

NAMIBIA SENIOR SECONDARY CERTIFICATE

FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH ORDINARY LEVEL

4102/1

PAPER 1 Reading and Directed Writing

2 hours 30 minutes

Marks 70

2017

Additional Materials: Answer Book

INSTRUCTIONS AND INFORMATION TO CANDIDATES

- Write your answers in the Answer Book provided.
- Write your Centre Number, Candidate Number and Name in the spaces on the Answer Book.
- Write with blue or black pen.
- Do not use correction fluid.

- Answer **all** questions.
- Dictionaries are not permitted.

- The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.

This document consists of **6** printed pages and **2** blank pages.



Republic of Namibia

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, ARTS AND CULTURE

PART 1**Passage A**

The following is taken from a website for students. Read the passage below and then answer the questions that follow.

Henry V

Written around 1599, *Henry V* is the final play in William Shakespeare's group of four history plays known as the Henriad, that includes *Richard III*, *Henry VI Part 1*, and *Henry IV Part 2*. In the earlier works, Shakespeare portrays Henry's days as a wild and reckless teenager. In *Henry V*, "Wild Prince Hal" has long since grown up into a capable king who is determined to invade France and lay claim to the French throne.

Henry V portrays events immediately before and after Henry's miraculous victory at the Battle of Agincourt (1415), a major turning point in the Hundred Years' War (when the English and the French squabbled over who had rights to the French crown).

Though written about the early 1400s, for hundreds of years audiences have found this piece of historical fiction relevant to their wars. When the play was first performed in 1599, the portrayal of Henry V's military campaign would have made Shakespeare's original Elizabethan audience think about their own unstable political situation. England had long been at war with Spain and, when Shakespeare was writing *Henry V*, England was gearing up for a messy war with the Irish. In Ireland, the Earl of Tyrone had recently started a rebellion (1594-1603) and Queen Elizabeth I had recently sent her favourite go-to guy, the Earl of Essex, to squash the uprising (which didn't exactly work out as planned).

Over the years, Henry's motivational St. Crispin's Day speech to his troops ("We few, we happy few, we band of brothers"), has become one of the most famous speeches of all time. During World War II, Laurence Olivier's dramatic reading of it was broadcast over the radio and, according to scholar Marjorie Garber, it soon "became a patriotic call to arms for embattled Britain" (*Shakespeare After All*). In other words, Shakespeare's words helped to incite the British to fight against Hitler. Two years after his radio broadcast, Olivier directed and starred in a film adaptation that adopted the same patriotic tone. The passage has also been quoted in countless political speeches, films, and literary works. It even inspired the name of Stephen Ambrose's book *Band of Brothers*, which was later turned into a TV mini-series about WWII soldiers.

It's not just the St. Crispin's Day speech that audiences remember. As a whole, Shakespeare's play has given rise to endless debates about the parallels between Henry V's military campaign and modern warfare. In 1989, Kenneth Branagh's film adaptation of *Henry V* underscored the horrific realities of war and called into question Henry's justification for invading a foreign country.

When it comes down to it, *Henry V* is the ultimate underdog war story. If you ask us, that makes this play the great-great-great-grandfather of blockbuster movies such as *300* (2006), *Braveheart* (1995) and even *Saving Private Ryan* (1998).

Think about it. Moments before the historic Battle of Agincourt begins, Henry's ragtag troops are exhausted, sickly, hungry, terrified of being killed and they know that they are seriously outnumbered. Not only that, but they're completely surrounded by the French army. In other words, the English soldiers don't have a snowball's chance in hell of winning this battle and it's highly unlikely that they'll make it home to their families.

Then King Henry V steps up and delivers one of the most astonishing (and famous) rousing speeches of all time and convinces his troops to stay and fight alongside him like a "band of brothers" who will share the glory when all is said and done. Instead of running away with their tails between their legs, Henry's troops are inspired to stay and fight and, then, against all odds, they actually win the battle. Just don't ask us how. Shakespeare leaves this part a big mystery.

- 1 Choose the best answer to the question from the choices provided. Write down only the question number and the letter of the answer of your choice.
- (a) *Henry V* is
- A a blockbuster play.
 - B one of a group of history plays.
 - C one of Shakespeare's earlier plays.
 - D the first of Shakespeare's plays. [1]
- (b) Henry's St Crispin's Day speech was delivered in
- A 1415
 - B 1594
 - C 1599
 - D WWII [1]
- (c) Which word best expresses the overall purpose of King Henry's speech?
- A to command
 - B to motivate
 - C to move
 - D to promote [1]
- 2 Which conflicts might Shakespeare's audience have related to the Battle of Agincourt as portrayed in the speech of Henry V? [2]
- 3 Identify **two** reasons which suggest a victory is unlikely, and **two** problems which affected King Henry's soldiers. [4]
- 4 What does King Henry promise in an attempt to convince his troops to stay and fight alongside him? [1]

[10]

- 5 Write a **dialogue** between two of King Henry's soldiers, who have just heard his influential speech. Detail how they experience a change in motivation and morale, as a result of Henry's abilities as a speaker. Remember to account for their mood and condition before the speech, as well as after the speech.

Write your dialogue. Base your writing on what you have read in Passage A.

You should write between **1 to 1½** pages in length.

[20]

PART 2

Read the passage below and the instructions given.

Passage B**The Amazing True Story of The Battle of Agincourt**

You might have seen *Henry V*, the 1989 movie with Kenneth Branagh set at the famous battle of Agincourt. According to William Shakespeare, King Henry and his squires won the battle with courage alone. The reality, however, was far more interesting and replete with lessons still applicable today.

First, you have to understand the context. King Henry thought France had confiscated lands in Normandy that England rightfully owned, and so he landed in northern France to reclaim them. After storming Harfleur, his army of 12 000 had dwindled down to less than 7 000, so Henry chose to retreat north to the British stronghold of Calais to re-equip. However, the French had been trailing Henry and forced all his troops into a narrow field bracketed by two woods, Agincourt and Tramecourt. It's hard to tell how many French forces stood before Henry, but we do know the French easily outnumbered the British by 3 to 1, and maybe as much as 4 to 1 or 5 to 1. To make matters worse the British had been marching 260 miles for two and a half weeks and were still suffering from a bout of dysentery.

The British had a few technological advancements on their side. One was the longbow used by the Welsh archers. The longbow was taller than any other bow, and thus had greater power and range, all adding up to one deadly advantage: from a distance, the British could safely hurl lethal arrows at the gathering French forces.

The other technological advancement was the archers' "palings", pointed wooden stakes buried into the ground at a sharp angle to deter an equestrian attack. Those two modern weaponry advancements were pivotal in the battle of Agincourt, but the longbow was especially crucial for one unique reason: the French considered the longbow unchivalrous.

Frequently unmentioned in the history books is the importance chivalry played at Agincourt. The French believed strongly in chivalry, a code of honour, about what was fair and morally right on a field of battle. The longbows, and the commoner longbowmen wielding them, were viewed as beneath the French. The French likely felt they had the superior moral ground and would show the British commoners how they could still win without using a disgraceful longbow.

The French knights were undeterred. They would attack by horse and during the attack, the "disreputable" Welsh archers would rain down devastating longbow arrows that pierced the approaching steed's unprotected backside ... and off the knights would be thrown. Any knight miraculously still seated on his horse who reached the archers, would suddenly see the archers retreat safely behind their large wooden palings ... and the knights would either dismount and stumble through the churned up mud and palings or be forced to retreat. In both cases, that would mean still more arrows from the archers.

Steeped in courtly etiquette and a strong moral code of conduct, the French elected not to use the longbow because they thought its use was unfair and a dishonourable way to conduct warfare ... and they lost.

The French failed to win a battle they dominated in manpower. Why? Because they were too caught up with what they thought was “right”, when they should have been looking at what was working. Right or wrong, longbows *worked*. Had the French swallowed their pride and returned their own longbow volley, they would have obliterated the British. But their delusion of moral superiority lost them the battle of Agincourt, and handed an unequivocal victory to their foes which rings throughout history to this day.

The larger lessons of Agincourt are how a marginalised group can turn the tables against a vastly larger foe, and how a superior force should never become so enamoured with its “moral superiority” that it won’t review and/or adopt new strategies with a mind unfettered by ideological prejudice. (I put “moral superiority” in quotes because what we consider “morally superior” today is radically different than what previous generations have defined it, as no doubt future generations will look at our own “moral superiority” and scratch their heads in confusion.)

History offers countless examples of how small groups of people chose a time and place of battle best suited to them to win a war against an impossible opponent: American revolutionaries used “dishonourable” guerilla tactics against the British, Afghan mujahideen whittled down their Russian occupiers, the Vietcong picked off American troops and, the Algerians subverted the French. In each case, the larger force should have easily won the war or battle, but they didn’t. Sure, we can point to any number of other factors as to why each case is unlike the other, but these examples all illustrate the very same lesson from Agincourt: to effectively fight and beat a smaller opponent, the larger opponent must be willing to adopt the same tactics employed by their smaller opponent no matter how dishonourable or morally questionable those tactics may seem at the time. History shows us now that the longbow wasn’t dishonourable at all. Quite remarkably, the morally questionable part of this scenario was the chivalrous attitude preventing the French from using the longbow.

The French didn’t lose at Agincourt as a result of a lack of resources, but from a moral “blindness”, a lack of willingness to see things as they really were and adapt to the situation before it was too late.

- 6** Read **Passage B** and re-read **Passage A**. Summarise **the reasons why the English invaded, and why the French lost the battle, as well as how the battle reflects on warfare since the Hundred Years’ War**.

Your answer should be between **1 - 1½** pages in length.

[20]

- 7** Write **a report** about the battle, based on the point of view of both sides, to be used in a history lesson presentation.

Base your answer on material from **both** passages. You may include some sound logical ideas of your own.

Your answer should be between **1 to 2** pages in length.

[20]

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE