

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2006 question paper

0488 LITERATURE (SPANISH)

0488/01

Paper 1, maximum raw mark 60

These mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. They show the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. They do not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

The minimum marks in these components needed for various grades were previously published with these mark schemes, but are now instead included in the Report on the Examination for this session.

- CIE will not enter into discussion or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2006 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

Answers will be marked according to the following general criteria:

- 18-20 Detailed, well-written, well-organised answer, completely relevant to question and showing sensitive personal response to book. For passage-based questions, detailed attention to words of passage.
- 15-17 Detailed answer, relevant to question and with personal response; may be a bit cut-and-dried. For passage-based questions, close attention to words but may be a few omissions/superficialities.
- 12-14 Competent answer, relevant but limited; signs of personal response, good knowledge of book. For passage-based, some attention to words but some significant omissions and/or misunderstandings.
- 9-11 Answer relevant to question but may show some misunderstanding and/or limitations; effort to communicate personal response and knowledge. Passage-based: significant omissions/misunderstandings, but some response comes over.
- 6-8 Attempt to answer question and some knowledge of book; limited, scrappy answer; clumsy expression. Passage-based: attempt to respond, but with severe limitations.
- 4-5 Short, scrappy answer; confused; signs that book has been read. Passage-based: has read the passage and conveyed one or two basic ideas about it.
- 2-3 Has read book and absorbed some very elementary ideas about it. Passage-based: may have glanced at passage and written a few words.
- 0-1 Nothing to reward. Obvious non-reading of book, or total non-appreciation.

It is very helpful if examiners comment on the scripts. This does not mean writing long essays, but simply ticking good points, noting a few observations in the margin (e.g. 'good point', 'irrelevant', 'excessive quotation', etc.). A brief comment at the end of an essay (e.g. 'rambling answer, shows some knowledge but misses point of question') is particularly helpful. **DON'T** forget to write your mark for each essay at the end of that essay, and to transfer all three marks to the front of the script, and total them.

Beware of rubric infringements: usually failure to cover three books, or **NO STARRED QUESTION** (easily missed). An answer that infringes the rubric scores **one-fifth** of the mark it would otherwise gain. THIS PENALTY IS APPLIED NOT TO THE LOWEST-SCORING ANSWER ON THE PAPER, BUT TO THE ANSWER THAT IS INFRINGING THE RUBRIC.

E.g.:

- (1) candidate answers a starred question on Moratín and scores 12; an essay question on Moratín and scores 15; an essay question on Rulfo and scores 12. The Rulfo question must stand, and so must the Moratín starred question, because candidates are **required** to answer a starred question. Therefore the essay question on Moratín is the one that must be penalised.
- (2) candidate answers two essay questions on Moratín scoring 13 and 14, and a starred question on Rulfo, scoring 10. The Rulfo answer must stand, because it is the required starred question. But **either** of the two Moratín questions could be reckoned as the offender, and so it is right here to penalise the lower-scoring of the two essays.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

- (3) candidate answers three essay questions, on Moratín, Rulfo and Vallejo, but no starred question. Here you simply penalise the lowest-scoring of the three answers.
- (4) candidate answers three essay questions *and* covers only two books. In theory, candidate has therefore incurred a double rubric infringement, but normally we would penalise only one answer.
- (5) candidate answers only two questions, on two different books, but not including a starred question. **THIS IS NOT A RUBRIC INFRINGEMENT.** We assume that the missing third question would have fulfilled the rubric. Both answers score their full mark.
- (6) candidate answers too many questions. **THIS IS NOT A RUBRIC INFRINGEMENT.** Mark all the answers (they will normally be very short) and take the three answers that jointly produce the highest possible score while obeying the rubric. **CROSS OUT** the answers you have discounted.

Lazarillo de Tormes

- 1* Note that the question does not ask what is going to happen to Lázaro in the novel, or what is going to happen in general, but what kind of world the happenings will take place in. Telling the story will earn only very limited reward.

Assuming the proper focus, the question can be answered on two levels: firstly, noting what happens in this passage and what it tells us about Lázaro's world; secondly, exploring the implications of the way the events are recounted. The majority of candidates are likely to stick on level one, but for a mark of 17 or above, level two will certainly be needed. In general, passable candidates are likely to note that we see only the underside of the world Lázaro lives in; we are not among the totally destitute, but we are definitely not in contact with the highest echelons. This is a harshly real world where what matters is survival, and that being assured, improving one's lot not by hard work, but by any means, however morally and legally dubious, that are available. The fate of Lázaro's father shows (a) that chronic dishonesty is a part of this world, (b) that when detected it is harshly punished, and (c) that warfare is endemic, but not an immediate feature of Lázaro's experience. The *tone* in which the father's mishaps are related reveals that dishonesty is taken as a matter of course, and even as something amusing; Lázaro's narration betrays neither shame or embarrassment. The ironical reference to the Gospels indicates a similarly disillusioned approach to religion, though without denying its validity. The mother's sexual incontinence again suggests an essentially immoral, or amoral, world, but Lázaro's ironical, even good-humoured, commentary reveals the same tolerant disillusionment: no ideal of pure motherhood here! (Good candidates may note how Lázaro here conveys both the innocence of his childhood and the understanding of his adult self.) In fact, young Lázaro rather welcomes his mother's paramour because he provides the necessities. The fact his little brother is a bastard does not bother Lázaro: again the ironical tolerance of immorality. Lázaro's final comment points to another important aspect of his world, the prevalence of self-deception, which emerges most strongly in the Escudero.

Covering all these aspects, with appropriate reference, is almost certain to produce a mark in the top band; correspondingly less detailed comment and reference will sort out those in the bands below; for a mark of 8 or below we will probably be looking for isolated acceptable comments.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

- 2 Candidates should have little difficulty in identifying the 'lessons' that the Ciego teaches Lázaro, starting with the initial one, that you should never take anyone or anything on trust. Lázaro sharpens his wits by pitting them against his master's cunning; he learns to trick him and outwit him, to nurse his dislike of him until it can find a vent, to seize any chance (usually of getting something to eat or drink) that comes his way, and never to expect any advantage unless it is obtained by trickery. In short, he learns how the weak can survive by cunning in a world that is dominated by the strong and hard-hearted. Arguably these lessons do stand him in good stead; for one thing, as he assures us, he would otherwise probably have starved to death under his second master. Most competent candidates will get that far, and with appropriate illustration I might even go up to 18 on that basis. Bare statement, without illustration, should keep the answer below 12. For highest reward, I should hope for some comment on the shortcomings of the Ciego's lessons: what Lázaro emphatically does not get from this very unpleasant old man is the kind of *aviso* that would equip him for a good Christian life as recommended by the innumerable moralists of the period. The really striking thing about Lázaro, perhaps, is that despite his cheerfully hard-boiled attitude, greatly developed during his time with the Ciego, he *doesn't* become a complete cynic and *does* develop a moral code. Not all his *avisos* come from the Ciego.
- 3 The Escudero flees because he has no money to pay the rent, so his first thought will probably be simply 'I must get away from here!' After that he is likely to ask himself what he can do next. The key to his answer lies in his speech, uttered just before the creditors call; it should be familiar to candidates, especially as it was set for a starred question last year: he thinks he could do well as a (dishonest) servant to a gentleman, and seeking such service is probably his only solution. He may pretend to Lázaro that his property in Castile is of value, but he can hardly pretend that to himself; in any case, the quarrel which (allegedly) led to his leaving home will probably preclude him from returning there. Will he regret abandoning Lázaro? Probably, not only because the latter's ingenuity has kept him from starving over the last few weeks, but also because they have a certain affection for each other. The Escudero probably thinks that Lázaro admires him; he has no idea of Lázaro's real opinions. One thing he will not dream of doing is going back to the house and facing the music: he is, basically, a coward.

Not all the above sentiments need be expressed in a good answer; others may be included, if the candidate can justify them from the text. The best answers will capture an authentic voice. In past years some candidates have given us a very fair attempt at sixteenth-century idiom, but this should not be taken as a *sine qua non* for awarding a mark of 18 or above. Do not over-credit lengthy answers which do little more than re-narrate the *Tratado* ('I remember the time when Lázaro came home in terror...'), unless the narrative is clearly conditioned by the Escudero's outlook and personality.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

El aleph

- 4* Most IGCSE candidates are likely to find this a demanding question, but it is completely in line with the way that Borges writes, both in general and in this particular story. Ideally all candidates offering this book ought at least be aware that it is very substantially composed of ideas and arguments rather than ordinary 'stories', but in previous years many candidates have shown a marked preference for the straightforward narrative elements, so they may avoid this passage, leaving it to the abler candidates who revel in ideas, and the less able who do not comprehend its difficulties. Time will show whether this assumption is justified and whether the marking needs to be adjusted accordingly.

If the question is tackled head on it is not, in fact, that difficult. The first part of zur Linde's defence here is simply a false analogy: if the actions of other historical figures have had consequences unanticipated by them for which they cannot be blamed, the same must be true of Hitler. This is backed by a false assumption, that those unanticipated consequences were, in previous cases, good (for Germany), and so will be good in Hitler's case as well. But there is a fundamental contradiction here, because zur Linde is assuming that the unintended consequences of Hitler's actions will be *bad* for Germany, will in fact lead to her destruction. But if they are bad for Germany, they will be good for the world. Now even if we accept (but we do not have to) that the actions of Luther and co. were good for Germany, there is no need to assume, as zur Linde does, that what is good for Germany is good, full stop. At this point, false logic gives way to false morality: in fact, zur Linde's morality is a precise inversion of 'normal' western morality, which is based on the Judeo-Christian which Hitler, and zur Linde, are dedicated to replacing by the doctrine of the sword. zur Linde argues that Germany is to be the necessary sacrifice that will bring, as the unintended consequence, nothing less than heaven on earth; the advent of that heaven ennobles and justifies the sacrifice. And what is that heaven? It is Hitler's new order, the reign of violence, the future which Orwell's O'Brien describes as 'a boot stamping on a human face – for ever'. To achieve that, zur Linde, and in his view Germany, are prepared to sacrifice not only their earthly existence but their immortal souls: *Que el cielo exista, aunque nuestro lugar sea el infierno*. Surely no greater sacrifice can be demanded of any man or nation than that of its or his immortal soul; but the purpose and result of that sacrifice, in this case, devalues it and renders it vile. Of course, this only holds good if one accepts traditional western morality. Borges, like zur Linde, is making an assumption: that his readers do accept it, or at least do not espouse the creed of violence and genocide. Borges juxtaposes the language of Judeo-Christian ethics with that of violence in order to force the reader to choose between the options they embody. Zur Linde chooses the second; this exposition of where his choice has led him provides ample reason for readers to choose the first.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

- 5 Each of the three stories presents the Arab/Islamic world in a different way; for high marks, I would hope for some illustration of this difference. Since we are asking for two stories, however, I would not demand a 'complete' treatment of either before giving a high mark; some selectiveness may indeed be a virtue. Ideally, we want not just the ideas but a demonstration of how Borges uses language to create a 'world' in each story: this means close reference. It is likely, however, that candidates will focus on the ideas, and this will probably be acceptable at least up to a mark of 14 (if well done). Answers that concentrate on one story and tack the other one into a scanty paragraph at the end should not be given high marks unless the discussion of the main story is exceptionally good.

Borges depicts the Islamic world sympathetically, sometimes lyrically, but also critically; he is not out to demonstrate that it is 'better' than any other. In *La busca de Averroes* he puts us inside that world and portrays it as a place where intelligent, peaceful and educated men debate questions of philosophy and philology in beautiful, civilised surroundings. As citizens of an Islamic empire, they can draw on anecdotes and knowledge from anywhere between Spain and China; as members of a society that venerates the written word, they can discourse on the poetry and thought of centuries. And yet all this apparent enlightenment is rigidly constrained by Islamic thinking and the ambit of the Koran, so that neither Averroes, who is capable of independent thought and has read Aristotle, nor Abulcásim, who has seen a theatre, can make the inductive leap that would show them what comedy and tragedy are. The question does not focus on the limitations of the Islamic world, but a full and well-referenced answer will probably include this aspect. A creditable answer could, however, be based on a detailed appreciation of how Borges creates this attractive and civilised world while hinting continually at its shortcomings (it is a world that permits torture, for example).

The Islamic component of *El Zahir* is slighter but constitutes the core of the story. Here we see the fictional Borges-persona exploring the Islamic world (intellectually) as one element in his personal world picture. Both the word *zahir* and the name belong to the Arabic/Islamic world and are connected with the Islamic notion of God. As in *La busca de Averroes*, we are given an idea of the vast extent of the Islamic empire, here conveyed by invocation of exotic names and places in India and Persia; and again we see the Islamic world as open to ideas. In *La busca de Averroes* the idea was (imperfectly) imported; in *El Zahir* the idea is exported, to become one of the stock of marvels available to the thinking citizens of the world, of which the fictional Borges is one: he is fascinated both by the origins of the *Zahir* and by what it has, over time, been taken to mean and to do.

In *Abenjacán el Bojarí* the focus is on the encounter of two profoundly different worlds, the (notionally) Christian rural isolation of nineteenth-century Cornwall and the mysterious East, the violent strangeness of which is figured in the lion, the slave and the labyrinth. The story behind the mysterious stranger points to a society which, though contemporary with Pentreath, goes in for a kind of exotic violence which is literally incomprehensible to Abenjacán's Cornish hosts even when it takes place in their midst. To top it all, there is mention of a lost treasure which might have come from the *Arabian Nights*. In this story, the fascination of the unfamiliar comes across very clearly.

There is a lot to do here, and so we may have to mark this question sympathetically. At the same time, however, all three stories have typically Borgesian qualities with which a well-prepared candidate should be familiar, so we will need some clarity of argument and marshalling of detail before advancing above a mark of 13.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

- 6 Another challenging question, answers to which will probably need to be marked fairly generously: anything that reveals a clear understanding of the story is likely to rate at least a mark of 13. The last paragraph actually offers two alternative endings: either God is not interested in the difference between Aureliano and Juan de Panonia, or there *is* no difference. Strictly speaking, Aureliano's conversation with God links only to the first alternative, but I don't think we need to be too picky about this. What is important, I think, is that Aureliano should convey the importance of the relationship between him and his 'double', and how he felt about it – in other words, why he hated Juan and yet did not intend to bring about his death. Even a clear re-telling of the events of the story should succeed in this. Any answer that even begins to show an appreciation of the way this pair of doubles relates to the 'heretical' ideas of historical cyclicity and of earthly and heavenly doubles should be generously rewarded. Anything that convincingly captures the precise but resentful voice of Aureliano the scholar is almost certainly going to merit a mark in the 18-20 band.

Como agua para chocolate

- 7* The question is a very precise one and requires the candidate to look closely at the author's use of language. Some candidates may ignore this provision and simply say what they find interesting about the content of the passage; such answers should receive only modest reward (as an approximate guide, not above 11, but do not attempt to be too rigid about this). Answers that make the contrary omission, i.e. examine the language but do not explain what makes it interesting, will probably be rarer, but again should not be allowed to score too highly. So long as the candidate does focus directly on the language, the task ought not to be a difficult one.

Some candidates may include the first recipe in the passage; this is perfectly acceptable and is unlikely to affect the quality of the answer. Beginning with the first paragraph itself, we already have a rapid and beguiling transition from the homely 'recipe' line which begins it to the idea of tears – crying while peeling onions being a well-nigh universal experience – to the fleeting introduction of a first-person narrator to the final focus on the heroine, Tita, who is immediately associated with tears and weeping. Thus the 'recipe' language is used to draw the reader out of his/her familiar world of experience into the world of the novel, which at first sight seems similar, but soon turns out to be very different, and to a considerable degree fantastic. Following on from this paragraph, the combination of culinary and emotional vocabulary, and the gradual introduction of the fantasy element, are very evident. High marks are likely to depend on the amount of detail examined, and on the coherence of the answer. Be careful not to over-reward candidates who quote copiously but do not explain how the language actually works ('inert quoting').

- 8 There should be no difficulty about providing instances of cruelty suffered by Tita, and many weak-to-average candidates are likely to concentrate exclusively on examples of the awful way Mamá Elena treats her. Such answers will certainly be 'passable' if they obey the command to give examples; mere vague generalisation and story-telling is unlikely to score above high 11 or possibly 12. Answers scoring 13-15 may do the same, but with wider range and better-developed examples. Really good answers are likely to be those that go beyond the Mamá Elena/Tita question and look at the world in general: even outside the sphere of Mamá Elena's tyranny it is still a cruel world, where life is hard, killing – of animals and humans – is an everyday occurrence, and the chaos and violence of the Revolution threaten to wash over people and places and overwhelm them at any moment. John's calm, civilised outlook is an island of kindness in an ocean of cruelty. It could be added that several of the characters, including Mamá Elena and Gertrudis, are able to navigate that ocean and even thrive under the cruel conditions of their lives, whereas the gentler people, like Tita, are in danger of being crushed; but such comments are not a requirement, even for a mark of 19-20.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

- 9 This should be a gift to any candidate with a gift for pastiche and an adequate knowledge of the book. Pedro, of course, only marries Rosaura because it is a way of getting close to Tita; he doesn't care at all for Rosaura and scarcely even bothers to treat her with consideration. At this juncture he will consider her as a necessary evil; I don't think it would occur to him that what he plans is deeply unfair to Rosaura and will end by hurting her horribly. He will nonetheless be aware that at the wedding at least, a semblance of affection and satisfaction needs to be kept up for the sake of the guests. His thoughts, however, will be centred on Tita, his eagerness to see and speak with her, and their future together, which he will probably paint in much rosier colours than it deserves. There may well be smugness at his own cleverness in making the arrangement. Since this is a very accessible question, we can afford to demand a fair amount of detail before rewarding above 11; for the highest marks there should be a clear impression of Pedro's passionate, but selfish and rather *borné* character.

Pedro Páramo

- 10* This famous scene is generally taken to represent Pedro Páramo's death at the hands of Abundio. However, if candidates don't take it this way, their remarks should not be dismissed if they are able to provide support for a different interpretation.

As to why Rulfo chooses this exceedingly indirect method of narration, it is of course consistent with his method throughout the book: the reader can never relax and let himself be carried through the story by the author, the reader has to work. Then there is the fact that the actual killing is seen through the eyes of Abundio, who is in a state approaching insanity and scarcely knows what he is doing; the impression that he is deliberately committing the awful sin of parricide – however great the provocation – is carefully obliterated. The bulk of this passage is in fact a nightmarish invocation not of what happens or what is about to happen, but of what has happened previously (Cuca's death) and of the uncontrollable grief and passion this unleashes in Abundio, so that we react with horror and pity, not seeing him as a 'murderer'. If he has a conscious desire it is for help and charity; perhaps the only charity that can be offered him is revenge, but he does not decide that consciously for himself. When the focus shifts (as *Por el camino de Comala...*) we notice that Abundio has made no attempt to run away, is indeed incapable of it. Is his vomiting attack a symbolic purgation of his hatred for Pedro Páramo (*una cosa amarilla como de bilis*)? The passage is also a supreme example of Rulfo's subtle narrative irony, in that arguably the most important event in the book is narrated almost without any direct mention either of what is happening or of the central character, and yet there is an idea that what is left of his power and bodily strength has been destroyed, so that he is reduced to a face and head that can barely move: *sólo movió la cabeza*.

The above is my interpretation; it is not, of course, prescriptive or definitive. As always with Rulfo passages, we must be open to any response the candidate offers, so long as there is support for it from the text. The more convincing the argument, and the more detailed and appropriate the support, the higher the mark, naturally.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

- 11 There is a vast range of possible approaches to this question, and we shall have to be very open to candidates' ideas. From a purely structural point of view, Juan Preciado's search for Pedro Páramo is an essential element: it gives a sense of direction to a novel that has very little 'direction', and it makes it easier to follow the author's switches from Pedro Páramo's past to Juan Preciado's present. From a narrative point of view, it provides a sort of suspense: will Juan Preciado finally track down Pedro Páramo, alive or dead, and if he does, what will happen? The suspense, of course, is never resolved because Pedro Páramo is not among the disembodied spirits (?) Juan Preciado meets in Comala. Some critics say this is because Pedro Páramo has gone straight to hell. Whether this is what the author intended is not clear, at least not in the final version of the novel; the question 'why is Pedro Páramo not among the dead?' is deliberately left open in order to stimulate the reader's curiosity. Juan Preciado's quest also serves to focus the reader's attention on the main, or at least titular, character: what sort of a man is Pedro Páramo? How can Juan Preciado find this out? The fact that Juan Preciado and Pedro Páramo are father and son serves as a sort of yardstick for Pedro Páramo's relationships with all his other sons: in fact, the only way in which Juan Preciado does 'find' Pedro Páramo is by learning about how Pedro Páramo treats these others.

The above does not, of course, in any way exhaust the possibilities, and I would not expect any candidate to exhaust them before awarding a high mark, even a mark of 19-20. What we are looking for is coherent arguments backed by detail from the novel, bearing in mind that such detail can be hard to gather amidst the complexities of the writing. Anyone who can use the question to impose coherence on such a deliberately in-coherent novel is likely to be worthy of substantial reward in any case.

- 12 Susana is vital to our understanding of Pedro Páramo, but she herself is even more elusive than the other characters. Generous reward should therefore be given to candidates who can capture her subdued yet passionate voice (heard most clearly in her deathbed scenes), and still more, infer how she would defend Pedro Páramo. Note that the question does not specify the time of Susana's defence. This is deliberate, owing to the extremely complex time scheme of the book. Candidates are entitled not to specify the time either; the question will probably work best if she is envisaged on her deathbed, or as a disembodied spirit (though she, like Pedro Páramo, is not among the lost souls that Juan Preciado encounters), but anything offered by the candidate should be accepted.

There is no doubt that Pedro Páramo's love for Susana is his main redeeming feature, even if it doesn't ultimately redeem him. He was consumed with love of her from his childhood; his remorseless pursuit of other women, and his venal marriage to Dolores, are surely the result of frustration at Susana's forcible removal by her father. All this Susana can cite in his defence. Susana and Miguel are the two great loves of his life, and the only people he does not mistreat: another thing in his favour, though Susana will of course be aware of his ruthlessness towards others, because her father brings it forcibly to her attention. Her madness and death cannot be laid directly at Pedro Páramo's door; her father is more to blame for taking her away, terrorising and ultimately abandoning her. Almost Susana's last words are *Él me cobijaba entre sus brazos. Me daba amor*. Although it is not quite clear that she is referring to Pedro Páramo, this is surely the most natural reading and points to the tenderness hidden deep inside this strange and terrible man. The way he swears to avenge himself on Comala for its indifference to Susana's death may be included as further evidence of devotion, if Susana is allowed to speak after her death – an ability normal enough among the inhabitants of Comala!

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

Esta noche gran velada

- 13*** Hopefully candidates will realise that the extract includes the long introductory stage direction; the question points to this as emphatically as it can. If they ignore it, we shall just have to consider the (probably very limited) merits of what they say about the dialogue.

The first thing Cabal establishes, with meticulous detail, is the sleaziness of the décor. A really observant candidate who remembers that he is dealing with a play, not a novel, may note that the audience is unlikely to pay conscious attention to (e.g.) the girlie calendar; part of this detail, at least, is evidently aimed at readers rather than spectators. Some elements, particularly the cats, will be more or less impossible to include in a staged production. Apart from these sordid details, the décor of course establishes that we are dealing with a professional boxer, and that the play is going to deal with what goes on 'behind the scenes', since the ring itself is not visible.

The dialogue between Sony and Marcel establishes that the play's time frame is to be short: the play ends with the combat, and the spectators of that combat are already coming in. An alert candidate may note this. More obviously, we are shown that although Kid's place in the boxing world is high (contending for European champion), his reputation seems to be flagging. Most candidates should be aware that this is a key element in the exposition. We are dealing with the implications of failure, in a décor that positively reeks of it. Candidates may, however, note that the atmosphere is lightened somewhat by Sony's loveable stupidity and by Marcel's affectionately tolerant attitude towards him: the play is not going to be 100% doom and gloom.

There is plenty to go on here, the question is a straightforward one, and for 12+ reward candidates *must* adduce detail from the text to support the points they make.

- 14** We shall have to watch out for candidates who miss the 'no' in the question, despite the emphasis we have placed on it. If they argue the contrary to what the question actually demands, we shall just have to credit any relevant points which emerge by default.

Superficially it is indeed easy to assume that everything *is engaño* in Kid's world, especially once the true extent of Mateos's and Achúcarro's duplicity, and Anita's disloyalty, have become clear. Those in Kid's world who are not actively wicked seem powerless to confront the wickedness. However, it is clear that Marcel is, at worst, weak, while Sony's stupidity preserves his innocence; Marina, too, despite her devotion to the undeserving Mateos, has positive qualities (unless one considers her, too, as a monster of duplicity, as some candidates have been arguing recently). Above all, Kid himself, with his simple rural background and his simple ideals, finally learns to both comprehend and resist the *engaño* that surrounds him: he himself is, or becomes, the best answer to his own cry of despair. Not all candidates will explore all these possibilities, but any of them, if developed with reasonable support, will be worthy of reward. The wider the coverage, obviously, the higher the potential reward, but in the middle (9-14 range) I think a narrow but well-supported answer may well have more merit than a wide-ranging but superficial one.

- 15** Sony's personality is not a difficult one to fathom, nor is his voice difficult to imitate: we can afford to be fairly demanding before rewarding highly here. The main problem may well be that the candidate is more intelligent than Sony and so lends the latter more understanding of character and situation than he really has. Sony doesn't know that the fight was fixed, and he has little awareness of Kid's mental torments. He was present at Achúcarro's intervention, but it is unlikely that he understood many of the scarcely-veiled threats; nor does he realise the depth of Mateos's villainy. He knew about Anita, but only vaguely. Until Kid was shot, Sony thought that everything had ended marvellously and was already spending his winnings from the bet in anticipation, so his main feeling, apart from shock and sorrow at his admired friend's death, will be bewilderment: what on earth went wrong? Appropriate content along those lines, along with a voice that at least approximates to Sony's, will probably earn up to 13/14. For greater reward there must be authentic 'Sony' touches; the more, the higher the reward, naturally.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

El sí de las niñas

16* To most readers/spectators, this charming scene must surely augur well for the future of the couple, if they can overcome their present difficulties. This is so obviously the case (though if a candidate can argue the opposite view convincingly, that is fine, of course) that the *Hasta qué punto* in the question is likely to be a less decisive discriminator than it often is. What will mark out the better candidates will be *detailed* attention to the scene, showing the various ways in which the lovers express their trust and devotion. A really good candidate will pay attention not just to what they say, but also the way they say it: for example, the frequent hesitations and unfinished sentences which show the intensity of their feelings and their struggle to convey them with complete honesty to each other. This is no sudden, fiery, Romeo-and-Juliet romance, likely to burn out in a few days; it is a solid devotion based on mutual respect. The way the lovers continually seek, and obtain, reassurance from each other, does not indicate any real doubt or mistrust, but merely a touching and charming need to express their feelings to each other and strengthen themselves for the trials to come. Serious as those trials promise to be, the lovers do not exaggerate them, or try to demonise their opponents: they speak of both Don Diego and Doña Irene with respect rather than resentment. This is likely to prove a very popular question, and we should try to stretch the marks as far up and down as the candidates' work permits.

17 Thoughtful candidates who have not been taught to view the play exactly like a novel may realise that this is a question about the dramatic effectiveness of the play. If Don Diego is obviously such a nice bloke that he will give way as soon as he realises Paquita's true feelings, does not this make the resolution too easy? Compare the very real obstacles faced by a Romeo and Juliet, or the really serious opposition put up by Molière's mean old men.

There are three ways of defending the Moratín approach, I think. First, one can argue that it does not matter whether or not Don Diego is a serious obstacle, so long as the lovers *think* he is. Secondly, one can argue that he does in many ways constitute such an obstacle, because he really does want Paquita for his own, and he is fully capable of jealousy and anger when he realises he has a rival. (This may be the sole factor that is seized on by weaker candidates; the result is likely to be a rather thin answer.) Thirdly, and most subtly, one can argue that Don Diego really is, in the last analysis, a non-existent obstacle, and that Moratín uses this to highlight the fact that the real obstacle is the social customs of the day: a more enlightened society would dismiss Don Diego's idea of marrying Paquita as simply grotesque, and not expect her to go along so meekly with the suggestion. In the end, of course, Don Diego himself does away with the 'obstacle', a fact which some candidates may point out. The range and subtlety of the arguments produced will probably discriminate here, plus, as always, the amount of relevant detail from the play.

18 An accessible question which may vie with Question 16 in popularity, and where again we can probably afford to be quite demanding, in terms of both voice and content, before rewarding highly. Simón's voice should be easy enough to imitate: unlike the other servants he is a *hombre de bien* whose style approximates closely to that of his master. The situation is also pretty clear: Simón is shocked and startled by Don Diego's decision to marry Paquita, but, being devoted to his master, hopes the idea will turn out all right, while still obviously having doubts that he has been too polite to express openly to Don Diego. He will presumably hope that the matter will swiftly be resolved one way or the other so that they can leave this disagreeable inn. He may also ask himself whether the intention he mistakenly attributed to Don Diego – that of marrying Carlos to Paquita – might not still be the best idea; he plainly considers Carlos a deserving young man. Some of the better candidates may manage some nice dramatic irony here, especially in view of the fact that Don Diego suspects Don Carlos of engaging in some amorous intrigue.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – MAY/JUNE 2006	0488	01

Poemas de Gabriela Mistral

- 19*** The main problem with this will probably be the tendency of some centres to teach these poems as if they were coded autobiography, preventing candidates from saying anything worthwhile about the words. Such answers will have to be combed for any appreciation they may contain, but are unlikely to score highly. Any candidate who approaches the poem as a poem should find it easy to find vocabulary, and expression, indicative of sadness and despair, starting with the relentless *no ... no*. The despair is self-confessedly religious, and many candidates are likely to comment on the religious imagery in the poem. There is some virtue in this, of course, but only limited reward can be given for solving the clues: for high reward we need to know how the religious references contribute to the poetic effect.
- 20** As usual, we are likely to get a lot of *Todas íbamos a ser reinas*, because it has been set before and so candidates will have 'practised' it. Many of them will still want to interpret the poem autobiographically (see above), and will also try to find a single decoded meaning for *el mar*. This will limit their range of response, but we shall just have to mark what is there as positively as common sense allows. Better-prepared candidates should be able to explore the theme more widely and get beyond consideration of the simple word *mar*. Candidates who venture into less popular poems may actually be doing themselves a favour, since their response will not be so conditioned by pre-conceptions.
- 21** Similar questions have been set before and are always tricky, particularly as there is a widespread tendency to see poetry as if it were merely decoded 'messages', the poetic form being quite without interest, a husk to be thrown away once the message has been extracted. One purpose of setting this kind of question is, indeed, to encourage the teaching of poetry as poetry. Even for candidates who have been taught in that way, however, it is always difficult to divorce form from meaning, and some intrusion of meaning may be accepted and, if relevant, even welcomed. Any sustained attempt to capture the effects of form, sound and rhythm should be generously rewarded. Weak candidates are quite likely choose this question merely because it specifies a poem that they know, whether or not they have anything relevant to say about it.

Los heraldos negros

- 22*** Earlier attempts on this poem have not been conspicuously successful, partly because candidates have been so keen to see behind the metaphor that they fail to appreciate the skill with which the 'spider' is created. That is why the question is so precise. We are not interested in metaphorical meanings, though we shall get them and will have to reward whatever relevance they may contain. We are looking specifically at the spider as a spider.
- 23** Again, the question is quite specific, and candidates who trot out their standard interpretation, or decoding, of the poem will receive only modest reward. Those who can really trace the delicate webs of association that Vallejo creates in these poems will probably be in the 15-20 bracket, especially if they can do it for two poems. If one poem is very well handled, but the other rather scamped, the candidate is unlikely to qualify for mark in the 18-20 band, but can be given generous credit (up to 17) for what has been achieved. Some candidates seem to be quite good at picking out detail from Vallejo's poems, but determined to force a coherent interpretation on each poem which it is not intended to bear; this may limit the overall mark, but full credit should be given to any candidate who really looks at details, even if the interpretation is strained.
- 24** The exercise here is similar to that in Question 19, though the autobiographical curse does not seem to dog Vallejo as much as it does Mistral. Weaker candidates may just pick out (hopefully appropriate) vocabulary items; the more the richness of the poet's overall poetic resources is responded to, the greater the reward. Again, decoding *per se* will not earn high reward; any comment that begins *aquí el poeta está tratando de decir* is probably suspect.