leading a strike, Sheila objects, insisting that the workers are not cheap labour but "people". This short, simple word carries great moral weight, and it shows that Sheila is already capable of seeing the humanity her father ignores. Her response to her own guilt is also strikingly different from his. Instead of blustering, she is genuinely distressed, runs out of the room in tears and later admits that she feels responsible. Her reaction may be emotional, but it is also honest, and honesty is the first sign of maturity in this play.

In Act 2 Sheila becomes the most perceptive character on stage. She is the first to grasp the Inspector's method, warning the others that "he knows", and her laughing remark that he is giving them the rope so that they will hang themselves shows a disturbing but accurate understanding of what is happening. Priestley gives her the role of a kind of chorus, warning her mother not to build up a wall between the family and the dead girl. The dramatic irony is strong: Mrs Birling ignores Sheila's warning and condemns the father of Eva's child, only to discover he is her own son. Sheila's maturity lies in her refusal to pretend.

Her treatment of Gerald also shows growth. She says she respects him more for being honest, yet she hands back the ring, recognising that they would have to start again and get to know each other. Her sharp image of Gerald as "the wonderful Fairy Prince" exposes the self-flattery in his rescue of Daisy Renton, and shows that she understands power and dependency in relationships. The return of

Question number

the ring is structurally significant: the object that she admired so childishly in Act I becomes a sign of her new seriousness.

The ending is where Priestley most clearly reverses the question of immaturity. When Gerald and Birling discover that there may be no Inspector and no single dead girl, the older generation relax and celebrate. Sheila refuses to join them, telling them that the point is that they do not seem to have learnt anything, and she describes their attitude as "childish". The adjective is deliberate. Priestley turns the accusation of immaturity back on the parents, who want to return to the comfort of the opening scene as though nothing has happened. When Gerald offers her the ring again, she says she "must think", a quiet response that contrasts sharply with her excitement in Act I. The final phone call, announcing that a girl has died and an inspector is on his way, proves her right.

In conclusion, I agree that Sheila is immature at the beginning of the play, but Priestley presents this immaturity in order to show how it can be outgrown. Through dramatic contrast with her parents and Gerald, he makes her the character who learns most, and by the final scene she is wiser and more responsible than anyone else on stage. Her journey suggests that it is the willingness to change, rather than age or status, that marks true maturity.

2b

In An Inspector Calls Priestley presents power as something the Birlings take for granted: the power of money, class, gender and age over those who have none. I largely agree that both Eric and Mr Birling use their power in selfish ways, and this extract, in which Eric confesses, exposes his abuse of power with uncomfortable clarity. However, Priestley draws an important distinction between them. Eric's selfishness is that of a careless young man who comes to feel shame,

Question number

while Birling's is a settled belief system that he defends to the very end.

The extract opens with the Inspector's brisk "Don't start on that. I want to get on", which shows where real authority now lies in the dining room. Priestley structures the scene as a question and answer interrogation, so that Eric's account is drawn out of him piece by piece. This form allows the audience to see the selfish logic of his behaviour exposed step by step. His admission that "I insisted" on going back to Eva's lodgings, and that he "threatened" to make a row, shows him using the power of a drunk, well-off young man over a vulnerable woman. The later detail that "she told me she didn't want me to go in" implies that Eva did not consent freely.

Eric's language reveals how he excuses himself. His phrase "I was in that state when a chap easily turns nasty" treats his behaviour as natural and typical of men, and the casual noun "chap" belongs to the comfortable world of his class. His repeated references to being drunk and to things being "very vague" suggest that he would rather not remember clearly. Priestley shows that Eric's power lies partly in his ability to forget: he "couldn't remember her name" and only "happened to see her again" by chance. Eva, by contrast, cannot forget, because she is left pregnant. Eric's admission that he "wasn't in love" but found her "pretty and a good sport" reduces her to an object of pleasure.

Mr Birling's power is visible in the extract too. He sharply orders his wife and Sheila out of the room. This could be read as protective, a father sparing the women from hearing something shocking, but it can also be seen as a desire to control the situation and limit the damage to the family's reputation. His harsh question, "So you had to go to bed with her?", is ironic because his concern is less with Eva than with the scandal. The most telling moment comes when Eric

Question number

admits that he took money: "I got it" from the office. When asked whether he stole it, Eric's evasive "Not really" closes the extract. The understatement shows how privilege has blurred his sense of right and wrong. He has taken money from the firm as if it were already his, which mirrors on a smaller scale the way his father treats the firm's workers.

Elsewhere, Priestley presents Birling's power as consistently selfish. In Act 1 he cannot resist talking about business at Sheila's engagement dinner, hoping that the match with "the son of Sir George Croft" will bring Crofts and Birlings closer together and secure "lower costs and higher prices". His speech that a man has to look after himself and his own, and his scorn for "community and all that nonsense", are interrupted by the doorbell, a structural device that suggests his philosophy is about to be challenged. His sacking of Eva shows the cruelty of his power. Although she was a good worker, he dismisses her for asking for higher wages, insisting that he was protecting his interests, and he refuses to accept any responsibility.

Eric, interestingly, uses his limited power differently in Act 1. He questions his father's treatment of Eva, asking why she should not try for higher wages, and points out that a worker cannot simply go and work somewhere else. Priestley shows that Eric has the beginnings of a conscience even before his own confession. His bitter attack on his father later in Act 3, saying he is not the kind of father a chap could go to when he is in trouble, suggests that Birling's selfishness has shaped his son. In this sense Eric is both an abuser of power and a product of a selfish household.

The Inspector acts as Priestley's moral voice in exposing all of this. His line "Public men, Mr Birling, have responsibilities as well as privileges" directly links power with

Question number	
	duty, and his accusation that the family used Eva as if she were "an animal, a thing, not a person" condemns their treatment of the powerless. Birling's response is to think of himself. He offers to pay thousands to undo the damage, and he laments the threat to the knighthood he was almost certain of, revealing that his reputation matters more than a girl's death. The ending sharply separates the two men. When it emerges that the Inspector may not have been real, Birling is jubilant and mocks the younger generation, returning to his old self. Eric refuses to do so, insisting that the girl is dead and that is what matters. Priestley rewards this: Eric, like Sheila, accepts responsibility, while Birling learns nothing and is left exposed by the final telephone call. In conclusion, I agree that both Eric and Mr Birling use their power selfishly, and the extract shows Eric's abuse of Eva in especially troubling terms. However, Priestley presents Eric as capable of change, so his selfishness is a failing he recognises. Birling's selfishness is deeper and more dangerous because it is a whole outlook on society, one that Priestley wants his audience to reject.
3a	Friel presents S.B. O'Donnell as a father who fails Gar in the one way that matters most to his son: he cannot speak to him. On the surface, then, it is easy to agree that S.B. is not a good father. He is cold, repetitive and locked in routine, and Gar's decision to emigrate is partly a flight from him. Yet Friel's dramatic methods, especially his stage directions and his use of Private Gar, allow the audience to see what Gar cannot: a well of unspoken love beneath S.B.'s silence. I would argue that S.B. is not a bad father so much as an inarticulate one, and that the tragedy lies in the failure of communication on both sides.

Question number

From his first entrance Friel presents S.B. as a man defined by habit. On Gar's last evening he asks, as if it were any other day, "How many coils of barbed wire came in on the mail-van this evening?" The question is mundane and practical, and its timing is painful: this is the night before his only son leaves for America, yet S.B. talks of stock. His phrases are so predictable that Private can anticipate them, announcing the next phrase before S.B. says it, including "Another day over" and "I suppose we can't complain". This device is comic, but it is also sad, because it shows that Gar has learned his father's speech by heart while never hearing anything personal in it. Friel uses the split between Public and Private to show how much remains unsaid in their relationship.

Friel develops this through the ritual of meals. The tea scenes, with their long silences, are made ironic by Private's sarcastic remark that the chatting in this place would deafen a body. Private's mocking fantasies, in which he imagines interrupting the silence with outrageous announcements, emphasise the emptiness of the real conversation. Madge, who acts as a surrogate mother, expresses the audience's frustration when she says that the house will be quiet soon enough, long enough. Her repetition gives a gentle reproach to both men: time is running out, and neither of them is using it.

The Canon's visit shows S.B.'s silence most painfully. As the two old men play draughts, Gar's departure is barely mentioned. When the Canon asks about the evening, S.B. replies with remarks such as "Living away as usual. Not a thing happening", as though nothing unusual were about to occur. Private's furious appeal to the Canon, asking him to translate S.B.'s feelings because he is the one person who could, shows how desperately Gar wants his father to break through. Here S.B. hides behind routine when his son most needs a word of love.

Question number

The night scene in Episode III is the emotional climax of their relationship, and here Friel complicates the picture. Gar, unable to sleep, tries to share a memory of a day when he and his father went fishing in a blue boat and S.B. sang to him. It is Gar's most open attempt at intimacy. S.B., however, fixes on the wrong details, the colour of the boat and the name of the song, and cannot remember the moment at all. His reply when Gar offers him another cup, "Sure you know I never take a second cup", repeated by Friel, shows him retreating into habit even when his son reaches out. But his halting remark, "It's hard to sleep sometimes", trailing off into silence, suggests that he too is troubled by Gar's leaving, even if he cannot say why.

Friel's stage directions reveal what S.B.'s words conceal. At one point he looks down at his newspaper and the audience see that it has been upside down, a comic detail exposing his distress. After a conversation in which he has said nothing of his feelings, he looks across at Gar's bedroom, sighs and exits very slowly. These moments, which Gar never sees, allow the audience to feel sympathy for S.B. and to recognise that his love is real.

The most moving evidence comes in his conversation with Madge near the end of the play. S.B. recalls Gar as a small boy in a sailor suit, walking with him "the two of us, hand in hand, as happy as larks". His memory of their closeness is tender, and the simile suggests a lost innocence. Strikingly, it echoes Gar's own memory of the boat: both father and son hold on to a moment of happiness, but they cannot share it. S.B.'s question, "Maybe, Madge, maybe it's because I could have been his grandfather, eh?", shows an awareness of the gap between them, and the hesitant repetition of "maybe" suggests regret. Madge's reflection that Gar will one day become just like his father deepens the tragedy, implying that the silence will be inherited.

Question number

Some readers might still hold S.B. responsible, since a parent ought to make the first move. Yet Friel shows Gar also failing: he mocks his father privately and asks only for a memory that S.B. cannot supply, rather than telling him plainly that he will miss him. Even so, Gar still wants to be told if his father got sick or anything, a sign of enduring fondness.

In conclusion, I only partly agree that S.B. is not a good father. Friel presents him as emotionally limited, trapped by routine and unable to express love, and these failures contribute to Gar's need to escape. However, through stage directions and S.B.'s private memories, Friel reveals a father who loves his son deeply but has no language for it. The play's sadness lies not in a lack of love but in two people who cannot reach each other before it is too late.

3b

Friel presents America as a land of opportunity in Gar's imagination, a place of jets, money and freedom, set against the narrow routines of Ballybeg. Yet the play repeatedly questions whether those opportunities are real. In this extract, the memory of the Sweeneys' visit, America is advertised most loudly by Aunt Lizzy, but her performance collapses into tears. I only partly agree that life in America will offer better opportunities. Friel suggests that it will offer Gar more freedom and a chance to escape, but not necessarily a better or happier life, because what Gar lacks is not so much opportunity as connection.

The extract shows Lizzy selling America to Gar with almost desperate enthusiasm. Her scornful "Typical Irish!" at his hesitation presents Ireland as a place of indecision and missed chances, while her claim that "America's Gawd's own country" turns the country into a promised land. Friel gives Lizzy a breathless,

Question number

rambling style full of lists, as she urges her husband, "You tell him the set-up we have", and boasts of their "many good, dear, kind friends in the US". The accumulation of adjectives sounds less like description than like advertising. Her sarcastic question, "What are you waiting for? For S.B. to run away to sea?", makes staying in Ballybeg seem absurd and implies that Gar's life there has no future.

However, Friel undercuts Lizzy's promises at every turn. Her motive is revealed in her admission that she has "an interest in him", that Gar is "the only nephew I have". The opportunity she offers is partly a way of filling the gap in her own childless life. Friel also contrasts her with the two men. Ben Burton's quiet remark that America is "just another place to live" punctures the dream, and Con's halting "what's the difference?", with its broken, dashed syntax, suggests that he cannot honestly say what Lizzy wants him to say. Lizzy's constant appeals to her husband, "Right, honey?", reveal insecurity beneath the confidence, as if she needs others to confirm that her life is good.

Friel adds dark comedy to show Lizzy's unreliability. She accuses Ben and Con of being drunk when she herself is clearly tipsy, and when she lists the sisters who have died she includes herself, prompting the correction "Honey, you're not dead" and her indignant protest. The humour is uncomfortable, because it suggests a woman confused about her own life. As the stage directions build her emotion, she approaches Gar now with growing urgency, kissing him and describing the comforts of their home in increasingly romantic terms. The climax comes when she admits that it is all so "Gawd-awful because we have no one to share it with us", and the final stage direction, She begins to sob, overturns everything she has said. Materially, America has given the Sweeneys plenty; emotionally, it has left them lonely. Friel makes the audience wonder whether Gar is being offered opportunity

Question number

or simply a different kind of emptiness.

Elsewhere in the play, Friel does show why America appeals. The opening of Episode 1 is full of energy as Gar celebrates his departure, singing "Philadelphia, here I come" and fantasising about the jet carrying him away over Ireland. Private's vivid imagery of the plane is exhilarating and suggests release and freedom. Against this, Friel sets the drudgery of Gar's life in the shop: weighing flour, salting fish and unloading barbed wire, all overseen by a father who speaks only in set phrases. The daily rituals of the Rosary, the tea and the Canon's draughts present Ballybeg as a world where nothing changes, and Gar's fear is that he will become as trapped as the older men around him.

The boys also confirm the lack of opportunity at home. Ned, Tom and Joe arrive to say goodbye but spend their time boasting about imagined exploits with girls, stories that Private, and the audience, can see are exaggerated. Friel presents them as young men who have nowhere to go, wasting their energy on fantasy. Gar's lost love, Kate Doogan, shows a further limit of Ballybeg: her father, the Senator, considers Gar unsuitable, and she marries the doctor instead. In the memory scene with Kate, Gar's outburst that he hates the place and "every stone, and every rock, and every piece of heather around it" shows the bitterness of a young man denied the chance to marry and prosper.

Yet Friel also questions what Gar will find in America. The low-level job awaiting him is hardly a dramatic step up from the shop, and the Sweeneys' world, as the extract shows, is comfortable but hollow. More importantly, Gar's Private self is full of nostalgia. He clings to memories of the blue boat and his father's song, of Kate, and of his mother, and these moments suggest that what he wants most is love and recognition, which no country can guarantee. The ending is deliberately

Question number

unresolved. When Private asks why he has to leave, Public can only answer "I don't know", a confession that undermines the confident dream of opportunity with which the play began.

In conclusion, I agree that America offers Gar opportunities Ballybeg cannot: escape from a stifling routine, a chance to earn money and a life away from his father's silence. However, Friel presents these opportunities as uncertain and possibly illusory. Through Lizzy's breakdown in the extract and Gar's final uncertainty, he suggests that emigration may solve the problem of a small place without solving the deeper problem of loneliness, which Gar will carry with him across the Atlantic.

4a I agree only to a limited extent that Mrs Johnstone is responsible for her own sufferings. Russell certainly shows her making choices that lead to pain, from the hire purchase catalogue to the moment she agrees to give away a twin. However, he deliberately frames these choices within a world of poverty, class and superstition that seems to have decided her fate before she makes them. By the end of the play, I think Russell wants the audience to see her less as the author of her own misery and more as its victim, someone whose mistakes are small compared with the forces that crush her.

There is evidence early in the play that Mrs Johnstone contributes to her difficulties. In her opening song she remembers how she was told she had "legs like Marilyn Monroe", and the Marilyn motif, which returns throughout, presents her as a dreamer who fell for romance without thinking of consequences. She married young and had a large family quickly, and her daughter repeats the pattern: "Our Donna Marie's already got three, she's a bit like me that way". The

Question number

casual tone here suggests that she accepts this cycle rather than questioning it. Her attitude to money is presented in the same way. She admits that "When y' look in the catalogue an' there's six months to pay, it seems years away", and the stretched-out phrase "years away" captures her habit of postponing reality. When the Milkman threatens that "either you pay up today, like now, or I'll be forced to cut off your deliveries", the audience may feel that her debt is partly of her own making.

The central decision of the play, giving away one of the twins, can also be read as her responsibility. Russell's stage direction that "Mrs Johnstone nods but is still uncomfortable" suggests that she knows the bargain is wrong, yet she lacks the strength to resist. She swears on the Bible, and later she is easily controlled by Mrs Lyons's invented superstition that if the twins learn the truth they will die. Her own superstitions, such as her horror of "shoes on the table", make her vulnerable to manipulation. She even seems to recognise her own weakness when she says "I know I shouldn't... But I do". Russell gives her this self-awareness so that her choices cannot be dismissed as ignorance, which strengthens the argument that she shares some blame.

However, Russell surrounds these choices with circumstances that make her responsibility much smaller. Her husband has walked out, and she is left alone, pregnant, with seven children. The offstage voices of the children complaining that they are "starvin'" and the stage direction that she is "aged thirty but looks more like fifty" show the audience, physically and aurally, how exhausting her life is. Russell's props, a brush, dusters and a mop bucket, define her by labour. When the Welfare threatens that some of her children should be put "into care", her decision to give Edward to Mrs Lyons begins to look less like selfishness and more like a desperate attempt to give one child a better life. Mrs Lyons exploits this, first by

Question number

tempting her with the promise that the baby would have everything, and later by sacking her and accusing her: "you sold your baby". The cruelty of that accusation shifts much of the guilt onto the wealthier woman who planned the deal.

Russell also uses the treatment of the two mothers to show that class, not character, determines suffering. The Policeman warns Mrs Johnstone, "Either keep them in order, Missis, or it'll be the courts for you", yet he chats politely with Mr Lyons about the same incident and treats Edward's behaviour as a prank. The parallel scenes encourage the audience to see that the Johnstones are punished more harshly simply because they are poor. Even when Mrs Johnstone seems to take control at the start of Act Two, moving to the country, paying her bills and happily shouting at Sammy to "Get off that bleedin' cow", the improvement does not last. Sammy's crimes, Mickey's unemployment and his imprisonment show that a fresh start cannot protect her family from the wider economic decline Russell presents.

The structure of the play is perhaps the strongest argument against her responsibility. Russell opens with the ending: the two dead brothers and the Narrator's question about the story of the Johnstone twins. Because the audience knows the outcome from the first moment, the tragedy feels inevitable, and the Narrator's sinister refrains about the devil and paying the bill turn her choices into steps along a path already laid out. At the climax her desperate plea and her confession that she gave Edward away come too late, and her final song "Tell Me It's Not True" expresses grief so complete that blame seems irrelevant. The Narrator's closing question, whether we should blame superstition, or "what we, the English, have come to know as class", directs the audience away from her personal failings and towards society.

Question number

In conclusion, Mrs Johnstone is partly responsible for her sufferings: she is impulsive with money, weak in the face of Mrs Lyons and too indulgent with her children. Yet Russell presents these as the ordinary mistakes of a warm-hearted woman under impossible pressure. Through staging, song, parallel scenes and a circular structure, he suggests that the real cause of her suffering is a class system that leaves her few real choices, so I agree with the statement only to a small degree.

4b

Russell presents Edward and Linda as genuinely good friends for most of the play: warm, honest and loyal to one another across the class divide that separates the Johnstones and the Lyonses. However, he also shows that their friendship is complicated by unspoken love, and when that love is finally acted upon it becomes a betrayal of Mickey with tragic consequences. I therefore agree that they are good friends to each other, but I think Russell suggests their closeness ultimately makes them poor friends to Mickey.

The extract opens with a quiet, intimate image as Edward waits alone "by a street lamp", and Linda's greeting immediately establishes the ease between them: "Well, hallo, sweetie pie; looking for a good time?" The mock flirtation is playful, and the stage direction that "She laughs" shows that this is a relationship comfortable enough for teasing. Her next question, "What's wrong with you, misery?", is affectionate rather than rude; the nickname shows that she reads his mood instantly, which is a sign of real friendship. Edward's reluctance to share his news, shown in the stage direction "after a pause", reveals how much he values her company. He confesses, "I've been pretending that if I didn't mention it the day would never come", and the childlike logic of the line reminds the audience how long they have known each other and how painful separation is for him.

Question number

Linda's response, "Tomorrow! You didn't say", conveys genuine shock, and the exclamation suggests that she too will miss him. Edward's request "Can I write to you?" is gentle and tentative, and her reply, "Yeh... yeh, if you want", is softened by the ellipsis, which creates a comforting, reassuring tone. Russell builds the warmth of the scene through shared laughter, with the stage direction "laughing" applied to both of them, so that they seem perfectly in tune. Edward's admission "I love it when we're together" is honest and open, yet he still holds back the full extent of his feelings.

The most important dramatic technique in the extract is Edward's song, "I'm Not Saying a Word". The lyric "If I was him I'd bring you flowers" shows his consideration for Linda and his frustration that Mickey does not appreciate her. Yet the repeated refusal to speak, "But I'm not saying a word", is a kind of loyalty: Edward is deliberately silencing his own feelings because Linda is his blood brother's girl. The dramatic irony is powerful, because the song lets the audience hear what Linda cannot, including the line "I'd just tell you that I love you if it was me". Russell uses the song form to expose a subtext that the friendship cannot yet contain. Even Edward's adaptation of a Shakespearean sonnet, ending on "summer's day", turns a romantic declaration into a joke between friends, which allows him to express affection safely. His honesty, "If I was Mickey I would have asked you years ago", is met with Linda's fond put-down, "I know you would. Cos y' soft you are", and her humorous frustration that Mickey will "be a pensioner before he gets around to it" shows she trusts Edward enough to share her feelings about Mickey. At this point Edward is a good friend precisely because he urges her towards Mickey rather than himself, and earlier he even persuades Mickey to ask her out.

Question number

Elsewhere, Russell presents the origins of the friendship in childhood. Linda welcomes Edward without suspicion, "Hi-ya, Eddie", and shares Sammy's airgun with him, showing that children ignore the class barriers that adults enforce. However, the friendship is not always perfect. When the Policeman catches them, Linda claims, "He's not with us", a moment of disloyalty that, although childish, hints that she can abandon Edward when it suits her. In the teenage summer sequence Edward, Mickey and Linda are presented as a happy trio, and the Narrator's warning that it cannot last casts a shadow over their friendship.

The real test of the friendship comes in Act Two. When Edward returns from university, he finally declares, "I've always loved you, you must have known that", and Linda turns him down because she loves Mickey. This shows that their friendship can survive honesty. Later, when Mickey is depressed and dependent on pills, Linda turns to Edward for help, phoning to ask, "Could I talk to Councillor Lyons, please?". Some may argue that she is using his power to get her family a house and Mickey a job, but I think Russell presents her as desperate rather than calculating. The friendship then becomes an affair: the stage direction "Suddenly they kiss" marks the moment friendship tips into romance, and Mrs Lyons uses it to destroy them all.

In the final scene Edward insists to Mickey that "Linda and I are just friends", and Mickey's bitter question about how Edward got "everything" while he got "nothing" exposes the cost. Edward and Linda have been good friends to each other, offering comfort and kindness, but their friendship has excluded and betrayed Mickey. Russell suggests that in a society divided by class, even the best friendships can be distorted, and so I agree that they are good friends, but only in a limited and finally destructive way.

Question number

Sa

Sherriff certainly presents Raleigh as immature when he first arrives in the dugout: he is boyish, naive and still living in the world of school. However, I would argue that Sherriff does not leave him there. Over the course of the play Raleigh's innocence is gradually stripped away by the reality of the trenches, and by the end his immaturity has become something closer to a painful, hard-won understanding. I agree that he is immature, but Sherriff uses that immaturity deliberately, as a measure of what the war destroys.

From his first entrance Raleigh is defined by his youth. The stage directions describe him as a "healthy-looking boy", and the noun "boy" sets him apart from the exhausted men around him. His language is full of public school slang such as "Rather" and "I say", which makes him sound as if he is still on the playing fields rather than at the front. When Osborne offers him a drink, he accepts "hastily", saying "just a small one, sir", and his eagerness to fit in shows a young man anxious to please. Most revealing is his delight at being placed under Stanhope: "It's a frightful bit of luck". The comic incongruity of calling a posting to the front line "luck" shows how little he understands of what lies ahead. For the audience, who know the date of the German offensive, his enthusiasm is painfully ironic.

Raleigh's immaturity is most obvious in his hero worship of Stanhope. He remembers him as "skipper of Rugger" at school, and he assumes that their relationship will simply continue in France as it did at home. He expects to be welcomed, but Stanhope is cold and even furious that Raleigh has requested to join his company. Sherriff uses this contrast between Raleigh's expectations and Stanhope's reality to reveal how naive the younger man is. Raleigh is shocked by Stanhope's drinking, and he does not seem to grasp that three years at the front have changed his friend. His letter home, in which he writes that Stanhope makes the men keen "like he did the kids at school", shows how completely he still sees

Question number

the war through the lens of school. He fails to anticipate that his letter will be censored, and his embarrassment when Stanhope demands to read it suggests a boy who does not yet understand the rules of the adult world he has entered. The scene is skilfully structured: Stanhope expects criticism and Osborne reads aloud only praise, so Raleigh's innocence exposes Stanhope's paranoia.

Sherriff also shows Raleigh's immaturity through his relationship with Osborne, who acts as a father figure. Osborne, called "Uncle" by the others, quietly takes him under his wing, explaining the trenches and talking to him about rugby and home. Raleigh's sense of wonder, as when he calls the front line "An amazing trench", reveals a schoolboy's curiosity. When he is chosen for the raid his reaction is excitement: he imagines "How topping" it would be if he and Osborne both win the Military Cross. The childish adjective "topping" clashes with the deadly purpose of the raid, and Sherriff makes the audience fear for him.

However, Sherriff complicates this view. Raleigh's comments that "The Germans are really quite decent, aren't they?" and that it "all seems rather silly" are expressed in naive language, yet they contain a mature insight into the futility of the war, an insight that older characters cannot afford to voice. After the raid, in which Osborne is killed, Raleigh enters "as though he were asleep", and the stage direction shows how the shock has shattered his innocence. His refusal to join the officers' celebratory dinner, choosing instead to eat with the men, is presented by Stanhope as insubordination, but the audience may see it as a moral response more mature than Stanhope's drunken attempt to forget. When Stanhope explodes that he drinks to forget and Raleigh realises how much Osborne meant to him, Raleigh begins to understand the strain that has changed his hero.

The ending brings both readings together. Mortally wounded, Raleigh compares his

Question number

injury to a rugby knock: "I got kicked in just the same place at rugger". The comparison shows that he still interprets experience through childhood, and it is heartbreaking because he does not realise he is dying. Yet he also says "I feel rotten lying here" while others are fighting, which shows courage and a sense of duty. His request "Can you stay for a bit?" and his use of Stanhope's first name, Dennis, return him to the vulnerability of a child seeking comfort. Sherriff's use of the single candle, which goes out as Raleigh dies, creates a quiet, intimate image of a young life extinguished.

In conclusion, Raleigh is immature in his language, his hero worship and his romantic view of war. However, I think Sherriff presents this immaturity sympathetically rather than critically. It allows the audience to see the war through fresh eyes, and the speed with which Raleigh's innocence is destroyed becomes Sherriff's most moving indictment of a conflict that sent boys to do men's work.

5b Sherriff presents the soldiers' lives as brutal, but the brutality is rarely shown directly. Instead it is concealed beneath politeness, routine and forced cheerfulness, and it comes most of all from a military system that treats men as expendable. I largely agree that the soldiers are treated in a brutal way, although Sherriff also shows small comforts and acts of kindness that make the men's suffering more bearable, and more moving.

The extract, in which the Colonel visits before the raid, shows brutality disguised as normality. It begins with a silence: "There is a pause. The COLONEL sucks hard at his pipe. STANHOPE roves restlessly." These stage directions create tension without a word being spoken. The Colonel's sucking at his pipe suggests discomfort

Question number

he cannot express, while Stanhope's restless movement shows his barely controlled anger at a raid he believes is suicidal. Sherriff relies on body language because the men cannot openly say what they feel; the code of the officer class forbids it.

The Colonel's language repeatedly minimises the danger. His comment "After all, it's only sixty yards" uses the casual "After all" to make a journey across No Man's Land sound like a short stroll. Stanhope reports that he has chosen men who are "All youngsters. Strong, keen chaps", and the Colonel's hesitation, marked by "Another pause", suggests he understands that young men are being chosen because they are less likely to hesitate, not because they are more likely to survive. When the Colonel says he would "give anything to cancel the beastly affair", the schoolboy adjective "beastly" is shockingly inadequate for an operation that will kill men, and his helplessness shows that brutality comes from above, from the Brigadier and the staff who will not change their plans.

The attempts at encouragement are equally hollow. The men are given rum, which Sherriff presents as a way of dulling their fear rather than removing the danger. Stanhope explains how the men view the red rags hung on the gap in the wire: "They naturally take it as a joke". This shows how humour is used as protection, but it also suggests that the soldiers are being kept from understanding how exposed they are. The Colonel's question "Are they cheerful?" reveals priorities that seem almost absurd, and his parting words, "Well, good luck, Osborne. I'm certain you'll put up a good show", reduce a deadly attack to the language of a school sports match. The brutal reality breaks through when he awkwardly asks the officers to empty their pockets in case of capture. The stage direction "There is an awkward pause" and the fact that Osborne hands his personal belongings to Stanhope foreshadow his death, and the props become symbols of a life that is about to end. Even the Colonel's instruction about prisoners, "One'll do, but bring

Question number

more if you see any handy", treats human beings like objects to be collected.

Elsewhere, Sherriff shows that brutality is part of daily life in the trenches. Hardy's report at the start, "They simply blew us to bits yesterday", is delivered cheerfully, and the gap between the violent image and the casual tone shows how normal horror has become. Stanhope, who has been at the front since he left school, has "stuck it till his nerves have got battered to bits", and his drinking is presented as the only way he can survive. Hibbert's suffering is treated without sympathy: Stanhope calls him "Another little worm trying to wriggle home" and threatens to shoot him rather than let him leave. This shows how the system forces even decent men to behave brutally towards each other. Private letters are censored, so the men cannot even express their feelings freely, and the knowledge that they will be "in the front row of the stalls" for the German attack gives the whole play a sense of doom.

However, Sherriff also shows that the soldiers' lives are not unrelievedly brutal. The officers have a servant in Mason, who brings soup, cutlets and tinned fruit, and the comic business about pepper and the wrong kind of pineapple, along with Trotter's horror at "war without pepper", provides humour that keeps them sane. Meals create a sense of civilised routine, and friendships such as that between Osborne and Raleigh, or Stanhope's care for Raleigh as he dies, show tenderness surviving in the dugout. Even Stanhope tries to spare Raleigh from the raid, suggesting that individuals resist the brutality where they can. Yet these comforts can be read as a mask. After the raid, the officers drink champagne while Osborne and several men lie dead, and the Colonel's interest in the information gained from the prisoner rather than in the cost shows how lives are weighed against results.

The ending makes the brutality unmistakable. As the German attack begins,

Question number

Sherriff's staging, with shells, flashes of light and the collapse of the dugout, destroys the enclosed world the audience has come to know. Raleigh dies quietly by candlelight, and then Stanhope goes up to his own likely death. In conclusion, I strongly agree that the soldiers are treated brutally: not mainly by the enemy, but by a command system that sends young men forward with rum, red rags and polite words. Sherriff's understated methods make that brutality all the more powerful.

6a

Stephens presents Christopher as someone for whom change is genuinely frightening, and the play repeatedly shows him overwhelmed when his routines are broken. However, I only partly agree that he is "unable to cope". Stephens structures the play as a journey in which Christopher meets one disruption after another, and although each one causes him distress, he develops his own methods of surviving them. By the end, the play suggests that he can cope, not in the way other people would, but in a way that is entirely his own.

The opening scene immediately presents a disruption to the ordered world Christopher values. The discovery of Wellington, the dead dog, is followed by the arrival of Mrs Shears shouting at him, and the stage directions show that Christopher puts his hands over his ears and begins groaning. These physical responses suggest that he cannot filter out noise and emotion when they arrive suddenly. When the policeman tries to lift him, Christopher screams and hits him, which leads to his arrest. Stephens begins the play at a moment of crisis so that the audience sees, from the first scene, how violently change can affect him. Yet even here Christopher states the facts plainly, "The dog is dead", and "I think someone killed the dog", which shows that his logical mind is already trying to impose order.

Question number

His relationship with his father shows how small changes in communication cause conflict. Ed often loses patience when Christopher will not let a subject drop, snapping "I said leave it for God's sake", and Christopher's silence or literal replies frustrate him further. For Christopher, the investigation into Wellington's death is itself a way of coping: it turns an upsetting event into a puzzle, and puzzles have solutions. Stephens uses Siobhan as a narrator who reads from Christopher's book, and this framing device reminds the audience that he processes experience by writing it down in a precise, factual way. Details such as playing "six games of Tetris" show his comfort in exact numbers and routine.

The greatest difference in Christopher's life comes when he finds his mother's letters and learns that she is alive. Stephens presents this as a breakdown: Christopher rolls himself into a ball, hitting his hands, feet and head against the floor, and later Ed confesses that he killed Wellington. The double shock destroys his trust in the one person who keeps his life ordered. In this sense, Christopher clearly cannot cope; the stage becomes a space of physical distress. The letters also reveal earlier failures to cope, such as the argument in which Christopher threw a chopping board and broke Judy's foot, which suggests that changes in family life have always caused him overwhelming anger and confusion.

Yet the response that follows is remarkable. Rather than staying in a house where he feels unsafe, Christopher decides to travel to London alone. The journey is presented through bold staging: the station is crowded with a chaos of voices, signs and announcements, and the ensemble physically surrounds him. Christopher is bewildered and tries to run, and on the train he wets himself because he cannot bring himself to leave his seat. These moments show the toll that an unfamiliar environment takes. However, he copes by using his own strategies: he counts,

Question number

recites prime numbers, and describes everything he can see in exhaustive detail. Stephens's use of ensemble movement and overlapping voices lets the audience experience the sensory overload from Christopher's point of view, so we admire the effort it takes him to keep going. When Toby escapes onto the Underground tracks, he climbs down to rescue him without seeming to recognise the danger, which suggests that his focus can be both a strength and a risk.

Arriving at his mother's flat is another huge change. Christopher has to live in a strange place with Judy and Roger, and he insists that he must return to Swindon to sit his A level Maths. His determination to keep this fixed point in his life shows how routine anchors him. Judy leaves Roger and brings him home, and although he cannot cope with Ed at first, the relationship is slowly rebuilt, symbolised by the gesture in which they touch fingers. Ed's gift of a puppy is a step-by-step approach to trust which Christopher can accept.

The ending shows how far he has come. He sits the exam and succeeds, and his question to Siobhan about whether this means he "can do anything" presents a new confidence. Stephens ends the play with his excited explanation of a maths problem, returning him to a world of logic where he is the expert.

In conclusion, Christopher finds change extremely difficult, and Stephens's staging of his screams, groaning and physical collapse makes that difficulty vivid. However, the play's structure shows him surviving every disruption, from a murder mystery to a journey across London, by using strategies others might not understand. I therefore agree only partly: Christopher struggles to cope with differences, but he is far from unable to cope.

Question number

6b

Stephens presents Christopher's family life as strained, painful and often unhappy, shaped by secrets, broken marriages and the exhaustion of parents who do not always know how to reach their son. However, I do not agree that it is always unhappy. Beneath the conflict, Stephens shows a family held together by love, and the play's structure moves from a home damaged by lies towards a fragile but real reconciliation.

The extract opens with an accusation. Ed's question, "Where have you been?", is abrupt and demanding, and it immediately establishes tension. The audience senses that Ed's anger comes from fear as much as from irritation, since Christopher has been out alone questioning the neighbours. Ed is exasperated by Christopher's determination to find out who killed Wellington, and his language becomes increasingly harsh, with phrases such as "What the hell" and the instruction to "keep your nose out". These blunt, colloquial phrases show a father whose patience is wearing thin.

The emotional peak of the extract comes when Christopher mentions Mr Shears. Ed's sudden outburst, "I will not have that man's name mentioned in my house", is far more intense than anything before it. The formal, controlled syntax and the possessive "my house" suggest a man defending the last part of his life he can control. The audience does not yet know why the name provokes such fury, and Stephens uses this dramatic mystery to hint at a hidden wound in the family. The stage direction "Beat" halts the action, giving the audience a moment to feel the shock, and the instruction that "Everybody on stage pauses" draws the whole ensemble into the tension so that we feel it too. Ed's use of imperatives, such as "You are to stop this", and his repetition of "please" reveal not just anger but weariness, as though he is pleading with Christopher rather than ordering him.

Question number

Yet the extract is not only unhappy. Ed's vocabulary is simple and direct, as he tries to speak in a way his son will understand, and this effort shows how much Christopher matters to him. Christopher responds to the pressure by changing the subject to astronauts, and Siobhan, as narrator, shares his fantasy of being alone in a spacecraft, communicating only by radio. Her line that "it would be a Dream Come True" is gentle and affectionate. Stephens may be suggesting that Christopher dreams of escape from the difficulties of home, but the narrative frame also shows that he has a safe adult in Siobhan who understands him. Ed's final request that he "give it a bit of a break, mate" is softened by the word "mate", which suggests that, even at his most frustrated, Ed is trying to be kind.

Elsewhere, Stephens reveals the reasons for the unhappiness. Christopher discovers letters from his mother, Judy, which show that she did not die but left the family. Her letters admit that she was "not a very good mother" and explain her belief that "it would be better if I went". The epistolary form, with Judy's words often spoken on stage as Christopher reads, lets the audience hear her guilt and her love at the same time. Her account of the arguments and her broken foot shows how desperate family life had become before she left. When Ed then confesses that he lied about her death and killed Wellington in a moment of anger, family life seems to collapse completely, and Christopher's terror of his father is the darkest point of the play.

Life with Judy in London is not happy either. Christopher's arrival puts pressure on her relationship with Roger, who resents the disruption, and the cramped flat becomes a place of quarrelling. Stephens shows that a change of parent does not remove the strain, because the difficulties lie in the situation and in the adults' own limitations.

Question number

However, the play offers evidence of happiness and love throughout. Ed fights for Christopher's right to sit his A level Maths, showing fierce loyalty. Christopher's ordinary routines at home, such as making himself a raspberry milkshake and playing Tetris, suggest moments of contentment. The gesture of spreading their fingers to touch is a private language of love between Christopher and both parents, and it reminds the audience that affection exists even when words fail. In the final section Judy returns to Swindon, and Ed slowly earns back Christopher's trust, giving him a puppy and promising to spend time with him. Christopher's success in his exam and his belief that he "can do anything" end the play on a note of hope.

In conclusion, Christopher's family life is frequently unhappy: it is marked by deception, anger, separation and grief, and the extract captures how close Ed is to breaking. Yet Stephens presents this unhappiness as the result of two flawed but loving parents struggling with situations they cannot easily manage. Because love persists and the family begins to heal at the end, I disagree that family life is always unhappy, although it is certainly rarely easy.

7a

Wilder gives the Stage Manager a remarkable degree of control over the play as a piece of theatre: he builds the set, manages time, summons and dismisses characters and speaks the first and last words. However, I would argue that his control stops at the edge of the lives he presents. He can arrange how we see Grover's Corners, but he cannot change what happens to the people in it, and Wilder seems to want it this way, because the play's central idea is that ordinary life runs its course regardless of who is watching.

From the opening stage directions the Stage Manager is in charge of the theatre

Question number

itself. Wilder has him place tables and chairs on a bare stage and then look out at the audience as the latecomers find their seats, so before a word is spoken he is already watching us. His first speeches are full of precise, almost bureaucratic detail: "The name of the town is Grover's Corners", followed by the exact latitude and longitude. This factual, matter-of-fact tone suggests a guide who knows everything about his territory. The stage direction in which he stares at the scene and then looks at the audience for a minute shows that he controls the pace of the play, holding the action still until he is ready to let it begin. By breaking the fourth wall so openly, Wilder makes the Stage Manager the link between audience and stage, the one figure who belongs to both.

His control over time is the clearest sign of his power. He moves the action forward and back at will, telling us to "skip a few hours", and he begins Act 2 by announcing that three years have passed. He is even able to reveal the future in casual asides. When Joe Crowell delivers the paper, the Stage Manager tells us that Joe was clever, won a scholarship and was going to be a great engineer, "But the war broke out and he died in France". The flat, conversational delivery is chilling, and it shows that the Stage Manager stands outside time, seeing lives whole. Yet this moment also hints at the limits of his control: he knows Joe's fate but does nothing to alter it, and the bitter "All that education for nothing" sounds more like regret than authority.

The Stage Manager also directs other characters as a theatre director would. He dismisses Mrs Gibbs and Mrs Webb with "Thank you, ladies", and they gather up their things and leave as instructed. When Professor Willard lectures for too long, the Stage Manager cuts him off politely but firmly because "our time is limited", and he invites questions from planted members of the audience, managing their contributions. His abruptness, as in "Thank you! That'll do", reminds us that he

Question number

decides when a scene has served its purpose. In these moments he appears to control not just the staging but the flow of information, choosing what "we want" to know about the town.

He even steps into the action, taking on roles such as Mr Morgan the druggist and the minister at George and Emily's wedding. He admits that playing the minister "gives me the right to say a few more things about it", which is revealing: he uses roles to gain a platform for commentary rather than to steer the plot. As minister he reflects wearily that he has married over two hundred couples and wonders whether he believes in it, reducing marriage to "M marries N" and a list of what follows. Here he seems less a controller than a chorus, distanced and slightly sceptical, offering Wilder's philosophical view of the ordinary cycle of life.

The strongest argument against the statement comes in Act 3. The Stage Manager can grant Emily's wish to return to her twelfth birthday, and he can explain that "everybody knows in their bones that something is eternal", a speech that gives him an almost godlike omniscience. Yet he warns Emily against going back and she ignores him, and when she is there he cannot make her mother really look at her. Emily's anguished question about whether anyone realises life while they live it is answered by him with a simple "No", followed by a qualification about saints and poets. His knowledge is vast, but it brings no power to change human blindness. Even Emily's return to the dead is driven by her own realisation, not by his instruction.

The play ends as it began, with the Stage Manager alone, winding his watch and wishing the audience "Good night". Wilder frames the whole play with his voice, which shows how far he controls the structure. Overall, I agree that the Stage Manager controls the shape, pace and telling of the play, but not its events. He is

Question number

a narrator and guide who arranges our view of life in Grover's Corners, yet births, marriages and deaths happen as they would have happened anyway. Perhaps Wilder's deepest point is that no one, not even the man who runs the show, can control life; the most anyone can do is notice it.

7b

Wilder presents the ambitions of the younger generation in Our Town as modest, fragile and easily surrendered, and in that sense I largely agree that they do not achieve what they first set out to do. However, the play complicates the statement, because George and Emily exchange one kind of ambition for another: they give up the wider world for marriage, a farm and a settled life in Grover's Corners, and they do achieve that. The real question Wilder raises is whether their ambitions were ever truly their own, or simply what small town life expected of them.

At the start of the extract George's ambition to attend State Agricultural College is already wavering. He worries that "being away three years you'd get out of touch with things", and the verb phrase "get out of touch" suggests that his deepest attachment is to the familiar world of home rather than to learning. He tells Emily that "whenever I meet a farmer I ask him if he thinks it's important to go", which shows a boy searching for permission to abandon his plan. It is telling that he seizes on the view that "some of them say it's even a waste of time". Wilder presents George as eager to be talked out of his ambition, almost relieved to discover a reason to stay.

The dramatic techniques in the scene reinforce this hesitancy. The repeated pauses in the stage directions create an awkward rhythm, as if neither character can quite say what they mean, and George's broken, elliptical speech, as he talks about

Question number

being gone all that time and meeting other people, conveys a young man whose thoughts are running ahead of his words. His final admission, "I don't want to go away", is strikingly plain, a child's statement more than a reasoned decision. Emily tries to steady him with "maybe it's very important for you to go" and "I don't see why you have to decide right now", but her encouragement is half-hearted, and the audience senses that she does not really want him to leave either.

By the end of the extract ambition has been replaced entirely by love. George concludes that "new people aren't any better than old ones", a comforting generalisation that also closes the door on the wider world. When he begins "I'm going to tell you why I'm not going to Agriculture School", Wilder makes the link explicit: George's reason is "a person that you're very fond of". Emily's exclamations, "My!" and "George!", capture her surprise and delight, and her reply that she is fond of him now and always has been suggests that this outcome was always waiting for them. The setting adds irony, since the conversation takes place over strawberry ice cream sodas in Mr Morgan's drugstore, a symbol of innocent small town life, with the Stage Manager playing the druggist. The decision that shapes George's whole life is made almost casually, at a soda fountain, before he even realises he has no money to pay.

Elsewhere, Emily's ambitions follow a similar pattern. In Act I she is presented as clever and confident, declaring "I'm going to make speeches all my life", and she is described as one of the brightest girls to graduate from the high school. Yet she never speaks of college, and her anxious question to her mother, "Am I pretty enough", reveals that her real hopes are bound up with being attractive and getting married. Mrs Webb's view that she would "rather have my children healthy than bright" shows how little the older generation expect from the young, so Emily's potential is quietly redirected. Rebecca Gibbs offers a contrast: she counts her

Question number

money, dreams of the wider world, and we learn that she eventually moved away to Ohio and married an insurance man, so she at least achieves some escape.

The most poignant failed ambition belongs to Joe Crowell, whose future as a great engineer is cut short when he dies in France, prompting the Stage Manager's bitter comment, "All that education for nothing". Joe's fate shows that ambition can be defeated not only by choice but by history and chance, and Wilder places it in the casual opening scene so that it hangs over the whole play.

On the other hand, it could be argued that the younger generation achieve exactly what they want. George becomes a farmer, inheriting his uncle's farm, and in Act 3 Emily proudly tells Mrs Gibbs about their new barn and the cement drinking fountain for the stock. The Stage Manager's remark in Act 2 that High School Commencement is "the time most of our young people jump up and get married" presents marriage as the natural fulfilment of youth in Grover's Corners. Yet Emily dies in childbirth while still a young woman, and her return to her twelfth birthday in Act 3 reveals that she never truly appreciated life while living it. Her ambition for a happy future is fulfilled only briefly.

Overall, I agree that the younger generation largely do not achieve the ambitions they first express. Wilder suggests that the town's routines, its gender expectations and the comfort of the familiar gently absorb young people's dreams. Yet he does not present this as a tragedy so much as a truth about ordinary life: George and Emily trade large ambitions for small, precious ones, and the play asks the audience whether those small things, properly noticed, might be worth more.

8a Both Matthew Arnold's Dover Beach and Robert Frost's The Road Not Taken are

Question number

poems about doubt, but the doubts they explore operate on very different scales. Arnold's speaker doubts the meaning of the whole modern world, fearing that the loss of religious faith has left humanity in darkness, while Frost's speaker doubts a single personal choice and whether it can ever be justified. In both, however, a calm, beautiful setting gives way to uncertainty, and both speakers end by looking for something to hold on to.

Each poem begins in a peaceful landscape that seems to promise certainty. Arnold opens with "The sea is calm to-night", and the gentle adjectives "calm", "full" and "fair" create a scene of balance and tranquillity, addressed in the manner of a dramatic monologue to the speaker's beloved: "Come to the window". Frost's speaker similarly stands in a "yellow wood", an autumnal image that is attractive but also hints at change and decline. Yet in both poems doubt intrudes almost at once. Arnold's imperative "Listen!" shifts us from sight to sound, and the onomatopoeic "grating roar / Of pebbles" is harsh and unsettling. Frost's speaker is "sorry I could not travel both", and the long hesitation of "long I stood / And looked down one as far as I could" captures the paralysis of indecision. Each poet uses the landscape to externalise an inner uncertainty.

The nature of the doubt is where the poems differ most. Arnold widens his focus from the private to the universal. The rhythm of the waves, which "Begin, and cease, and then again begin", brings "The eternal note of sadness in", and the speaker recalls that Sophocles heard the same sound and thought of "the turbid ebb and flow / Of human misery". The sea becomes a metaphor for history, and then, in the extended metaphor of "The Sea of Faith", for religion. Faith was once "at the full", wrapping the earth "like the folds of a bright girdle furl'd", a simile that suggests something bright, protective and binding. Now the speaker hears only "Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar". The long vowels and the drawn out

Question number

phrase enact the slow retreat of the tide, and the bleak image of the "naked shingles of the world" leaves humanity exposed. Arnold's doubt is therefore spiritual and collective, a fear for the whole of civilisation.

Frost's doubt, by contrast, is intimate and practical, concerned with one decision. He insists the second road had "perhaps the better claim, / Because it was grassy and wanted wear", but immediately undermines himself: the passing there had worn them "really about the same", and both lay "In leaves no step had trodden black". The tentative "perhaps" and the corrective "really" reveal a speaker who cannot even be certain the choice was a real one. Whereas Arnold's doubts are expressed with sweeping, rhetorical grandeur, Frost's appear in quiet, conversational qualifications, which makes his uncertainty feel ordinary and recognisable.

Form reinforces these differences. Arnold writes in four irregular verse paragraphs with uneven line lengths and an unpredictable rhyme scheme, so the poem itself seems unsettled, its structure mirroring the loss of certainty it describes. Frost, in contrast, uses five tightly controlled stanzas with a regular ABAAB rhyme scheme. This order is ironic: the neat form suggests a confident speaker, yet the content is full of hesitation. One might argue that Frost's speaker imposes a tidy pattern on his life precisely because he doubts it.

Both poems end by facing the future, but with different consolations. Arnold turns to human love: "Ah, love, let us be true / To one another!" Personal faithfulness is offered in place of religious faith, but the consolation is fragile, because the world only "seems" a "land of dreams" and in fact has "neither joy, nor love, nor light". The final simile of "ignorant armies" that "clash by night" on a "darkling plain" is one of the darkest images in the anthology, suggesting confusion and violence without purpose. Frost's speaker imagines telling his story "with a sigh /

Question number

Somewhere ages and ages hence", and claims that taking "the one less traveled by" has "made all the difference". The "sigh" is ambiguous: it may be satisfaction or regret, and the pause created by the repeated "I" at the line break suggests he is constructing a story to justify a choice that was arbitrary. Arnold's speaker confronts doubt honestly; Frost's speaker perhaps learns to disguise it.

Context deepens both poems. Arnold is thought to have written Dover Beach around 1851, near the time of his honeymoon at Dover, which explains the tender address to his "love". The Victorian period saw growing religious doubt, intensified when Darwin's On the Origin of Species appeared in 1859, challenging the Biblical account of creation, and the poem was published in 1867 into a world anxious about faith. Frost wrote The Road Not Taken partly as a gentle joke about his friend Edward Thomas, who on country walks would always regret not choosing a different path. Thomas reportedly took the poem seriously, and soon afterwards enlisted and was killed in the First World War in 1917, a sad context that makes the poem's doubts about choice feel weightier.

Ultimately, both speakers are troubled by doubt and both reach for a personal response to it. Arnold's speaker doubts the very foundations of meaning and can only cling to love, whereas Frost's speaker doubts his own judgement and copes by turning his choice into a story. Arnold's poem feels more desolate, but Frost's is perhaps more unsettling, because it suggests that the certainty we claim about our lives may itself be an illusion.

8b

William Ernest Henley's Invictus and Ciaran Carson's Belfast Confetti both present speakers caught in frightening, threatening experiences, but they respond in opposite ways. Henley's speaker meets suffering with defiant, unshakeable control,

Question number

declaring that nothing can conquer his spirit, while Carson's speaker is overwhelmed and disoriented by the violence of a riot, losing control even of his own language and identity. One poem is a statement of mastery; the other is a record of panic.

Both poets present difficult experience through powerful imagery of darkness and violence. Henley opens with "Out of the night that covers me, / Black as the Pit from pole to pole", where the metaphor of night and the simile of the "Pit", with its suggestion of hell, make suffering seem total and inescapable. The phrase "from pole to pole" stretches the darkness across the whole world. Carson's opening is equally violent but far more concrete: "it was raining exclamation marks, / Nuts, bolts, nails, car-keys". The list of hard, everyday objects turned into weapons creates a sense of chaos, and the extended metaphor of punctuation makes the explosion itself "an asterisk on the map". Where Henley's darkness is abstract and spiritual, Carson's danger is physical, local and immediate.

The speakers' responses to hardship are strikingly different. Henley's speaker presents himself as stoical: "I have not winced nor cried aloud". The negative verbs emphasise what he refuses to do, and the alliteration of "bludgeonings" and "bloody" reproduces the blows he endures, yet the stanza ends with the triumphant caesura of "My head is bloody, but unbowed". The conjunction "but" turns the line from injury to defiance. Carson's speaker, by contrast, cannot hold himself together. He is "trying to complete a sentence in my head, but it kept stuttering", and the verb "stuttering" shows that fear has broken down his ability to think and speak. In Henley's poem "but" introduces resistance; in Carson's it introduces failure.

Structure and form reinforce these contrasting attitudes. Invictus is written in four

Question number

regular quatrains of iambic tetrameter with an alternate rhyme scheme, and this steady, marching rhythm reflects the speaker's self-discipline. Each stanza ends with a firm statement of strength, such as "Finds, and shall find, me unafraid", so the form itself seems to resist chaos. Belfast Confetti, on the other hand, uses long, sprawling lines and is broken up by full stops, fragments and lists: "A Saracen, Kremlin-2 mesh. Makrolon face-shields. Walkie-talkies." These clipped noun phrases, naming an armoured vehicle and riot gear, feel like the jerky impressions of someone glancing around in alarm. The poem's form enacts the very confusion Henley's form defeats.

Setting is also important. Henley's experience is internal and universal: the "place of wrath and tears" could be anywhere, and the "Horror of the shade" is death itself. Carson's experience is rooted in a specific place, the streets of Belfast. The speaker insists "I know this labyrinth so well", yet the familiar streets become a trap, and his question "Why can't I escape?" conveys helplessness. The irony that he is lost in his own neighbourhood, where "Every move is punctuated", suggests that conflict turns home into a maze. Henley faces difficulty alone and on his own terms, whereas Carson's speaker is at the mercy of forces around him.

The endings bring the contrast into sharp focus. Henley dismisses the religious threat of judgement, saying "It matters not how strait the gate", and concludes with the famous parallel statements "I am the master of my fate: / I am the captain of my soul". The repeated "I am" and the metaphors of master and captain give him complete authority over his life. Carson's poem ends in a storm of questions: "What is / My name? Where am I coming from? Where am I going?" The enjambment that splits "What is" from "My name" mimics the speaker's broken thought, and the questions suggest that the experience has shaken his sense of identity, perhaps reflecting how the questioning of individuals at

Question number

checkpoints made people feel their identities were under suspicion. The final metaphor, "A fusillade of question-marks", turns the questions themselves into gunfire. Henley ends with answers; Carson ends with questions.

Context explains much of this contrast. Henley wrote Invictus in 1875 while in hospital being treated for tuberculosis of the bone, after his foot had been amputated. Medical treatment was dangerous at the time, so the poem's defiance of death is grounded in real suffering, and the vague reference to "whatever gods may be" suggests a Victorian scepticism, finding strength in the self rather than God. He survived and went on to lead an active life, which makes his claim to be "unconquerable" feel earned. Carson, born in Belfast in 1948, wrote during the Troubles, when riots, bombings and army patrols were part of daily life. The title refers to the slang term for the scrap metal that shipyard workers threw in riots. The streets he names, such as Raglan and Inkerman, are named after battles of the Crimean War, so Belfast's history of imperial conflict is literally written into its map, adding to the sense that the speaker is trapped by forces far larger than himself.

In conclusion, both poets confront the terror of difficult experiences, but they offer opposite visions. Henley presents a speaker who masters suffering through willpower, rhythm and control, while Carson presents one who is overwhelmed, disoriented and silenced. Perhaps the contrast reflects their situations: Henley's struggle is a private battle with illness, where courage is a matter of attitude, whereas Carson's speaker is caught in a collective conflict where no individual can claim to be the master of his fate.

9a Both W H Auden's Funeral Blues and Tony Harrison's Long Distance II explore the

Question number

overwhelming grief caused by the death of a loved one, but they express it in very different registers. Auden's speaker responds with a public, dramatic outpouring, demanding that the whole world stop to mourn, while Harrison presents grief as private and quiet, seen in a father's small rituals of denial and in the speaker's own unspoken refusal to let go. Both poems suggest that death destroys the normal order of life, but Auden's speaker rages against that loss, whereas Harrison's characters try, sadly, to pretend it has not happened.

The openings set up this contrast immediately. Auden begins with a series of imperatives: "Stop all the clocks, cut off the telephone". The abrupt verbs "Stop", "cut off", "Prevent" and "Silence" create an urgent, commanding tone, as though the speaker can no longer bear the noise of ordinary life. The images of the "muffled drum" and the "coffin" suggest a solemn funeral procession, giving the death a dignified, almost military grandeur. Harrison, by contrast, begins with a plain statement of fact, "Though my mother was already two years dead", and then describes the father's habits: he "kept her slippers warming by the gas" and "put hot water bottles her side of the bed". The domestic details are tender and mundane. Whereas Auden's speaker wants time to stop, Harrison's father behaves as though time has not moved at all.

Both poets use everyday objects to convey grief, but to opposite effects. Auden magnifies them. The aeroplanes "circle moaning overhead", a personification that makes the whole sky seem to mourn, and they are "Scribbling on the sky the message He Is Dead". The capital letters and the blunt monosyllables turn the death into a public announcement, while the "crêpe bows" on the "public doves" and the policemen's "black cotton gloves" force the outside world into mourning dress. Harrison's objects, however, are hidden rather than displayed. Visitors "had to phone" first, so the father could "clear away her things and look alone", and the

Question number

comparison of his "still raw love" to "a crime" suggests he is ashamed of his grief, as if it must be concealed. Auden's speaker wants the world to see his loss; Harrison's father fears that it will.

The third stanza of Funeral Blues is the emotional heart of the poem. The series of metaphors, "He was my North, my South, my East and West, / My working week and my Sunday rest", presents the dead man as the speaker's entire world, the compass by which he found direction and the shape of every week. The list builds through "My noon, my midnight, my talk, my song" before collapsing in the stark admission "I thought that love would last for ever: I was wrong." The colon creates a painful, devastated pause. Harrison's equivalent moment is the father's belief that "very soon he'd hear her key / scrape in the rusted lock and end his grief". The image of the "rusted lock" quietly reveals the truth he denies: the door has not been opened for a long time. The colloquial line "He knew she'd just popped out to get the tea" is heartbreaking precisely because it is so ordinary.

Structure shapes the grief in both poems. Funeral Blues is written in four quatrains of rhyming couplets, and the regular, insistent rhymes give it the feel of a song or lament, fitting the "Blues" of its title. The final stanza escalates to hyperbole: "Pack up the moon and dismantle the sun; / Pour away the ocean". These impossible commands show that without the beloved, the universe itself is meaningless, ending in the absolute "nothing now can ever come to any good". Long Distance II is a sixteen line sonnet. The first three stanzas, about the father, rhyme in an alternate pattern, but the final stanza changes to an enclosed rhyme and shifts into the speaker's own voice. He insists "I believe life ends with death, and that is all", a flat, rational statement, but the conjunction "just the same" undoes it, and he confesses that he keeps his parents' "name" in his new phone book and rings "the disconnected number I still call". The twist reveals that the

Question number

son, who mocked his father's denial, grieves in exactly the same way, and the "disconnected number" captures the long distance between the living and the dead.

Context enriches both poems. Funeral Blues first appeared in 1936 in The Ascent of F6, a play Auden wrote with Christopher Isherwood, where it was a satirical lament for a politician. Auden later revised it as a sincere elegy, and it reached a huge audience when it was read at a funeral in the film Four Weddings and a Funeral in 1994. Harrison, born into a working class family in Leeds, wrote Long Distance II as part of his sonnet sequence The School of Eloquence, about his parents and his own education, which separated him from them. His father's private grief reflects a generation of working class men who were not expected to show emotion openly, while the son's educated certainty about death is shown to be no protection against love.

In conclusion, both speakers find that death shatters their world and cannot be accepted. Auden expresses this through grand, public, hyperbolic commands that demand the universe share his pain, while Harrison uses quiet domestic detail and a final confession to show grief persisting secretly in ordinary life. Auden's poem is perhaps more powerful in its immediate anguish, but Harrison's is more unsettling, because it shows how long grief lasts after the funeral is over.

9b

Shakespeare's Sonnet 130 and Andrew Marvell's To His Coy Mistress both present speakers with strong feelings for a woman, but they express those feelings in strikingly different ways. Shakespeare's speaker conveys a deep, honest love by refusing to flatter, mocking the exaggerated praise of conventional love poetry, whereas Marvell's speaker uses elaborate flattery, wit and then shocking imagery to pursue a passionate, urgent desire. One speaker's strong feeling is quiet devotion;

Question number

the other's is impatient longing.

Both speakers use comparison as their main method, but in opposite directions. Shakespeare opens with "My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun", deliberately overturning the Petrarchan habit of comparing a lover's eyes to the sun. Line after line, nature outshines her: "Coral is far more red than her lips' red", and in some perfumes there is "more delight / Than in the breath that from my mistress reeks". The verb "reeks" is shockingly blunt, and the comparison "If hairs be wires, black wires grow on her head" is almost comic in its harshness. Marvell, by contrast, uses hyperbole to inflate his praise. He imagines that "An hundred years should go to praise / Thine eyes", and that his "vegetable love should grow / Vaster than empires and more slow". The image of slow, organic growth spreading across empires is extravagant and playful, and it is exactly the kind of exaggerated compliment Shakespeare rejects as "false compare".

The tone of each speaker reveals what kind of strong feeling drives him. Shakespeare's tone is calm, wry and affectionate. Even in his criticism there is warmth: "I love to hear her speak, yet well I know / That music hath a far more pleasing sound". The plain statement "I love" sits quietly in the middle of the poem, and the admission that she "treads on the ground" grounds her firmly in reality, not myth. Marvell's tone changes across the poem. The opening is gently teasing, "Had we but world enough, and time, / This coyness, lady, were no crime", where the conditional "Had we" shows that this leisurely courtship is only a fantasy. The second section turns urgent and dark: "But at my back I always hear / Time's wingèd chariot hurrying near". The personification of time as a pursuing chariot and the vast emptiness of "Deserts of vast eternity" express fear of death, and this fear intensifies his desire.

Question number

At their most intense, the two speakers' feelings take very different forms. Marvell's passion becomes almost aggressive. He warns that in the grave "worms shall try / That long-preserved virginity", a grotesque image designed to shock the lady into yielding, and adds the ironic understatement "The grave's a fine and private place, / But none, I think, do there embrace." His final section is full of energetic, violent language: the lovers should be "like amorous birds of prey", and should "tear our pleasures with rough strife / Thorough the iron gates of life". The verbs "roll" and "tear" convey a desire that is physical and consuming. Shakespeare's strong feeling, by contrast, is never possessive or pressuring. His love simply accepts her as she is.

Form and structure shape these feelings. Sonnet 130 is a Shakespearean sonnet, three quatrains of alternate rhyme and a closing couplet, in iambic pentameter. The quatrains build a steady catalogue of unflattering comparisons, but the volta arrives in the couplet: "And yet, by heaven, I think my love as rare / As any she belied with false compare." The oath "by heaven" and the adjective "rare" reveal the true intensity of his feeling: his love is precious precisely because it is real. To His Coy Mistress is written in rhyming couplets of iambic tetrameter, a quicker, livelier line than the pentameter, which suits the speaker's restless urgency. Its three sections form a kind of argument: if we had time, but we do not, therefore let us act now. This logical structure makes his strong feeling sound persuasive, even manipulative. The final couplet, "Thus, though we cannot make our sun / Stand still, yet we will make him run", turns defeat into defiance: lovers cannot stop time, but their passion can make it race.

Context helps to explain the differences. Shakespeare wrote his 154 sonnets in the Elizabethan period, when the Petrarchan sonnet, inspired by the Italian poet Petrarch, was highly fashionable, and courtly poets praised idealised, golden haired

Question number

women in ever more extravagant terms. Sonnet 130 is a parody of that fashion. It is often linked to the so-called Dark Lady sonnets, and the "black wires" of her hair deliberately reject the blonde ideal of the age. Shakespeare's strong feelings are therefore also feelings about poetry itself, a rejection of insincere language. Marvell, writing in the mid seventeenth century, was a metaphysical poet, known for intellectual wit and surprising conceits, and the poem belongs to the carpe diem, or "seize the day", tradition. It was published only after his death, in 1681. The poem reflects a culture in which female chastity was highly prized, which is why the speaker treats the lady's "coyness" as the obstacle his argument must overcome.

In conclusion, both poems present speakers with intense feelings, but Shakespeare's is a mature, honest love that values truth over flattery, while Marvell's is an urgent, physical desire sharpened by the fear of death. Shakespeare uses the restraint of the sonnet and the plain truth of his comparisons to suggest that real love needs no exaggeration, whereas Marvell uses hyperbole, shock and logic to persuade. Perhaps Shakespeare's speaker feels more deeply, since he loves the woman as she actually is, while Marvell's passion, for all its energy, is as much about time and mortality as about the lady herself.

10a

Both Eleanor Farjeon's "Easter Monday" and Jane Weir's "Poppies" are spoken by women who love someone caught up in conflict, and both find that the battlefield is felt most sharply at home, through small domestic objects and rituals. Yet the poems arrive at different kinds of grief. Farjeon's speaker writes after a death that has already happened, so her tender memories are shadowed by an ending she cannot change; Weir's mother speaks of a son who has simply left, and her grief is suspended and uncertain, never quite allowed to settle. In both, love expresses

Question number

itself not through grand statements about war, but through restraint, ordinary detail and silence.

Farjeon addresses her loved one directly as "you", so the whole poem feels like a private letter or conversation. The "E.T." of the title is Edward Thomas, the poet with whom Farjeon had a deep emotional and intellectual friendship, and who was killed at Arras on 9 April 1917, Easter Monday itself. Knowing this, the very first line becomes painful: "In the last letter that I had from France". "Last" could mean simply the most recent, but the reader quickly senses that it means final, so loss is present from the opening words. Weir also uses second person address, speaking to her son as he leaves home, but where Farjeon is talking to someone who can no longer answer, Weir's mother is talking to someone who has already turned away from her, "intoxicated" by the world beyond the front door.

Both speakers show love through gentle, practical acts. Farjeon remembers hiding a "silver Easter egg" in "the box of apples / You liked to munch". The colloquial "munch" is affectionate and slightly comic, capturing the ordinary appetite of a living man, which makes his death more shocking. The egg itself is a traditional symbol of new life and of Easter resurrection, but here it offers only false hope: the gift arrives, the man dies. Weir's mother similarly expresses love through care for her son's appearance. She pins a poppy "onto your lapel" and uses "Sellotape bandaged around my hand" to lift "white cat hairs" from his blazer. The word "bandaged" quietly introduces images of wounds into a domestic scene, just as the "spasms of paper red" of the poppy suggest bleeding. Where Farjeon's symbolism is soft and traditional, Weir's is more unsettling, threading violence through the fabric of everyday life.

Restraint is central to how both women speak about love. Farjeon writes a

Question number

fourteen line poem in loose iambic pentameter, like a sonnet, the traditional form for love poetry, yet it has no rhyme. The missing rhyme might suggest a love story left incomplete, a sonnet that cannot reach its proper resolution. Her language is plain and largely free of metaphor, as if elaborate imagery would be dishonest to so simple and pure a feeling. Weir's mother also holds herself back: she "steeled the softening / of my face" and "resisted the impulse" to touch her son's hair. The enjambment across "softening / of my face" mirrors the emotion spilling over the line even as she tries to control it. Her inability to speak is captured in textile imagery: "All my words / flattened, rolled, turned into felt". Weir's background in textiles shapes this language, and the metaphor suggests that feeling has been pressed down into something dense and silent. Both women, then, love most intensely in what they do not say.

Repetition and structure shape the movement of grief in each poem. Farjeon repeats Thomas's own words, "It was such a lovely morning", but in the second stanza they belong to her. This echo is deeply tender, as though she is keeping his voice alive by speaking it, and yet the shift from his "This is the eve" to her "It was the eve" moves from present to past tense, quietly marking his death. "Eve" also hints at darkness and at the eve of battle, perhaps a premonition felt both by the man in the trenches and the woman in her garden. Weir's poem moves in time too, from the moment of leaving to an imagined later visit to the war memorial. The mother "released a song bird from its cage", an image of letting her son go, and then follows a "single dove" to the memorial, where she "leaned against it like a wishbone". The simile is fragile and hopeful, suggesting a wish that might snap.

The endings show the clearest difference. Farjeon closes with the blunt, mundane statement, "There are three letters that you will not get." The monosyllables and flat tone make death a matter of undelivered post, and the understatement is

Question number

more devastating than any lament. Her orchard, where "The apple-bud was ripe", offers renewal in nature, and given Farjeon's strong religious faith the Easter setting may hint at resurrection, but the final line refuses comfort. Weir ends instead on hope and uncertainty: the mother is "hoping to hear / your playground voice catching on the wind". The son is remembered as a child, and the reader cannot tell whether he is dead, deployed or simply grown up. Written in 2009, when British soldiers were serving in Afghanistan, and commissioned by Carol Ann Duffy, the poem speaks for every parent whose child might not return.

Overall, both poets suggest that conflict reaches loved ones through ordinary objects, eggs, apples, poppies and blazers, and that love is shown in quiet care rather than rhetoric. Farjeon's grief is certain and final, contained in a broken sonnet; Weir's is open-ended and anxious, stitched together from fragments of memory. Together they reveal that war's deepest costs are often recorded not on battlefields but in gardens, bedrooms and unopened letters.

10b

Alfred, Lord Tennyson's "The Charge of the Light Brigade" and Ted Hughes's "Bayonet Charge" both describe soldiers charging into enemy fire, but they say strikingly different things about courage. Tennyson's speaker celebrates courage as collective, disciplined obedience, something noble that deserves eternal "Honour" even when the order behind it is a mistake. Hughes's speaker strips this idea away: his lone soldier's bravery collapses into raw terror and survival instinct, and the ideals that once inspired him are exposed as hollow. Read together, the poems trace a movement from Victorian heroic certainty to a modern questioning of what courage in war really is.

Tennyson wrote the poem in 1854 after reading a newspaper report of the Battle

Question number

of Balaclava in the Crimean War, where a misunderstood order sent the Light Brigade charging towards Russian guns. As Poet Laureate he was expected to voice the nation's feelings, and the public response mixed patriotic pride with unease. The opening, "Half a league, half a league, / Half a league onward", uses repetition and a galloping dactylic rhythm that imitates horses' hooves, so the courage of the men is felt as relentless forward motion. "Onward" is the key word: the brigade never hesitates. Hughes's poem, by contrast, begins mid action: "Suddenly he awoke and was running". The adverb "Suddenly" suggests the soldier is not making a courageous decision at all; he is jolted into movement, almost as if waking from a dream of war into its reality. Where Tennyson's men ride forward as one unit, Hughes's single soldier is "Stumbling across a field of clods", the verb undermining any heroic image.

The two poems treat obedience very differently. Tennyson admits the disaster, "Some one had blunder'd", but turns it into proof of the men's courage. The anaphora of "Theirs not to make reply, / Theirs not to reason why, / Theirs but to do and die" makes their acceptance of duty sound almost sacred, and the rhetorical question "Was there a man dismay'd?" expects the answer no. Courage here means trusting the chain of command without question. Hughes's soldier, however, does stop to reason why. "In bewilderment then he almost stopped", and he asks "In what cold clockwork of the stars and the nations / Was he the hand pointing that second?" The metaphor presents him as a tiny mechanical part in a vast, indifferent system, and the "cold clockwork" suggests that the forces sending him to fight are impersonal rather than glorious. Hughes, whose father survived Gallipoli in the First World War, writes with a twentieth century awareness of the mass slaughter that Tennyson's age had not yet seen.

Both poets use the violent setting to measure courage. Tennyson's anaphora,

Question number

"Cannon to right of them, / Cannon to left of them, / Cannon in front of them", surrounds the men, and the sibilance of "Storm'd at with shot and shell" makes the danger hiss around them. His personification of "the jaws of Death" and "the mouth of Hell", together with the Biblical echo of "the valley of Death", turns the battlefield into a monster swallowing them, and their courage lies in riding into it "Boldly". Yet the imagery remains grand and distant; we never see an individual wound. Hughes brings us inside the body. The soldier's rifle is "numb as a smashed arm", and the "patriotic tear" in his eye becomes "Sweating like molten iron from the centre of his chest". The simile suggests that patriotism, once noble, has become a painful, burning weight. Most disturbingly, a "yellow hare" is thrown up by the gunfire and "rolled like a flame", its "mouth wide / Open silent". The hare's agony mirrors the soldier's own silent scream, and shows that war destroys the innocent and natural world as well as men.

The endings make the contrast clearest. Tennyson describes the survivors riding back, "Not the six hundred", the repeated negative creating a moment of grief. However, the final stanza returns to celebration with exclamatory imperatives: "Honour the charge they made! / Honour the Light Brigade, / Noble six hundred!" The poem insists that their courage will outlive the error, asking "When can their glory fade?" Courage, for Tennyson, is a kind of immortality earned through sacrifice. Hughes ends with the soldier plunging towards "the green hedge" as the ideals that drove him, "King, honour, human dignity, etcetera", are "Dropped like luxuries". The casual, dismissive "etcetera" reduces the great values of nationalism to a meaningless list. What is left is "His terror's touchy dynamite", a final image of fear so volatile that it explodes into action. Ironically, the soldier still charges forward, so perhaps his courage is real, but it springs from terror rather than honour.

Question number

Form reinforces these attitudes. Tennyson's six stanzas of changing length, held together by insistent rhythm and rhyme, keep the poem moving like a ballad or march, a public poem meant to be read aloud and remembered. Hughes uses irregular free verse with heavy enjambment, so lines spill over in the same breathless, chaotic way as the soldier's run, and there is no steady beat to suggest order or control.

In conclusion, both poets admire the soldiers' willingness to charge into fire, but they define courage very differently. Tennyson presents it as noble, collective obedience that turns a blunder into glory, which reflects the patriotic role of a Victorian Poet Laureate. Hughes presents it as something far more human and ambiguous, the desperate forward motion of a frightened individual who has lost faith in the causes he was told to fight for. Tennyson asks us to honour courage; Hughes asks us to question what it costs.