

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2008 question paper**

### **0488 LITERATURE (SPANISH)**

**0488/01**

Paper 1 (Open Books), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began.

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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2008 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2008</b>	<b>0488</b>	<b>01</b>

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. If your team leader disagrees with the mark, s/he will find it helpful to have some idea of what was in your mind! **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.**

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2008</b>	<b>0488</b>	<b>01</b>

E.g.:

- (1) candidate answers a starred question on Arrabal and scores 12; an essay question on Arrabal and scores 15; an essay question on Martín Gaité and scores 12. The Gaité question must stand, and so must the Arrabal starred question, because candidates are **required** to answer a starred question. Therefore the essay question on Arrabal is the one that must be penalised.
- (2) candidate answers two essay questions on Arrabal scoring 13 and 14, and a starred question on Martín Gaité, scoring 10. The Gaité answer must stand, because it is the required starred question. But **either** of the two Arrabal questions could be reckoned as the offender, and so it is right here to penalise the lower-scoring of the two essays.
- (3) candidate answers three essay questions, on Arrabal, Gaité and Storni, 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. This is a rare occurrence; if you come across it, and feel uneasy about how to treat it, please contact the Principal Examiner.
- (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** – just stupid. 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.

Finally, **do not forget to send your Assistant Examiner's Report to the principal examiner as soon as you have finished your marking.** These reports are of the utmost importance so that a fair and balanced picture can be given in the report to centres.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2008	0488	01

### Gallegos, Doña Bárbara

- \*1 *Vuelva a leer una parte del Capítulo V, Primera Parte, desde ‘Eran dos corrientes contrarias...’ (página 171, Cátedra) hasta ‘Ya no venderé Altamira’ (página 174). ¿Cómo se las arregla el autor para que el cambio de ánimo en Santos Luzardo sea dramático y asombroso a la par de ser creíble?*

Sensible students who underline the key words in questions will observe that the keys here are ‘dramático’, ‘asombroso’ and ‘creíble’. The passage is dramatic because Gallegos, who doesn’t believe in the art that conceals art, revels in dramatising everything he can and this very much includes his characters’ thought processes, which are often presented very like stage soliloquies. It is astonishing because the chain of reasoning in Santos Luzardo’s sensible decision to sell up is set out with such care, only to be overturned in an instant by the *coup de théâtre* of the embedded lance. And it is credible, because the author makes it clear here, as throughout the novel, that Santos Luzardo’s civilised and mild exterior covers not only a ruthless determination not to give up or be beaten, but also a depth of *barbaridad* which frequently masters him in spite of himself. For a mark of 12-14+ candidates ought to be able to convey these three elements, in outline at least. If they have an awareness of context they ought also to be able to see that the passage is crucial because it makes the rest of the novel possible: if Santos Luzardo decides to sell, Doña Bárbara and ‘la barbaridad’ have won the battle before it even starts. Over and above that, discrimination will, as usual, depend on the amount of precise analysis of language. Candidates who answer in a sweeping and impressionistic way – and they are likely to be fairly numerous – will probably start repeating themselves and so limit their reward.

- 2 *¿Por qué cree usted que la novela se titula Doña Bárbara y no Santos Luzardo? Justifique su respuesta refiriéndose detalladamente a la novela.*

This central question will, I hope, serve as a touchstone to find candidates who are capable of thinking clearly and critically, on their feet, about the novel as a whole and how it is structured. Any candidate should be aware that the novel consistently – and insistently – opposes *la civilización* and *la barbaridad*, and that in very broad outline, Santos Luzardo ‘represents’ the one and Doña Bárbara the other. Neither is it difficult to work out that Santos Luzardo is, again very broadly speaking, the hero and Doña Bárbara the villain, so why isn’t the novel named after the hero? A number of answers are possible and I wouldn’t want any proffered answer to be automatically considered ‘right’ or ‘wrong’; we are far more interested in the reasons the candidate gives for his/her decision. I should expect discussion of the way Doña Bárbara, as her name suggests, represents the dangerous yet seductive force of the *llanura* which Santos Luzardo has to grapple with, so that only by vanquishing her can he triumph, and civilisation along with him. Because Doña Bárbara is a single, identifiable figure, the triumph is much easier to pin down in her person – and much more exciting and vivid – than in more general terms of legal rights, efficient pastoral practices, etc. Moreover, while Santos Luzardo is consistently foregrounded, the very fact that Doña Bárbara is often remote, a sinister (yet far from totally unsympathetic) figure controlling the puppets whom Santos Luzardo vanquishes one by one, makes her more fascinating. Many candidates, including the weaker ones, may focus on the question of which of the two characters is intrinsically more interesting, even more attractive. It is notoriously easier to create a memorable baddie than a memorable goodie, and this reader, for one, is frequently irritated by Santos Luzardo’s sanctimonious superiority; this, however, is likely to be an unintended effect! We shall be open to any of the above suggestions and to any others, and mark, as usual, on the quality, detail, and presentation of the evidence.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2008</b>	<b>0488</b>	<b>01</b>

- 3 *Usted es Lorenzo Barquero inmediatamente después de su encuentro con Santos Luzardo en el Capítulo 10, Primera Parte. ¿Qué está pensando?*

A great many ideas might go through Lorenzo Barquero's addled head at this juncture, and I would not want to be too prescriptive as to content. Candidates who can capture the voice of a once-able man who has become an utter wreck will be likely to score highest. Strictly speaking, Lorenzo Barquero's thoughts at this juncture ought to be incoherent, since he only recovers his wits spasmodically under 'el latigazo del alcohol'. Suitably incoherent answers ought therefore, unusually, to be rewarded rather than penalised! It will also be in order if Lorenzo Barquero pours himself another drink or two during the monologue. While he is past any real redemption (as the rest of the book shows), it is likely that some thoughts of his promising youth, and of his road to ruin, will still linger. Candidates may draw on what he says in the chapter here, but should not of course copy word for word. Thoughts (resentful? regretful?) of Doña Bárbara may also come to him. The parallel he has drawn between himself and Santos is also likely to recur; he obviously feels no hatred for the young man and may well envy him, while feeling a gloomy satisfaction in the idea that Santos Luzardo will end up just where he is. Will Marisela also find a place in his thoughts? This would be legitimate, but candidates who imagine him planning a match between his daughter and the champion of civilisation will, I think, be going considerably too far.

### **Güiraldes, Don Segundo Sombra**

- 4\* *Vuelva a leer una parte del Capítulo XV, desde '¡Campo fiero y desamparao' (página 192, Cátedra) hasta 'y tuve ganas de reír' (página 195). ¿Cómo se las arregla el autor en este pasaje para hacernos sentir la aterradora grandeza de la naturaleza?*

As always with descriptive passages of this sort, generalised and/or narrative answers are likely to be low-scoring, though comments on the horror of being sucked into the bog may earn a few marks. Statements such as 'the author makes us feel part of nature by using descriptive words' are also unlikely to impress; we need precision. Candidates may score higher by at least picking out some of the most obviously relevant phrases such as 'sentía un presagio de hostilidad', 'campo bruto', 'parecían tener miedo', etc. etc. Relevant comment on a few such phrases may take the answer into the lower end of the 12-14 bracket. Thereafter, quality will probably be demonstrated by the way the candidate works through the passage showing how the atmosphere of hostility, danger and repulsion is built up before the dramatic moment when the horses panic and plunge into the bog. I shall be favourably impressed by anyone who does justice to the magnificent shift in perspective at the end of the passage.

- 5 *¿Cómo cree usted que Güiraldes ha logrado aumentar el impacto de la novela con su representación de los animales que comparten la vida de los gauchos? Dé ejemplos.*

This is an aspect that teachers, who tend to focus on character and plot, may not have considered, so candidates are likely to be thinking on their feet and should be treated with cautious indulgence. The number of examples mentioned may be limited, but this does not matter much so long as they are examined in reasonable detail; vague generalisation will not, of course, impress. The mere realisation that the whole life of the gaucho depends on and revolves around the animals will itself be worth credit, especially if it is linked to appreciation of the superb descriptions of vast herds on the move. Also to be desired is a response to the way the animals are presented: vividly, sometimes brutally, quite without sentimentality, but with a kind of austere tenderness and respect for their way of life. Although the gauchos drive the cattle, the rhythm of the drive is largely dictated by the cattle themselves: another point worth raising and illustrating. The importance of horses to the gauchos generally, to the narrator, and to don Segundo is also central and there is abundant material to illustrate it. An awareness of how the taming, ownership and treatment of horses (including betting on them!) conditions the relationship between the narrator and don Segundo would be a real bonus. There is plenty to go on, but no candidate is likely to cover all the possibilities and markers will have to use their professional discretion.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2008	0488	01

- 6 *Usted es Paula y acaba de despedirse del narrador en el rancho de don Candelario (Capítulo XIX). ¿Qué está pensando?*

It is clear that Paula, for all her determined and taciturn detachment, is powerfully attracted to the narrator. Like her, he is an outsider to Candelario's ranch; like her, he is young and ardent. Circumstances push them together: he is hurt, she is a woman and therefore destined to care for hurt males; her brother, with (doubtless unintended) suggestiveness, calls him *cuñado*. She may be shocked by the narrator's readiness to use a knife on Numa, but she can hardly not be flattered by the knowledge that it was on her account – even if we (and she) doubt whether Numa is really such a boar as the arrogant narrator believes. On the other hand, she can scarcely go away with the narrator, since the gaucho's life is a ruthlessly masculine one and he has, as yet, no resources to set up as a married landowner, so Paula is left to her lonely fate on the alien ranch, among dull women who seem determined to exclude her from their tiny society. Her thoughts are therefore likely to be both melancholy and bitter, but softened by (unwilling?) affection for the narrator and borne up by pride. So much can be inferred; candidates may be judged according to how much and how convincingly they infer it. We do not hear too much of Paula's voice, but there is enough, backed by the overall speaking style of the gaucho society, to enable good candidates to produce a convincing rendition of her lively character.

### Martín Gaité, *El cuarto de atrás*

- 7\* *Vuelva a leer una parte del capítulo segundo, desde 'Me quito el pijama...' (página 28, Destínolibro) hasta '—Pase —le digo' (página 29). ¿Cómo se las arregla la autora en este pasaje para crear un ambiente siniestro?*

This is an extraordinarily rich passage and candidates may be forgiven for not attending to every detail. It is unlikely, however, that any answer will score above 10/11 if it does not pay considerable attention to the two great fear factors: the cockroach (giant intelligent sci-fi roach! ugh!) and the inexorably ascending lift with its unknown cargo. Among answers that make at least some use of these key factors, further discrimination may be achieved by assessing how the candidate has responded to details both major and minor. Naturally, some latitude in interpretation may be allowed. For instance, does the fact that the doorway at the beginning is covered by a red curtain signify danger? And is this picked up by the red arrow of the lift? Martín Gaité's art throughout the novel is to suggest without dictating, and this passage is a splendid example.

- 8 *Dé su apreciación de cómo Martín Gaité atribuye progresivamente más importancia al 'cuarto de atrás'. No olvide referirse a detalles precisos.*

This is a demanding, though central, question and candidates may have to think on their feet, so a certain indulgence in the marking may be required. The importance of the *cuarto de atrás* is in fact constructed retrospectively: the subject is not brought into the open – discussed between the narrator and the *desconocido* – until nearly the end of the book. To see how the importance of the *cuarto de atrás* is constructed, in fact, one has to re-read the book, preferably backwards! However, its significance is made plain to the 'forward' reader (though not to the *desconocido*) in chapter 3, where the/a 'real' *cuarto de atrás* is explicitly linked with the narrator's mental *cuarto de atrás*: 'un desván del cerebro, una especie de recinto secreto lleno de trastes borrosos'. At this point the alert reader will realise that the *cuarto de atrás* represents the rich *desorden* of memories and experiences that constitutes both the narrator's self and the source of her literary art. As more and more of these memories are brought to the surface the *cuarto de atrás* yields more of its contents and becomes more important. The whole book, in fact, is, or comes out of, the *cuarto de atrás*; the final explanation does not change this idea but pins it down in time and space, offering a way of anchoring the narrator's 'disordered' memories so that she can get on with the writing. That is how I see it; any other ideas offered by candidates will, as always, be given a sympathetic hearing if they can be justified from the text.



Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2008	0488	01

- 9 *En su opinión de lector, ¿quiere Martín Gaité convencernos de que el desconocido existe ‘en realidad’, o es más bien un sueño/un producto de la imaginación de la narradora? Argumente su respuesta.*

This is another central question and one that candidates may find more approachable, since it relates (broadly) to a favourite approach to novel reading, that of ‘character’. Character *per se* is not at issue, however; what needs to be explored is the fascinating series of presentations and re-presentations of the *desconocido* that continually seems to establish his ‘real’ existence only to throw it once again in doubt. From his first appearance soon after midnight (an odd time to arrange an interview, surely, even in stay-up-late Spain!) to his disappearance with the morning light he is an enigma. Evidence that initially seems to prove his existence, particularly the phone call from the girl-friend, is itself subject to doubt. There is plenty to go on, perhaps too much; selection of detail, if judicious, will itself be a virtue. Candidates in the past have proved that they can do justice to the sophistication of this text; do not hesitate to give high reward to those who do so this time, without being too hard on those who may be floundering, but do demonstrate a degree of appreciation and understanding of Martín Gaité’s art. Of course, the candidate does not need to come down on one side or other of the debate; the book does not provide a definitive answer to the question – though candidates may suggest one, if they think they have sufficient evidence. The book itself does not supply a definitive answer, and most candidates are, I hope, likely to realise why this is so (‘no saber si aquello que se ha visto es verdad o mentira, no saberlo nunca’).

### **Martín-Santos, *Tiempo de silencio***

- 10\* *Vuelva a leer una parte de la descripción de la fiesta en casa de Matías, desde ‘Los dos amigos –incluidos en la esfera intermedia...’ (página 157, Seix Barral) hasta ‘...la vemos con distinta perspectiva (tableau)’ (página 158). ¿Cómo ridiculiza el autor a los huéspedes en este pasaje, y sobre todo al ‘Maestro’?*

*In the first paragraph of the extract the same technique is used repeatedly, creating a dazzling series of rather savage linguistic jokes: a potentially impressive image is constructed and then punctured with a single detail, often expressed in exuberantly inventive, pseudo-learned language that intellectualises the ridicule. Thus the ex-seminarist is covered in dandruff, horribly visible of course on his black garb (‘pintacaspiana’); the poets are ‘de varios sexos’, hinting at something either sexually ambiguous or scarcely human or both; the woman dressed in the height of fashion is wearing a lavishly ridiculous hat; and so on. The Maestro himself approaches through a comically impenetrable linguistic thicket, consigning inferior souls to purgatory as he assumes godlike eminence, but needles of satire are stuck into his inflated image: he is ‘dotado’ (inter much alia) with a ‘gran cabeza’; he is respected in ‘las universidades alemanas de provincia’. When he starts to speak the satire descends to pure farce as he delivers, with ridiculous solemnity (‘pausa ... tableau’) a philosophical commonplace of stupefying obviousness. Martín-Santos’s language is difficult (so we can’t be too demanding), but hopefully candidates will have had some practice in dealing with it; this passage is in fact pretty typical. Those who have difficulty with the first part of the extract ought to be able to deal with the Maestro’s speech; anything on top of that will be a bonus.*

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2008	0488	01

- 11 *En su opinión de lector, ¿quién o quiénes son los verdaderos culpables de la muerte de Florita? Argumente su respuesta.*

The two prime suspects are of course Muecas and Pedro: Muecas for incestuously making her pregnant, Pedro for his ham-fisted surgery, though whether his intervention was directly responsible for her death is not made clear. A passable answer could be constructed simply on that basis, so long as there is some supporting detail. However, thoughtful candidates ought to realise that the guilt goes wider and deeper: the girl's mother for tolerating Muecas's awful behaviour; Amador for encouraging the horrible mouse-breeding setup; probably the apostles of medical research worldwide, who think far more of their own success and reputation than of whom or what they torture in order to succeed; certainly those who accept and profit from the social inequality that nourishes the *chabolas*. Martín-Santos does not attempt to put the suspects in rank order, but candidates may of course do so if supporting evidence is presented.

- 12 *El director del laboratorio no da a Pedro la oportunidad de defenderse antes de despedirle. De haber tenido tal oportunidad, ¿qué hubiera dicho Pedro? Conteste con la voz de Pedro.*

Pedro's two obvious defences – that he was released without charge, and that he is truly devoted to science – have been pre-empted by the Director's nauseatingly hypocritical speech, but he would still be bound to advance and try to substantiate them. There is ample material in the novel for this. Will he add – since he can hardly lose by it at this juncture – that if his research had been properly funded he would never have become involved with Muecas's mouse-breeding programme? He could throw further blame for this on Amador, but Pedro does have some sense of loyalty and this may prevent such accusations, though he might explain the arrangement without naming names. His desperation and (well-founded?) sense of injustice should be easy to formulate. Pedro's voice is not a particularly distinctive one, but the *style indirect libre* used throughout the book gives us ample insight into his character and state of mind and this should be drawn on by the candidate. A candidate who can convey Pedro's profound sense of guilt without making him confess it out loud is likely to merit high reward.

### **Arrabal, El cementerio de automóviles**

- 13\* *Vuelva a leer una parte del Acto Primero, desde 'EMANU.—Quiero ser bueno, Dila' (página 94, Cátedra) hasta 'EMANU.—Me tengo que ir, si no se enfadarán' (página 96). ¿Hasta qué punto cree usted que Arrabal quiere darnos en este pasaje la impresión de que Emanu es verdaderamente 'bueno'?*

This is a pretty straightforward – though very striking – passage and we should require detailed consideration of it before rewarding highly. By any 'normal' standard of goodness there is nothing here to qualify Emanu for the description. We already know that he can parrot an argument in favour of goodness, and here he repeats himself word for word, with as little understanding as before, and adds a further layer of inane vanity. In this passage he does not even show his usual enthusiasm for entertaining the poor; playing the trumpet is merely a token of his own cleverness. What's more, if he reckons female goodness by degrees of promiscuity, this will not recommend itself very widely outside the world of the play, even if it does inside (which, judging from the attitude of the people in the cars, it does not). His claims to intellectual superiority are revealed here as being equally pathetic; candidates will find this easy to note, though not all of them will pause to consider the connection between cleverness and 'goodness'. Thus far the picture is plain. But what are we to make of the overtly blasphemous account of his birth? If Emanu 'is' Christ, and Christ is the repository of all goodness, then do we have to accept the Emanu we see here as the repository of goodness for the world of the play? In that case, the most striking words in this passage are probably Dila's: '¿para qué nos va a servir el ser buenos?'



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2008</b>	<b>0488</b>	<b>01</b>

- 14 *Lo escrito por Arrabal ¿qué impresión le ha dado de la relación entre Milos y Dila? No olvide referirse a detalles precisos del texto.*

There is, of course, no one consistent relationship, and most candidates should be aware of this; if they aren't, they aren't likely to score very highly. Milos and Dila appear to be husband and wife, or at least partners, but even this is unstable, particularly when Emanu is introduced into the equation: is Milos jealous, or does he tolerate and/or thoroughly enjoy the couplings of Dila and Emanu? Like Lasca and Tiosido, Milos and Dila swap characters in Act II, the original bully – Dila – becoming the victim. They do collaborate to keep the people in the cars under control, but the way they do this is again inconsistent, sometimes courteous and flattering, sometimes rude and bullying. I think that candidates will have to at least mention, and to an extent illustrate, most of the above points to gain a passable reward. Good candidates will provide broader coverage and better illustration, and really good ones may go deeper. Milos and Dila illustrate what seems to be one of Arrabal's main points in this play: that in its world (and perhaps in ours?) 'personality' is a delusion and there is therefore no such thing as a meaningful human relationship. How far this depressing conclusion is alleviated, or rather complicated, by Dila's additional 'relationship' with Emanu is something that discerning candidates may wish to consider; I would consider it relevant so long as Milos is not lost sight of in the discussion.

- 15 *En su opinión, ¿qué estado de ánimo pretende provocar Arrabal en los espectadores cuando cae el telón? Justifique su respuesta refiriéndose a detalles del texto.*

'Confusion', 'horror', 'bewilderment', 'outrage' are some words that come to mind, though 'amusement' and 'intellectual satisfaction' are far from impossible. Candidates may use any or all of them, or any others, so long as they substantiate them with detail from the play. Obviously the final scenes are important, though candidates may (and hopefully will) refer well back in the play in order to fully explain the final effect. To me the climax seems to convey two main ideas: (1) the culmination of the blasphemous equation of Emanu with Christ, Dila here assuming the role of St Veronica; (2) the idea that the entire action of the play is cyclic (as in *Huis Clos*), with all characters reverting to their original roles as if Emanu's passion had never happened, or was completely unimportant (shades of Auden's *Icarus*?); it will all happen again tomorrow. This endless repetition is alluded to frequently in the play and Arrabal clearly considers it significant, insofar as anything here is significant. Perhaps it makes the play like a sort of parodic Mass, in which Christ's sacrifice is continually re-enacted? Whether or not this is so, the final impression, for me, is that both Emanu's passion and, by implication, Christ's are meaningless and have no saving power; they are even commonplace. We have been shown stirring, dramatic events and made to feel that they don't matter. Our final image will be of the wrecked cars with their invisible inhabitants, stuck in their sordid lives for ever. Personally I haven't been enraptured or uplifted, but I have been shocked, intrigued, entertained and intellectually stimulated. I shall be interested – and very open – to see what the candidates think.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2008	0488	01

**Tirso de Molina, *El burlador de Sevilla***

**Important note: there are at least two editions of this play in circulation. The latest (2007) Catedra edition contains a text that differs quite radically from the older edition, though the order of scenes remains the same. We have been careful to delimit passages using lines that are identical in both versions, but do not be surprised if candidates quote lines that do not appear, or are in a different place, in your copy. The notes below are based on the 2007 text.**

- 16\*** *Vuelva a leer una parte de la Jornada Tercera, desde '(Un golpe dentro.)' (Cátedra) hasta la acotación 'Don Juan, retirándose hasta estar en medio del teatro'. ¿Cómo combina el autor las palabras y las acciones en este pasaje para aumentar la tensión dramática?*

Not for nothing is this one of the most renowned scenes in European theatre, playing superbly on our atavistic horror of the Undead Dead. The physical action is simple but highly effective. The blow on the door will make both audience and characters jump. The servant's and Catalinón's animated figures, repeatedly approaching the door and then recoiling in horror, contrast with Don Juan's superbly nonchalant and stationary one. Catalinón's agitated to-ing and fro-ing loads the door with sinister significance, so that when Don Juan himself approaches it, we are agog to see what will come in. His final slow retreat before the statue's silent and inexorable progress produces an intense dramatic climax. The dialogue reinforces these effects at every point. Catalinón's verbose fencings contrast with Don Juan's curt commands; Catalinón's nervous evocations of supernatural horrors build up our sinister expectations; his final inability to say what he has seen brings the apprehension to its height before the dauntless Don Juan is terrified by the final apparition. This is a brilliantly conceived scene, but it is also fairly straightforward and a detailed appreciation will be necessary in order to gain high reward. It will also be important for candidates to imagine how it would work on stage – an aspect that many of them are not happy with, perhaps because their own theatrical experience has been limited. We may have to be a little indulgent here.

- 17** *¿Cómo se vale Tirso del personaje del Rey para aumentar la fuerza dramática de la obra? Argumente su respuesta.*

There are two kings in the play (Naples and Castile), but since they are presented very much as king-figures rather than individuals, they can be treated as one – apart from the 'Lisbon' scene which establishes the king of Castile as a historical and geographical reality. (Any candidate discussing only one king will, of course, be treated sympathetically.) We are not looking for character sketches; the key words in the title are 'fuerza dramática'. *El burlador*, like many other Golden Age plays, is deeply concerned with the responsible exercise of power, and since Don Juan is the very embodiment of anarchic irresponsibility, this turns the king, as the legitimate, and in secular terms supreme, authority into a vital antagonist. We see both kings attempting to impose lawful restraint on Don Juan, and we then have the interest, and guilty enjoyment, of seeing how Don Juan evades it. Since Don Juan preys on women, the king's traditional responsibility for protecting women and providing them with suitable husbands assumes particular importance; we see both kings attempting to discharge this responsibility, and Don Juan not only confounding them but turning their conscientious efforts to his own advantage. In the end it is not the king who imposes Don Juan's punishment but don Gonzalo, executing the judgment of Heaven. Though the king is, conventionally, given the last word, and though he speaks throughout with authority, the play both questions the limits of royal power and tempts the audience to range themselves, at least temporarily, against it and with the gloriously anarchic Don Juan. Any arguments along the above lines, with support, will be accepted; the more the ideas are explored, and the more support is given, the higher the reward, naturally. And naturally, any alternative ideas that are convincingly argued will be equally well rewarded.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2008	0488	01

- 18 *Usted es Catalinón. Imagine que unos días después de la última escena, Don Diego le pide una descripción más detallada de la muerte de Don Juan. Escriba lo que usted diría.*

'Más detallada' of course refers to the brief and tidy narrative Catalinón supplies in the final scene. The two 'convidado' scenes supply ample corroborative detail and candidates who can reconstitute them into a coherent narrative will probably merit a 12+ mark. For higher reward there must be a convincing Catalinón voice, and one would also hope for some consideration of what Catalinón would evade or leave out. He is unlikely to dwell on his own unheroic conduct, and he may try to spare a father's feelings – though the latter caution should not be exaggerated, since Don Diego has few illusions about Don Juan.

### Poemas de Octavio Paz

- 19\* *Vuelva a leer El mar, el mar y tú... (en 'Sonetos', página 77, Libertad bajo palabra, Cátedra). Dé su apreciación de cómo Paz aprovecha las imágenes asociadas con el mar en este poema.*

Experienced examiners will not be surprised to see that the question does not ask candidates to *interpret* the imagery. In the past, candidates have insisted on doing just that, offering a range of dogmatic interpretations some of which were startlingly obscene, and none of which allowed the sea to *be* the sea. If they insist on doing the same again we shall just have to look for whatever genuine appreciation may escape the decoding process.

- 20 *Dé su apreciación de cómo Paz aprovecha el vocabulario de la luz y/o los colores para crear un efecto inolvidable en uno de los siguientes poemas: Cerro de la estrella, Primavera y muchacha, Palabra*

- 21 *Dé su apreciación de cómo Paz mezcla detalles de la vida diaria con imágenes raras y sorprendentes en uno de los poemas siguientes: En la calzada; Conversación en un bar*

There is nothing to be said about the above two questions that has not been said many times before. The dividing line between reasonable and low reward, insofar as there is one, will as always be between those who actually attempt to answer the question, and those who choose it merely because they happen to know one of the poems mentioned, and regurgitate ideas which are relevant only by default.

### Storni, Poesías

- 22\* *Vuelva a leer Rebeldía (página 32. Poesía, Editores Mexicanos Unidos). ¿Cómo ha conseguido intrigarle Storni al desarrollar la idea de 'rebeldía' anunciada en el título del poema?*

This specifically asks for a personal response, and we should be reluctant to give a 12+ reward unless it is clear that the candidate is doing more than regurgitate a taught decode. The poem's message – that the poet rejects things that are too strongly delimited, too tidy and too predictable – is both simple and obvious and we can't give much reward for spelling it out; we are interested in appreciation of the individual images and of the way they are linked, or at times deliberately not linked. However, since the images are both rich and numerous, we will not demand full attention to every line before rewarding highly.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2008</b>	<b>0488</b>	<b>01</b>

- 23** *Dé su apreciación de las poderosas imágenes que crea Storni en uno o dos de los siguientes extractos de Letanías de la tierra muerta: (a) Desde el principio hasta ‘Ruinas y escombros / Soportará sobre los muertos hombros’; (b) Desde ‘Ya nada quedará’ hasta ‘¡Oh cuántos vanos, torpes sufrimientos!’; (c) Desde ‘Y acaso un día, por piedad sin nombre’ hasta ‘Querrán volar al que los ilumina!’*

I have tried to spell out unequivocally how much of the poem should be considered; if any candidate ignores these restrictions, please consult me before attributing a mark. Apart from this, the question is straightforward. As usual, we are not interested in messages or decodes.

- 24** *Examine la manera en que la poetisa se caracteriza a sí misma de una manera evocadora en uno de los siguientes poemas: El siglo XX, Tú me quieres blanca, Así*

Weaker candidates are likely to ignore the key words ‘de una manera evocadora’. They may nevertheless have worthwhile things to say about the ‘character’; if they insist on calling it the *yo poético*, fine, though it’s a phrase I sedulously avoid because I believe that poets very often do speak about themselves, in their ‘own’ voice, and that if you discount this possibility you distort the poem just as much as if you insist on every poem being autobiographical. That being said, any candidate who can do something to explain *how* Storni creates vivid word portraits, whether they are personal or not, will deserve generous reward.