

Directions: Read the following text carefully and write a SEPARATE answer in Spanish to each of the questions, (3a) and (3b), that follow it. Be sure to use your time effectively so that you can answer each question fully.

Instrucciones: Lee con cuidado el texto a continuación y escribe, en español, las respuestas a las preguntas (3a) y (3b) POR SEPARADO. Organiza tu tiempo eficazmente para que puedas responder de modo adecuado a cada una de las preguntas.

Question 3
Análisis de texto
(Tiempo sugerido—40 minutos)

3. “Como no hay luz, debo acostarme a las ocho. Ya debería estar acostumbrado al Chac Mool, pero hace poco, en la oscuridad, me topé con él en la escalera, sentí sus brazos helados, las escamas de su piel renovada, y quise gritar.”

“Si no llueve pronto, el Chac Mool va a convertirse en piedra otra vez. He notado su dificultad reciente para moverse; a veces se reclina durante horas, paralizado, y parece ser, de nuevo, un ídolo. Pero estos reposos sólo le dan nuevas fuerzas para vejarme, arañarme como si pudiera arrancar algún líquido de mi carne. Ya no tienen lugar aquellos intermedios amables en que relataba viejos cuentos; creo notar un resentimiento concentrado. Ha habido otros indicios que me han puesto a pensar: se está acabando mi bodega; acaricia la seda de las batas; quiere que traiga una criada a la casa; me ha hecho enseñarle a usar jabón y lociones. Creo que el Chac Mool está cayendo en tentaciones humanas, incluso hay algo viejo en su cara que antes parecía eterna. Aquí puede estar mi salvación: si el Chac se humaniza, posiblemente todos sus siglos de vida se acumulen en un instante y caiga fulminado.”

(Excerpt from “Chac Mool”)

Carlos Fuentes.

Excerpt from *Los días enmascarados*

© Carlos Fuentes, 1954

- (a) Analiza la relación entre el narrador y Chac Mool en el fragmento.
(b) Refiriéndote al fragmento y al resto del cuento, explica los cambios de Chac Mool en su proceso de humanización.

STOP

END OF EXAM

AP® SPANISH LITERATURE 2012 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3(a): Text Analysis

5 DEMONSTRATES SUPERIORITY

- Clearly and accurately analyzes the relationship between the narrator and Chac Mool in the passage cited.
- Organization contributes to the quality of the response.
- Provides examples from the passage that clearly and explicitly support the analysis.
- Contains virtually no irrelevant or erroneous commentary.
- May show insight or originality.

4 DEMONSTRATES COMPETENCE

- Analyzes the relationship between the narrator and Chac Mool in the passage cited.
- Organization supports the response.
- Provides examples from the passage that support the analysis.
- May contain some errors of fact or interpretation, but the overall quality of the response is not significantly affected.
- There may be some ambiguity or incompleteness, but the response clearly demonstrates competence.

3 SUGGESTS COMPETENCE

- Basically understands and addresses the question and the passage cited.
 - Attempts to analyze the relationship between the narrator and Chac Mool in the passage.
 - Errors, ambiguity, or incompleteness detract from the quality of the answer.
 - Paraphrasing may predominate; contains relatively superficial commentary.
 - Reader may have to make some inferences because the response is not always explicit.
-

2 SUGGESTS LACK OF COMPETENCE

- Student has not adequately understood the question or the passage cited, or both.
- May not address the relationship between the narrator and Chac Mool in the passage.
- May contain irrelevant comments or significant errors.
- Possibly a prepared overview of Fuentes or “Chac Mool.”
- May consist entirely of paraphrasing or plot summary.
- The reader is forced to make significant inferences.

1 DEMONSTRATES LACK OF COMPETENCE

- Does not address the question.
- Demonstrates a lack of understanding of the passage cited.
- Does not address the relationship between the narrator and Chac Mool in the passage cited.
- Is confused, chaotic, or incorrect.

0 NO CREDIT

- Merely restates the question; OR is on task but is so brief or so poorly written as to be meaningless; OR is written in English; OR is crossed out; OR is completely off topic or off task (obscenity, nonsense poetry, drawings, letter to the reader, etc.).

— BLANK RESPONSE

**AP® SPANISH LITERATURE
2012 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 3(b): Text Analysis (continued)

0 NO CREDIT

- Merely restates the question; OR is on task but is so brief or so poorly written as to be meaningless; OR is written in English; response is crossed out; OR is completely off topic or off task (obscenity, nonsense poetry, drawings, letter to the reader, etc.).

— BLANK RESPONSE

AP® SPANISH LITERATURE 2012 SCORING GUIDELINES

Language Usage

The AP Spanish Literature Exam tests the ability of students to write well-organized essays in correct and idiomatic Spanish. These scoring guidelines assess **the degree to which language usage effectively supports an on-task response to the question**. All the criteria listed below should be taken into account in categorizing the student's command of the written language as related to each literature question.

5 VERY GOOD COMMAND

- Infrequent, random errors in grammatical structures.
- Varied and accurate use of vocabulary.
- Control of the conventions of the written language (spelling, accents, punctuation, paragraphing, etc.).

4 GOOD COMMAND

- Some errors in grammatical structures; however, these do not detract from the overall readability of the response.
- Appropriate use of vocabulary.
- Conventions of the written language are generally correct (spelling, accents, punctuation, paragraphing, etc.).

3 ADEQUATE COMMAND

- Frequent grammatical errors, but response is comprehensible.
- Limited vocabulary.
- May have numerous errors in conventions of the written language (spelling, accents, punctuation, paragraphing, etc.).

2 WEAK COMMAND

- Serious grammatical errors that force a sympathetic reader to supply inferences.
- Very limited or repetitive vocabulary.
- Pervasive errors in the conventions of the written language.

1 INADEQUATE COMMAND

- Constant grammatical errors that render comprehension difficult.
- Insufficient vocabulary.
- Lack of control of the conventions of the written language.

0 NO CREDIT

- Unintelligible, written in English, or off task.

— BLANK RESPONSE