Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education
2023

English Literature

Unit 2

The Study of Drama and Poetry

GEL21

[GEL21]
WEDNESDAY 24 MAY, MORNING

TIME

2 hours.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

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

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

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

stemup.co.uk

Page Index to Sections and Questions

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

stemup.co.uk

Section A – Drama

Answer **one** question from this section.

1 O'Casey: *Juno and the Paycock*

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

Use the Drama Answer Booklet for your answer.

(a) With reference to the ways O'Casey **presents** Johnny, show how far you agree that he is to **blame** for what happens to him.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 3 beginning at the top of page 126 with Joxer's words: "Be God, they must all be out; I was thinkin' there was somethin' up" and ending at the top of page 129 with Boyle's words: "What did he do it for? How the hell do I know what he done it for?"

With reference to the ways O'Casey **presents** shame in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that members of the Boyle family bring **shame** upon the family.

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** the younger generation, show how far you agree that the younger generation create **hope** for the future.

(b) Look again at the extract beginning at the start of Act 3 on page 50 and ending on page 52 with Mrs Birling's words, "Oh – Eric – how could you?"

With reference to the ways Priestley **presents** Eric in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Eric is **unpleasant**.

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** Gar, show how far you agree that Gar is **weak-willed**.

(b) Look again at the extract from Episode II, on page 64 with Public's words, "I want to go to America" and ending on page 67 with the stage direction, *The tears begin to come*.

(For those using the version which was reset in 2000, the extract begins on page 51 and ends on page 54.)

With reference to the ways Friel **presents** control in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Lizzie and Madge are **controlling**.

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** Linda, show how far you agree that Linda deserves **sympathy**.

(b) Look again at the extract beginning on page 98 with the stage directions: *From his audience a commotion beginning* and ending on page 100 with the Narrator's words, ''and they died, on the self same day?''

(For those using the ''red-backed edition'', the extract begins at the top of page 105 and ends on page 107.)

With reference to the ways Russell **presents** events in this extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that the deaths of Mickey and Edward are **shocking**.

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** Hibbert, show how far you agree Hibbert is **dislikeable**.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 1 beginning near the top of page 9 in the Samuel French edition with Osborne saying, "My name's Osborne", and ending on page 11 with Osborne's words, "It – it tells on a man – rather badly –".

(For those using the Penguin edition, the extract begins on page 17 and ends on page 19.)

With reference to the ways Sherriff **presents** the past life of Raleigh and Stanhope in England in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that the war **changes** Raleigh and Stanhope.

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** decisions, show how far you agree that decisions made by the members of the Boone family and Roger are **hurtful** to Christopher.

(b) Look again at the extract in Part One on page 45 beginning in the 9th line from the top of the page in Judy's letter: "And everyone turned round to see what was going on" and ending at the top of page 47 when Judy says, "And so I said yes".

With reference to the ways Stephens **presents** Judy in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Judy is a **poor** mother.

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** life in Grover's Corner, show how far you agree that life in Grover's Corner is **predictable**.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act One beginning at the top of page 38 with George's words, "You certainly do stick to it" and ending at the top of page 40 with Emily's words, "Oh, Mama, you're no help at all".

(For those using the edition re-issued in 2017, the extract begins on page 21 and ends on page 22.)

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

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 *Sonnet 29* by William Shakespeare which deals with the theme of discontent, and at one other poem from the IDENTITY anthology which also deals with the theme of discontent.

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

(b) Look again at *The Road Not Taken* by Robert Frost which deals with the theme of looking back, and at one other poem from the IDENTITY anthology which also deals with the theme of looking back.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **looking back**. 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 *On My First Son* by Ben Jonson which deals with the theme of grief, and at one other poem from the RELATIONSHIPS anthology which also deals with the theme of grief.

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

(b) Look again at *Wild Oats* by Philip Larkin which deals with the theme of being young, and at one other poem from the RELATIONSHIPS anthology which also deals with the theme of being young.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **being young**. 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 *Out of the Blue – 12* by Simon Armitage which deals with the theme of fear, and at one other poem from the CONFLICT anthology which also deals with the theme of fear.

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

(b) Look again at *Poppies* by Jane Weir which deals with the theme of grief, and at one other poem from the CONFLICT anthology which also deals with the theme of grief.

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

GEL21/6
289942

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

Question number

1a

I largely agree that O'Casey presents Johnny as responsible for what happens to him: he betrays his comrade Robbie Tancred, and the Irregulars who execute him are carrying out a punishment that Johnny himself has been dreading throughout the play. However, O'Casey does not let the audience simply condemn him. Johnny is also a wounded, frightened young man, used up by the violence of the "principles" he once believed in, and the play suggests that blame is shared between Johnny and the cycle of political killing that made him both a victim and a betrayer.

From his first appearance, O'Casey uses stage directions to make Johnny a figure of nervous guilt, before the audience knows the cause. His face is "pale and drawn" and his voice is anxious and tremulous, and he springs up from the fire as if hunted. These details work as dramatic anticipation: they plant a mystery which the play slowly solves. When Mary and Juno discuss Tancred's death, Johnny's irritable outburst, "Is there nothin' betther to be talkin' about but the killin' o' people?", shows that the subject is unbearable to him. The rhetorical questions sound like a protest against violence, yet they really betray a guilty conscience. Similarly, his sardonic mockery, "Tay, tay, tay", turns his mother's kindness into something to sneer at, suggesting a man so consumed by fear that he can no longer accept comfort. O'Casey makes us notice that Johnny's suffering is mental as well as physical, and the audience begins to suspect that he is suffering because of something he has done.

The clearest evidence of his blame is his obsession with the votive light before the picture of the Virgin. Johnny is desperate for the light to be kept burning, as if it

Question number

could protect him from punishment. The light becomes a powerful stage property: a visual symbol of his fragile safety. When he says he has seen Tancred "kneelin' down before the statue", the broken syntax and ellipsis show that his mind is haunted by the dead man, and that he associates his own guilt with the sacred image. He even cries, "I won't stop here by meself!", the exclamation exposing a terror of being alone with his conscience. O'Casey's structure is important: the light flickers and finally goes out in Act 3 at the moment Johnny's fate is sealed, so the symbol and the plot fall together and the audience feels the inevitability of his punishment.

Johnny's hypocrisy also makes him harder to defend. When Mary's pregnancy is revealed, he declares, "She should be dhriven out o' th' house she's brought disgrace on!" The irony is sharp: Johnny, who has secretly informed on a neighbour's son and caused his death, condemns his sister for a private misfortune. His self-pity is equally revealing: he complains that nobody has "any thought for me", even though Juno has spent the play thinking of nothing but her family. These moments suggest that Johnny's moral blindness is part of his tragedy; he judges others while refusing to judge himself, insisting that it was not his fault that Tancred "was done in".

The Irregulars' accusation makes the case explicit: "you didn't think o' that when you gave him away to the gang that sent him to his grave". The rhythm of the line, with its harsh final stress on "grave", sounds like a sentence being passed. When the Mobilizer first appears, Johnny protests, "haven't I done enough for Ireland?", and the cold reply that no man can do enough for Ireland shows that the movement he served has no mercy. Here Johnny's earlier boast in Act I, that he would "do it agen" because "a principle's a principle", rebounds on him. Juno's retort that he lost his best principle when he lost his arm already hinted that his

Question number

idealism had a cost, and now the same principles demand his life.

However, O'Casey also generates pity. Johnny was shot in the hip in Easter Week and lost his arm in later fighting, so his body carries the damage of years of conflict. When he is dragged out, his final prayer, "be with me now in the agonies o' death!", is pathetic rather than heroic, and the audience sees a terrified young man rather than a villain. The killing takes place offstage, and the news is brought to Juno and Mary, so O'Casey focuses our attention on the family's grief rather than on Johnny's guilt. Juno then repeats Mrs Tancred's lament, asking the Sacred Heart to "take away our hearts o' stone". By giving both mothers the same words, O'Casey links the two dead sons: Tancred and Johnny are both victims of the same violence.

Overall, Johnny is to blame for the betrayal that leads to his death, and O'Casey's careful use of stage directions, symbolism and dramatic irony makes his guilt clear long before it is confirmed. Yet the play refuses a simple verdict. Johnny's fate is the result of his own choices, but also of a political culture in which men kill neighbours for principles. O'Casey seems to want his audience to condemn the betrayal while pitying the betrayer, and to see in Johnny's death the waste that "principles" cause when they replace compassion.

1b

I agree that members of the Boyle family bring shame on the family, but O'Casey distinguishes sharply between kinds of shame. Captain Boyle and Johnny bring real disgrace through idleness, vanity, cowardice and betrayal, whereas the "disgrace" attached to Mary is largely a label imposed by a hypocritical society. In the extract, the family's humiliation is public and comic, but across the play O'Casey suggests that the deepest shame belongs to the men, while Juno and Mary emerge

Question number

with dignity.

The extract opens with Joxer sneaking into the empty flat: "Be God, they must all be out". The furtive entrance immediately shows how far the Boyles' status has fallen; the home that was briefly full of new furniture is now a place where neighbours creep in to gossip. The conversation between Joxer and Nugent turns the family into a subject of public scorn. The Boyles are accused of "forgettin' their friends; forgettin' God", and of failing even to lift a hat when passing a chapel. The repeated participle "forgettin'" builds a list of charges, as if the street were holding a trial. O'Casey shows that the shame is not only financial but social and religious: in the tenement, pride in a false fortune is treated as a betrayal of community.

The simile describing Boyle "goin' about like a mastherpiece of the Free State counthry" exposes his vanity. The image is mocking: Boyle has strutted around as if he were a national monument, yet the audience knows his wealth never existed. This links to Juno's earlier description of him "sthruttin' about from mornin' till night like a paycock". The peacock, a bird all display and no use, becomes the play's central image of shameless self-importance, and the extract shows the bill for that display arriving. The gossip that "there isn't hardly a neighbour in the whole street that hasn't lent him money" emphasises how widely Boyle has spread his debts, and the dismissive question about who would leave anything to "that oul' bummer" suggests that his reputation has collapsed completely. The fact that Joxer, his drinking companion, joins this mockery makes Boyle's humiliation even greater and exposes the false loyalty that he has preferred to his family.

O'Casey also uses comedy to make Boyle's shame visible on stage. When Boyle tries to keep borrowing, calculating "six an' seven is thirteen", his casual arithmetic

Question number

shows that he still does not grasp the seriousness of his position. As Nugent removes the suit, the desperate repetition "Ey, Nugent; ey, Mr Nugent, Mr Nugent!" turns him from a self-styled Captain into a pleading debtor; the shift to the polite title "Mr" shows him grovelling. The stage direction that Boyle enters hastily, buttoning the braces of his moleskin trousers, is a visual symbol of his fall: the fine suit that represented his new status is replaced by working clothes. His complaint that Nugent "stole in like a thief in the night" is ironic, because the suit was never paid for, and the biblical echo suggests judgement arriving. The proverb, "him that goes a borrowin' goes a sorrowin'!", delivers the moral with mock solemnity.

Elsewhere in the play, Boyle's shame is rooted in idleness. He claims his legs prevent him working, yet Juno observes that he can "skip like a goat into a snug" when drink is on offer, and she reminds him that he borrowed money from everybody "to fill yourself with beer". Most shamefully of all, his response to Mary's pregnancy is to reject her: "she'll leave this place, an' quick too!" O'Casey makes the audience see that the true disgrace lies in a father abandoning his daughter, not in the daughter herself. Johnny's shame is darker still. His betrayal of Tancred, a neighbour's son, is a moral crime, and his protest that it "wasn't my fault" shows his refusal to face it. His cry, "haven't I done enough for Ireland?", sounds less like patriotism than self-pity.

Mary is the more complex case. Society calls her pregnancy a "disgrace", and both Boyle and Johnny treat it as such, yet O'Casey presents her sympathetically. She stands up for her trade union principles and for a fellow worker, and she is herself the victim of Bentham's desertion. Juno, meanwhile, is presented as the family's moral strength. Her answer to Mary's fear that the baby will have no father, that "it'll have two mothers", rejects the shame the men want to impose. Her final

Question number

prayer, borrowed from Mrs Tancred, to "take away our hearts o' stone", lifts the play beyond gossip and status to a plea for compassion.

The final scene completes O'Casey's judgement. Boyle and Joxer return drunk to an empty flat, Boyle still mumbling that the world is in a state of "chassis". The juxtaposition of Juno's dignified exit with this pathetic ending shows where the shame really lies. Overall, I agree that the Boyle family brings shame upon itself, but O'Casey makes clear that it is Boyle's vanity and Johnny's betrayal that disgrace the family, while the women, condemned by others, are the ones who keep their moral worth.

2a

I largely agree that Priestley presents the younger generation as a source of hope, because Sheila and Eric are the only characters who are genuinely changed by the Inspector's visit. However, the hope is not unqualified. Gerald, who also belongs to the younger generation, slides back into the complacent attitudes of the Birlings, and even Sheila and Eric are shown to be capable of selfishness and cruelty. Priestley suggests that hope lies not in youth itself but in the willingness to learn, and the young are simply more able to do this.

At the start of the play, the younger generation are presented as part of the comfortable world of the Birlings. Sheila is described in the stage directions as "very pleased with life and rather excited", and Eric is "half shy, half assertive". These descriptions suggest immaturity: Sheila is absorbed in her engagement, and Eric is awkward and uneasy, laughing at the wrong moments. Birling's patronising attitude, dismissing his children's views and mocking "the famous younger generation who know it all", shows that the young are expected to stay silent. Yet the sarcasm backfires, because Priestley structures the play so that the younger

Question number

generation really do come to know more than their parents.

The first sign of hope comes in Act 1, when Eric challenges his father's sacking of Eva Smith: "Why shouldn't they try for higher wages?" The simple question contrasts with Birling's long, self-satisfied speeches about business, and it exposes the cruelty behind his "hard-headed" logic. Sheila responds even more strongly once she hears the story: "these girls aren't cheap labour", she protests, "they're people." Her insistence on "people" rather than labour shows that she sees Eva as a human being, which is exactly the Inspector's lesson. When she realises her own part, her guilt is immediate and sincere: "I'll never, never do it again to anybody." The repetition of "never" suggests a genuine resolution, even if it is also a little childish.

Sheila's growth continues across Act 2, where she becomes almost an ally of the Inspector. She warns her mother not to "build up a kind of wall" between the family and the girl, a metaphor which captures the class barrier that the Birlings use to protect themselves. Her perceptiveness gives the audience hope that the young can see through their parents' hypocrisy. Eric's confession in Act 3 is more shocking, but his reaction also carries hope. When his parents try to escape, he refuses: "the fact remains that I did what I did." He insists that "the girl's dead and we all helped to kill her", and the inclusive pronoun "we" echoes the Inspector's message that "We are members of one body. We are responsible for each other." The Inspector himself makes the point that the young are "more impressionable", suggesting that they are still open to change, unlike Birling and Mrs Birling, whose views have hardened.

The ending is where Priestley most clearly places hope in the young. Once Gerald suggests that the Inspector was a fraud, Birling and Mrs Birling rejoice, but Sheila

Question number

says bitterly, "I suppose we're all nice people now." The stage direction "bitterly" and the sarcasm reveal her disgust that her parents have learned nothing. She also tells them, "It frightens me the way you talk". Eric supports her, so the stage divides along generational lines, a structural contrast that dramatises Priestley's argument: the old are fixed, the young can change.

However, Priestley complicates this hope through Gerald. Although Gerald showed some affection for Daisy Renton, he took advantage of her desperation while engaged to Sheila, and in Act 1 he supports Birling's treatment of the strikers, agreeing "I should say so!" At the end, he is the one who does most to undermine the Inspector by investigating his identity, and he offers Sheila the ring again as if nothing has changed. By making Gerald young but complacent, Priestley shows that youth alone does not guarantee moral progress.

Even Sheila and Eric are flawed. Sheila had Eva sacked out of jealousy and vanity, and Eric drank heavily, forced himself on Eva and stole money from his father's office. In Act 3, Eric turns violently on his mother, telling her "you killed her", which shows anger rather than moral clarity. These flaws prevent the play from becoming a simple fable; the younger generation have to earn their hope through confession.

Structurally, the final telephone call, announcing that a girl has died and a police inspector is on his way, throws the family back into the nightmare. The cyclical ending suggests that those who have not learned will be tested again, while Sheila and Eric are already prepared. The Inspector's final warning of "fire and blood and anguish" hangs over the family, and only the young seem to have heard it.

Overall, I agree that Priestley presents the younger generation as creating hope for

Question number

the future, but only Sheila and Eric, and only because they accept responsibility. Through Gerald, Priestley warns that the young can easily repeat the mistakes of the old. The hope he offers is conditional: the future depends on whether people choose to learn the Inspector's lesson.

2b

To a large extent I agree that Priestley presents Eric as unpleasant: in this extract he is drunk, defensive and evasive, and the story he tells reveals that he forced himself on a vulnerable young woman. Yet Priestley does not present him as irredeemable. Eric's unpleasantness is partly the product of a family which has never taught him responsibility, and by the end of the play his honesty and remorse make him one of the characters through whom the Inspector's message survives. He is unpleasant, but he is also capable of change.

The extract opens at the start of Act 3 exactly where Act 2 ended, with Eric framed in the doorway and the family staring at him. This structural cliffhanger makes his entrance feel like the arrival of the guilty party in a detective story, and it focuses the audience's judgement on him. His first exchanges are hostile. He speaks bitterly to his mother, "You haven't made it any easier for me, have you, Mother?", a deflecting question which shifts blame onto her rather than facing what he has done. When he learns that Sheila told the Inspector about his drinking, he snaps, "Why, you little sneak!" The childish insult shows his self-centredness: he is more concerned with being exposed than with Eva.

Priestley's stage directions emphasise his drinking. Eric helps himself to a whisky, and the way he does it shows his familiarity with quick heavy drinking. This small piece of business tells the audience that his drinking is a habit, not a one-off, confirming Sheila's earlier warning in Act 2 that he had been drinking too much

Question number

for two years. When he describes the night he met Eva, he excuses himself by saying he was "a bit squiffy" and "rather far gone". The light, upper-class slang trivialises what he did, as though being drunk explained everything.

The most disturbing moment is Eric's account of going back to Eva's lodgings. He says he insisted on going in and threatened to make a row, and then admits, "a chap easily turns nasty". The generalising word "chap" suggests that Eric sees this behaviour as normal for a man of his class, and the casual tone reveals a frightening sense of male entitlement. His euphemisms, "the usual sort" to describe the women in the bar and "that's when it happened" to describe the encounter, allow him to avoid naming what he did. He even claims, "I'm not very clear about it", distancing himself from the event. Priestley's audience is invited to fill the silence, and it is far more damning than anything he says. When Mrs Birling responds with "how could you?", her horror marks the end of the extract, ironically, since she too has refused Eva help.

Elsewhere, Eric's unpleasantness is established from the beginning. In Act I he suddenly guffaws at the dinner table, a disconcerting stage direction which hints that something is wrong beneath the surface of the celebration. He is rude about his sister and squabbles with her like a schoolboy. When he recalls Eva, his description of her as "a good sport" sounds dismissive, reducing her to a pleasant companion for a night out. His reaction to her pregnancy is self-absorbed: he says he was "in a hell of a state about it", focusing on his own distress. He also stole money from his father's office to support her, and when Eva realised it was stolen she refused it, which makes her seem more principled than him.

However, Priestley gives Eric a more complex role as the play develops. His accusatory remark, "I hate these fat old tarts round the town", aimed at his

Question number

father's "respectable friends", exposes the hypocrisy of the older generation and suggests he can see what is wrong around him. In Act 1 he sympathises with the strikers, asking why they shouldn't try for higher wages. When he learns that his mother turned Eva away, he is devastated, crying "you killed her" and speaking of "your own grandchild". This outburst is cruel, but it comes from grief. He also tells his father that he is "not the kind of father a chap could go to when he's in trouble", which suggests that his behaviour stems partly from neglect. Birling's concern is only for the scandal and the money, and Mrs Birling has never noticed her son's drinking.

By the end of the play, Eric's honesty is unmistakable. When his parents rejoice that the Inspector may have been a hoax, Eric refuses to pretend: "the fact remains that I did what I did." His insistence that "we all helped to kill her" shows that he has accepted the Inspector's message of collective responsibility, while his parents reject it. Priestley's use of contrast here is crucial; Eric's earlier unpleasantness makes his change more striking.

Overall, Eric is unpleasant in what he did and in much of how he speaks in the extract, and Priestley does not excuse his treatment of Eva. However, by showing Eric's remorse and his willingness to accept blame, Priestley suggests that even someone who has behaved badly can learn, and that the real unpleasantness in the play lies with those, like Birling and Mrs Birling, who refuse to change.

3a

I largely agree that Friel presents Gar as weak-willed, at least in his public self. Gar Public repeatedly fails to say what he feels, to stand up to his father, to fight for Kate or to challenge the boys, and even his decision to emigrate is taken on impulse. However, Friel's central dramatic device, the division of Gar into Public

Question number

and Private, complicates this judgement. Private is full of energy, wit and desire, which suggests that Gar's problem is not an absence of will but a paralysis caused by the silence of Ballybeg and of his father. He is weak in action, but not in feeling.

Gar's weakness is clearest in his relationship with S.B. O'Donnell. In the stage directions he responds to his father with a surly, taciturn gruffness, and when S.B. asks about the coils of barbed wire, his answer collapses into hesitation: "There was two", he begins, before correcting himself again and again. The dashes and ellipsis in the line show his inability to assert even a simple fact in front of his father. Private, by contrast, is merciless about S.B., mocking him as "Screwballs", and the contrast between the two voices shows the audience that Gar's contempt and frustration are real but never spoken. Friel uses the device to dramatise a will that exists only internally. When Private urges him, "it's your place to make the move", Public cannot do it, and the opportunity passes in silence.

This pattern is repeated in the flashback to Senator Doogan's house, perhaps the most painful exposure of Gar's weakness. Gar and Kate have made plans, and Private's mocking count of the children they will have, "14 of a family", shows how far his dreams have run ahead of reality. Yet when Kate leaves him alone with her father, Gar can only manage "Mr Doogan, I want", and the sentence is never finished. Private's frantic commands, "Speak, you dummy you!" and "Get out! Get out!", heighten the comedy and the agony. The stage direction that Public rushes off shows that he flees before Kate even returns. Friel's use of flashback makes this failure part of Gar's memory on his last night, so the audience sees how it still torments him. His later admission, "all my fault", suggests that he knows that his weakness cost him Kate, who goes on to marry another man.

Question number

Gar's weakness also appears in his friendships. When the boys visit on his last night and tell their exaggerated stories about girls, Gar does not contradict them, even though Private's monologue reveals the truth: the night was a miserable anticlimax. Private's quiet line, "And that was that night", exposes the gap between myth and reality, and Gar's silence shows him going along with the group. Similarly, when he wants to know about his dead mother, he cannot ask S.B. directly and tries to get information from Madge, who refuses to be pumped and tells him to ask "the Boss". Friel suggests that Gar is weak-willed in confronting the people closest to him.

The decision to leave for Philadelphia may seem like strength, but Friel undermines it. The stage direction "impetuously" indicates that Gar accepts Aunt Lizzy's invitation in a moment of emotion. Private observes that she got him soft "on account of the day it was", the day Kate married Francis King. Gar is therefore not choosing freedom so much as running from pain. Even on his last night, Private's frenzied singing of "Philadelphia, here I come" sounds more like an attempt to convince himself than a statement of purpose.

However, there are moments where Gar shows strength. He organises the egg deal behind his father's back, which shows a desire to make his own decisions, even if its success is limited. He tells Ned to take "a running race" to himself, a rare moment of open defiance. Private's outburst that the boys are "ignorant bloody louts" shows that Gar's judgement is clear-sighted. It could also be argued that it is Kate, not Gar, who leaves him in a weak position at the Doogans' house, abandoning him with "You talk to Daddy, Gar". And Gar's courage in deciding to emigrate at all, leaving everything he knows, should not be dismissed.

The ending, however, returns us to weakness and uncertainty. The memory of the

Question number

blue boat, which Gar hopes his father will share, is not remembered by S.B. in the same way, and the two men miss each other again. In the final lines Private asks why he has to leave, and Public can only answer "I don't know", stammering over the first word before repeating the phrase. The halting repetition and broken syntax capture a man who cannot articulate his own reasons, and the curtain falls on doubt rather than resolve.

Overall, I agree that Friel presents Gar as weak-willed in his public actions. But through Private, Friel shows a mind full of longing, anger and humour that has no outlet in the repressive world of Ballybeg. Gar's weakness is a tragedy of communication: he has the will, but not the words, and the play suggests that his community and his father share responsibility for that silence.

3b

I agree that Friel presents both Lizzy and Madge as controlling, but in very different ways and with very different degrees of success. Lizzy's control in this extract is overwhelming, emotional and almost physical: she takes possession of Gar, and her pressure decides his future. Madge's control is brisk, maternal and often ineffective, and the extract ends by exposing her vulnerability. Friel suggests that both women try to control Gar because they love him and need him, and that their control, like so much in Ballybeg, hides loneliness.

The extract begins with Public's sudden declaration, "I want to go to America", and Lizzy seizes on it at once. Her reply, "That's why I'm here! That's why I'm half-shot-up", is full of exclamation and repetition, the speech of a woman whose emotion sweeps everyone along. The admission that she is "half-shot-up" suggests that she has been drinking, which could mean she is not fully in control of herself, yet her drunkenness actually increases her dominance of the scene: she

Question number

talks over others and refuses to slow down. Private's horrified "Laddy!" registers the shock of a decision made in seconds, and the dashes in Public's speeches suggest he is rushing to agree before he can think.

Lizzy's control over the conversation is shown through her treatment of Con. When Con tries gently to intervene, suggesting that Gar should think about it or reminding her that Ben is waiting, Lizzy cuts across him. Her interruption, "Look son", shows her refusing to let her husband speak, and the stage direction as if for confirmation, when she turns to Con, suggests that she uses him only to support decisions she has already made. The word "son" is especially revealing. Lizzy, who has no children of her own, claims Gar as the son she longs for, and so her control is rooted in emotional need. When she embraces him, Private's line "Don't touch me yet!" shows Gar's reluctance, but Public cannot resist. Friel's divided protagonist makes the audience see that Lizzy's control works because Gar's public self is too weak to refuse it.

In the bedroom afterwards, Private continues the theme by mimicking Lizzy and imagining the suffocating life awaiting Gar in Philadelphia: "She'll tuck you into your air-conditioned cot". The image of a cot reduces Gar to a baby, and the comic detail of air-conditioning mocks Lizzy's American comforts while showing the smothering control he will face. Public's desperate "Shut up! Shut up!" reveals that Private has touched a nerve. The stage direction in which Public whistles so that he won't hear, and his repeated recitation of the "Dauphiness" passage, are theatrical devices showing Gar's attempt to block out the truth. When he flings open the bedroom door and dashes into the kitchen, he is fleeing from his own fear of Lizzy's control.

Madge's control is very different. She gives Gar orders, "Don't you dare come home

Question number

drunk!", and her exclamation marks show the force of her commands. She is equally dismissive of his instructions, shrugging off his request with "If you hear it well and good", which shows that she does not let him boss her. She even exerts control over S.B., reprimanding him for his behaviour "while there's a lady in your presence". Her scornful exclamation about "The Boys!" shows that she judges Gar's friends with clear eyes. Yet Friel ends the extract by showing that Madge cannot control her feelings. The stage direction that suddenly, on the point of tears, she accuses him, followed by The tears begin to come, and her stammering repetition of a single word, shows her composure collapsing. Friel exposes the vulnerability behind her bossiness; the woman who rules the kitchen cannot rule her grief at Gar's departure.

Elsewhere, Lizzy's dominance is confirmed in the flashback scene. She tells the story of her sisters and family in a long, unstoppable monologue, rebuking Con's interruptions with "Would you please desist?" and belittling him as "bonzo" who finally got himself a job. However, she also loses control: she begins to sob when talking about her inability to have children, and in her confusion she includes herself among the dead sisters. These moments suggest that her controlling manner covers deep sadness.

Madge, too, is shown both controlling and limited elsewhere. She tries to discipline Gar, "Stop it! Stop it! You brat you!", but her commands are usually ignored or turned into a game. She refuses to be drawn on the subject of his mother, telling him "you're not going to pump me", which shows that she controls the family's secrets. She also quietly arranges for the boys to visit Gar on his last night, a gesture of care rather than domination. In her final monologue, though, she reflects sadly on Gar leaving and on how Gar will one day become just like his father, and she has no control over the departure itself, nor over the naming of

Question number

Nelly's baby.

Overall, I agree that Lizzy and Madge are controlling, but Friel presents their control as a sign of love and need rather than simple domination. Lizzy's control is the more dangerous because it actually shapes Gar's future, while Madge's is affectionate and ultimately powerless. Through both women, Friel shows a world in which characters try to hold on to what they love, and in which the real control belongs to silence, loss and the pull of emigration.

4a

I agree to a large extent that Linda deserves sympathy. Russell presents her as the most loyal and loving character in Blood Brothers, a girl whose spirit and warmth are gradually worn down by poverty, by Mickey's breakdown and by a class system that offers her almost nothing. However, Russell does not make her a saint. Her childhood cheekiness, her flirtation with Edward and her eventual affair complicate the audience's response, so that our sympathy is real but never simple. Ultimately, I would argue that even her faults make her more sympathetic, because they grow out of need rather than selfishness.

From her first appearance, Russell makes Linda a protector. When Sammy bullies Mickey, she is shown undaunted, approaching him and shouting "Oh, leave him alone, you. Y' big worm!" The insult is comic, but the stage direction "undaunted" reveals a fearless loyalty that the audience instantly warms to. Her childish declaration, "I don't care who knows. I just love you. I love you!", uses repetition and exclamation to show how open and generous her feelings are, especially in contrast to Mickey's embarrassed reticence. Russell lets the audience laugh at the children, but he also plants the idea that Linda gives her love wholeheartedly, which makes what later happens to her more painful.

Question number

It could be argued that young Linda is far from innocent. She suggests "Let's throw some stones through them windows", and when the policeman catches them she disowns Edward with "He's not with us". Yet these moments belong to the ordinary mischief of childhood games, and Russell uses them more to show the gang's closeness than to criticise her. Similarly, when she teases Mickey that Edward is "gorgeous", she provokes jealousy, but this is the playful rivalry of adolescence rather than cruelty. Her frustration that Mickey will not ask her out, joking that "He'll be a pensioner before he gets around to it", is affectionate humour that keeps her likeable.

Sympathy grows sharply in Act Two, where Russell compresses Linda's adult life to show how quickly her opportunities are taken from her. She becomes pregnant young, marries Mickey and almost immediately faces his redundancy. Even then, she tries to remain hopeful, insisting "Never mind, Mam. Mam isn't it great; if he's workin' an' we've got our own place". The optimism is touching precisely because the audience can see how fragile it is. After Mickey's imprisonment for his part in Sammy's robbery, Linda continues to stand by him, gently urging him to give up the pills: "You'll be home soon, Mickey, and you should come off them". Her later plea, "When you take those things, Mickey, I can't even see you", is one of the most moving lines in the play. The metaphor of not being able to "see" him suggests that the man she loved has vanished while still standing in front of her, and that she is lonely within her marriage.

Russell's stage directions reinforce this weariness. Linda appears weighed down with shopping bags and weary, an image of the drudgery the Narrator later sums up with "She's washed a million dishes / She's always making tea". The hyperbole and the simple, repetitive domestic verbs suggest a life reduced to chores, and the

Question number

girl who once defied Sammy now seems trapped.

The affair with Edward is the part of the play most likely to reduce sympathy. When Linda asks "An' what about what I need?", some audiences might see selfishness. However, Russell frames the relationship carefully. Linda first approaches Edward, now a councillor, for her family's sake, to secure a house and a job for Mickey, asking "Could I talk to Councillor Lyons, please?" Even then she hesitates at the telephone, and the Narrator describes her dilemma: "But the woman stands in doubt / And wonders what the price would be / For letting the young girl out". This choric commentary invites us to understand rather than judge her. The "young girl" inside the exhausted wife is the lively child we met earlier, and the "price" anticipates the tragedy to come. The song "Light Romance" also presents the affair as gentle and brief, a moment of tenderness rather than a betrayal driven by greed. Russell juxtaposes these scenes with Mickey's growing desperation, so the audience feels sorry for both of them.

Linda's lack of control over events is the final reason she deserves sympathy. It is Mrs Lyons, not Linda, who reveals the affair, turning Mickey round and pointing out Edward and Linda to him. Linda never intended to destroy anyone, yet she becomes the trigger for the final confrontation. At the end, she loses both her husband and the man she had loved since childhood, and the tragic structure of the play, with the deaths shown from the very start, means the audience watches her move towards this loss knowing she cannot escape it.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that Linda deserves sympathy. Russell gives her flaws, from childhood naughtiness to adult infidelity, but he presents these as human responses to a life of hardship and emotional neglect. Through stage directions, choric narration and her own warm, humorous dialogue, Russell shapes

Question number	
	her as a victim of circumstance and class whose loyalty and love deserved a far better outcome than the one the play gives her.
4b	I agree that the deaths of Mickey and Edward are shocking, but Russell makes them shocking in a particular way. Because the Narrator and the opening tableau reveal the deaths at the very start of the play, the audience is never surprised by what happens. Instead, the shock lies in how suddenly, violently and pointlessly it happens, and in the horror of watching an ending we have been powerless to stop. In this extract Russell turns knowledge into dread and then into horror.
	The extract opens with a commotion beginning in the audience, and Mickey appears from the stalls. This is a startling piece of staging. By bringing Mickey out of the auditorium, Russell breaks the boundary between stage and audience, making the spectators feel physically close to the danger and perhaps implicated in it. The stage directions describe a gun held two-handed, to steady his shaking hands, which immediately signals that Mickey is not a confident killer but a frightened, broken man. The detail of his "shaking hands" is shocking in itself, because it shows how far the cheerful boy who once played at guns has fallen.
	The pace of the scene adds to its intensity. The Councillors hurry off, and the rapid exchanges of the Policemen, such as "What's that woman doin'?" and "Get that woman away", create panic. Screams, shouting and a loudhailer fill the theatre with noise, so the audience feels the chaos of a real public incident. Then Russell slows everything down with pauses and the word "eventually" in the stage directions, leaving Mickey and Edward alone on stage. This contrast between frantic noise and sudden stillness forces the audience to focus on the two brothers, and the tension becomes almost unbearable.

Question number

Mickey's dialogue is fragmented and broken by hesitation: "Just one thing I had left, Eddie" and his jagged reference to Linda show a man barely able to complete a thought. When Edward insists they are friends, Mickey's reply, "Friends! I could kill you", is shocking because it turns the childhood bond of the blood brothers into its opposite. Yet Russell also makes Mickey pitiful: he admits "I don't even know if the thing's loaded". This line suggests that Mickey may never have intended to fire at all, which makes the ending even more tragic, since the violence is driven by confusion as much as by rage.

The arrival of Mrs Johnstone is the catalyst. Her confession, "He's your brother. You had a twin brother", is the revelation that the superstition foretold would kill them, and the audience knows it. Mickey's anguished response, "I could have been him!", is perhaps the most shocking line of all, because it shows that what destroys him is not only jealousy over Linda but the sudden realisation that the gap between his life and Edward's was the result of chance and class. The gun explodes and, in the stage direction, blows Edward apart, and then four guns explode as the Policemen shoot Mickey. The brutal verb "blows" and the repeated "explode" make the violence feel sudden and mechanical. The deaths take seconds, after a whole play of build up, which makes them deeply shocking.

Music and dimming lights then give a moment of contrasting calm, and the choric Narrator returns to make the audience reflect. His final question about whether to blame superstition or "what we, the English, have come to know as class" turns the shock outwards. Russell wants the audience to be disturbed not just by two deaths on stage but by the society that produced them.

Elsewhere in the play, Russell deliberately removes any surprise. The play opens

Question number

with a mimed re-enactment of the deaths and the Narrator's "An' did you never hear how the Johnstones died", so we know the ending from the first moments. Some might argue that this makes the deaths less shocking. However, it also means that every happy scene is shadowed by our knowledge. The Narrator's ominous refrain "But y' know the devil's got your number" and warnings such as "Y'know he's gonna find y'" keep reminding us that time is running out, and the dramatic irony makes the audience dread the ending even more.

Russell also prepares the violence carefully. The children's games of cowboys and shooting each other are innocent at the time, but in hindsight they foreshadow real guns. The growing class divide between the twins, which leads Mickey to call Edward a "dick head", shows their friendship breaking down. Mrs Lyons becomes more vindictive and unhinged, finally pointing out Edward and Linda to Mickey, and Mickey's depression and dependence on tablets make him unstable. When Mickey disappears with the gun, the audience senses the climax coming.

In conclusion, I largely agree that the deaths are shocking, but not because they are unexpected. Russell tells us what will happen and then shocks us with the speed, noise and senselessness of it, and with Mickey's devastating recognition that he "could have been" Edward. The real shock, the Narrator suggests, is that class divided two brothers so completely that the only place they could finally meet as equals was in death.

Sa

I agree only partly that Hibbert is dislikeable. Sherriff certainly presents him in an unflattering light: he complains, shirks, gossips and, at the worst possible moment, boasts about women and drink. Through Stanhope's contempt the audience is encouraged to see him as a coward. However, Sherriff also allows us to see

Question number

Hibbert's terror and suffering, and by the end of Act Two the play suggests that he is not so different from the others. I would argue that Hibbert is often unpleasant, but that Sherriff uses him to make the audience question whether fear deserves contempt at all.

Sherriff's first description of Hibbert is designed to create an unsympathetic impression. The stage directions describe him as small and slightly built, with a pallid face, and he sneaks quietly away. The verb "sneaks" immediately associates him with furtiveness, the opposite of the upright courage expected of an officer. When he complains about "this neuralgia of mine", claiming "I'm afraid I can't stick it any longer", he seems to be preparing an excuse to leave the front at the very time when his fellow officers are trying to keep up morale. After he goes, Stanhope dismisses him as "Another little worm trying to wriggle home". The animal imagery of the worm suggests something low, spineless and contemptible, and the verb "wriggle" implies slyness. Stanhope later calls him an "Artful little swine", again reducing him to an animal. Because Stanhope is the respected commander, the audience is initially inclined to share his view.

Hibbert's behaviour in the middle of the play reinforces this. Stanhope suspects that he is starving himself on purpose to make his illness look real, and Hibbert takes himself off to sleep apart from the others, isolating himself from the companionship that keeps the dugout going. When he finally tries to leave to see the doctor, his concern with his reputation, "You won't say anything, Stanhope", seems self-centred. He appears far from the heroic soldier of popular imagination, declaring "I hate and loathe it all".

The most dislikeable Hibbert appears in Act Three. After the raid in which Osborne is killed, Hibbert joins Stanhope for a celebratory dinner and chatters about

Question number

women, drink and picking up "a couple of tarts". He boasts that one girl had "glorious bedroom eyes". The crude language feels deeply inappropriate in a scene shadowed by Osborne's death, and Hibbert's enthusiasm about "the chicken and champagne and cigars" seems callous. Sherriff juxtaposes this with Raleigh's grief, which makes Hibbert's chatter jar even more. On the morning of the final attack he dawdles, asking for "another spot of water", irritating Stanhope and delaying the others when every man is needed.

However, Sherriff complicates this picture. In the confrontation in Act Two, when Stanhope draws his revolver and threatens to shoot him rather than let him desert, Hibbert collapses. His speech becomes fragmented: "I'll never go up those steps again", he says, adding that he would "rather die here". The dashes and broken phrasing in the script reveal genuine panic, and the image of the men watching him suggests that his deepest fear is shame. His despairing question "What does it matter?" also gives voice to the pointlessness of the carnage, a view the play itself seems partly to share. It becomes hard to see him as simply a malingerer.

The most important shift comes when Stanhope responds with sympathy. He admits that he feels the same fear, telling Hibbert "We all feel like you sometimes", and their scene ends with "We know how we both feel now". This structural turning point blurs the difference between the "coward" and the "hero". Stanhope copes through whisky and Hibbert through pleading illness, but both are terrified. Osborne, the play's moral centre, also remarks "You can't help feeling sorry for him", which guides the audience towards compassion. In this light, even Hibbert's crude talk at the dinner might be read as a desperate attempt to block out fear, mirroring Stanhope's drinking.

Question number	
	Finally, when the attack comes, Hibbert does go up. Sherriff shows him accepting his fate and leaving with a slight smile, a small but significant act of courage. This undercuts Stanhope's early judgement and suggests that Hibbert, like the others, finds the strength to face what he fears most.
	In conclusion, I agree that Sherriff makes Hibbert dislikeable at many points, through unflattering stage directions, Stanhope's animal imagery and his crude, self-pitying behaviour. However, I do not think he is presented as wholly dislikeable. By revealing his terror, linking it to Stanhope's own, and allowing him to go up the steps at the end, Sherriff turns Hibbert into a disturbing reflection of what the war does to ordinary men. He may be unpleasant company, but the audience is left feeling that he deserves pity as much as blame.
Sb	I agree that the war changes Raleigh and Stanhope, but Sherriff shows that it changes them in very different ways and to very different degrees. Stanhope, after nearly three years at the front, has been transformed from the admired school hero Raleigh remembers into an exhausted, hard drinking commander. Raleigh, by contrast, arrives with his school values intact and keeps much of his innocence almost to the end. Through this extract, which looks back to their life in England, Sherriff establishes the gap between past and present that drives the tragedy of the play.
	In the extract, Raleigh's memories of England are dominated by school. He describes Stanhope as "one of the big fellows" and recalls that he was "skipper of Rugger at Barford" and kept wicket for the eleven. The proud listing of sporting achievements shows Raleigh's hero worship, and the schoolboy vocabulary, with words like "frightful", "Yes, rather!" and "splendid chap", reflects the enclosed world

Question number

of the public school. Sherriff presents this as a world where excellence at games was the measure of a man, and Raleigh assumes that the same qualities will make Stanhope a splendid officer. In a sense he is right: Stanhope has earned the MC and leads his company superbly. But Sherriff makes the audience aware that something has been lost on the way.

Raleigh himself is presented as a modest follower. He insists "I was only a kid" and that he was not in the same class as Stanhope, and the stage directions show him speaking awkwardly and hesitating. These pauses and dashes reveal how easily embarrassed he is, and how much he still sees himself as the junior boy looking up to the captain. His uncertainty about whether to call Stanhope "Dennis" shows that the private friendship of England now sits uneasily inside the formal hierarchy of the army.

The past also contains family connections. Raleigh explains that "we were terrific pals" and that their fathers were friends, and the audience learns that he has used influence to be sent to Stanhope's battalion. He calls this "an amazing bit of luck", and Osborne responds "Extraordinary coincidence!" The irony is gentle but clear. Osborne knows how unwelcome Raleigh's arrival may be, and Raleigh's eagerness highlights his naivety about what the war has done to his friend. The repetition of "keen" suggests the eager spirit admired at school, but in the trenches this eagerness looks dangerously innocent.

The extract ends with Osborne warning that three years of strain "tells on a man", and the hesitation in his speech shows his reluctance to say plainly that Stanhope has changed. Earlier he cautions that Raleigh mustn't expect to find him quite the same. Sherriff uses Osborne as a bridge between the two worlds: a former schoolmaster who understands both the boy Raleigh was and the man Stanhope

Question number

has become.

Elsewhere in the play, the change in Stanhope is stark. His heavy drinking is the clearest sign, and he admits that without whisky he would "go mad with fright". The hero of Barford is now ruled by fear and temper, and his greatest anxiety is that Raleigh will write home and reveal to his sister what he has become. When he censors Raleigh's letter, he expects condemnation but finds only admiration, a moment that shows Raleigh's view of him has not changed even though Stanhope himself has. Stanhope's bitterness about his superiors, imagining that the conference cannot be moved "because of dinner", shows a cynicism that the schoolboy captain would never have felt. When Raleigh calls him by his first name at the dinner, he snaps "Don't 'Dennis' me!", rejecting the intimacy of their shared past.

Raleigh changes more slowly. He arrives excited and eager to please, and before the raid he seeks reassurance that it will all be over quickly, revealing his immaturity. However, the raid and Osborne's death do shake him. He refuses to join the dinner and eats with the men instead, showing that he can no longer share in what he sees as a callous celebration. Stanhope's realism, expressed in his question about whether Raleigh thinks there is no limit to what a man can bear, contrasts sharply with the idealism Raleigh brought from England.

Yet Sherriff's final scene suggests that something of the past survives. When Raleigh is mortally wounded, Stanhope carries him down into the dugout, and the tableau shows Raleigh "like a child in his huge arms". The image takes both men back to the relationship of school, the older boy protecting the younger. Stanhope calls him "Jimmy", returning to first names, and lays him gently on Osborne's bed. In this moment the war has not destroyed Stanhope's affection, only buried it.

Question number

In conclusion, I largely agree that the war changes Raleigh and Stanhope. Stanhope is deeply altered, worn down by fear and responsibility, while Raleigh is changed later and less completely, moving from naive hero worship to a painful awareness of loss. By contrasting their memories of England with the reality of the trenches, Sherriff shows how the war consumes the young men it once made heroes, while suggesting that their bond, rooted in the past, survives until the very end.

6a

I agree to a large extent that the decisions made by Christopher's parents and by Roger are hurtful to him. Ed's decision to lie, Judy's decision to leave and Roger's decision to reject him all cause Christopher real distress, and Stephens structures the play so that the discovery of these decisions becomes the crisis that sends him running. However, Stephens also shows that these are flawed people trying, and often failing, to cope, and several of their later decisions are made in an attempt to repair the hurt. The play presents decisions as hurtful, but rarely as cruel in intention.

Ed's decisions are the most damaging because they strike at Christopher's need for truth. Christopher cannot tell lies and depends on facts to make sense of the world, so Ed's choice to tell him that his mother is dead is a profound betrayal. The line "Your mother has had to go into hospital" begins a chain of lies that ends with Christopher believing she has died. Ed then hides Judy's letters, denying Christopher any communication with her. When Christopher finds the letters in his father's room, Stephens shows the physical impact of this discovery through his body: he curls up, groans and is sick, unable to process what he has learned. The audience sees that the lie has caused more pain than the truth ever could.

Question number

Ed's rash decisions also cause physical and emotional harm. He throws Christopher's book in the bin, swears at him and, in a moment of fury, hits him. Worst of all, Ed admits "I killed Wellington", revealing that the mystery Christopher has been so carefully investigating was caused by his own father. Stephens makes this the turning point of the play. Christopher reasons that if his father could kill a dog, he could kill him, and his trust collapses completely. The repeated line "I had to get out of the house" emphasises how Ed's decisions leave him feeling unsafe in his own home, and this leads directly to his decision to travel to London.

Judy's decision to leave is equally hurtful, though Stephens presents it more sympathetically. Through her letters, read aloud on stage, Judy explains that she could not cope with Christopher's behaviour, writing "Maybe if things had been different, maybe if you'd been different, I might have been better at it". The repetition of "maybe" reveals her guilt and uncertainty, but the phrase "if you'd been different" is quietly devastating, because it suggests that Christopher himself was the problem. Her hope that he will not "stay angry" with her forever acknowledges the damage she has done. By using multiple narrators and shifting between time and place, Stephens allows the audience to hear Judy's side, which provides context for her decision without excusing it.

Roger's decisions are the least defensible. His very first entrance shows him arguing with Judy, complaining that she has made him look "like a complete idiot", which establishes his impatience. He reluctantly lets Christopher stay but soon resents him, exclaiming "It's bloody ridiculous". His sneering "You think you're so bloody clever, don't you?" mocks the very intelligence that defines Christopher, and when he comes home drunk and grabs at Christopher, the hostility becomes physical. Roger chooses to see Christopher as a nuisance, and this is hurtful to a

Question number

boy who has just lost all trust in his father.

However, Stephens does not allow the audience to condemn these characters completely. Ed is shown as the parent who stayed, taking on the daily care of Christopher. He tries to justify his lies by saying he did not know how to explain because it was "so complicated", and his decision to tell the truth about Wellington is based on the belief that "if you don't tell the truth now, then later it hurts even more". This shows a man trying, however late, to do the right thing. Characters often defend themselves through confrontational dialogue, as when Ed attacks Judy with "You wrote him some sodding letters", suggesting each parent feels the other's choices were worse. Stephens leaves the audience to weigh their competing claims.

Even Roger shows a moment of thoughtfulness, giving Christopher a library book, 100 Number Puzzles. More significantly, Judy decides to leave Roger and return to Swindon so that she can look after Christopher, a decision that puts her son first. Ed's decision to buy Christopher a puppy, Sandy, and his patient project to rebuild trust are presented as small but important steps towards healing.

In conclusion, I agree that many of the decisions made by the Boone family and Roger are hurtful to Christopher, especially Ed's lies and the killing of Wellington, Judy's abandonment and Roger's hostility. Stephens uses physical theatre, repetition and multiple viewpoints to make the audience feel the pain these decisions cause. Yet he also shows decisions made in love and regret, so that by the end, when Christopher asks "Does that mean I can do anything?", the audience senses that he has survived the hurt caused by the adults around him and is beginning to make decisions of his own.

Question number	
6b	I agree to some extent that Judy is a poor mother. In this extract she admits her impatience, her anger and her decision to leave her son, and elsewhere she abandons Christopher for two years. However, Stephens gives Judy a voice that no other adult in the play receives, allowing her to explain herself honestly, and by the end she chooses Christopher over her own happiness. I would argue that Stephens presents her less as a bad mother than as a mother who has failed and knows it, and who tries, imperfectly, to make amends. The form of the extract is crucial. Judy speaks a monologue that is also a flashback, reading the letter she wrote to Christopher while Siobhan, who is holding the letter, shares the lines with her. This is the only time the play gives the audience an extended first person perspective other than Christopher's. The effect is double edged. On the one hand, Judy is confessing her failings directly, which makes her shortcomings very clear. On the other hand, the intimacy of the confession invites understanding, as we hear her own account of how she felt. The letter recalls the shopping trip in Bentalls, beginning with "And everyone turned round to see what was going on". The line conveys Judy's embarrassment in public, and much of what follows centres on her own feelings rather than on Christopher's fear. She admits "I was so cross" and that she was "at the end of my tether". The idiom suggests that she had reached the limit of her patience, and it seems to confirm the question's view: she lacks the endurance that Christopher's needs demand. When she recalls throwing food "across the room" and confesses "I got cross", her behaviour appears childish and out of control, a reversal of the calm a parent is expected to show. Stephens uses the structure of Judy's sentences to reveal her state of mind. Long sentences joined by repeated "and" create a stream of consciousness, as though

Question number

the memories are pouring out of her without pause. The repetition of "cried" emphasises her distress. Some audiences may see this as genuine pain, while others might find it self-centred, since her tears are for herself rather than for her frightened son. Similarly, when she admits that she was "so upset" after the argument with Ed, her focus remains on her own emotions.

Yet the extract also shows moments of real awareness. Judy walked home "because I knew you wouldn't go on the bus again", which suggests she understood Christopher's needs and adapted to them, even when exhausted. She also recognises that Ed was better suited to caring for him, describing him as "Much calmer". This could be read as an excuse, but it also shows honesty and a painful self-knowledge that a truly careless mother would lack. Her confession that "I started spending lots of time with Roger" leads to the final line of the extract, "And so I said yes". The flat, simple phrasing makes her decision to leave sound almost passive, as though she drifted into it, and the audience may judge her harshly for abandoning her child so quietly. Meanwhile, Stephens shows Christopher's physical response through the stage directions, as he hits his hands, feet and head against the floor. Placing his distress alongside her words makes the consequences of her choices visible.

Elsewhere in the play, Judy's letters reveal both guilt and love. She admits she "was not a very good mother", and she insists "I thought what I was doing was best for all of us", which suggests a sincere, if mistaken, belief that leaving was the kind thing to do. Her sign off, "Loads and loads of love", contrasts with her absence, and the audience is left unsure whether love that is only written down can count as good mothering.

When Christopher arrives in London, however, Stephens shows Judy's maternal

Question number

instincts returning. She is horrified to discover that Ed told Christopher she had died, and she ultimately leaves Roger so that she can care for her son in Swindon. This is a decisive act that places Christopher's needs above her own relationship. Even so, Stephens is honest about how hard she still finds it. Her plea "Jesus. Half an hour, Christopher. I need you to be quiet for half an hour" and her warning "But I am this close to losing it, all right?" show that her impatience has not disappeared. The blunt, colloquial language makes her sound strained and human rather than villainous.

In conclusion, I agree that Judy is presented as a poor mother in many respects. She loses her temper, puts her own feelings first and abandons Christopher, as her own letter painfully admits. However, Stephens complicates this judgement by giving her a unique voice in the play, revealing the exhaustion and despair behind her choices, and showing her eventually choosing to care for Christopher. She is a flawed mother rather than a bad one, and her honesty about her failures may be the quality that finally allows her relationship with her son to begin again.

7a

On the surface, Wilder presents life in Grover's Corners as almost completely predictable: the same milk arrives, the same trains pass, the same mothers call the same children down to breakfast. I largely agree that the town runs on routine, but Wilder's purpose is more subtle than simply showing a dull place. He uses predictability as a frame so that the audience notices the unpredictable things, love, war and above all death, which break into it, and so that we learn, as Emily does, that the ordinary days we take for granted are in fact precious.

From the opening of Act One, the Stage Manager presents the town as a place where nothing surprising happens. He tells us, with a shrug, that "Nobody very

Question number

remarkable ever come out of it", and the casual, colloquial grammar of "come out of it" makes the town sound modest and settled. Because he speaks directly to the audience, breaking the fourth wall, his knowledge seems total: he can tell us the date, the weather and even the future of the people we are watching. When the train whistle sounds, the stage direction has him take out his watch and nod, as if the town keeps time with the railway. The 5.45 for Boston arrives exactly when it should, and Wilder makes the audience feel that the rhythm of life here could be set by a clock.

This sense of routine is built through structure. Each act contains a morning scene which closely mirrors the others. Howie Newsome delivers the milk, a Crowell boy throws the newspaper, and Doc Gibbs comes home from a call. The parallel scenes in the Gibbs and Webb kitchens are deliberately similar: both mothers urge their children to hurry, both fuss about breakfast, and George and Rebecca, like Emily and Wally, are told they will be late for school. Wilder strips the stage almost bare, with a few chairs and tables and actors miming their cooking and chores, so that the audience focuses entirely on these repeated actions. The effect is that these families seem to stand for every family, and their days seem to stand for every day.

The Stage Manager even tells the audience what is coming. At the start of Act Two he explains that the first act was the daily life and this one is love and marriage, and adds: "There's another act coming after this: I reckon you can guess what that's about." The structure of the play follows the most predictable pattern of all, birth, marriage and death, so in one sense the shape of every life in Grover's Corners is known in advance. When he talks of placing a copy of the play in the cornerstone of the new bank, he suggests that future people will learn a few simple facts about how ordinary people lived, implying that the town's life is

Question number

typical rather than unique.

However, Wilder undercuts this predictability in several ways. The most shocking example comes early, when the Stage Manager casually reveals that Joe Crowell, the bright paperboy, will win a scholarship, graduate with honours and then die in France in the war. The flat, matter of fact delivery makes the news more disturbing: a future the audience might have imagined as hopeful is suddenly cut off. Wilder shows that the wider world can break into the small town without warning. Similarly, the wedding morning in Act Two is unsettled, not routine. It has been raining, Mrs Gibbs and Mrs Webb are anxious, and both George and Emily panic just before the ceremony, each wanting to stop time. For a moment it seems possible that the wedding will not happen at all, and the expected ritual becomes tense and uncertain.

Act Three is where predictability is most powerfully broken. The audience learns that Mrs Gibbs has died and, most painfully, that Emily has died in childbirth while still young. The dead sit calmly in rows of chairs, and their stillness contrasts with the busy movement of the living in earlier acts, suggesting that the only certain thing is the end. Wally Webb's death on a camping trip and Simon Stimson's suicide also remind us that lives here do not follow a neat plan.

Yet Wilder's most important point is that predictability is not the same as dullness. When Emily returns to her twelfth birthday, the stage directions describe the stage becoming very bright, like a crisp winter morning. The day she relives is utterly ordinary, with Howie Newsome, Joe Crowell and her mother calling her down to breakfast, but seen through the eyes of the dead it becomes overwhelmingly beautiful. Emily cries that "It goes so fast" and that people do not have time to look at one another, and her farewell list of clocks ticking,

Question number

sunflowers, food and coffee shows that the repeated details of daily life were the things most worth loving. Her question, whether anyone ever realises life while they live it, turns the predictability of the earlier acts into a criticism of the living, who move through the same routines without seeing them.

In conclusion, I agree that life in Grover's Corners is presented as predictable in its daily rhythms and in the larger pattern of growing up, marrying and dying. However, Wilder deliberately disrupts this pattern with war, anxiety and sudden death, and he uses the Stage Manager and the play's repeating structure to show that the predictable moments are exactly what we fail to appreciate. The routine of the town is not the play's weakness but its message.

7b

In this extract Wilder presents Emily as a confident girl in public and intellectual matters, sure of her brains, her ambition and her place in the classroom. I would agree with this to a large extent, but Wilder also reveals, even here, a private uncertainty beneath the confidence, especially about how others see her. Across the play this pattern grows: Emily is assured when she can rely on her intelligence or her moral judgement, but she becomes frightened at the great turning points of her life, marriage and death, before finally reaching a deeper, wiser kind of confidence.

At the start of the extract George praises her, saying "You certainly do stick to it", and Emily's reply, "I always feel it's something you have to go through", is calm and mature. She does not giggle or deflect the compliment; she treats hard work as a duty, which makes her sound older than her years. When George hints that he is struggling with his algebra, Emily immediately takes control. The broken rhythm of "hints are allowed", followed by "So" and a pause, suggests that she is

Question number

weighing up honesty against kindness, but she quickly settles the matter on her own terms: "if you get stuck, George, you whistle to me". The imperative shows that she is the one who sets the rules of their friendship. Wilder stages this exchange with the two teenagers at their upstairs windows, on ladders in the original staging, so that they are physically separate but connected by talk. It is Emily who leads that talk, which suggests her confidence is greater than George's.

Her view of her own ability is strikingly sure. She explains her cleverness by saying "it's just the way a person's born", which presents intelligence as a natural fact rather than something to be boastful or modest about. A modern audience might find this slightly arrogant, but Wilder seems to present it with affection, as the frank self-belief of a bright girl who has not yet learned to doubt herself.

When she moves into the kitchen with her mother, her confidence becomes even more open. She announces that she made a speech in class and "I was very good". The short, plain sentence leaves no room for doubt. She then describes the speech with the simile "like silk off a spool", an image of smoothness and ease which itself shows a gift for language: Emily does not just claim to be articulate, she proves it. Her declaration "I'm going to make speeches all my life" reveals real ambition, unusual for a girl in a small town at the start of the twentieth century, and the future tense shows how certain she is of the life ahead of her.

However, Wilder then reverses the mood. Emily's question "What I mean is: am I pretty?" exposes a vulnerability that her schoolwork cannot solve. The colon acts like a pause in which she gathers her courage before asking what really matters to her. Her persistence suggests a kind of confidence, since she is bold enough to press her mother repeatedly, but the content of her questions shows insecurity. The ellipses in "Am I pretty enough ... to get anybody ... to get people interested

Question number

in me?" capture her hesitation, as she corrects herself mid sentence, perhaps embarrassed to admit she is thinking of boys, or of George in particular. Mrs Webb's brisk reply, that she is "pretty enough for all normal purposes", is comic but deflating, and Emily's final line, "Oh, Mama, you're no help at all", is both a confident rebuke and an admission that she still wants reassurance she cannot find. The extract therefore ends on a note of frustrated uncertainty rather than triumph.

Elsewhere in the play Emily's confidence continues to show itself in her honesty. In the drugstore scene in Act Two she tells George plainly that he has become conceited and only cares about baseball. It takes courage to criticise a popular boy so directly, and her judgement changes the course of his life, since he decides to stay in Grover's Corners rather than go to agricultural college. Yet even here she becomes flustered, insists she is not really angry, and almost cries, which suggests her boldness is fragile. Elsewhere she declares "I'm the brightest girl in school for my age. I have a wonderful memory", which echoes the assurance of the extract.

At her wedding, her confidence collapses. Moments before the ceremony she begs her father to let her stay at home, saying she does not want to get married and wishing she could stay just as she is. Wilder uses this panic to show how frightening adult life feels, even to a capable young woman. In Act Three, newly dead, Emily is uncertain and lonely among the calm dead, unsettled by being new among them. Her decision to relive her twelfth birthday, against Mrs Gibbs's advice, is a final act of stubborn self-belief, but the experience breaks her: "I can't. I can't go on. It goes so fast."

By the end, though, she reaches a quieter confidence based on understanding. Back in the graveyard she observes that the living "don't understand, do they?",

Question number

and her tone is no longer anxious but sure. In conclusion, I largely agree that Emily is confident, especially in the extract, where she is articulate, ambitious and in control of her conversations. However, Wilder carefully balances this with her insecurity about her looks and her fear at life's great changes, making her a more realistic and moving character than simple confidence would allow.

8a

Both Shakespeare's Sonnet 29 and Matthew Arnold's Dover Beach are spoken by men overwhelmed by discontent, and in both poems the speaker finally turns to a loved one as the only escape from it. The crucial difference lies in the cause and the cure. Shakespeare's speaker is discontented with his own personal status, his poverty, reputation and lack of friends, and love lifts him completely out of that misery. Arnold's speaker is discontented with the whole modern world, which has lost its religious faith, and love offers him only a fragile refuge within a darkness that does not lift.

Shakespeare opens with the conditional "When, in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes", which suggests that his discontent is a recurring mood rather than a single event. The synecdoche of "men's eyes" makes society a watching, judging presence, and the pairing with "fortune" implies that his low status is partly bad luck and partly public opinion, both beyond his control. The self pity is intense in "I all alone beweep my outcast state". The archaic verb "beweep" stretches the act of weeping, and "outcast" presents him as excluded from society. This may reflect Shakespeare's own position as a commoner from Stratford trying to make his fortune in London, in a rigidly hierarchical Elizabethan society where rank largely fixed a man's chances. His discontent even reaches upwards: he says he troubles "deaf heaven with my bootless cries", personifying heaven as deaf, so that his prayers are useless.

Question number

Arnold's discontent also begins in a particular moment, but it opens deceptively calmly: "The sea is calm to-night". The early lines are full of light and stillness, and only gradually does his mood darken as he hears in the waves "The eternal note of sadness". Where Shakespeare's misery is loud and self focused, Arnold's is philosophical and quiet, located not in his own status but in the human condition. The repeated sound of the pebbles being dragged back and flung up gives the poem a restless, rolling rhythm, so that discontent seems built into nature itself.

The heart of both speakers' discontent is comparison and loss. Shakespeare lists what others have, in the octave's anaphora of "like him": he wishes to be "like to one more rich in hope", with good looks and "friends possessed", "Desiring this man's art and that man's scope". The repetitive listing mimics obsessive envy, and the line "With what I most enjoy contented least" shows how discontent poisons even his pleasures. Arnold, by contrast, mourns a loss shared by everyone: "The Sea of Faith / Was once, too, at the full". The extended metaphor of faith as a tide that has gone out, leaving only its "melancholy, long, withdrawing roar", is the poem's central image. The long vowels and the slow, extended line enact the sound of retreat. Written in the middle of the nineteenth century, when geology and new scientific thinking were challenging traditional Christian belief, the poem expresses the anxiety of a Victorian intellectual who can no longer rely on God. Shakespeare's "deaf heaven" is a personal complaint that God is not listening; Arnold's receding sea suggests that, for his age, heaven itself is fading.

Both poets then turn to love, but very differently. Shakespeare's volta, "Yet in these thoughts myself almost despising, / Haply I think on thee", arrives exactly at the sestet, and the word "Haply", meaning by chance, makes the change of mood feel sudden and joyful. The simile "Like to the lark at break of day arising / From

Question number

sullen earth" is the turning point of the poem. Enjambment carries the line upwards, imitating the bird's flight, while "sullen earth" transfers his former gloom to the ground he leaves behind. The lark "sings hymns at heaven's gate": the heaven that was "deaf" now seems open, so love even restores his faith. The final couplet, "For thy sweet love remembered such wealth brings / That then I scorn to change my state with kings", reverses the language of status and poverty. The repetition of "state" from the octave shows that his circumstances have not changed at all; only his attitude has. Love makes him richer than a king, so his discontent is fully cured.

Arnold's turn comes later and is less confident: "Ah, love, let us be true / To one another!" The exclamation sounds more like a plea than a celebration. Love here is not a lark rising but a promise of loyalty in a world that is "really" a place with "neither joy, nor love, nor light". The negative listing hammers home how little the world can offer, and the final image, where "ignorant armies clash by night", leaves the poem in darkness and confusion. The world only seems like "a land of dreams"; underneath it is chaotic. While Shakespeare's sonnet ends on a rhyming couplet that resolves his mood, Arnold's irregular stanzas and uneven rhyme refuse that neat closure, mirroring a discontent that love can soften but not remove.

Form reinforces this contrast. Shakespeare uses the tight Shakespearean sonnet, part of the sequence addressed to the Fair Youth, published in 1609, and the shift from octave to sestet gives his discontent a clear beginning and end. Arnold's looser, more conversational form, possibly addressed to his new wife on honeymoon at Dover, allows his thoughts to drift and darken. In conclusion, both speakers find their discontent at its worst when they feel alone and unheard, and both seek salvation in a loved one. Yet Shakespeare's speaker is finally lifted into joy, whereas Arnold's discontent is too deep and too widely shared for love to do more

Question number

than offer two people a place to hold on to each other.

8b Both Robert Frost's The Road Not Taken and Thomas Hood's I Remember, I Remember are poems about looking back, and in both the act of remembering is coloured by a sense of loss. However, they look back in different directions. Frost's speaker looks back on a single choice, and even imagines looking back on it again in the distant future, so his poem is about the uncertainty of decisions and the stories we tell about them. Hood's speaker looks back on the whole of his childhood, and his memories become a painful measure of how much happier and closer to heaven he once was.

Frost's poem opens with an image that is both literal and symbolic: "Two roads diverged in a yellow wood". The "yellow wood" places the memory in autumn, perhaps evoking the New England landscape where Frost lived, and autumn itself suggests a time of reflection and decline. The extended metaphor of the roads as life choices is set up immediately, and the speaker's regret begins as early as the second line: "And sorry I could not travel both". From the start, looking back means recognising the life he did not live. Hood also opens with a precise image, "The house where I was born", but the repeated phrase "I remember, I remember" sets a very different tone. The repetition works like a refrain or a sigh, suggesting that memory is something he returns to again and again, almost compulsively, and each stanza begins with it, so the whole poem is structured as a series of returns to the past.

Frost's speaker examines his choice carefully, and the long vowels and alliteration of "long I stood / And looked down one as far as I could" slow the line down, enacting his hesitation. Yet when he looks back honestly, he admits that the

Question number

difference between the paths was slight. One had "perhaps the better claim, / Because it was grassy and wanted wear", but he immediately qualifies this: the passing there had worn them "really about the same", and both "equally lay / In leaves no step had trodden black". The run of qualifications shows that memory is unreliable and that his choice was not as meaningful as he might like to think. The exclamation "Oh, I kept the first for another day!" sounds hopeful, but he instantly corrects himself, "I doubted if I should ever come back", because he knows "how way leads on to way". Looking back, for Frost, means accepting that choices are final.

Hood's speaker, by contrast, is not weighing a decision; he is cataloguing a lost world of beauty. His memories are full of colour and light: "The roses, red and white", the violets, and the lily-cups, "Those flowers made of light!" Yet each stanza turns from the happy past to the unhappy present. In the first, the sun that came "peeping in at morn" is gently personified as a friendly visitor, but the stanza ends with the shocking wish that "the night / Had borne my breath away!" Looking back on such innocent happiness makes him wish he had died as a child. This sharp turn is far darker than anything in Frost. Hood wrote the poem in the 1820s, and he suffered from poor health for much of his life, which may help to explain the weariness and sorrow in the adult voice.

Both poets use contrast between past and present to show what has changed. Hood's swing stanza recalls how "My spirit flew in feathers then, / That is so heavy now". The metaphor of feathers suggests the lightness and freedom of childhood, against the heaviness of adult cares, and the "fever on my brow" hints at illness or anxiety that even summer pools could not cool. In his final stanza, the "fir trees dark and high" once seemed to touch the sky, and he admits this was "a childish ignorance". The closing lines, where he says it is "little joy" to

Question number

know he is "farther off from heav'n / Than when I was a boy", end the poem on a religious note of loss.

Frost's ending is more ambiguous. He projects himself forward: "I shall be telling this with a sigh / Somewhere ages and ages hence". The repetition of "ages and ages" makes the future seem vast, and the word "sigh" is open to interpretation: it could express regret, nostalgia, or even contented satisfaction. The repetition of the first line, now broken by a dash and a stammering "I" at the line end, suggests hesitation as he prepares to give his story a neat moral: "I took the one less traveled by, / And that has made all the difference." Because he has already told us the roads were about the same, many readers see irony here. Frost said the poem was partly inspired by walks with his friend Edward Thomas, who would regret whichever path they took, and the gentle mockery of indecision may be part of its meaning. Looking back, in Frost's view, is a way of inventing significance after the event.

The form of each poem supports its attitude. Frost's five line stanzas with a regular ABAAB rhyme scheme give a calm, controlled surface to a mind that is actually unsure. Hood's four eight line stanzas, each beginning with the same refrain and each moving from delight to sorrow, create a repeated pattern of hope and disappointment. In conclusion, both speakers look back with a sense of loss, but Frost's regret is quiet, uncertain and perhaps ironic, focused on the choices that shape identity, while Hood's is openly mournful, longing for a childhood innocence that cannot be recovered.

9a Ben Jonson's On My First Son and W. H. Auden's Funeral Blues are both poems of overwhelming grief for a loved one, yet they handle that grief in almost opposite

Question number

ways. Jonson's speaker, a father mourning his seven year old son, tries to contain and rationalise his sorrow through religious argument and tightly controlled verse, though his pain keeps breaking through. Auden's speaker, mourning a lover, refuses all control and demands that the whole world stop and share his loss. Both, however, end with a bleak conclusion about love itself.

Jonson begins with a direct address, "Farewell, thou child of my right hand, and joy". The phrase "child of my right hand" is a translation of the Hebrew name Benjamin, so the father is literally naming his son, who shared his name, and the right hand suggests strength, skill and favour. The word "joy" placed at the line end, after the pause of the comma, sounds like a cry that escapes him. Auden, by contrast, begins with commands: "Stop all the clocks, cut off the telephone". The imperatives show grief as a need to freeze time and silence the ordinary world.

Jonson's grief is complicated by guilt. He confesses, "My sin was too much hope of thee, lov'd boy". In a deeply Christian seventeenth century, loving a child too much could be seen as setting earthly hopes above God, so the father wonders whether his pride caused his loss. The metaphor of the child as a loan, "Seven years thou wert lent to me", presents the death as the repayment of a debt "Exacted by thy fate, on the just day". The legal and financial vocabulary is an attempt to make the loss seem fair and orderly, but the effort itself reveals how much he is struggling. Jonson's son died of the plague in 1603, and although child mortality was very common at the time, the poem shows that this did not make grief any less devastating.

Auden's speaker never attempts to justify his loss. Instead, he wants the world to display mourning on an enormous scale: aeroplanes should circle "moaning overhead", writing in the sky "He Is Dead". The personification of the aeroplanes as

Question number

"moaning" turns machines into mourners, and the capital letters of the message make it a public announcement. He asks for crêpe bows on the necks of the public doves, a symbol of peace dressed in black, and for traffic policemen to wear black gloves. These images are deliberately exaggerated and slightly absurd, which reflects the poem's origins: Auden first wrote a version with Christopher Isherwood for their play The Ascent of F6 in the 1930s as a satirical piece, before rewriting it as a cabaret song. Read now, especially after its use in the film Four Weddings and a Funeral, the excess feels sincere, capturing how grief makes the mourner feel that everyone should notice.

The most moving part of each poem is where the speaker defines what the loved one meant. Jonson turns to his profession, calling the boy "Ben Jonson his best piece of poetry". The metaphor shows enormous pride: his son was his finest creation, better than any of his famous plays or poems. It is also a kind of epitaph, written as though the child himself is speaking from the grave, so that the poem becomes a monument. Auden uses a sweeping list of opposites: "He was my North, my South, my East and West, / My working week and my Sunday rest". The lover was every direction and every part of time, so his loss leaves the speaker without bearings. The line "I thought that love would last for ever: I was wrong" is shockingly blunt. The plain monosyllables after the colon, "I was wrong", strip away all poetic decoration, and the speaker's naive belief is crushed.

Both poets use their forms to express their attitudes to grief. Jonson writes in rhyming couplets of iambic pentameter, a restrained, classical form that suggests the father trying to impose order on chaos. His rhetorical question, "For why / Will man lament the state he should envy?", argues that the boy has escaped the miseries of the world, "world's and flesh's rage", and even old age. Yet the exclamation "O, could I lose all father now!" shows him wishing he could stop

Question number	
	being a father in order to stop feeling, which reveals that reason cannot overcome his love. Auden's poem also uses rhyming couplets in four quatrains, but the lines are longer and less regular, and the build up of imperatives creates mounting intensity. His final stanza moves from the human world to the cosmos: "The stars are not wanted now: put out every one; / Pack up the moon and dismantle the sun". The verbs "pack up" and "dismantle" make the universe sound like a stage set to be cleared away, and the final line, "For nothing now can ever come to any good", is completely hopeless. Both endings are bleak, but in different ways. Jonson concludes with a vow that "what he loves may never like too much". The alliteration of "loves" and "like" and the careful distinction between them suggests he will protect himself in future by never loving so intensely again, a heartbreaking resolution for a father. Auden offers no lesson and no comfort, just total despair. In conclusion, both speakers feel that their loved one was everything to them, and both learn a painful truth about love. Jonson's grief is held within religious faith and formal restraint, even as it strains against them, whereas Auden's grief is limitless and public, refusing any consolation at all.
9b	Philip Larkin's Wild Oats and Carol Ann Duffy's Before You Were Mine both look back across a gap of years to a time of being young, and both speakers are drawn to a glamorous image of youth preserved in a photograph. However, their attitudes are very different. Larkin's speaker looks back on his own youth with wry embarrassment and self mockery, presenting it as a time of awkwardness, missed chances and failure in love. Duffy's speaker looks back on her mother's youth, which she never witnessed, and celebrates it as a time of freedom, fun and glamour, while feeling a guilty sense that her own birth brought it to an end.

Question number

Both poems open by establishing the distance in time. Larkin begins with the casual "About twenty years ago", and the vague "About" suggests that the memory is half dismissed, as if it hardly matters. Duffy begins more precisely and intimately: "I'm ten years away from the corner you laugh on / with your pals". The present tense makes the past feel alive, as though she can see her mother laughing now, and the colloquial "pals" captures the easy friendship of youth.

Larkin presents being young as a time of shallow impressions and social awkwardness. The two girls are introduced through a sharp contrast: "A bosomy English rose / And her friend in specs I could talk to." The metaphor of the "English rose" with the blunt adjective "bosomy" shows how the young man saw the beautiful girl purely in physical terms, while the other girl is reduced to her glasses. The added phrase "I could talk to" reveals his insecurity: he chooses the girl who does not intimidate him. This seems to echo the popular saying that men do not make passes at girls who wear glasses, and the poem exposes the immature attitudes of a young man of his time. The colloquial idiom "The whole shooting-match" makes his youthful desire sound comic and slightly ridiculous, and the line "I doubt / If ever one had like hers" shows that, even twenty years later, the rose's face is the one he idealises.

Duffy's mother, by contrast, is presented as the one who is beautiful and admired. The image of her polka-dot dress blowing round her legs is followed by the single word "Marilyn", a minor sentence that compares her to Marilyn Monroe, the screen goddess of the 1950s. The three girls "shriek at the pavement", a verb full of uninhibited, noisy joy. Duffy's speaker imagines her mother in "the ballroom with the thousand eyes", a metaphor for the glittering lights of the dance hall in Glasgow, and the hopeful phrase "the fizzy, movie tomorrows" suggests that being

Question number

young meant a future full of excitement and romance.

Both poets suggest that youth involves taking risks and breaking rules, but they view this differently. Duffy shows her mother defying authority: her Ma waits with a hiding for the late one, and the speaker comments, "You reckon it's worth it." The colloquial, almost admiring tone shows that the daughter approves of this rebellion, valuing the mother's fun over obedience. Larkin's young man, however, never seems to enjoy himself. He spends seven years with the friend in specs, writing "over four hundred letters" and giving "a ten-guinea ring / I got back in the end". The precise numbers and the cost of the ring make the relationship sound like a dutiful transaction, and the flat line ending "in the end" deflates any romance. His only meetings with the beautiful girl are summed up in "I met beautiful twice", where the adjective used as a noun turns her into an abstract ideal. She was trying "not to laugh", which shows his youthful humiliation.

Each poem's attitude to youth is also shaped by what came afterwards. Duffy's speaker sees her birth as the end of her mother's freedom. She refers to "my loud, possessive yell", a phrase that admits her own selfishness as a baby, and asks whether the decade before it "was the best one, eh?" The question, with its conversational tag, is affectionate but tinged with guilt. Larkin's young man learns a harsher lesson: their parting was an agreement that he was "too selfish, withdrawn, / And easily bored to love". The list of faults, perhaps the fiancée's judgement rather than his own, is followed by the dry, sarcastic line "Well, useful to get that learnt." The understatement hides real pain: being young taught him that he might be incapable of love. Larkin based the poem on his own long engagement to Ruth Bowman, whom he met while working as a librarian, and his reputation for glum, self deprecating honesty is clear here.

Question number

Both poems end with an image that preserves youth. Larkin keeps "two snaps / Of bosomy rose with fur gloves on", and calls them "Unlucky charms, perhaps." The oxymoron suggests that his fixation on an unattainable ideal of beauty may have spoiled his real relationship, while the final "perhaps" shows his characteristic hesitation and refusal to commit even to a conclusion. Duffy ends with a celebration: she wants "the bold girl winking in Portobello", and her closing lines insist that glamorous love lasts where her mother will always sparkle and waltz and laugh "before you were mine". The repetition of the title in the final words shows that this youthful self is frozen forever, like a photograph.

In conclusion, both speakers look back at being young through photographs and through the eyes of an older self. Larkin presents youth as awkward, mistaken and unfulfilled, a time he remembers with ironic regret. Duffy presents it as joyful, rebellious and glamorous, a time she celebrates even though she can only imagine it, and which she fears her own arrival ended.

10a

Both Simon Armitage's "Out of the Blue 12" and Ted Hughes's "Bayonet Charge" present fear not as a single emotion but as something that strips a human being down to the body and its instincts, until ideas about meaning and value fall away. Yet the two speakers experience it from opposite positions. Hughes's soldier is an aggressor, running towards the enemy, whose fear exposes the emptiness of the patriotism that sent him there. Armitage's speaker is a helpless civilian, trapped in the North Tower of the World Trade Center on 11 September 2001, whose fear is above all the terror of not being seen.

The most striking similarity is the way both poets make fear immediate. Armitage writes almost entirely in the present continuous, so that the reader lives through

Question number

each second with the speaker: he is "waving", "trying and trying", "still breathing". The temporal adverb in "you have noticed now" suggests that the speaker is narrating events as they unfold, which is horribly ironic because the reader, unlike the speaker, knows how the morning will end. Hughes achieves a comparable immediacy in a different way. "Suddenly he awoke and was running" throws us into the charge without preparation, as though fear arrives before thought. Where Armitage's continuous tense traps us in a moment that will not end, Hughes's past tense works like a camera in slow motion, freezing the soldier "in bewilderment" in the second stanza. Both, then, suggest that fear distorts time itself.

Both poets also personify the forces of danger, so that fear seems to come from something almost alive and malicious. In Armitage, "The heat behind me is bullying, driving", making the fire a deliberate tormentor. In Hughes, "Bullets smacking the belly out of the air" turns the sky into a body being beaten, and the harsh plosives make the violence audible. However, there is a difference in what the speakers fear. Hughes's soldier fears death in battle, but he also fears the realisation that he is simply a part in a machine: the "cold clockwork of the stars and the nations" reduces him to "the hand pointing that second". Armitage's speaker, by contrast, fears that his life has no value to anyone watching. His final question, "a soul worth saving?", carries religious weight, suggesting he is pleading not only to rescuers but perhaps to God.

The poets use ordinary imagery to sharpen fear, but in different ways. Armitage contrasts the abnormal horror of the tower with everyday domestic actions. The speaker's waving is compared to "shaking crumbs" or "pegging out washing", homely images that make the reader feel the gulf between normal life and this atrocity. The "white cotton shirt" he waves becomes a symbol of surrender and of how pitifully small his means of signalling are. Hughes instead uses the natural world.

Question number

The "yellow hare that rolled like a flame" and crawled in a "threshing circle" is an image of innocent suffering which mirrors the soldier's own terror: like the hare, he is a creature caught in something he does not understand. Interestingly, Armitage also uses an animal image, since "a bird goes by", but here the effect is ironic, reminding us of a freedom and flight the speaker can never have. Where Hughes's animal shares the human's pain, Armitage's bird only emphasises his isolation.

Structure reinforces the sense of rising fear in both poems. Armitage's fluctuating rhyme and the repeated "ing" endings create a breathless, panicked rhythm, and the lines in the penultimate stanza are shortened, as in "Are your eyes believing", as though the speaker's breath and hope are both running out. The contrast between the energetic sirens "wailing, firing" and the exhausted "But tiring, tiring" shows fear turning into numbness. Hughes, too, shapes his poem around a change, but it moves in the other direction. His soldier pauses in confusion and then breaks into action, so that by the final stanza "King, honour, human dignity, etcetera" are "Dropped like luxuries" and he is driven only by "His terror's touchy dynamite". The casual "etcetera" is devastating: fear exposes noble ideals as meaningless. Armitage's speaker grows weaker, whereas Hughes's soldier becomes a kind of explosive, yet in both cases fear has removed choice.

Context deepens these differences. Hughes, whose father survived Gallipoli, wrote "Bayonet Charge" in the 1950s about the First World War, and his poem questions the patriotic myths that sent young men "over the top": the "patriotic tear" that once brimmed in the soldier's eye is now "Sweating like molten iron". Armitage, writing for the fifth anniversary of the attacks, responds to a new kind of fear, the global terror threat, in which civilians at work become victims and the whole world watches on television. His interest in the effects of televised violence, the subject of his postgraduate thesis, seems relevant: the speaker addresses watchers

Question number

who can see him but cannot help, and the repetition of "appalling" points to the helplessness of the world.

The endings sum up the contrast. Hughes leaves his soldier mid-charge, a man transformed by terror into an instrument of war. Armitage ends with a direct, intimate appeal: "Do you see me, my love. I am failing, / flagging." The double meaning of "flagging", both tiring and signalling with his shirt, shows that his fear has not concluded; he is still hoping to be seen even as he weakens. Ultimately, Hughes presents fear as something that dehumanises and exposes the lies of nationalism, while Armitage presents it as unbearably human, a fear of dying unseen and unloved.

10b

Jane Weir's "Poppies" and Wilfred Owen's "Anthem for Doomed Youth" both suggest that the true grief of war is felt not on the battlefield but at home, in private and often silent ways that public ceremony cannot fully express. However, they approach grief from very different angles. Weir gives us a single mother's intimate, fragmented memories of the day her son left, so that grief becomes personal and domestic. Owen, writing as a soldier, speaks for whole generations of young men and the families who mourn them, angrily questioning whether any ritual can honour those who "die as cattle".

The most obvious difference lies in voice. Weir writes in the first person and addresses her son directly as "you", which makes the reader feel we are overhearing a private conversation with someone who may never answer. The intimacy of the pronouns heightens our sense of loss: she remembers how she "smoothed down your shirt's / upturned collar" and wanted to "graze my nose / across the tip of your nose" as they did when he was "little". These tactile details

Question number

characterise her as a tender mother whose grief is rooted in physical closeness now lost. Owen, by contrast, uses an impersonal, almost public voice. He never names a single soldier; instead he asks rhetorical questions such as "What passing-bells for these who die as cattle?" The simile reduces men to animals slaughtered in bulk, and the anonymity of "these" suggests that the scale of death is too vast for individual mourning.

Both poets, however, explore the inadequacy of words and rituals in the face of grief. Weir's speaker cannot express what she feels at the moment of parting: "All my words / flattened, rolled, turned into felt, / slowly melting." The textile metaphor, drawn from Weir's own background as a designer, suggests that her language has been pressed into something soft and shapeless. She even "steeled the softening / of my face", suppressing her grief to appear "brave". Owen also suggests that the conventional language of mourning is useless. In the sestet he dismisses Christian rites as "mockeries", insisting that the only "voice of mourning" for the dead is "The shrill, demented choirs of wailing shells". The personified shells grotesquely replace a church choir, so that grief is drowned out by the noise of war. Both poets, then, suggest that grief exceeds the forms available to contain it, though Weir's speaker turns inward into silence, while Owen turns outward into protest.

Structure reflects these differences. Weir's poem is non-chronological, moving between "Three days before Armistice Sunday", "Before you left" and "After you'd gone". These time shifts imitate the way grief disorders memory, as the speaker circles the same moments again and again. The poem also opens and closes with war graves and a war memorial, so that the reader realises, gradually, that the son may never return. Owen instead uses the tight form of a sonnet, traditionally the form of love poetry, which itself becomes a kind of ironic elegy. The octave is

Question number

filled with harsh battlefield sounds, such as the alliterative "stuttering rifles' rapid rattle", while the sestet moves to the quiet of home, "sad shires", where grief is truly felt. This volta mirrors Weir's movement from the son's departure to the mother's lonely walk, and in both poems the final emphasis falls on those left behind.

The poets' imagery of grief at home is particularly worth comparing. Owen's final lines locate mourning in the faces of women and children: "The pallor of girls' brows shall be their pall" and "each slow dusk a drawing-down of blinds". The pun on "pall" links the pale faces of the bereaved with the cloth draped over a coffin, and the slow, heavy rhythm of the last line suggests grief repeated every evening. Weir's mother experiences a similar ongoing, physical grief: walking "hat-less, without / a winter coat", her stomach "making tucks, darts, pleats", she is in disarray, consumed by anxiety. Her image of "leaning against it like a wishbone" at the memorial suggests both fragility and a desperate wish, perhaps for her son's safety. Yet Weir offers a faint, ambiguous hope that Owen does not. The released "song bird" and the "single dove" that "pulled freely against the sky" may symbolise peace or her son's freedom, or perhaps his spirit, and the poem ends with her "hoping to hear / your playground voice".

Context makes these contrasts clearer. Owen wrote "Anthem for Doomed Youth" in 1917 while recovering at Craiglockhart, and he was himself killed a week before the Armistice in 1918, so his poem is grimly prophetic of his own mother's grief. Weir's poem was published in 2009 after Carol Ann Duffy asked poets to respond to the deaths of soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan, and its setting around Armistice Sunday deliberately links modern loss with the remembrance tradition that grew out of Owen's war. Her years in Belfast during the Troubles may explain her focus on violence reaching into family life. The poppy itself, with its "spasms of paper

Question number

red", connects the two: a public symbol that, for Weir's mother, cannot heal private pain.

In conclusion, both speakers suggest that grief in war is borne most heavily by those at home, and that ceremony is an inadequate response. Owen's anger is directed at a system that slaughters young men without dignity, while Weir's quieter poem shows the lasting, private ache of one mother. Perhaps the most moving difference is that Owen mourns the dead, whereas Weir's speaker seems trapped in a grief that has no ending, still listening for a voice that may never come back.