Rewarding Learning

General Certificate of Secondary Education
2024

English Literature

Unit 2

The Study of Drama and Poetry

GEL21

[GEL21]
THURSDAY 30 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** attitudes to work, show how far you agree that members of the Boyle family have **poor attitudes** to work.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act 1 beginning at the top of page 74 with the stage directions: *Joxer steps cautiously into the room* and ending near the top of page 77 with Mrs Boyle's words: "Oh, you'll do a lot o' good as long as you continue to be a butty o' Joxer's!"

With reference to the ways O'Casey **presents** Joxer in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Joxer is **solely responsible** for Captain Boyle's behaviour.

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** Eva/Daisy, Sheila and Mrs Birling, show how far you agree that women are **treated poorly**.

(b) Look again at the extract beginning at the top of page 21 with the Inspector's words, "If you'll come over here, I'll show you" and ending on page 23 with the Inspector's words, "But you're partly to blame. Just as your father is."

With reference to the ways that Priestley **presents** the Inspector in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that he has **control** over the other characters.

stemup.co.uk

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

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

Use the Drama Answer Booklet for your answer.

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

(b) Look again at the extract from Episode II, beginning at the bottom of page 69 with Ned's words, "By the way, lads, who's the blondie thing" and ending at the bottom of page 71 with the stage direction, *Another brief silence.*

(For those using the version which was reset in 2000, the extract begins towards the top of page 57 and ends towards the top of page 59.)

With reference to the ways Friel **presents** attitudes in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that the male characters in the play are **sexist**.

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** Edward, show how far you agree that Edward shows **concern** for others.

(b) Look again at the extract beginning on page 39 with the stage direction*: The Narrator enters* and ending on page 41 with the stage direction: *The song ends with a percussion build to a sudden full stop and the scene snaps from Mrs Lyons to the children.*

(For those using the "red-backed edition", the extract begins at the bottom of page 43 and ends near the top of page 46.)

With reference to the ways Russell **presents** events in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Mrs Lyons **cannot control** the consequences of her actions.

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** trench warfare, show how far you agree that trench warfare brings **only suffering**.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act II, Scene 2 beginning on page 46 in the Samuel French edition with Stanhope's words, "Good man, Hibbert." and ending on page 49 with Stanhope's words, "You and Raleigh."

(For those using the Penguin edition, the extract begins on page 57 and ends on page 59.)

With reference to the ways Sherriff **presents** Stanhope in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Stanhope is **fit to serve** as a Commanding Officer.

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** the Boone family, show how far you agree that members of the Boone family are **untrustworthy**.

(b) Look again at the extract beginning at the bottom of page 81 with Ed's words: "I'm talking to her whether you like it or not" and ending near the bottom page 83 with the stage direction, *London Policeman watches Ed leave*.

With reference to the ways Stephens **presents** Ed in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that Ed is **caring**.

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** George, show how far you agree that George is **strong-minded**.

(b) Look again at the extract from Act Three beginning at the bottom of page 88 with Emily's words, "I didn't realize" and ending near the bottom of page 90 with Mrs Gibbs's words, "No, dear. They don't understand".

(For those using the edition re-issued in 2017, the extract begins towards the bottom of page 64 and ends on page 66.)

With reference to the ways Wilder **presents** human life in the extract and elsewhere in the play, show how far you agree that the people of Grover's Corners **waste** their lives.

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 *In Mrs Tilscher's Class* by Carol Ann Duffy which deals with the theme of change, and at one other poem from the IDENTITY anthology which also deals with the theme of change.

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

(b) Look again at *Docker* by Seamus Heaney which deals with the theme of conflict, and at one other poem from the IDENTITY anthology which also deals with the theme of conflict.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **conflict**. 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 *Symptoms of Love* by Robert Graves which deals with the theme of heartbreak, and at one other poem from the RELATIONSHIPS anthology which also deals with the theme of heartbreak.

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

(b) Look again at *Clearances 7: In the last minutes* by Seamus Heaney which deals with the theme of family relationships, and at one other poem from the RELATIONSHIPS anthology which also deals with the theme of family relationships.

With close reference to the ways each poet uses language, compare and contrast what the speakers in the poems say about **family relationships**. 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 *Bayonet Charge* by Ted Hughes which deals with the theme of the horror of conflict, and at one other poem from the CONFLICT anthology which also deals with the theme of the horror of conflict.

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

(b) Look again at *Requiem for the Croppies* by Seamus Heaney which deals with the theme of death, and at one other poem from the CONFLICT anthology which also deals with the theme of death.

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

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTION PAPER

stemup.co.uk

Sources

Q1...From 'Three Dublin Plays: "Shadow of a Gunman", "Juno and the Paycock" and "Plough and the Stars" by Sean O'Casey. Published by Faber & Faber. © 1998
Q2...From 'An Inspector Calls' by J. B. Priestley. Published by Heinemann. © 1992
Q3...From 'Philadelphia, Here I Come!' by Brian Friel. Published by Faber & Faber. © 1975
Q4...From 'Blood Brothers' by Willy Russell. Published by Methuen Drama. © 2001
Q5...From 'Journey's End' by R.C. Sherriff. Published by Penguin Classics. © 2000
Q6...From 'The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time: The Play (Critical Scripts)' by Mark Haddon, Adapted by Simon Stephens. Published by Methuen Drama. © 2013
Q7...From 'Our Town and Other Plays' by Thornton Wilder. Published by Penguin Classics. © 2000

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.

GEL21/7
289171

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

Question number

Ia

I largely agree that members of the Boyle family have poor attitudes to work, but only if the statement is aimed squarely at Captain Boyle. O'Casey makes Boyle's idleness the comic engine of the play, yet he deliberately surrounds him with characters whose attitudes are far more complicated: Juno, who works relentlessly; Mary, whose strike is a matter of principle rather than laziness; and Johnny, whose inability to work is the cost of the fight for Irish freedom. The family is therefore not uniformly idle. Instead, O'Casey uses their contrasting attitudes to show how one man's refusal to work drags everyone around him towards ruin.

From the opening of Act I, Boyle's attitude to work is established through Juno's complaints before he even appears. Her bitter observation that he is "afther wearin' out the unemployment dole" and is "constantly singin', no less" captures the absurdity of a man who treats unemployment as a holiday. The comic exaggeration of her religious language, that he "ought always to be on his knees offerin' up a Novena for a job!", is undercut when she adds, viciously, that "it's not for a job he's prayin'". The sarcasm is comic but also signals Juno's exhaustion. Her simile that he goes "sthruttin' about from mornin' till night like a paycock" gives the play its title, suggesting that Boyle's vanity and his idleness are the same flaw: he displays himself instead of providing for his family.

O'Casey then lets Boyle condemn himself through his own words. When Juno is present he puts on a show of eagerness, claiming "I'm fed up knockin' round, doin' nothin'", but the moment he is alone with Joxer the pretence collapses: "It's only eleven o'clock; we've lashins o' time". The leisurely verb "saunther" and the cheerful "at our ayse" reveal that work is the last thing on his mind. The audience sees the

Question number

gap between his performance and the real man. Joxer's line that Boyle is "Lookin' for work, an' prayin' to God he won't get it" confirms what we already suspect, and it is especially damning coming from his closest crony.

The arrival of Jerry Devine with genuine news of a job exposes Boyle completely. The stage direction "suspiciously" and his flurry of irritated questions, "What business is it of yours...? What do you want to be gallopin' about afther me for?", show him treating an offer of work as a personal attack. His sudden complaint about "the pains in me legs" and his question "How d'ye expect me to be able to go up a ladder with these legs?" are farcical, since these pains appear only when work is mentioned. Juno's retort that he would "do far more work with a knife an' fork than ever you'll do with a shovel!" is a brilliant comic deflation. Even more revealing is Boyle's self-pity, "It's a curious way to reward Johnny be makin' his poor oul' father work", which twists a priest's kindness into an injustice. His cynical picture of the clergy wanting men to "work, work, work" so that they will be in "betther fettle" when collecting dues shows that Boyle disguises laziness as political or anticlerical grievance.

However, O'Casey complicates the picture. Juno herself is the opposite of idle; her reproach that his "poor wife" is "slavin' to keep the bit in your mouth" reminds the audience that the family survives on her labour, and the verb "slavin'" makes her work sound like bondage. She challenges Mary about striking and is harsh even with Johnny, telling him he "lost your best principle" when he lost his arm, because principles are no use to "a workin' man". Juno's attitude is practical: work means survival. Yet even she weakens when the inheritance is announced, telling Boyle, "You won't have to trouble about a job for awhile, Jack". This small line is structurally important. It suggests that the poor attitude to work is not simply a personal vice but a temptation that affects anyone offered easy money, and it

Question number

prepares for the reckless spending on credit in Act 2.

Mary is perhaps the most interesting case. The statement could be applied to her, since she is on strike and Juno worries about the lost wages. Her remark that "The hour is past now when we'll ask the employers' permission to wear what we like" sounds defiant, even careless. But her question, "What's the use of belongin' to a Trades Union if you won't stand up for your principles", shows that her absence from work comes from solidarity, not idleness, and Juno admits that "ever since she left school she's earned her livin'". O'Casey presents Mary as someone with a strong, even idealistic, attitude to work, whose strike is about dignity rather than avoidance.

Johnny, finally, cannot work at all. Jerry's reference to "poor Johnny an' his father bein' idle so long" bitterly yokes together two very different kinds of idleness: one is chosen, the other is the result of injury in the national struggle. The pairing makes Boyle's chosen idleness look all the more shameful.

The ending removes any doubt about Boyle. Even when the will has collapsed, the debts have mounted and the family has disintegrated, he announces, "I'm goin' out now to have a few dhrinks with th' last few mates I have". The structure of the play, moving from the comic idleness of Act 1 to this tragic irresponsibility, turns what seemed harmless clowning into something destructive. Overall, I agree that Boyle's attitude to work is poor, and that the family suffers for it, but O'Casey presents Juno and Mary as people who value work deeply, which makes Boyle's laziness all the more shameful.

1b I agree that Joxer bears a heavy responsibility for Captain Boyle's behaviour, but I

Question number

do not agree that he is solely responsible. O'Casey presents Joxer as a sly flatterer who feeds Boyle's laziness, his drinking and his resentment of Juno, yet the play makes it equally clear that Joxer only encourages tendencies Boyle already has. In many ways Joxer is less a cause of Boyle's behaviour than a mirror that reflects it back to him in its most flattering form.

The extract opens with a stage direction that tells us a great deal: Joxer steps cautiously into the room. The adverb suggests a man who knows he is not welcome, and who understands that Juno sees him as a corrupting presence in her home. O'Casey's description of him, with eyes that have a cunning twinkle and a manner meant to be ingratiating, presents him as a parasite from the start. His first words immediately take Boyle's side against Juno: "It's a terrible thing to be tied to a woman that's always grousin'". Joxer does not create Boyle's grievance, but he sharpens it. The cliché "when the cat's away, the mice can play!" is revealing, because it frames Juno's absence at work as an opportunity for mischief and casts both men as children escaping discipline. This supports the idea that Joxer actively encourages bad behaviour.

However, the extract also shows Boyle as a willing participant. Boyle orders, with a commanding and complacent gesture, "Pull over to the fire", playing the host and the "Captain". O'Casey makes clear who has the status in this friendship: Joxer is the guest, Boyle the self-appointed master. The term cronies captures a mutual relationship of idleness rather than one man leading another astray.

Juno's arrival transforms the scene. The stage direction Both are stupefied is comic, but it also shows that the two men know exactly how she views their companionship. Juno's sweet irony as she repeats Boyle's own invitation, "Pull over to the fire, Joxer Daly", turning her head to glare at Joxer, aims her anger directly

Question number

at the visitor. Her sarcasm that "people is always far more comfortabler here than they are in their own place" mocks Joxer's habit of sponging off the Boyles. When she shuts the door with a bang, the sound effect marks her as the real authority in the house. Joxer's panic, "I'm in a desperate hurry, a desperate hurry", with the repetition showing his eagerness to escape, and the directions that he makes hastily for the door and stands at door ready to bolt, turn him into a cowardly figure of farce. A man so frightened of Juno hardly seems capable of controlling Boyle completely.

Most revealing is the lie about the job. Boyle invents a story about meeting a foreman, and Joxer, with the truth dawning on him, quickly plays along: "The foreman at Killesther, oh yis, yis". O'Casey's direction makes clear that the lie originates with Boyle; Joxer merely supports it. His string of proverbs, "it's a long lane that has no turnin'", "God never shut wan door but He opened another" and "for want of a nail the shoe was lost", is comically empty. These ready-made phrases show that Joxer has no ideas of his own and simply produces whatever words will keep him in Boyle's favour. Juno's final exclamation, "Oh, you'll do a lot o' good as long as you continue to be a butty o' Joxer's!", places the blame on the friendship, yet even she addresses Boyle, implying he chooses to be Joxer's "butty".

Elsewhere, O'Casey adds weight to the case against Joxer. Juno tells Mary that Boyle is "wherever Joxer Daly is, dhrinkin' in some snug or other", linking Joxer directly to his drinking. Joxer feeds Boyle's self-pity about his legs, declaring that "any man havin' the like of them pains id be down an' out, down an' out", and the repetition gives Boyle permission to stay idle. He also tries to set Boyle against his wife, urging him, "Be firm, be firm", and telling him "as a butty, as a butty" that he has "stuck it too long". In these moments Joxer seems a genuine, malign influence.

Question number

Yet the counter-evidence is strong. Joxer is a sycophant who agrees with whatever Boyle says: "You're afther takin' the word out o' me mouth". His gushing "You could sing that if you had an air to it" is praise so empty it becomes absurd. These lines suggest that Boyle leads and Joxer follows. Crucially, the moment Boyle hears of the inheritance, he drops his friend without hesitation: "I'm done with Joxer; he's nothin' but a prognosticator". If Joxer controlled him, Boyle could not discard him so easily. Boyle's vanity, his lies about being a sea captain, his reckless spending in Act 2 and his cruel rejection of Mary in Act 3 all happen without any prompting from Joxer. These are failings of Boyle's own character.

The ending of the play brings the two men back together, drunk and rambling while Juno and Mary have left to face the future alone. O'Casey's final scene suggests that each man is the other's worst influence: Boyle supplies the bluster and Joxer the flattery. Joxer certainly enables and encourages Boyle's behaviour, and the extract shows him as a cunning, cowardly hanger-on, but O'Casey makes Boyle the source of his own idleness and selfishness. I therefore disagree that Joxer is solely responsible. Boyle chooses Joxer, again and again, over his family.

2a

Priestley presents a world in which women are treated poorly, but not in a single, simple way. Eva Smith is the most obvious victim, exploited and discarded by every member of the family, yet Sheila and Mrs Birling are also patronised, deceived and finally exposed. What makes the play so powerful is that Priestley shows women as both victims and agents of cruelty: Sheila and Mrs Birling themselves treat Eva appallingly. I therefore largely agree with the statement, but I would argue that the poorest treatment comes from the powerful towards the powerless, and that gender works together with class to decide who suffers most.

Question number

Eva/Daisy is the clearest example. She never appears on stage, and this structural choice is itself significant: she is spoken about, judged and summarised by others, but never allowed to speak for herself. The Inspector's list of her circumstances, "no work, no money... no relatives to help her, few friends, lonely, half-starved, she was feeling desperate", builds a cumulative picture of total isolation, the rhythm of short phrases mirroring the way her support is stripped away piece by piece. Birling's dismissive phrase "wretched girl's suicide" shows how little her death means to him: the adjective expresses irritation rather than pity, as if she has inconvenienced him.

Each of the younger characters then treats her poorly in turn. Sheila's confession, "I told him that if they didn't get rid of that girl, I'd never go near the place again", reveals how casually a privileged young woman could destroy another's livelihood. The conditional threat and the dismissive "that girl" show Sheila using her family's custom as a weapon. Gerald's admission, "I didn't feel about her as she felt about me", is honest but exposes the imbalance in their relationship; Daisy was a source of gratitude and flattery for him rather than an equal. Eric's behaviour is the most disturbing. His admission that he was "in that state when a chap easily turns nasty" and "threatened to make a row" hints at coercion, and the Inspector's judgement that he used her "as if she was an animal, a thing, not a person" is a stark tricolon that descends from living creature to object, capturing the dehumanisation at the heart of the play.

Mrs Birling's treatment of Eva is perhaps the cruellest because it comes from a woman, and from a woman whose role is supposedly charitable. Her contemptuous phrase "Girls of that class" reduces Eva to a category, and her verdict, "I think she only had herself to blame", is chilling in its lack of compassion. Here Priestley

Question number

shows that women are not united by their gender; Mrs Birling's class loyalty is far stronger than any sympathy for a pregnant young woman in despair.

Sheila, too, is treated poorly, though in subtler ways. Mrs Birling's patronising "You seem to have made a great impression on this child, Inspector" refuses to see her as an adult capable of moral judgement. Gerald's affair, which he admits with "I'm sorry, Sheila. But it was all over and done with, last summer", reveals that he has lied to her throughout the summer when he claimed to be busy at the works. At the end, both Birling and Gerald expect her simply to forget: Birling's suggestion that she ask Gerald for the ring and Gerald's breezy "Everything's all right now, Sheila. What about this ring?" treat her as a possession to be reclaimed, as if her moral awakening counts for nothing.

Mrs Birling is also treated harshly, although the audience may feel she deserves it. The Inspector cleverly leads her into condemning the father of Eva's child before revealing it is her own son: "we know what to do, don't we? Mrs Birling has just told us". The dramatic irony is devastating, and her shock, conveyed when she stops, and exchanges a frightened glance with her husband, shows her fear. Eric's furious confrontation leaves her very distressed now. Yet I would argue this is not poor treatment in the same sense as Eva's: Mrs Birling is being held to account, not exploited.

There is also evidence against the statement. The Inspector treats Sheila with real respect, warning that if she leaves and "doesn't hear any more, then she'll feel she's entirely to blame". Gerald shows some genuine kindness to Daisy, explaining that he moved her to Morgan Terrace "because I was sorry for her". Birling is even protective of his wife, asking Sheila to take her mother along to the drawing-room and then, in a gentler tone, "Go on, Sybil". Sheila's frantic attempt to stop her

Question number

mother before she condemns Eric shows that she cares for her, even though her mother has not treated her as an equal.

Overall, I agree that women are treated poorly in the play, but Priestley's message goes beyond gender. Eva suffers because she is a woman and because she is poor, and the image of young women "counting their pennies in their dingy little back bedrooms" makes her representative of a whole class. Sheila and Mrs Birling suffer far less because their wealth protects them, and Mrs Birling uses her privilege to inflict suffering. Priestley seems to suggest that the worst treatment of women comes from a society in which power, whether held by men or women, is used without responsibility.

2b

I strongly agree that the Inspector has control over the other characters for almost the whole of the play. Priestley presents him as a figure who directs the investigation, manages information and dictates the emotional rhythm of each scene, so that the Birlings and Gerald seem to move to his timetable rather than their own. However, his control is not complete. It is resisted, especially by Mr and Mrs Birling, and once he leaves it proves temporary for the older characters. Priestley seems to suggest that the Inspector can force people to confront the truth, but he cannot force them to change.

The extract opens with the Inspector in charge of the most powerful object in the scene, the photograph. His polite but firm "If you'll come over here, I'll show you" draws Sheila across the stage to him, and he alone decides who may look. The stage direction that he puts the photograph back into his pocket emphasises that information belongs to him. This device runs throughout the play: earlier, when Gerald and Eric try to see the photograph shown to Birling, the Inspector

Question number

interposes himself between them and the photograph. By showing it to one person at a time, he isolates each character and prevents them from forming a united front.

Sheila's reaction demonstrates the effect of this control. The stage direction with a little cry, gives a half-stifled sob, and then runs out is a moment of intense physical drama, and it happens without the Inspector raising his voice. He has only to show her a face for her guilt to overwhelm her. Birling's angry protest reveals his loss of authority in his own house, and the direction that Birling looks as if about to make some retort, then thinks better of it shows the head of the family silencing himself. Priestley's stagecraft makes the power shift visible: the man who lectured his guests about the future is now unable to finish a sentence.

The Inspector also controls the pace and order of events. "One line of inquiry at a time" is a curt, almost procedural line that refuses to let the family set the agenda. His vague "All in good time" deliberately withholds information, creating suspense both for the characters and for the audience. When Gerald begins to object, the Inspector is cutting in, massively, and the adverb gives him an almost physical weight, as though he is simply too large to be argued with. His declaration that "some things are left to me. Inquiries of this sort, for instance" asserts a quiet but absolute authority. Even his imperative to Gerald, "you'd better stay here", is obeyed. The stage direction uneasily attached to the others shows that he intimidates them without any open threat.

Priestley uses the Inspector's moral judgements as a further form of control. His remark to Gerald about "promising life there, I thought, and a nasty mess somebody's made of it" is pointed, and the vague "somebody" forces every listener to wonder whether he means them. The extract ends with the verdict to Sheila,

Question number

"But you're partly to blame. Just as your father is". The short, balanced sentences link daughter and father in shared guilt, and this sets up the chain structure of the play, in which each character is implicated in turn.

Elsewhere in the play, Priestley's opening stage direction establishes the Inspector's control before he has said much at all. He creates an impression of massiveness, solidity and purposefulness, and he has a disconcerting habit of looking hard at the person he addresses before actually speaking. This silence is a form of power. He openly criticises Birling, "(sharply) Your daughter isn't living on the moon", and warns him "(sternly) I warn you, you're making it worse for yourself". In Act 3 he brushes aside Birling's status as father and host, conceding "I know" before insisting "look at him", so that Birling's house is no longer his to command. His apparent omniscience, "And anyhow I knew already", makes resistance seem pointless.

His final speech is the climax of his control. The inclusive "We'll have to share our guilt" and the declaration that "We are members of one body. We are responsible for each other" shift him from investigator to prophet. He then leaves, and the stunned silence that follows suggests that his words linger after he has physically gone.

However, the play also shows the limits of his power. Mrs Birling resists him with "You're not telling me the truth" and remains defiant for much of Act 2, and the Inspector's own admission, "I'm losing all patience with you people", hints at frustration with those who will not listen. Most significantly, once he has gone, Birling and Gerald work to dismiss him. Birling's triumphant "By Jingo! A fake!" and the complacent "He never talked like one. He never looked like one" show how quickly the older generation slips back into their old attitudes. Birling's sneer at

Question number

"the famous younger generation who know it all" ironically proves that the Inspector's influence survives in Sheila and Eric, but not in their parents.

Overall, I agree that the Inspector controls the other characters during his time on stage, and the extract shows this control at its most theatrical. Yet Priestley carefully limits that control, because his message depends on the characters' own choices. The final telephone call announcing that an inspector is on his way suggests that if the Birlings will not learn willingly, they will have to learn again. Control alone cannot redeem them; only responsibility can.

3a

On the surface, S.B. O'Donnell appears profoundly uncaring. He says almost nothing about his only son's emigration, he talks about flour and barbed wire on Gar's last night at home, and he seems locked in routines that leave no room for feeling. Yet I only partly agree with the statement. Friel uses the device of Gar Public and Gar Private to show us the world largely through Gar's frustrated eyes, and in doing so he invites us to judge S.B. harshly; but in the final episode he lets us see S.B. without Gar present, and what we find there is not a man who does not care, but a man who cannot say that he cares.

The case against S.B. is built through his silence about Gar's departure. When Madge asks whether S.B. has said anything, Gar's reply is simply "Not a word", and Private's crude "The bugger" voices the resentment Gar cannot express aloud. Gar's account of his last working day, in which S.B. "Lines up five packs of flour", reveals a father who treats the day as completely ordinary. Friel builds comedy and pain from this ordinariness: S.B.'s question, "How many coils of barbed-wire came in on the mail-van this evening?", is so mundane that it becomes absurd. The barbed wire is also quietly symbolic, suggesting the fences and barriers between

Question number

father and son.

Friel's most effective technique here is Private's ability to predict S.B.'s words. Because S.B. always says the same things, Private can mouth them before he speaks, as with "Another day over", and can mock them as if they were lines in a script: "Good. Next phrase. I suppose we can't complain". This exposes S.B. as a man of rigid habit, but it also shows how deeply Gar knows his father, which hints at a relationship that has been close enough to memorise. Private's invented commentary, including the ironic "and above all please don't stop eating", is very funny, yet the comedy masks Gar's desperation for some sign that his father will miss him. Private's nickname for him, "Screwballs", is both affectionate and contemptuous.

Madge, who acts as the conscience of the house, adds to the case against S.B. The stage direction She gives S.B. a hard look, and her pointed line "Won't the house be quiet soon enough", rebuke his silence. Her irony, "The chatting in this place would deafen a body", sums up the household's failure to communicate. S.B.'s small discourtesies, such as not wearing his dentures "while there's a lady in your presence!", show a man careless of others' feelings. When the Canon visits for draughts, S.B. barely acknowledges the departure: "Aye, tomorrow morning. Powerful the way time passes, too". The commonplace remark about time passing is almost painful, because time is exactly what father and son are running out of.

Perhaps the most heartbreaking moment is Gar's attempt to share his memory of the day fishing in the boat, when his father sang to him. S.B. cannot remember it and is drawn instead to trivial details such as the colour of the boat and the name of the song. To Gar, this seems proof that the moment meant nothing to his father. Even S.B.'s short, flat replies to Gar's efforts at intimacy, and his

Question number

repeated "Sure you know I never take a second cup", seem to shut his son out.

Yet Friel complicates this reading through stage directions that Gar never sees. Earlier, S.B. looks down at the paper again, and the audience notices that it has been upside down, revealing that he has not been reading at all but brooding. He looks across at Gar's bedroom, sighs, rises, and exits very slowly, and the slow, heavy movement suggests sorrow he cannot voice. Late at night he admits "It's hard to sleep sometimes...", and the ellipsis trails off into everything he is unable to say.

S.B. also shows care in practical, understated ways. He has listened to the forecast and concluded "it would be a fair enough day for going up in thon plane", and he wants to advise Gar that "you should sit at the back". These are the only words of love available to a man like S.B.: concern expressed as weather and seating. He even accepts Gar's instruction about the milk lorry with a halting "Aye... right...", as if struggling to go further. He asks Madge with real concern, "There's nothing wrong, is there?", when she returns from visiting her new niece.

Most revealing of all is his conversation with Madge in the final episode. He remembers Gar as a small boy in a sailor suit, "the two of us, hand in hand, as happy as larks, we were that happy". The simile is touchingly simple, and the repetition of "happy" shows the strength of a memory he has never shared with his son. His humble question, "Maybe, Madge, maybe it's because I could have been his grandfather, eh?", suggests he understands, sadly, the gap of age and temperament between them. This is a father who cares deeply but whose memories, like Gar's, are of a different moment.

Overall, I disagree that S.B. is truly uncaring. Friel presents him as

Question number	
	uncommunicative, set in his ways and emotionally inarticulate, and from Gar's point of view this looks like indifference. But the tragedy of the play is that both men care, and both remember a moment of closeness, yet neither can reach the other. S.B.'s silence is not the absence of love; it is the inability to express it.
3b	The extract presents the male characters at their most crudely sexist: Ned, Tom and Joe talk about women as objects, rank them by their looks and boast about conquests. To that extent I agree with the statement. However, Friel does not let these attitudes stand unchallenged. Through Gar's scepticism, Private's commentary and the tenderness shown elsewhere towards Kate and Madge, he exposes the boys' sexism as a hollow performance that hides loneliness, fear and immaturity. I would therefore argue that many of the male characters speak in sexist ways, but Friel presents this less as a fixed belief than as a symptom of the narrow, frustrated life of Ballybeg.
	The extract opens with Ned's question about "the blondie thing", and the noun "thing" immediately reduces a woman to an object. Tom picks up and extends the language with "A big redhead?" and "the big red thing", and the repetition of "thing" shows how the boys feed off each other, each competing to sound more worldly. Ned's confident "That's me fixed up for the next two weeks" assumes that a woman's consent is irrelevant; she exists simply to satisfy him during the holiday. The casual tone makes the sexism sound routine, as if this is how the boys always speak.
	Ned's language becomes increasingly degrading. His question, "Were any of youse ever on that job?", turns Annie McFadden into a "job", something to be worked on, and his claim that "she damned near killed me" and that "you need the

Question number

constitution of a horse" turn sexual boasting into crude comedy. Joe's contribution, "the one with the squint", mocks her appearance. Friel's stage direction, with dignity, as Ned insists she "has no squint", is beautifully ironic: Ned is pompously defending his own reputation rather than the girl's, since he cannot be seen to have gone out with someone imperfect. The verbal sexism here is relentless, and the audience is likely to find it both funny and uncomfortable.

Crucially, Gar refuses to join in completely. His blunt "You were never out with big Annie McFadden in your puff" exposes Ned as a liar, and Ned's response, with quiet threat, suggests a bully who cannot bear his boasting to be questioned. Tom immediately rushes to defend him: "Ned was there, Gar, manys and manys the time". The phrase "was there" treats the woman as a place to be visited, and the repetition of "manys" sounds desperately insistent. Gar's wearily delivered reply shows that he knows arguing is pointless. When Ned turns sulkily, then begins thawing once the others flatter him, Friel's stage directions reveal how fragile his ego is: his sexism depends on admiration from the group.

This is followed by the "reminiscence" of the two Greenock girls. Ned's coarse "Liveliest wee tramps I ever laid!" and the boys' delight in "the one that hauled you down into the ditch!" are the most offensive lines in the extract. The adjectives "fat" and "fast" judge the women by their bodies and their supposed morals, while verbs such as "hauled" falsely present the girls as predatory, shifting responsibility onto them. Yet the more the boys repeat the story, the more it sounds like a myth they have told themselves many times.

Friel's dramatic technique undermines it completely. Private observes that the boys "weren't always like this", which encourages the audience to look past the swagger to the boys they once were. In Private's monologue, the real version of that night

Question number

is revealed as timid and uneventful: the boys were too nervous to approach the girls at all. This structural juxtaposition of boast and reality turns their sexism into something pathetic rather than threatening. Ned's later "£10 to a shilling I click with one or other of them!" now sounds empty. Joe, too, seems less committed to the fantasy, admitting "No, I wasn't there that night", which hints that he is half aware of the pretence.

Elsewhere in the play, Friel shows that the male characters are capable of very different attitudes. Gar's memory of Kate is full of tenderness, and the loving repetition in "Kate... sweet Katie Doogan... my darling Kathy Doogan" contrasts sharply with the boys' "thing". When the memory turns sour after her father's humiliation of Gar, Private's insults, such as "Rotten aul snobby bitch!", show that Gar too can lash out in sexist language when hurt. When Kate visits on his last evening, Gar is cruel, telling her "You're stuck here!" and adding the coarse "And if you can't be good". These moments suggest that sexist language is a weapon Gar uses when he feels rejected, not a settled view of women.

Other men in the play are gentle and respectful. Con Sweeney comforts his wife with "It's okay, honey, okay", and S.B., for all his silence, depends on Madge and seeks her approval: "I'll manage rightly, Madge, eh?". Gar's attitude to Madge is affectionate and even reverent, as Private tells himself to "Watch her carefully, every movement, every gesture", fixing her in his memory before he leaves.

Overall, I agree that the boys in the extract are sexist in the way they speak about women, and Friel makes their language deliberately ugly. But I disagree that the male characters in the play are sexist in any simple or universal sense. Friel presents the boys' sexism as a mask for inexperience and fear, and shows Gar, Con and S.B. capable of love and respect. The real target of the scene is the stifling

Question number

world of Ballybeg, where young men have nothing to do but invent stories, and where talk replaces life.

4a

Russell presents Edward as a character whose concern for others is genuine and instinctive, especially in childhood, and I largely agree that he is caring. However, Russell also shows that Edward's concern is shaped, and at times limited, by his privilege. Because he has never had to struggle, his kindness can become careless, and in the second half of the play the audience sees that good intentions are not the same as understanding. Russell uses Edward to suggest that concern for others is not enough when it cannot cross the gap that class has opened up.

From his very first appearance Edward is defined by generosity. When he meets Mickey he offers him a sweet almost at once, and the stage direction (He offers a bag from his pocket) makes the gesture casual and unthinking. This matters because Mickey has just been sulking about his brother Sammy refusing to share, so Russell sets Edward's openness against the grabbing world of the Johnstone household. Edward is fascinated rather than repelled by Mickey's swearing and bravado, and he agrees eagerly to become his "blood brother", a ritual which shows how quickly he offers loyalty. His politeness is also part of his concern for others. He greets Mrs Johnstone with "Hello, Mrs Johnstone. How are you?", a formal and slightly comic courtesy from a young boy, but one which shows that he treats people with respect regardless of where they live.

Edward's concern extends to keeping faith with people. When Mrs Johnstone gives him the locket and later Mrs Lyons demands to know where it came from, he refuses to tell her: "I can't tell you that. It's a secret". The short, firm sentences show a child who understands that a promise matters, and the audience, knowing

Question number

the truth, sees how much the locket means to the mother who gave it. Even towards Mrs Lyons, who treats him with a smothering and frightening possessiveness, he asks "Are you feeling all right, Mummy?" The gentle question reveals that he notices her distress even when he does not understand it, which presents his concern as instinctive rather than calculated.

As a teenager his concern takes the form of selfless friendship. He coaches Mickey on how to ask Linda out, telling him to look "straight into her eyes", even though Russell makes clear through the song "I'm Not Saying a Word" that Edward loves her himself. The line "If I was him I'd bring you flowers" is sung in private, so the dramatic irony lets the audience see the sacrifice he makes. Rather than competing with his friend, he pushes Mickey forward, and Russell uses song here to reveal feelings that Edward's politeness keeps hidden. When he leaves for university, the stage direction (after a pause) before he tells Linda his news suggests he is reluctant to hurt her.

However, Russell complicates this picture. Edward's concern can be careless and even hurtful. As a child he tells his mother that Mickey is "my best friend. I like him more than you", a cruel line however natural it may be. More importantly, when he returns from university, dressed in a duffle coat and college scarf, Russell uses costume to mark how far he has moved from Mickey's world. He enthuses that he has never been to "so many parties", unaware that Mickey has been made redundant and cannot afford to go out. His speech about being unemployed, in which he imagines there would still be "a few bob in your pocket and you've got good friends", may be meant kindly, but it reveals that he cannot imagine real poverty. Even his offer, "I've got money, plenty of it", which seems generous, is humiliating to Mickey. The stage direction that he is slightly unsure but laughs anyway shows that his concern has become blind. Here Russell suggests that

Question number	
	Edward does care, but his comfortable life prevents him from caring in a way that helps.
	Edward's relationship with Linda while Mickey is in prison and depressed is the most damaging challenge to the view that he is concerned for others. Edward does, to his credit, use his position as a councillor to secure Mickey a job and a house, which is a practical act of care. Yet his affair with Linda betrays the friend he once swore to protect, and it is this betrayal that drives Mickey, armed, to the council chamber. Some members of the audience may judge Edward harshly here, though Russell is careful to show that Linda turns to Edward in loneliness and that Edward's feelings for her are long-standing and sincere.
	In the final scene Edward still faces Mickey with no weapon and no anger, and the stage direction Edward and Mickey are now alone on the platform isolates them as the two boys they once were. Edward's willingness to stand before a man with a gun suggests a deep concern for his friend that has never disappeared. Overall, then, I agree that Edward shows concern for others: it is the most consistent thing about him. But Russell's tragedy lies in showing that concern is not the same as understanding. Edward's kindness is real, yet his advantages blind him to Mickey's suffering, and Russell implies that this blindness, created by class, is as destructive as any cruelty.
4b	Russell presents Mrs Lyons as a woman who believes she can engineer her own happiness by taking another woman's child, and who spends the rest of the play desperately trying to manage what follows. I strongly agree that she cannot control the consequences of her actions. In this extract her attempts at control are already collapsing into panic and superstition, and across the play Russell uses

Question number

the Narrator, motifs and a circular structure to suggest that the consequences of her bargain were fixed from the moment it was made.

The extract opens with the Narrator, whose song immediately takes control out of Mrs Lyons's hands. He warns that "the devil's got your number", a colloquial idiom which suggests she has been marked and that her punishment is coming whatever she does. The menacing present tense of "He's starin' through your windows / He's creeping down the hall" makes the threat seem physically close, as though something is stalking her inside her own home. Ironically, the house that Mrs Lyons thought would protect her secret becomes a trap. The Narrator is invisible to her, but the audience watches him circle her, so Russell uses staging to show that she is being watched by forces she cannot see, let alone control.

Her conversation with Mr Lyons shows that she is losing control not only of events but of herself. Her vague but ominous "I feel that something terrible will happen, something bad" foreshadows the tragedy, and the plain adjectives suggest a fear she cannot put into words. Mr Lyons's suggestion that they should be talking about "getting something for your nerves" shows that he sees her as unwell, and his mounting frustration, expressed in "For God's sake" and the stage direction in which he turns away from her in despair, reveals that her secret is isolating her from her husband. She cannot tell him the truth, so when he asks "What is this thing you keep talking about getting away from", she has no answer. Here Russell shows that the lie she told to gain a family now threatens her marriage.

The repetition in "I'm frightened. I'm frightened for Edward" exposes the source of her terror. Her fear for Edward is genuine, but it is also fear of losing him, and her insistence that she does not want him "out playing" is an attempt to control

Question number

his world which Mr Lyons dismisses: "Jennifer he's not a baby". The quickening exchanges and her repeated "I don't care, I don't care" show her rationality breaking down. The most powerful moment is when she is stopped by the sight of the shoes on the table. The superstition she invented to frighten Mrs Johnstone has now taken hold of her, and the Narrator's refrain "There's shoes upon the table" turns it into a motif of doom. The scene ends as the song ends with a percussion build to a sudden full stop, a harsh, abrupt sound which suggests a door slamming on her hopes.

Elsewhere in the play Russell shows that Mrs Lyons once believed she was fully in control. In Act One she persuades Mrs Johnstone with a cold, practical logic, reminding her that she already has too many children and that the "welfare people" are threatening her. It is Mrs Lyons who invents the superstition that if either twin learns he was one of a pair, both will immediately die, and she makes Mrs Johnstone swear on the Bible. At this point she seems a manipulator, using fear and religion to secure her plan. Yet Russell's irony is that the lie she creates to control another woman becomes the prophecy that controls her.

As the play continues, every attempt she makes to control the consequences of her actions backfires. She dismisses Mrs Johnstone from her job and offers her money to move away, she tries to keep Edward from Mickey, and she eventually moves the family to the countryside. Each move only brings the twins closer, since the Johnstones are rehoused nearby and Edward and Mickey meet again as teenagers. Her questioning of Edward about the locket, "Why do you wear it?", shows obsessive fear rather than strength, and when she attacks Mrs Johnstone with a knife and cries "I curse the day I met you. You ruined me", she blames another woman for what she herself began. By the end, her final, desperate act, showing Mickey that Edward and Linda are together, helps to bring about the very

Question number

deaths she feared.

Some might argue that Mrs Lyons does not even have the chance to control events, because the play is fated from the start. Russell's cyclical structure opens with the deaths of the twins, so the audience knows the outcome before she makes her bargain. The Narrator's question, "Did you believe that you were free at last", mocks her hope of escape. Furthermore, the Narrator's closing suggestion that the cause may be "what we, the English, have come to know as class" implies that society, not one woman, is to blame.

Overall, I agree that Mrs Lyons cannot control the consequences of her actions. Russell presents her not simply as a villain but as a woman whose single act of selfishness sets off forces of superstition, guilt and class that she can neither see nor stop. The extract is the moment when the audience sees her control dissolve, and the rest of the play shows how completely it is lost.

Sa

Sherriff presents trench warfare as overwhelmingly a source of suffering, physical and mental, and the play ends in a darkness that seems to confirm this view. However, I do not fully agree that it brings only suffering. Sherriff also shows that the extreme conditions of the trenches produce courage, humour and a deep comradeship between men, and part of the tragedy is that these qualities are real, yet they cannot save the men who possess them. The play suggests that the best of human nature is revealed by trench warfare and then destroyed by it.

Sherriff establishes the suffering of trench life through his setting before a word is spoken. The opening stage directions describe rough steps, gloomy tunnels and a wire-covered bed, and the dug-out has almost no furniture. The confined, dim

Question number

space becomes a symbol of the men's trapped lives, and because the whole play takes place there, the audience shares their claustrophobia. Throughout the action, the candlelight and the sounds of distant guns remind us that the world outside is lethal, while the dug-out offers only the illusion of shelter.

The most powerful suffering Sherriff presents is mental. Stanhope, who has been at the front for nearly three years, is described with dark shadows under his eyes, and his drinking is his way of surviving. He admits that there were only two ways of breaking the strain: pretending to be ill and going home, or whisky, and the stage direction He holds up his glass makes the admission visual and painful. His bitter question to Osborne, "You think there is no limit to what a man can bear?", reveals that he feels himself near collapse. Hibbert suffers in a different way. His repeated complaints about his "neuralgia" become a desperate excuse to escape, and his confession that every sound above makes him feel cold and sick shows fear turning into physical illness. The broken syntax in his speech, interrupted by pauses, suggests that suffering makes the men almost inarticulate.

Physical suffering and death are equally central. Osborne's story of a wounded man who "lay out there groaning all day" shows the agony of no man's land. The raid, which the Colonel greets excitedly with "We've got all we wanted", kills Osborne and six men to capture one frightened German boy, and the contrast between the Colonel's enthusiasm and Stanhope's grief exposes how little senior command understands of the suffering of the men. The quick succession of Osborne's death and Raleigh's at the end makes the human cost feel relentless. Before the raid Osborne removes his ring and leaves his watch and a letter, so Sherriff uses props to show that the men must sacrifice their domestic lives, and the audience realises he expects to die.

Question number

However, Sherriff does not present trench warfare as only suffering. Dark humour is shown to be a vital defence. Mason's anxious apologies about the food and Trotter's complaint that "War's bad enough with pepper" bring comedy into the dug-out, and Trotter's habit of drawing circles to cross off the hours of his duty is both funny and quietly heartbreaking. Osborne reads "How doth the little crocodile" from Alice in Wonderland, finding nonsense more bearable than reality. These moments suggest that the men cope by refusing to take the horror seriously, which is itself a form of courage.

Even more importantly, the war creates intense comradeship. Stanhope persuades Hibbert to stay by asking if he could ever "look a man straight in the face again" after leaving others to do his work, and he asks whether it is worth "standing in with men like that". Here the men's loyalty to each other gives their suffering a purpose. Osborne, known affectionately as "Uncle", tenderly puts Stanhope to bed in Act One, and his gentle conversation with Raleigh about walking in the New Forest before the raid shows how they protect each other from fear. Raleigh, at first, is thrilled by the war, as his naive "How topping!" shows, and although Sherriff uses this to create dramatic irony, it also reminds us that young men found genuine excitement and pride in service.

The ending, however, brings these strands together in suffering. When Raleigh is mortally wounded, Stanhope abandons the role of commanding officer and calls him "Jimmy", a return to their school friendship which shows love surviving at the very moment it is lost. Then Stanhope must leave him to face the attack. The final stage directions are overwhelming: the shelling has risen to a great fury, and a shell strikes the dug-out so that the shock stabs out the candle-flame. The extinguished candle suggests the snuffing out of life and hope, and the darkness that ends the play leaves the audience with no consolation.

Question number

In conclusion, I agree that suffering dominates Sherriff's presentation of trench warfare, and the play's ending gives it the final word. Yet I would not say it brings only suffering. Sherriff shows humour, loyalty and courage flourishing in the dug-out, and it is precisely because these men are so decent and so bonded that their suffering moves us. The play's tragedy is not that war contains nothing good, but that everything good in it is destroyed.

5b Sherriff presents Stanhope as a commander under almost unbearable strain, and on the surface his drinking and rages might suggest he is unfit to lead. Having considered the extract and the play as a whole, however, I largely agree that he is fit to serve as a Commanding Officer. In this scene in particular Sherriff shows that Stanhope's understanding of fear, because it comes from his own suffering, makes him an exceptional leader of frightened men. His weaknesses are real, but Sherriff suggests they are the cost of command rather than proof of failure.

The extract follows directly from a moment of crisis in which Stanhope has threatened to shoot Hibbert for desertion. What is remarkable is how quickly and skilfully he changes tactic. His opening words, "Good man, Hibbert.", and his praise, "I liked the way you stuck that", transform a confrontation into encouragement. The congratulatory tone turns Hibbert's moment of terror into evidence of courage, so that Stanhope gives him a reason to stay rather than a reason to flee. This shows a commander who understands that threats alone cannot hold a man in the line.

Stanhope's sensitivity is shown through Sherriff's stage directions. When Hibbert breaks down, Stanhope turns away, giving him privacy to cry, and later puts an

Question number

arm round his shoulder. These small gestures reveal a tact and gentleness rarely seen elsewhere in his behaviour. He does not object to Hibbert sitting on his bed, and he pours out a whisky, sharing his own comfort. The colloquial address "old chap" eases the tension and turns a superior officer into a friend. Sherriff makes the audience see that Stanhope's leadership is personal, built on trust rather than rank.

The most striking moment is Stanhope's confession: "Because I feel the same". Few commanding officers would admit fear to a junior officer, and some readers might view this as weakness. Yet Sherriff presents it as a deliberate and generous act. By sharing his own terror, Stanhope removes Hibbert's shame and makes his fear normal. He then offers a shared future, asking whether they should "see if we can stick it together". The repetition of "together" turns duty into companionship. Stanhope even jokes about his own cowardice, asking Hibbert to promise "not to tell anyone what a blasted funk I am", and the self-mocking tone makes them equals. When Hibbert replies "It's awfully decent of you", Sherriff confirms that the tactic has worked.

His appeal to Hibbert's conscience is also persuasive. He suggests that staying is the only thing a decent man can do, and that leaving his comrades to do his work would mean he could never "look a man straight in the face again". Stanhope understands that loyalty to fellow soldiers is a stronger motive than fear of punishment, and he uses it to keep Hibbert at his post. The extract ends with a sudden shift to business as Stanhope turns to Osborne and the raid: Stanhope's clipped, factual sentences, "Tomorrow afternoon. Under a smoke-screen. Two officers and ten men", show him returning instantly to the role of commander, and his final words, "You and Raleigh.", reveal the burden he carries in sending his closest friend into danger.

Question number

Elsewhere in the play Sherriff gives further evidence of Stanhope's fitness to lead. Raleigh admires him as a hero from school, and Osborne tells Hardy that he would follow Stanhope anywhere. He has been at the front for nearly three years, has won the Military Cross, and he runs his company with precision, insisting on clean trenches, careful storage of ammunition and proper sanitation, in contrast to Hardy's untidy handover. He is fiercely protective of his men, refuses to expose Hibbert's weakness to others, and at the end he comforts the dying Raleigh, calling him "Jimmy", a duty of love he does not shirk.

However, Sherriff does not hide Stanhope's flaws. He depends heavily on whisky, admitting that drink was one of only two ways of breaking the strain, and Hardy reports that Stanhope's drinking makes others in the battalion talk about him. His outburst when Raleigh's letter is withheld, and his paranoia that Raleigh will expose him to his sister, suggest a man whose personal fears threaten his judgement. After Osborne's death his bitter anger towards Raleigh for eating with the men seems to let grief override his responsibilities. Some may also feel that he avoids directness when he tells Osborne the Colonel chose him for the raid. These moments suggest a mind close to breaking point.

In conclusion, I largely agree that Stanhope is fit to serve as a Commanding Officer. Sherriff presents a man who is damaged by war, but whose damage gives him insight into the fear of others. The extract shows him at his best: firm, compassionate and honest, able to turn a deserter back into a soldier. His drinking and outbursts make him a flawed leader, yet Sherriff suggests that in the conditions of the trenches, a perfect commander does not exist, and Stanhope's devotion to his men makes him the best they could have.

Question number	
6a	Stephens presents the Boone family as one built on secrets, and at first glance the play seems to prove that its members cannot be trusted: Ed lies about Judy's death and about Wellington, Judy abandons her son, and even Christopher breaks his promise. However, I only partly agree that the Boones are untrustworthy. Stephens shows that most of their deceptions grow out of love, exhaustion and fear rather than malice, and the play is ultimately about how trust, once broken, can slowly be rebuilt. The most serious breach of trust comes from Ed. Early in the play he tells Christopher that his mother has died, explaining that "She's had a heart attack". For a boy who takes language literally and depends on facts to make sense of the world, this lie is devastating, and the audience later learns that Ed has hidden Judy's letters in a shirt box in his wardrobe. When Christopher finds them, the shock is so great that he is physically sick and curls up, unable to respond. Ed's lie about Wellington is even worse. He tries to stop Christopher's investigation, ordering him to "stop this ridiculous bloody detective game right now", and the expletive shows his anger is partly fear of being found out. When Christopher continues, Ed grabs and shakes him hard, a moment of violence that betrays the trust Christopher placed in his father's protection. Ed's confession that he killed Wellington is the turning point. Stephens uses an extended monologue, in which Ed tries to explain his anger at Mrs Shears and urges Christopher to "Trust me". The irony is painful, because the very words he uses ask for something he has just destroyed. Christopher's response is to flee, and he later holds his knife out to defend himself from his father. Stephens uses this stage direction to show that, in Christopher's mind, Ed has moved from protector to threat.

Question number

Judy, too, seems untrustworthy. She leaves the family and moves to London with Roger Shears, abandoning her son. Her letters, read aloud on stage while she stands apart from Christopher, reveal that she felt she could not cope, admitting she was "at the end of my tether" and that she was "not a very good mother". The staging is significant: Judy's voice fills the space, but she cannot reach him, which presents her as a mother who has broken the most basic promise of all. Christopher himself is not perfectly trustworthy either. Despite saying "I promise", he continues to investigate, finding ways round his father's instruction. Stephens presents this almost comically, since Christopher argues about the exact terms of the promise, but it shows that the son can deceive too.

However, Stephens complicates the idea that the Boones are simply untrustworthy. Ed's lie about Judy, however wrong, was an attempt to protect Christopher from rejection, and his care is consistent and practical. Much of the play shows him cooking, cleaning and supporting his son, listening to his facts with comments like "Is that right?" and "Terrific". Their ritual gesture, in which they touch fingers, shows the fragile but real trust they share, since Christopher hates to be touched. After Christopher is sick, Ed gently says "we have to get you cleaned up, OK?", and his voice shows tenderness even at his lowest moment. Judy also proves her trustworthiness in the end. She leaves Roger and takes Christopher back to Swindon, recognising that if they stay in London "someone was going to get hurt". When Judy and Christopher touch hands, Christopher spreads his fingers to meet hers, and the gesture he once shared only with his father now shows his growing trust in his mother.

Stephens uses the final scenes to show trust being rebuilt slowly and on Christopher's terms. Ed uses a kitchen timer to ask for small periods of time with his son, explaining "I have to show you that you can trust me". The timer is a

Question number

perfect dramatic device because it turns trust into something measurable, which Christopher can understand. He then gives Christopher a puppy, Sandy, "to show you that I really mean what I say", and the gift links back to Wellington: the dog whose death broke their trust is answered by a dog that begins to restore it. Christopher's success in his A level maths, and his final question, "Does that mean I can do anything?", suggest that he is learning to trust not just others but himself.

In conclusion, I agree that members of the Boone family behave in untrustworthy ways, and Ed's lies in particular are a profound betrayal. Yet Stephens presents them as flawed people under extreme pressure, whose deceptions come from love and failure rather than cruelty. The play does not excuse them, but it suggests that trust is not fixed: it can be broken, and, with patience, it can be earned again.

6b

Stephens presents Ed as a father whose love for Christopher is fierce and constant, but whose way of caring is often clumsy, angry and dishonest. I largely agree that Ed is caring. In this extract his desperation to see his son shows how deeply he cares, yet the aggression with which he expresses it frightens the very child he wants to protect. Across the play Stephens suggests that caring is not only a feeling but a practice, and the drama follows Ed's painful journey from caring possessively to caring in a way Christopher can accept.

The extract opens with Ed forcing his way into the conversation: "I'm talking to her whether you like it or not". The defiant tone shows that he has driven to London in a state of panic, and his claim "He's my son in case you've forgotten" asserts his right as a father. The sarcasm here reveals hurt as well as anger. His

Question number

accusation, "You were the one that bloody left", reminds the audience that Ed stayed when Judy did not, and the expletive suggests years of buried resentment. Stephens lets us see that his anger comes from love that has been tested and not rewarded.

His list of what he has done for Christopher is the clearest evidence of his care: "I cooked his meals. I cleaned his clothes. I looked after him every weekend". The short, repetitive sentences, each beginning with "I", build a powerful case, and the simple verbs show that his care has been practical and daily rather than grand. When he turns on Judy with "And you? What?", the abrupt questions challenge her, implying that her letters meant little compared with his years of work. Yet the extract also shows his defensiveness. When Judy asks whether he thought it was acceptable to tell Christopher his mother was dead, Ed's reply, "Well, isn't that what you wanted?", tries to shift the blame onto her, and the audience may feel that his care has become entangled with his pride.

Roger's attempts to calm him, with "let's just calm down here" and the repeated "Whoa", show that Ed's behaviour is becoming threatening, and the ellipsis in "And if you try to stop me" leaves a menace hanging in the air. Most powerfully, when Ed approaches his son, Christopher points his knife at him. This stage direction is shocking, because it shows that to Christopher his father's care now feels like danger. Ed's bewildered "Christopher?" captures his confusion: he cannot understand that his love is not received as love. His broken attempt to explain, stumbling over "About" three times before he can reach "the letters" and then trailing off with "I never meant", uses repetition and fractured syntax to show a man unable to find words for his guilt. When he spreads his fingers, reaching for their private gesture of affection while his son still holds a knife, the audience sees how far apart they have drifted. His final promise, "Christopher. I'll be back. I

Question number

promise you, Christopher", repeats his son's name as if to hold on to him, and the closing stage direction, in which the London Policeman watches Ed leave, isolates him as an outsider to his own family.

Elsewhere in the play Stephens gives considerable evidence of Ed's care. He is patient with Christopher's routines and listens to his facts with encouraging comments such as "Is that right?" and "Terrific". Their ritual of touching fingers shows a tenderness adapted to Christopher's dislike of being touched. When he finds his son unresponsive after the discovery of the letters, he says gently, "Christopher, we have to get you cleaned up, OK?", and cares for him physically. Even his lie that Judy had "a problem with her heart" was, in his mind, a way to protect his son from rejection, although the play makes clear that this kind of protection is also a betrayal.

However, Stephens also shows Ed's failings. His anger leads him to shake Christopher hard when he discovers the detective book, and his killing of Wellington is a moment of uncontrolled rage. His monologue confessing to the killing, with its plea to "Trust me", shows that he cares, but it also reveals how his emotions damage those around him. A modern audience might argue that a truly caring parent would not lie for years or use violence.

By the end, Stephens shows Ed learning to care in a better way. He uses a kitchen timer to win small periods of time with Christopher, saying "I have to show you that you can trust me", and he promises "I am going to tell you the truth from now on". He gives Christopher a puppy "to show you that I really mean what I say". These actions show a father who has learned patience and accepts that trust must be earned on Christopher's terms.

Question number

In conclusion, I agree that Ed is caring, and the extract shows how desperately he loves his son. Yet Stephens presents his care as flawed, too often expressed through anger, possessiveness and lies. The tragedy of this scene is that Ed's love is real but frightening, and the rest of the play suggests that caring well means learning to put Christopher's needs before his own feelings.

7a

I agree only in part that George is strong-minded. Wilder certainly presents him as confident, decisive and well liked, the all-American boy who knows what he wants from life. Yet the play repeatedly shows that this confidence is fragile, and that George is most himself when he is uncertain, persuadable and moved by others. Wilder seems less interested in George as a strong individual than in George as an ordinary young man whose firm decisions are really emotional impulses, and this makes him a fitting representative of the "everybody" the Stage Manager describes.

In Act One George first appears as a boy with a clear will of his own. He tosses a baseball in the air as he crosses the stage, and his single-minded love of the game is shown before he speaks. He knows exactly what his future holds: he wants "to be a farmer", and he is sure that his uncle's farm will one day be his: "if I'm any good I can just gradually have it." There is a quiet assurance in the conditional here, as though George has already worked out his path in life at sixteen. He is also shrewd in getting what he wants. Struggling with his algebra, he calls across from his upstairs window to persuade Emily, his clever neighbour, to help him, and his idea for a system of communication between the two houses suggests a practical, determined mind. Even his complaint about how his sister "comes to have so much money", followed by his successful request for a bigger allowance because he is "getting older", presents a boy who stands up for himself.

Question number

However, Wilder undercuts this confidence almost immediately. Mrs Gibbs worries that "something's come over him lately", because he leaves his mother to chop the wood while he plays ball. When Dr Gibbs gently confronts him, George is not defiant but ashamed. The stage directions show him crying, and his father's quiet line, "Here's a handkerchief, son", reduces the would-be farmer to a child. Wilder uses this domestic scene, with its understated dialogue and long pauses, to suggest that George's strength of will is still the untested certainty of youth. He does not argue; he simply promises to do better.

The soda fountain scene in Act Two is the clearest test of George's character, and here the question becomes more complicated. Emily's criticism that he has become "conceited and stuck-up" wounds him, but rather than defending himself he accepts it, vowing "I'm going to change so quick". It could be argued that this shows weakness, as George reshapes himself to win approval. Yet he is still prepared to answer back, insisting "I don't think it's possible to be perfect, Emily", which suggests a mind of his own. His most dramatic moment comes when, in the stage direction very seriously, he announces "I'm going to make up my mind right now" and abandons his place at agricultural college. On the surface this is decisive, even heroic, as he chooses love over ambition. On the other hand, the decision is made in a matter of seconds, over an ice-cream soda, and it is driven by feeling rather than reason. Wilder lets the comedy of George being deeply embarrassed when he realises he cannot pay for the sodas puncture the romance, reminding the audience that this is a boy, not a man of settled judgement. The flashback structure, which the Stage Manager introduces so that we watch the courtship after we have already seen the wedding day, adds poignancy: we know that this impulsive choice will shape the rest of George's short married life.

The wedding scene presents George at his least strong-minded. Wilder uses stage

Question number

directions to show him taking a few steps of withdrawal as he panics, asking his mother "Why's everybody pushing me so?" His plea "All I want to do is to be a fella" is touchingly immature, and his fear of growing old exposes the anxiety beneath his confident exterior. Wilder interrupts the realism of the scene by giving the characters' inner thoughts directly to the audience, so that George's doubts are laid bare. Yet the moment he sees Emily, his fear dissolves and he commits himself to her. Perhaps this is a different kind of strength: not stubbornness, but the courage to step into adulthood despite fear.

By Act Three we learn that George has made a success of his farm, so his early decision has been justified. But Wilder ends George's story not with strength but with collapse. At Emily's grave he sinks to his knees then falls full length at her feet, and the dead disapprove: "That ain't no way to behave!" This wordless stage image is perhaps the most powerful moment of his presentation. The tableau as the scene closes forces the audience to pity a man broken by grief, and it reminds us that, like all the living in Grover's Corners, he does not understand the meaning of life and death.

Overall, I agree that George is strong-minded in his clear ambitions and his decisive commitment to Emily, but Wilder presents this strength as youthful, emotional and easily shaken. George is persuadable, tearful and frightened as often as he is firm. Wilder's purpose, I think, is not to create a hero but an everyman, and George's mixture of certainty and vulnerability makes him a convincing picture of ordinary human life.

7b

In this extract Wilder seems to agree, painfully, that the people of Grover's Corners waste their lives. Emily, having relived a single ordinary morning, discovers that the

Question number

living move through their days without truly seeing them. Yet Wilder's view is more complex than simple condemnation. Across the play he celebrates the small routines of the town even as he shows how little they are noticed, so that the waste lies not in how the townspeople live but in their failure to realise the value of what they have. I largely agree with the statement, but I think Wilder presents this waste with compassion rather than contempt.

The extract opens with Emily's shattered recognition: "I didn't realize." The short, simple sentence carries enormous weight, as though the whole of her life has been summed up in a single failure. Her next words, "we never noticed", widen the guilt from herself to everyone, and the collective pronoun suggests that this blindness is universal. Wilder's stage direction, through her tears, conveys her despair, and her request to be taken back to her grave shows that the experience of life without awareness is too painful to bear. The return to her twelfth birthday, which she chose against the advice of Mrs Gibbs, has become a lesson in loss.

Emily's farewell speech is the emotional climax of the play. The repetition of "Good-bye" builds a mournful rhythm as she takes leave of the world, and the list that follows moves from her parents to tiny, everyday things: clocks ticking, her mother's sunflowers, food and coffee, newly ironed dresses and hot baths. The repeated "And", together with ellipsis, gives the speech a breathless, accumulating quality, as if Emily cannot stop remembering. Wilder deliberately chooses humble domestic details rather than grand events, suggesting that the real substance of life is in what is overlooked. Her cry, "Oh, earth, you're too wonderful for anybody to realize you", is paradoxical: life is wasted not because it is empty but because it is too rich to grasp.

Her question to the Stage Manager, "Do any human beings ever realize life while

Question number

they live it?", is directed beyond the stage to the audience, and the Pause before his reply adds weight to the silence. His answer, "No", is blunt, softened only slightly by the qualification "The saints and poets, maybe". Wilder uses the Stage Manager as a choric figure who speaks with authority, so his judgement feels final. It implies that only rare individuals escape the waste that is the common condition.

Simon Stimson's response is the harshest view of human life in the play. The stage directions, with mounting violence and bitingly, show his anger, and his description of life as moving "in a cloud of ignorance" and his summary, "Ignorance and blindness", condemn the living outright. His bitterness reflects his own wasted life: the alcoholic choir master who hanged himself in his attic. However, Wilder does not allow his view to stand unchallenged. Mrs Gibbs immediately insists that this "ain't the whole truth", suggesting that Simon's despair is as limited as the blindness he attacks. Emily's verdict, "Just blind people", is gentler and more pitying.

The extract ends with George throwing himself on Emily's grave, a wordless image of grief, while the dead look on with puzzlement and disapproval. Emily's final question, "They don't understand, do they?", and Mrs Gibbs's quiet "No, dear. They don't understand" close the scene with a sense of distance between the living and the dead. The simple language is deeply moving; the living are pitied rather than blamed.

Elsewhere, Wilder suggests both that lives are wasted and that they are rich in value. In Act One the Stage Manager manipulates time to show the routines of an ordinary day: the milkman's round, breakfast, the paper boy, the choir practice. These scenes are mundane, but the simple staging, with almost no scenery, invites

Question number

the audience to look closely at what the characters themselves take for granted. Mrs Gibbs dreams of seeing Paris, France, and is offered enough money for her old highboy to make the trip, but she never goes; this feels like a small, quiet waste of a lifelong wish. In Act Two, the flashback to George and Emily's courtship captures the beauty of their brief time together, while their fears on the wedding day show how quickly life passes. The Stage Manager's monologue at the start of Act Three, that "everybody knows in their bones that something is eternal, and that something has to do with human beings", insists that human life matters deeply. Even among the dead, Mrs Soames remembers "wasn't life awful", followed after a sigh by "and wonderful", a balanced response which suggests that not everyone has missed its value.

In conclusion, I agree to a large extent that the people of Grover's Corners waste their lives, since Emily, the Stage Manager and Simon Stimson all expose their blindness. However, Wilder's purpose is not to condemn them but to awaken the audience. By showing the ordinary as precious, he asks us to avoid the same waste, so the play is ultimately a celebration of life as much as a warning about how easily it slips by.

8a

Both Carol Ann Duffy's In Mrs Tilscher's Class and D. H. Lawrence's Piano explore change as the movement from childhood into adulthood, but they look at it from opposite ends. Duffy's speaker stands at the threshold, watching childhood dissolve as adolescence arrives with a mixture of excitement and fear. Lawrence's adult speaker looks back across "the vista of years" and finds that the change has been a loss he cannot accept. Where Duffy presents change as inevitable and even thrilling, Lawrence presents it as something to be mourned, and the contrasting tones of the two poems reflect this difference.

Question number

Duffy begins by creating a world of safety before change disrupts it. Her use of the second person, "You could travel up the Blue Nile / with your finger", universalises the experience, drawing every reader back into their own primary school. The list of exotic place names, "Tana. Ethiopia. Khartoum. Aswân.", is chanted in short, full-stopped fragments, conveying childish wonder and the sense that the whole world can be held in a classroom. Sensory details such as "The scent of a pencil" and "a skittle of milk" make the memory vivid, and the simile "The classroom glowed like a sweetshop" captures the child's delight. The blunt short sentence "Mrs Tilscher loved you" shows how complete this security is. Lawrence, too, begins with sensory memory, but it is aural and maternal rather than educational. The "boom of the tingling strings" and the image of the child "pressing the small, poised feet of a mother who smiles as she sings" recreate an intimate, protected world. Both poets, then, present childhood as warm and enclosed, so that the change which follows feels like an expulsion.

The difference lies in how each speaker responds to change. In Duffy's poem the shift is signalled by a temporal marker, "Over the Easter term", a season of rebirth, and by the striking metaphor of "the inky tadpoles changed / from commas into exclamation marks". The punctuation imagery links growth to the world of school, and the move from pausing commas to dramatic exclamation marks suggests the energy and alarm of puberty. The rough boy's account of "how you were born" brings an unwelcome new knowledge, and the isolation of "appalled" at the end of the stanza captures the child's shock. Lawrence, by contrast, is not moving forward into change but being dragged backward against his will. The phrase "insidious mastery of song" presents music as a seductive force that "Betrays me back", and the verb suggests he feels cheated by his own emotions. His adult identity is undermined: "my manhood is cast / Down in the flood of

Question number

remembrance". The metaphor of the flood shows memory overwhelming him, and the final simile, "I weep like a child for the past", completes the reversal: change has made him a man, yet nostalgia unmakes him again.

Structurally, both poems are shaped by their attitude to change. Duffy's four stanzas grow shorter as the poem progresses, as though the safe space of childhood is shrinking. Her final stanza is dominated by pathetic fallacy: "That feverish July, the air tasted of electricity", "the heavy, sexy sky". The tension of the weather reflects the emotional and physical restlessness of adolescence, and the poem ends as "the sky split open into a thunderstorm", an image both frightening and liberating. The child runs through the gates "impatient to be grown", so the speaker embraces change despite its fears. Lawrence's three quatrains use rhyming couplets and long, rolling lines that mimic the flowing music of the piano. His poem ends not with escape but with collapse, and the movement across the stanzas is backwards, from the present singer to the "old Sunday evenings at home". Even the "great black piano appassionato" of the present cannot compete with the "glamour / Of childish days".

The relationships with adult figures also reveal different attitudes. Mrs Tilscher "smiled, / then turned away", and the matter-of-fact "Reports were handed out" marks the end of her protection with unsentimental finality. Duffy accepts that the nurturing adult must step back. For Lawrence, the mother is the centre of the lost world, and his grief for her seems to lie beneath his grief for the past.

Context deepens these readings. Duffy's poem is autobiographical, recalling her primary school in Stafford in the 1960s. The reference to "Brady and Hindley", the Moors Murderers whose crimes dominated the news at that time, intrudes on the classroom, but the simile "faded, like the faint, uneasy smudge of a mistake"

Question number

shows the children only half aware of adult horror. This hints that innocence is temporary and that change into knowledge cannot be avoided. Lawrence, the son of a Nottinghamshire miner, was intensely close to his mother, who died in 1910, and many readers see Piano as an expression of that bond and of his grief. His resistance to change is therefore bound up with personal loss in a way Duffy's is not.

In conclusion, both poets use sensory language and imagery to show change as the loss of a secure childhood world. However, Duffy's speaker runs eagerly towards an uncertain future, while Lawrence's speaker is pulled helplessly into the past. Duffy presents change as a natural, electrifying storm; Lawrence presents it as a flood that drowns his adult self.

8b

Seamus Heaney's Docker and Ciaran Carson's Belfast Confetti both explore conflict in Northern Ireland, but they approach it from different moments and perspectives. Heaney, writing in the mid 1960s, presents conflict as a threat simmering beneath the surface of one man, a bigotry that could "start again" at any moment. Carson, writing in the 1980s at the height of the Troubles, places his speaker inside the violence itself, where conflict has already erupted and is destroying both the city and his sense of who he is. Where Heaney's speaker observes conflict from a cool distance, Carson's speaker is trapped and bewildered by it.

Heaney's portrait is built from the language of the Belfast shipyards, so that the docker seems to be made of the same metal as the ships he works on. The simile "The cap juts like a gantry's crossbeam" and the compound metaphors "Cowling plated forehead and sledgehead jaw" present him as hard, heavy and mechanical. The harsh consonants and monosyllables make him sound immovable, and the line

Question number

"Speech is clamped in the lips' vice" suggests a man whose silence holds back violence. The pun on "vice" is significant: it is a tool for clamping, but it also hints at moral wrongdoing. Carson also uses industrial objects, but in his poem they have become weapons. The title itself refers to the "Belfast confetti" of "Nuts, bolts, nails, car-keys" thrown during riots. The asyndetic list mimics a hail of debris, and the ironic word "confetti", normally associated with weddings and celebration, exposes how conflict has twisted ordinary life. Both poets, then, connect the everyday materials of working Belfast with violence, but Heaney presents a potential for harm, while Carson presents its reality.

The sectarian nature of the conflict is central to both poems. Heaney's second stanza opens with the shocking statement "That fist would drop a hammer on a Catholic", and the conditional "would" makes the violence chillingly hypothetical yet entirely believable. The casual interjection "Oh yes, that kind of thing could start again" uses euphemism to downplay brutality, and in hindsight it seems prophetic, since the Troubles began only a few years after the poem was published. The wry metaphor of "The only Roman collar he tolerates", the white head on his pint of porter, mocks his bigotry: he will swallow the drink but not the people. In Belfast Confetti, sectarian division is shown through the city's geography. The street names, "Balaclava, Raglan, Inkerman, Odessa Street", all recall the Crimean War, so the speaker's own city seems built from the memory of old wars. His frantic question, "Why can't I escape?", and the dead end he keeps reaching present a labyrinth in which conflict surrounds him on every side.

The two poets differ strongly in the way they use form to reflect conflict. Heaney's four quatrains are controlled and orderly, mirroring the rigid, disciplined mind of the docker. His religious certainty is expressed through work: "God is a foreman with certain definite views", and "Mosaic imperatives bang home like

Question number

rivets". The simile fuses Old Testament law with the hammering of shipbuilding, suggesting that his faith is mechanical and unforgiving. Carson's form, by contrast, is fractured and chaotic. His long, uneven lines are broken by short phrases, and he turns the language of writing itself into the language of violence: "it was raining exclamation marks", "an asterisk on the map", "This hyphenated line, a burst of rapid fire". The speaker tries "to complete a sentence in my head" but it keeps "stuttering", so conflict is shown destroying not only the city but the ability to communicate. Carson was a writer who grew up in Belfast speaking Irish at home, and the poem's focus on broken language reflects how conflict can silence or scatter a voice.

Perhaps the most important difference lies in what each speaker says about identity under conflict. Heaney's docker is utterly certain of who he is; he sits "strong and blunt as a Celtic cross", an ironic simile, since the Celtic cross is a symbol of the Irish heritage he seems to reject. His certainty spreads into his home, where "Tonight the wife and children will be quiet / At slammed door and smoker's cough in the hall". The future tense and the harsh sounds of the "slammed door" show that conflict does not stay in the pub; it dominates his family too. Carson's speaker, however, has lost all certainty. His questions, "What is / My name? Where am I coming from? Where am I going?", are the kind of interrogation a soldier at a checkpoint might demand, but they are also existential. The final image of "A fusillade of question-marks" shows that conflict has fired upon his very identity.

Contextually, Docker reflects Heaney's awareness, as a Catholic from rural County Derry, of the discrimination in the Belfast shipyards, where the workforce was overwhelmingly Protestant. Belfast Confetti comes from a period when the riot squads, armoured vehicles and checkpoints Carson lists were part of daily life.

Question number

In conclusion, both poets use industrial imagery and controlled or broken forms to present the destructive effect of sectarian conflict. Heaney warns of a hatred waiting to explode, while Carson shows what happens once it has, leaving the speaker lost in his own city and unsure of his own name.

9a

Robert Graves's Symptoms of Love and W. B. Yeats's When You Are Old both present heartbreak as an inseparable part of loving deeply, but they speak from very different positions. Graves's speaker addresses a lover in the present, diagnosing the pain of love as a sickness that must simply be endured. Yeats's speaker imagines the distant future, when the woman who rejected him will be old and will realise what she has lost. Graves treats heartbreak as the price of passion, while Yeats turns his own heartbreak into a quiet, almost tender reproach.

Graves's title immediately establishes a cynical, clinical tone. By describing love through its "symptoms", he presents it as an illness to be diagnosed rather than an emotion to be celebrated. The opening metaphor, "Love is a universal migraine", is striking because it is so unromantic: a migraine is painful, disorientating and incapacitating, and the adjective "universal" suggests that no lover can escape it. The following image, "A bright stain on the vision / Blotting out reason", develops the idea that love distorts perception. The word "bright" hints that love is dazzling and attractive, but "stain" suggests something that damages and cannot be removed. Yeats's opening is entirely different in tone. "When you are old and grey and full of sleep, / And nodding by the fire" creates a calm, gentle scene, and the soft sounds and slow, flowing iambic rhythm make it seem almost soothing. Yet beneath this calm lies heartbreak, because the speaker is imagining a future in which the woman will regret her choice, and in which he is absent.

Question number

The two poets present the experience of heartbreak in contrasting ways. Graves lists the physical and emotional suffering of the lover: "leanness, jealousy, / Laggard dawns". The list suggests sleeplessness, loss of appetite and suspicion, so that love wastes the lover's body and mind. The present participles in "Listening for a knock, / Waiting for a sign" create a sense of anxious, ongoing waiting, as if the lover's life is suspended until the beloved responds. Yeats, however, presents his heartbreak through memory and contrast. He asks the woman to "dream of the soft look / Your eyes had once", reminding her of a beauty that time will take away. He then distinguishes himself from other admirers, who "loved your beauty with love false or true", whereas "one man loved the pilgrim soul in you, / And loved the sorrows of your changing face". The repetition of "loved" emphasises the depth and constancy of his devotion, and the metaphor of the "pilgrim soul" suggests he valued her spirit and her restless search for meaning rather than her appearance. The heartbreak lies in the fact that this deeper love was not returned.

Both poems also suggest that the pain of love is bound up with its value. Graves's fourth stanza shifts towards longing: "For a touch of her fingers / In a darkened room, / For a searching look". The sensory images of touch and sight reveal that the lover's suffering is endured for brief moments of intimacy, and the repeated "For" shows how much is sacrificed for so little. The final stanza moves into direct address with the exclamation "Take courage, lover!", and the closing question, ending "At any hand but hers?", suggests that true love is proved by a willingness to suffer for one particular person. The repeated pronoun focuses on her as the sole cause of both pain and joy. Yeats's ending is more melancholy. The old woman will "Murmur, a little sadly, how Love fled / And paced upon the mountains overhead / And hid his face amid a crowd of stars." Love is personified as a figure who has withdrawn beyond reach, and the image of the stars makes it remote and

Question number

almost divine. The understatement of "a little sadly" is moving because it suggests that her regret will be quiet, too late to change anything.

Structurally, the poems reflect their attitudes. Graves uses short, compressed stanzas of three lines with no regular rhyme, which feel fragmented and restless, like the symptoms they describe. Yeats uses three quatrains with a regular rhyme scheme, adapted from a sonnet by the French poet Ronsard, and this measured form gives his heartbreak a composed, dignified quality. His poem is almost a gift to the woman, since she is asked to "take down this book" and read it, whereas Graves's poem is a warning to any lover.

Context enriches both readings. Graves's own relationships were complicated: his marriage to Nancy Nicholson was strained, and after meeting the poet Laura Riding in 1926 he eventually left his wife for her in 1929. His sense of love as a painful obsession may reflect this turbulent experience. Yeats wrote his poem about Maud Gonne, the Irish nationalist he loved and proposed to more than once, but who repeatedly rejected him. His heartbreak was therefore lifelong and real, which explains the tenderness and restraint of the poem.

In conclusion, both poets show heartbreak as the cost of deep love. Graves, with his clinical metaphors and urgent questions, presents it as a sickness every true lover must endure. Yeats, with his gentle tone and personified Love, presents it as a lifelong sorrow that he hopes the beloved will one day understand.

9b

Seamus Heaney's Clearances 7: In the last minutes and Tony Harrison's Long Distance II both explore family relationships at the moment of a mother's death, and both are told by a son who watches his father's grief for his wife. Each poem

Question number

is autobiographical and written in a version of the sonnet, and each shows a father who imagines being reunited with the woman he has lost. However, the poems differ in what the sons take from the experience. Heaney's speaker describes a family united in a moment of loss that becomes almost spiritual, while Harrison's speaker reveals the distance between himself and his father, and ends by admitting that he too cannot let go.

Heaney focuses on the closeness of his parents in the final minutes of his mother's life. The opening lines, "In the last minutes he said more to her / Almost than in all their life together", suggest that the father was usually a man of few words, and that death unlocks a tenderness previously unspoken. The hesitant "Almost" is touching, as if the son is careful not to exaggerate. The father's direct speech imagines a future together: "You'll be in New Row on Monday night / And I'll come up for you". The familiar place name and the promise to "come up for you" seem to take the father back to their early life together, as if he is reliving their courtship, and the ellipsis before "Isn't that right?" suggests his voice faltering as he seeks reassurance. Harrison's father also refuses to accept his wife's death, but his denial lasts years rather than minutes. The opening line, "Though my mother was already two years dead", is blunt and factual, yet the routines that follow are deeply moving: "Dad kept her slippers warming by the gas, / put hot water bottles her side of the bed". These domestic details, written in plain, colloquial language, show a love expressed through care and habit rather than words. Both fathers, then, express love through imagined reunion, but Heaney's father speaks it aloud while Harrison's hides it.

The physical and emotional closeness of the family is central to Heaney's poem. "His head was bent down to her propped-up head" creates a tender visual image, and the repetition of "head" mirrors the closeness of the couple. The line "She

Question number

could not hear but we were overjoyed" introduces the children's perspective, and the collective pronoun "we" emphasises the family's togetherness. Their joy at witnessing their parents' love seems almost surprising in the face of death. The affectionate simplicity of "He called her good and girl" recalls the language of their youth, and the short, stark sentence "Then she was dead" follows abruptly, the bluntness capturing the shock of the moment. In contrast, Harrison's poem shows the family divided. The father must protect his secret from his son: "You couldn't just drop in. You had to phone." He needs time "to clear away her things and look alone / as though his still raw love were such a crime". The metaphor of crime suggests the father's shame about his own grief, and his fear of "my blight of disbelief" shows that he sees his educated son as an outsider who will judge him.

The sonnet forms of both poems shape their meaning. Heaney's sonnet turns at the volta from the father's words to the family's shared experience. The sestet shifts into abstract, almost religious language: "The space we stood around had been emptied / Into us to keep". The mother's absence becomes a presence carried within each of them, and the final line, "High cries were felled and a pure change happened", suggests a movement from grief to acceptance and even grace. The title Clearances itself suggests both loss and a space opened up. Harrison's poem has sixteen lines in four rhymed quatrains, and the final quatrain also turns, but towards the son. "I believe life ends with death, and that is all" is a firm, monosyllabic statement of disbelief. Yet the shift to direct address, "You haven't both gone shopping", and the final image of "the disconnected number I still call" reveals that the son, like his father, cannot let go. The word "disconnected" suggests both the dead telephone line and the emotional distance between them.

Context enriches both poems. Heaney's mother, Margaret, died in 1984, and Clearances is a sequence of sonnets in her memory. As the eldest of nine children,

Question number

he grew up in a large family on a farm in County Derry, which explains the strong sense of collective grief. Harrison grew up in a working-class family in Leeds and won a scholarship to grammar school, which he felt separated him from his parents. Long Distance, from his sequence The School of Eloquence, explores this gap: his mother died in 1976 and his father in 1980. His educated scepticism, the "blight of disbelief", makes the final admission all the more moving.

In conclusion, both poets present family relationships as most powerful at the point of loss, and both use the sonnet to explore a father's devotion to his wife. Heaney presents death as an experience that draws the family closer and brings a kind of peace. Harrison presents it as something that exposes the distance between father and son, until the son finally recognises that he shares his father's inability to let go.

10a Both Ted Hughes in "Bayonet Charge" and Keith Douglas in "Vergissmeinnicht" present the horror of conflict as something that strips away the noble ideas used to justify war and leaves only the frightened or ruined human body. However, they approach that horror from opposite ends of the experience. Hughes plunges us into the moment of combat, where horror is a chaotic, physical terror felt from inside one soldier's mind, while Douglas writes about the aftermath, where horror lies in the cold, almost detached sight of a decaying enemy who was also a lover.

Hughes creates horror through disorientation from the first line. The poem begins in media res, "Suddenly he awoke and was running", so that the soldier, like the reader, has no time to understand what is happening. The verb "awoke" suggests he has been jolted out of a dream, perhaps the dream of patriotic glory, into a nightmare. Hughes uses relentless enjambment and free verse so that sentences

Question number

spill over line endings, mimicking the soldier's breathless, stumbling run "across a field of clods towards a green hedge / That dazzled with rifle fire". The contrast between the natural "green hedge" and the man-made "rifle fire" is disturbing: even the English-sounding countryside has been turned into a place of death. Similarly, the onomatopoeic "bullets smacking the belly out of the air" makes the air itself seem wounded, as though violence has infected the whole of nature.

Douglas, by contrast, opens with a calm, retrospective voice: "Three weeks gone and the combatants gone". The repetition of "gone" and the regular rhyming quatrains create an eerie stillness which is almost the opposite of Hughes's frantic free verse. Yet this control is itself horrifying, because the speaker is describing "the nightmare ground" and "the soldier sprawling in the sun" as if they were ordinary. The verb "sprawling" is casual, almost relaxed, which makes the body's undignified position more shocking. Where Hughes shows horror as panic, Douglas shows a deeper horror: that war has made such sights normal enough to be described in tidy verse.

Both poets expose the hollowness of the ideals soldiers are told they fight for. In Hughes's poem, "The patriotic tear that had brimmed in his eye" becomes "Sweating like molten iron from the centre of his chest". The simile transforms an emotion of pride into something industrial and painful, as if patriotism is now burning him from the inside. Most bitterly, Hughes lists "King, honour, human dignity, etcetera", and the dismissive "etcetera" reduces these grand abstractions to a throwaway list which are "Dropped like luxuries" the moment real danger arrives. The reference to the "King" suggests the First World War, and Hughes's father, who survived the slaughter at Gallipoli in 1915 when most of his regiment did not, may lie behind this angry stripping away of propaganda.

Question number

Douglas undermines romantic ideals in a different way, through the photograph of "Steffi" inscribed "Vergissmeinnicht", meaning "forget me not". The speaker remembers how the dead German had "hit my tank with one / like the entry of a demon", which presents him as a frightening enemy, yet the photograph reveals a tender private life. The horror lies in the gap between the girlfriend's loving words and what she "would weep to see today": "how on his skin the swart flies move". The present tense "move" forces us to look at decay happening now, and the simile "the burst stomach like a cave" is grotesque, turning the human body into an empty, hollow landscape. Douglas served as a tank commander in the North African desert campaign, and this cool, unflinching detail feels like the eyewitness record of someone who has seen too much to be shocked, which is perhaps the most disturbing horror of all.

Both poems also use the natural world to intensify the horror. Hughes's yellow hare "rolled like a flame / And crawled in a threshing circle, its mouth wide / Open silent, its eyes standing out". The hare is an innocent victim, and its silent scream seems to mirror the soldier's own terror, reflecting Hughes's lifelong interest in animals and their relationship with humans. In Douglas's poem nature is not a fellow victim but a scavenger, since the "swart flies" feed on the body. Where Hughes asks us to feel pity, Douglas makes us confront the indifference of the world to human death.

Finally, both poets suggest that individuals are reduced to tiny parts of a vast, uncaring system. Hughes's soldier asks, "In what cold clockwork of the stars and the nations / Was he the hand pointing that second?" The metaphor of "cold clockwork" presents war as mechanical and inevitable, a machine in which a man is merely a moving part. Douglas makes a similar point when the dead soldier is "mocked at by his own equipment / that's hard and good when he's decayed": the

Question number

gun survives while the man rots, so the object outlasts the human. Douglas's final stanza fuses the two identities of the man, "the lover and killer are mingled", and declares that death "has done the lover mortal hurt". The real tragedy is not that a killer has died but that a lover has.

Ultimately, Hughes's horror is immediate and sensory, ending in the explosive image of "His terror's touchy dynamite", where fear itself becomes a weapon about to detonate. Douglas's horror is quieter and more lingering, rooted in the speaker's admission that he sees the body "almost with content". I find Douglas's poem the more unsettling, because while Hughes shows a man losing his ideals in a moment of panic, Douglas shows a man who has already lost his capacity to feel, which suggests that the lasting horror of conflict is what it does to the living.

10b

Both Seamus Heaney in "Requiem for the Croppies" and Wilfred Owen in "Anthem for Doomed Youth" write about death in war as something brutal, mass and unceremonious, and both choose the sonnet, a form traditionally linked with love, to turn their poems into elegies. However, they reach very different conclusions. Owen's speaker is angry and grieving, insisting that the young men of the First World War die without dignity or meaning, while Heaney's dead rebels speak for themselves and suggest that, although death was certain, it was not the end, since something of their cause grows back out of the ground.

The titles immediately show how each poet frames death. Heaney's "Requiem" is the Latin name for the Catholic Mass for the dead, so the poem itself becomes an act of remembrance for the Croppies, the rebels of 1798 who were named for their cropped hair, copied from the French revolutionaries. Owen's "Anthem" is also ceremonial, suggesting a hymn or a national song of praise, but it is bitterly

Question number

undercut by "Doomed Youth". The adjective "Doomed" removes any sense of heroic choice: these boys are destined to die before they have lived. Both poets therefore borrow religious and ceremonial language, yet Heaney uses it to honour the dead, while Owen uses it to expose the lack of honour in their deaths.

Owen's opening question, "What passing-bells for these who die as cattle?", is shocking. A passing-bell was rung in church to mark a death, but the simile "as cattle" reduces the soldiers to animals herded to slaughter, anonymous and expendable. The answer replaces church ritual with the sounds of the battlefield: "the monstrous anger of the guns" and "the stuttering rifles' rapid rattle". The alliteration and onomatopoeia imitate machine-gun fire, and the personification of the guns as "monstrous" suggests that the weapons have more life and feeling than the men. Even prayer is mocked, since the rifles "patter out their hasty orisons", so that the only funeral service these soldiers receive is the noise of the weapons that killed them.

Heaney's dead are also stripped of ritual, but the poem's voice is collective and quietly proud rather than angry. The first-person plural "We moved quick and sudden in our own country" makes the rebels speak from beyond the grave, and the possessive "our own country" stresses that they are fighting, and dying, for their homeland. The repetition of "No kitchens on the run, no striking camp" shows a hard, improvised existence, and the contrast "The priest lay behind ditches with the tramp" suggests that death threatened everyone equally, regardless of status. Unlike Owen's helpless "cattle", Heaney's rebels act: they "stampede cattle into infantry", ironically using the animals as weapons. Death is approaching, but it is faced with ingenuity and courage.

Both poets reach a climax of mass death in which the individuals disappear.

Question number

Heaney's volta comes with the ominous ellipsis leading to "Vinegar Hill" and "the fatal conclave", where "Terraced thousands died, shaking scythes at cannon." The contrast between farm tools and artillery makes the outcome brutally inevitable, while "Terraced thousands" presents the dead stacked up the hillside like a field. The metaphor "The hillside blushed, soaked in our broken wave" is especially powerful: "blushed" makes the land itself seem to redden with blood, perhaps even with shame, and "broken wave" turns the rebel charge into a sea that crashes and is destroyed. Owen's "shrill, demented choirs of wailing shells" works in a similar way, replacing the church choir with the scream of artillery. The adjective "demented" suggests that war itself is insane, and the shift from human voices to shells reinforces the idea that the soldiers are lost among the machinery of killing.

The greatest difference lies in what follows death. Owen's sestet turns from the front line to the grief at home. "Not in the hands of boys, but in their eyes / Shall shine the holy glimmers of goodbyes", so the candles of a funeral become the tears of the soldiers' comrades or young brothers. "The pallor of girls' brows shall be their pall" uses the half-rhyme of "pallor" and "pall" to make the grief of the women into the cloth covering a coffin. The final line, "And each slow dusk a drawing-down of blinds", is quiet and devastating: the drawing of blinds was a sign of mourning in a house, and the slow, soft sounds suggest grief that will be repeated every evening. Owen, writing at Craiglockhart in 1917 with Siegfried Sassoon's encouragement, and killed a week before the Armistice, offers no consolation beyond this private sorrow.

Heaney, by contrast, ends with renewal. The British "buried us without shroud or coffin", which shows the same lack of dignity Owen protests about, yet "in August... the barley grew up" from the grave. This completes the cyclical structure begun with "The pockets of our greatcoats full of barley", since the rebels carried

Question number

barley as food on the march. The image suggests that their deaths planted something which would rise again. Heaney wrote the poem in 1966, the fiftieth anniversary of the Easter Rising, and the barley can be read as the spirit of Irish resistance that resurfaced in 1916. It may also be read simply as nature reclaiming the dead.

Ultimately, both poets insist that the victims of war deserve remembrance that the battlefield denied them. Owen presents death as pointless waste and grief as the only response, while Heaney presents death as tragic but fertile, a sacrifice that sustains a nation's memory. Owen's poem is perhaps the more universal lament, yet Heaney's quiet voice of the dead is more haunting, because it suggests that the dead are never entirely silenced.