

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME FOR the November 2003 question papers

0488 Literature (Spanish)

0488/1	Paper 1, maximum raw mark 60
0488/3	Paper 3, maximum raw mark 20

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*.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the November 2003 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced (A) and Advanced Subsidiary (AS) Level syllabuses.



Grade thresholds taken for Syllabus 0488 (IGCSE Literature (Spanish) in the November 2003 examination

	maximum mark available	minimum mark required for grade:			
		A	C	E	F
Component 1	60	50	35	18	12
Component 2	40	36	26	16	11
Component 3	20	16	12	6	4

The threshold (minimum mark) for B is set halfway between those for Grades A and C.

The threshold for D is set halfway between those for Grades C and E.

The threshold for G is set as many marks below the F threshold as the E threshold is above it.

Grade A* does not exist at the level of an individual component.

NOVEMBER 2003

INTERNATIONAL GCSE

MARK SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 0488/1

**Literature (Spanish)
(Open Books)**



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 questions, 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 questions: 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 questions: attempt to respond, but with severe limitations.
- 4-5** Short, scrappy answer; confused; signs that book has been read. Passage-based questions: 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 questions: may have glanced at the 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 (eg 'good point', 'irrelevant', 'excessive quotation', etc). A brief comment at the end of an essay (eg '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.

Eg:

- (1) candidate answers a starred question on Lope de Vega and scores 12; an essay question on Lope de Vega and scores 15; an essay question on Cervantes and scores 12. The Cervantes question must stand, and so must the Lope de Vega starred question, because candidates are required to answer a starred question. Therefore the essay question on Lope de Vega is the one that must be penalised.
- (2) candidate answers two essay questions on Lope de Vega, scoring 13 and 14, and a starred question on Cervantes, scoring 10. The Cervantes answer must stand, because it is the required starred question. But either of the two Lope de Vega 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 Lope de Vega, Cervantes and Bécquer, 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.

It is vital that Examiners notice and penalise rubric infringements. Not to do so unfairly advantages offending candidates and unfairly disadvantages other candidates who have obeyed the rubric. Please mark offending scripts prominently 'RI' for rubric infringement, and show the 'calculation' which has produced the mark you have awarded.

Carpentier

- 1 As usual with Carpentier, very careful close reading is needed to answer the question well. Unfortunately many candidates prefer to latch on to one or two details rather than appreciating the whole passage; if they do this we shall have to hope that the details are appropriate and the comments acceptable. Go up to a mark of 12 on this basis. For a better mark, candidates should really show how Mackandal's boredom and frustration in his enforced isolation from the rest of mankind drive him to take an interest in the tiny secrets of nature ('misterioso'), and how his desire for revenge swiftly turns that interest into a search for venomous plants ('siniestro'). After this first phase, Ti Noel is brought in as a nervous observer, to contrast with Mackandal's new-found assurance in this sinister new world. Mystery and menace reach a climax in their journey through remote country to visit the 'anciana' (clearly a voodoo practitioner; candidates who have studied the book at all seriously should realise this). The weird horror of her 'fried' arms should strike candidates if nothing else does. Finally, there is the cold-blooded (and cold-bloodedly described) killing of the dog, which ushers in Mackandal's terror campaign.
- 2 It is, of course, intended to be both, as the author makes clear in Ti Noel's great revelation at the end. Candidates who realise, and can document, this possibility of synthesis are probably heading towards marks of 15 and above. Those who opt for only one possibility are more likely to prefer the second: human degradation is so abundantly shown in the way blacks and whites treat each other – often literally worse than animals – throughout, that this can seem like the dominant note of the book. It is certainly easy to document and at least some detailed support is required for a mark of 13 or above. Individual affirmations of dignity might be found in Mackandal's imagined escape and the hope this inspires in his black followers; in the terribly flawed but nonetheless impressive achievement of Henri Christophe; and in the survival of Ti Noel. But the real dignity is in the unconquerable spirit of man, 'hermoso dentro de su miseria', and particularly in the striving of the slaves towards full humanity – despite the savagery with which they pursue it. A really good answer would include a personal view of how convincingly this philosophy is actually demonstrated in the novel itself.
- 3 Mackandal is an obvious teaching target, and most candidates ought to be able to convey at least some impression of his importance and role in the book. It is scarcely possible to regurgitate a 'character sketch', but some answers are likely to have the feel of prepared material; we shall have to accept this if it is relevant. Only the better candidates are likely to answer the question fully, ie to show how Carpentier makes Mackandal so important and fascinating, although he is killed less than half way through the book. As soon as he is removed from 'normal' life after his accident, he becomes an element of mysterious power, a symbol of hope to the blacks and of terror to the whites; his death paradoxically makes him immortal, and he remains as a sort of god to the revolutionaries – an angel who nurtures a lively hope. Any answer that can convey even an idea of how Carpentier's writing achieves this will certainly be in the 18-20 bracket.

Cervantes

- 4 This question may cause some consternation, as the whole Gristóstomo episode is detachable from its context and some teachers/candidates may have skipped it. On the other hand, it is squarely in the (modest) prescribed section of the novel. We can probably expect some poor answers from the sort of candidate who always chooses the set passage out of laziness, or because s/he is too unfamiliar with the book to attempt an 'essay' question. In point of fact, it would be quite possible to answer this question while treating the passage as an unseen: one does not need to know the story in order to appreciate Marcela's impeccable logic, crystal-clear exposition and compellingly ironic defence against the age-old accusation that beautiful women always betray. Any candidate who can produce such an analysis, remaining close to the text and showing appreciation, will merit high marks even if it is on an 'unseen' basis.

- 5 As so often, the crunch here comes in the demand for ‘precise details’. Weak candidates should at least be able to talk in general about the impossible adventures and exaggerated sentiments which clearly occur in these books, but for a mark of 12 or above there must be some precise references to places in the text where they are discussed – either admiringly, by Don Quijote, or in a hostile tone, eg the Cura and the Barbero in chapter VI. A really good answer would also include some explanation of how Don Quijote’s devotion to these stories leads him into endless scrapes as he is shown repeatedly (but never learns) that real life isn’t like that. An answer which does only the latter, without referring precisely to the books themselves, might scrape a mark of 12, but no more, I think.
- 6 We have given a precise reference for the context, and a quick read of the last few pages of chapter VII should give the lead. Sancho Panza’s abundant conversation throughout the book will supply the appropriate earthy tone. Note that at this point Sancho Panza does not seem to be worried about Don Quijote’s dottiness: he is so seduced by the glittering prospect of his ‘ínsula’ that he is even willing to sneak away from his family without leave-taking (although he does of course have them in mind). Candidates may legitimately introduce some doubts into his mind as he proceeds, but the general tone should be optimistic. If a candidate introduces, or refers to, the windmill episode, I think we should probably let it pass, although that was not the intention of the question.

García Márquez

- 7 The one thing that all candidates ought to note is that here at long last we get the actual moment of the stabbing, allusions to which have dominated the book since its first sentence. For this reason alone, the ending must produce some satisfaction – we have waited long enough for it! The moment is certainly dramatic, but in a *grand guignol* way: the repeated reference to Santiago’s ‘tripas’ and the ‘terrible olor a mierda’ scarcely adumbrate his death as noble or tragic. But it is satisfactory in its stylistic and narrative consistency: it continues the grotesquerie that has pervaded references to the killing throughout the novel. Also consistent, to the end, is the constant shifting of viewpoint owing to the narrator’s ‘witness statement’ method: even at this point it is hard to be clear about what actually happens, because each witness sees only a little bit of it, and even when they see the same thing their testimony does not agree (compare Argénida’s impressions with her father’s). But is the ending a true conclusion? Arguably not, because Santiago has ‘died’ a myriad times already in the reminiscences of various characters, and there seems no compelling reason why the witness statements should not go on *ad infinitum*. Even the last sentence is ambiguous: not ‘cayó muerto’ but ‘se derrumbó de bruces’. Thus there is no limit to the possible responses of candidates; we will reward each one according to the quality of its references to the text, and of the comments thence derived.
- 8 See above for lack of tragic impact in the death itself; but counter-arguments can certainly be found. Despite its grotesqueness, the event clearly does have an almost ‘Greek tragedy’ dimension in its appalling inevitability – which is constantly being countered by hints of how easily it could have been averted, if things had been just that little bit different. But to my mind it is not the inevitability of Greek tragedy (or Shakespearean or whatever) that makes it touch the heart, but our engagement with the doomed tragic hero; and I, for one, feel not a trace of such engagement with Santiago, nor do I think the author intends us to. Candidates may argue along those lines or along completely different ones; any well-referenced argument will of course be credited. The core is perhaps whether the death ‘touches our hearts’; it is not necessary for the candidate to define in detail what s/he understands by ‘tragedy’, but a good answer will probably convey a pretty clear idea.
- 9 Pedro’s state of mind, though undescribed in the text, is easily inferred. He will be shocked at Angela’s revelations and probably disgusted with her; but his mother has already dealt out condign punishment. The brothers’ duty is to avenge the family honour on the man who has sullied it. At no time do they (or anyone else, for that matter) have any doubt on that score, and at no time does it occur to either brother to doubt Angela’s word or to consider any aspect of the situation critically: Santiago’s guilt is simply a given. But it is an oddly impersonal given: the brothers have no personal dislike of Santiago and see his murder as a disagreeable necessity. Thus a candidate who makes Pedro do anything to evaluate the evidence against Santiago, or to examine his own motives, will be off-beam, as will a candidate who has Pedro express personal hatred against Santiago. Pedro will be outraged and will immediately start planning his revenge – probably already considering the weapon and the circumstances, since it has to be done quickly. He may think of consulting Pablo, but will certainly expect Pablo to follow his lead; if he thinks of his mother it will be to assume that she will endorse what he intends to do.

Puig

- 10** There is plenty to go on here. Puig clearly is trying to move us, and a candidate who is not emotionally affected (or cannot imagine how this could happen!) will do well to avoid this question. As usual with long passages, we will not expect everything to be covered before awarding high marks, but answers must range through the passage and not get stuck on a few details. The situation with Valentín still weak from his ‘poison’ attack, Molina quietly sympathetic, and Valentín’s trust in him, is affecting in itself. The incoherence of Valentín’s dictation adds to the pathos (even a weak candidate should be able to comment on this). As for the sentiments expressed, they are perhaps *too* heart-rending – Valentín could be seen as exaggerating to gain sympathy, though the reality is bad enough in all conscience. Note Valentín’s sad little attempts at self-justification before someone who is, after all, wedded to The Cause. A shrewd candidate might just note that the letter makes no mention of Molina – just at this moment Valentín seems to see him purely as an amanuensis.
- 11** All sorts of reasons could be given, and we should have no preconceptions. Candidates may be quite frank about their personal preferences here and this will be perfectly acceptable so long as they are reacting to the book and the question, and not indulging in personal anecdote. It may be that girls will react differently from boys; if so, again, we should accept anything that is backed up by reference to the text. We should also, of course, accept an answer that shows no liking for either possibility – so long as support from the text is given.
- 12** I don’t personally think that Puig intended to give the Director any private, ‘better’ feelings to underlie his official persona as a devoted servant of the regime; like many jailers and torturers he can be as smooth as butter if he thinks this will help him gain influence over the prisoner, but it is all calculated. So the text will warrant a Director who is satisfied with the way he has manipulated Molina, unaware of the extent to which Molina has misled him and has been won over to Valentín’s point of view, but certainly resolved on keeping tabs on him to see whether, once freed, he will give them a useful lead (which of course he does). If a candidate endows the Director with more decency and sensibility than this we shall probably have to accept it, though there must still be a clear awareness of the thorough way he does his job.

Castellanos

- 13** This bitingly and exuberantly satirical scene has long been a favourite with candidates, and I shall hope for some good answers here, with the best focussing on both ‘who’ and ‘what’. The former is the easier, because the targets are obvious: the Mother, with her tyrannical assertion that an expectant mother must expect to suffer, and Lupita, for her inability to resist this pressure. Both are comical, but candidates will probably feel that Lupita also deserves some sympathy. A reasonable exposition of this obvious situation may earn up to 12-13 marks. Most candidates will be able to contrast Lupita’s pathetic condition at the end of the scene with her exultant healthiness at the beginning, but apart from that weaker candidates are likely to ignore the first part of the scene, in which Lupita exultantly plays both bull and bullfighter, a game clearly to be understood in sexual terms, but which also interestingly exemplifies the power-play between man and woman that recurs throughout the play. Note how the ‘corrida’ scene merges into the ‘hotel’ scene so that the connotations of both become comically clear. A candidate who can suggest how Castellanos uses the contrasts in this scene to satirise stereotyped expectations about sex and marriage will be on the way to high reward.
- 14** The Lupita scenes are the likeliest source of reference for arguing this point, though the Josefa and Adam and Eve scenes could also be drawn upon. A case could be made for agreeing with the Perico, but Castellanos also offers plenty of evidence that domestic life can be perfectly tolerable when it is not bedevilled by false expectations and impossible dreams. (Note that even the Perico qualifies his own statement.) A shrewd candidate may think to ask for whom domestic life is hell: for women only, or for men and children too? As usual, we shall be unimpressed by vague generalisation and will look for detailed support from the text; for a mark of 17 or above, that support must be wide ranging
- 15** Here, as always with this type of question, we will accept anything proposed by the candidate, so long as it is backed by exploration of an intelligently chosen scene. The ‘mujeres históricas’ are likely to provide the best material; Eve is likely to be extremely popular, as her scene cropped up in a passage-

based question so recently. Where Eve is used, we must not reward highly until we are sure that the question being addressed is this year's and not the old one!

Lope de Vega

- 16 When examining the long set speeches, candidates tend to divide into those who have a set of 'teacher's notes' and those who are approaching the speech virtually unseen. There is, of course, no reason why teacher's (or editor's) notes should not be drawn upon, so long as they are turned to the service of the question and not merely regurgitated – be suspicious of displays of technical vocabulary that don't convey any real appreciation. Candidates who are approaching the speech unseen are likely to flounder unless they really read the speech carefully: it isn't particularly hard to understand, but its artificial rhetoric (or rhetorical artifice) may not be appreciated. Any signs of genuine personal understanding should be rewarded. Whether or not the candidate agrees with Inés's view will of course be up to him/her; I have always been inclined to think that Inés is a bit tough on poor Rodrigo (though she has the grace to keep her opinion back until he is out of earshot). He is expressing the time-honoured sufferings of the disfavoured lover, in language that could be paralleled a thousand times in courtly literature; his problem is that he can't convince Inés (as Alonso can) that he is using it to convey real feelings. A good candidate will hopefully realise this and discuss whether Rodrigo succeeds in conveying those feelings to the audience. Whatever the approach and the final opinion, there must be close attention to the language for high reward. For those scoring below 12 we shall really be looking to see if the speech has been understood.
- 17 Clearly the love affair is doomed from the beginning: Lope goes to great length to make that clear. But is it the dabbling with the occult that dooms it? That is much more problematical: the impetuosity of the lovers, Alonso's naivety, Rodrigo's jealousy and the inexorable workings of fate are amply sufficient to bring about the tragedy without 'cercos y conjuros'. So is the 'sorcerous' sub-plot mere decoration, or are Alonso and the rest really stirring up evil powers and so sealing their fate? The play clearly does postulate the existence of supernatural forces (witness the 'sombra', for example), so the latter suggestion may well be justified. There is room for a wide range of opinions here, and we shall accept any suggestion with the usual proviso that it is backed up from the text. Sadly, it has been evident in the past that some candidates' knowledge of the text is rather sketchy,
- 18 I would love to play this part, and even boys (and girls who see themselves rather as the pretty Inés!) should surely be able to imagine why such a lively and prominent character should be an attractive proposition. Her character is strongly delineated, and is both comic and sympathetic; she is both an influential actor in the drama and a persuasive commentator on it; she appears in all kinds of contexts and is seen in dialogue with all kinds of people, in situations ranging from the light-hearted to the sinister to the tragic. For high reward we need some solid points about what makes her interesting, combined with some detailed support; this need not cover the whole play, but two or more key scenes can certainly be hoped for. Little reward will be given for a regurgitated character sketch, unless a real attempt has been made to relate it to the question (in which case we will probably go up cautiously to a mark of 11/12).

Bécquer

- 19 This is quite a long poem, which may put some weaker candidates off (see below); sensible candidates ought to realise that the longer the poem, the more scope for comment. The key point, which seems very obvious but will doubtless be missed, or not clearly conveyed, by some candidates, is that this image of death is described entirely in terms of life. Bécquer even spells it out: 'no parecía muerta'. The poem does include some traditional concomitants of death – rest, silence, a stony bed – but they are all seen as positive and desirable, with all grief and horror rigorously excluded. Candidates who see poetry entirely in terms of decodable messages will have an easy task here – but will also have trouble saying anything interesting, since the message is so plain that it scarcely needs de-coding. Nonetheless we shall probably have to award a mark of at least 12 on the 'message' basis, with higher reward reserved for those who engage with the language.
- 20 Bécquer in the past has proved popular with the candidate who wishes to offer the two shortest poems s/he can find; at least this question cuts out the more obvious four-liners! Poem XII is likely to feature prominently, having been set last year; so may XIII, XLI, LII, LXXII. Close attention to the words is needed, as always, but naturally when gauging the effect of sea imagery in a poem, the candidate is

entitled to consider that poem as a whole, so long as the focus remains on the 'sea' element. This applies particularly to poem XII.

- 21** This will probably attract the more able candidates – which does not, of course, mean that we should be more rigorous in our expectations when awarding marks. The candidate will have to clearly understand the implications of the question if it is to be tackled well; it draws attention to an important aspect of Bécquer's (and most romantic's) works, but it may not have been stressed by teachers and so candidates may have to think on their feet: substantial reward should be given to any who demonstrate that they have done that successfully. Some of the shorter poems could very well exemplify the point at issue, but since only one poem is being asked for, the analysis would have to be very mature and thorough if such a short poem were to yield a top-class essay. Longer poems will probably give a better result; we shall wait and see.

Spanish American Modernista Poets

- 22** Evidently the poet begins by describing the enjoyment of the others and then contrasts himself ('yo fiero rehuso...'); but most candidates should be able to see that the first part of the poem conveys a negative impression, in that the imagery used to describe the festivities is violent and/or satirical. The real test is to show how despite this, the enjoyment of the others is conveyed, albeit disapprovingly: the gaiety, the dancing, the champagne, the love-making (in the old-fashioned sense), the flowers. It is really an exercise in the cumulative effect of imagery.
- 23** This is of course a reaction to the eternally recurring phrase contained in the question, and in so many IGCSE essays. What the candidate finds hard to understand is of course a personal matter, but to answer this question well, s/he will need to demonstrate that there is real uncertainty about decoding or understanding the chosen poem, and that the candidate has been intrigued and stimulated by that difficulty. It is hard to write lucidly about uncertainty and ambiguity; any candidate who can do so will merit substantial reward.
- 24** There is plenty of choice here. A straightforward task.

NOVEMBER 2003

INTERNATIONAL GCSE

MARK SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK: 20

SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 0488/3

**Literature (Spanish)
(Unseen)**



Answers will be marked according to the following general criteria:

- 18-20** Detailed, well-written, well-organised answer, paying close attention to author's use of language. Shows appreciation of structure and near-total comprehension of passage, has no significant omissions and conveys a sensitive personal response.
- 15-17** Detailed answer, paying close attention to author's use of language. Understands all essentials of passage; few omissions. Conveys clear personal response but may be a bit cut-and-dried.
- 12-14** Competent answer with some attention to language. May be some misunderstandings and significant omissions, but conveys some personal appreciation.
- 9-11** Attempts to respond and does pay attention to some details of language, but there are significant misunderstandings and substantial omissions. May distort passage by trying to apply some rigid preconception, or note use of literary devices without explaining their effect. Answer probably rather short.
- 6-8** Tries, but has not really grasped what the passage is about. Offers a few ideas, some of them irrelevant or plainly wrong. A few glimmers are perceptible. Short, scrappy.
- 4-5** Short, scrappy, confused; little response to passage, but candidate has at least read it and tried to respond it.
- 2-3** Scrawls a few lines; has attempted to read passage, but clearly doesn't understand it.
- 0-1** Nothing to reward.

The introduction should enable candidates to understand what is going on, but misunderstandings are always possible, and where the candidate is obviously confused we shall have to reward whatever signs of partial understanding may be perceptible.

Basically, the workmen are doubly alien to Julius: because they are adult, and because they are lower-class (and perhaps feel racially different: hence 'gringuito', 'blanquito'). The workmen rather resent the class difference and compensate for it by stressing the age gap, violating the child's innocence with verbal violence – obscene talk – and more or less forcing him to share their lifestyle. The more he pretends to understand, when they know he doesn't, the more initiative they gain, the more amused they become and the more they tease him. However, their innate decency and the presence of the foreman prevent the covert danger from becoming overt. Julius's innocence is shown by his reaction to this treatment: he is uneasy, but does not want to admit inferiority by running away. His desire to appear grown-up, a man among men, wars with his dawning class-consciousness and his tenderly nurtured fastidiousness. Echenique makes the reader vividly aware of Julius's predicament by his skilful juxtaposition of the child and adult viewpoints.

Julius' naivety is apparent from the beginning of the passage, the sexual innuendo about his brothers and sisters passes over his head, he hears and answers only the very orthodox question whether he actually has brothers and sisters. He scarcely speaks after that, overwhelmed by the cannonade of coarse jokes and swear-words which has an almost physical impact on him. He does not in the least understand the suggestion of his being 'bien machito', or the obscene dialogue which is said to follow, although he is vaguely aware that it isn't *comme il faut* ('¿qué haría el padre de la parroquia?'). He is obscurely flattered by the offer of food and drink, and views acceptance of it as a challenge or a rite of passage, rather than a joke or attempt to humiliate him; also a challenge is the suggestion at the end that he should lift Agua Bendita's 'lata'.

The very alienness of the workmen's world is fascinating to this sheltered and cosseted child, though the fascination is inseparable from repulsion. The workmen's physical presence is forcibly conveyed by the description in the first full paragraph, supplemented by further details later, all of which focus on their dirtiness, which makes them repellent and yet fascinating. Dirt again, makes Cucaracha's beer bottle nauseating, but to refuse it would be to admit defeat and inferiority – 'you won't take a dare'. The coughing, hawking and swearing in the last part of the passage are not directed at Julius, but they establish an atmosphere of don't care violence which is obscurely threatening, so that the 'se la alcanzó a Julius' could

be interpreted almost as an assault. Julius cannot act in this world, he can only react; to put it rather prissily perhaps, he cannot purify the workmen, but they can pollute him. The fact that Julius is not in danger of actual physical injury does not detract much from this sense of violation.

Adequate answers will need to convey at least some of these elements, with supporting detail. As usual, candidates who work carefully through the passage are likely to do much better than those who skip over it, citing randomly here and there. However, since a number of answers are likely to be bitty, we shall have to go up to a mark of at least 12-14 on that basis, and perhaps to 15/16 if the citations and comments are apt. This is quite a challenging passage, and marking may have to be on the generous side.