**Script 3000**

**Beckett: How far do you agree that Samuel Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot* has no meaning?**

This essay has a good clear structure and there is a veneer of sophistication in the language used. At first sight it appears to be well planned and to contain some mature insights. On a closer reading, the arguments are not always clear and links are not always made between ideas.

In the first paragraph the idea of lack of progression is mentioned and it is linked to a feeling of absence in the play but this link is not developed. The argument in this paragraph drifts. But the main point that the lack of progression, the repetitions and dislocations reflect ‘Vladimir and Estragon’s isolation from society, from purpose’ maintains the overall point that the play’s apparent meaninglessness does in fact convey meaning.

In the second paragraph, the main point is about distorted communication. There is a lot of good material in this paragraph but it often goes beyond distorted communication. The second part of this very long paragraph (could have been broken up into several different ideas) becomes rather unclear since the sentence beginning *Yet, Beckett strives*…makes little sense. What is Beckett’s *moralistic intention* and does the candidate mean *wilful* or *willing*? There is good material that ends with Lucky’s ‘dependence on dictated purpose through oppression’: the overall thread being that the apparent lack of meaning of Lucky’s speech reveals a deeper meaning.

The third paragraph apparently relates little to the question but there is an attempt to make it relevant. Although the point is not well argued, the idea that the metatheatrical effects suggest that ‘the narrative presented on stage affects both the characters and audience in equal measure’ – (i.e. the play is as much about the audience as it is about the characters, with characters looking at the audience as if they’re the play) is a good one.

The conclusion makes a new point about Vladimir that appears entirely unrelated to the question and the statement that *purpose is humanity’s dependency* is rather opaque. Presumably the candidate means that the play shows how much humanity lacks – and needs – a sense of purpose. The play’s lack of progression, the characters’ imperfect communication and the use of metatheatre to suggest that the play is as much about the audience as it’s about the characters, all illustrate this.

The candidate has shown analytical skills and there is an overarching view of the play which reveals intelligent thought and a critical sense. At times, the sentences are long and over complex with a dependence on abstractions. There is also a tendency to drift away from the topic. There are clear elements of both KP14 and KP17. **Mark 16** – best fit.

At times the thread is lost and the expression is not always as clear as it needs to be at key moments – eg the ‘moralistic purpose’. But the essay is quite sophisticated and ambitious, it treats the play as a play, and it seems to have a lot of the qualities of KP17 in terms of its analysis and informed critical perspective. It falls down somewhat on ‘demonstration’ – but more within paragraphs than in terms of the overall argument. KP17 does include the phrases, ‘even if the more complex or subtle ideas may be less well controlled or sequenced into the argument’ and ‘the forward thrust of the argument is lost at certain points’.

**Script 12455**

**Beckett: How far do you agree that Samuel Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot* has no meaning?**

Introduction – this is unclear both linguistically and logically. The comment *has been criticised a lot* is inappropriate in an essay at this level.

In the first main paragraph there are a number of points made after a rather assertive first sentence. Relevant points include lack of evolution in the play, cross talk, slapstick and the impact of silence. Unfortunately, these points are merely listed with little in the way of development. Lucky’s speech is referred to but not in any depth. There is an attempt at illustration with quotation from the play.

In the second paragraph the post-war and holocaust context is introduced. There are ideas here but the expression is rather awkward and development rather brief.

The conclusion is poorly expressed with the exception of the closing sentence.

This is a basic response with some sound moments. The control of language is flawed but sufficient to ensure basic communication. KP11. **Mark 11**.

**Script 2553**

**Critical Appreciation – A C Grayling and Jenny Joseph**

Introduction – this does not read well and there is no need to describe the texts.

In the first paragraph there is a good attempt to analyse both texts with parallels being clearly shown with reference to the texts. At the end of the paragraph, the candidate struggles to make the point and imposes a view on the text.

In the second paragraph, there is some good material showing the differing viewpoints of love in the two authors. There is also mention of the certainty and positivity in the poem contrasting with the formal and clinical approach to love offered by the text passage. These points are well made even if linguistically there are some considerable failings.

In the final paragraph there is a personal response offered to the effect of the two texts which is to be applauded.

This is an essay where there are many language and stylistic errors but the response is both sensible and sensitive with a good feel for the effect of both texts. There are some limitations and sometimes there are some assertions not necessarily appropriate. The candidate does move confidently between the texts and there is a strong comparative element to the essay. The limitations of language will keep this to a KP14. **Mark 15**.

**Script 12908**

**Tremain: How and to what effect does Tremain explore the notion of loss in *The Road Home*?**

Introduction – there is too much narrative here but it does set out the parameters of the essay.

This essay begins with paragraphs describing different types of loss related to family and friends. It talks about the loss of Lev’s wife, the loss of his father, the loss of Christy to alcoholism. It then turns to the effect of loss on Lev. It can be seen to keep him anchored in the past or can act as a source of motivation for him. The second part of the essay deals with other forms of loss such as loss of hope or motivation and loss of values as Lev becomes more integrated into British society. He feels adrift and his reaction to different forms of loss is instrumental in how his character evolves through the novel. These are good points, well made. There are also relevant points made about how Lev loses his roots and his sense of his hometown. The candidate explains that when he finally returns home, at first he feels lost before experiencing the “feeling of joy” in his kitchen.

Conclusion – rather short and trite.

Overall, this essay feels rather list-like but it is thorough, efficient and competent and there are good insights into Lev’s experiences and character. It sticks to the task throughout. There are also some pertinent quotations. At times the expression is awkward. KP14. **Mark 15**.

**Script 78763**

**Pound – How does Pound explore sorrow in his poetry?**

Introduction – sets out clearly the parameters of the argument to follow.

The essay has a good structure with points clearly defined. There is close textual reference and knowledge of a range of poems. The essay is not list-like in structure as the candidate develops themes first and then illustrates them with appropriate examples. Good knowledge of literary terms and references is shown. The candidate makes intelligent comment about the important aspects of Pound’s poetry seen in the light of the question. Sorrow is not just equated with sadness with quotations taken from the poems as was the case with many candidates answering this question. In this essay, sorrow is seen as a universal human emotion and the candidate demonstrates how it is presented in different ways in the poems while considering its significance as a part of human experience.

There are occasional linguistic errors and lack of development of a point made but this is an impressive piece of writing where argument, discussion and evidence are woven naturally and inseparably together. KP20. **Mark 19**.