

#### Question 4

Both texts agree with the statement to a certain extent, although Text 2 presents the harsh weather as more dangerous than Text 1.

Text 1 opens with the father stating that “we’d be lucky to find one. Very lucky.” To show the lack of danger in going out in this weather, which is emphasised by the repetition of “lucky” and the short sentence. By describing it as “lucky” he is also implying that finding a storm would be a positive experience, therefore minimising the amount of danger involved.

On the other hand, Text 2 presents the storm as “Shrieking wind. The bitter coffee trembled.” The use of personification reinforces how this is a storm to be fearful of: not only is the wind like a physical being that is attacking us, but also the effect it has even on inanimate objects. “Shrieking” is a powerful verb that suggests an attack and an attempt to be frightening rather than from something which is scared, further emphasising the danger of the storm. This is unlike the descriptions of the weather in Text 1, which sees the storm as something to be enjoyed instead of feared.

In Text 2, the weather is described as “Needles of snow in his face.” Which suggests an element of danger, as the metaphorical “needles” imply Quoye is being attacked. The short sentence also highlights the severity of this sudden attack. Although there is a hint of the domestic here, which may serve to undermine the storm’s apparent strength, by coupling it with the rest of the extract serves to emphasise the storm’s danger.

However, in Text 1 the dangerous side of the storm is less clear: “the wind whoo-whooping around our walls like a ghost.” The use of childish language here makes it appear less scary and less dangerous, unlike Text 2’s “shrieking wind”. The alliteration here also undermines the idea that the storm could be strong, as it creates a weak sound. Yet there is a degree of danger implied here through the simile, as ghosts link to concepts of death and destruction, although this remains less dangerous than Text 2 because it is not a literal description, so the reader does not feel as if they are experiencing the storm itself.

The lack of danger is also demonstrated in Text 1 when the father says, “‘We won’t be long,’ I say” because this shows he is not expecting the storm to delay them. It also shows how foolish he is being because he is taking his young son out into a storm with no concern regarding his wellbeing, as he would be very vulnerable. It could be seen, however, that this optimistic response is quite forced, as if he is attempting to make himself believe this too and is trying to hide his concerns for the sake of his son, who has already shown he is worried.

Likewise, this forced optimism is also displayed in the ending of Text 2, where Sunshine asks “Dad, are we scared?” for Quoye to respond with, “No, honey. It’s an adventure.” We have a clear idea of how dangerous the storm is, but again the father figure is trying to minimise the danger for the sake of the children. His daughter’s reliance on him is emphasised by her question, as she needs her father to explain to her what emotion she should be feeling, which again shows how foolish the decision to bring a child out into this weather is. But this forced optimism is more clear here than in Text 1, due to Quoye’s short, clipped sentences, which suggest he does not believe this himself, whereas the father in Text 1 appears to believe that chasing the storm would be a fun thing to do.

Overall, both texts agree with the statement, especially regarding how foolish taking these journeys in harsh weather is, as both fathers take their children into this weather and have to spend time reassuring them because the children are scared. However, Text 2 demonstrates how dangerous the storm is far more than Text 1, due to the short descriptions of key emotions or parts of the storm in comparison to Text 1’s frequent observations regarding how unlikely it is to be a serious storm.