

# FRENCH LITERATURE

---

Paper 8670/41

Texts

## Key messages

Teachers should think carefully about which texts to prepare as some present conceptual problems that are challenging for average and below average candidates.

### **For passage-based questions**

Read the passage carefully and focus on key words.

Briefly put the passage in context. Answer questions separately, not in a block essay form. Read the questions carefully and avoid repetition. Show knowledge of the text but only if it relates to the question. Go to the heart of the question in the introductory paragraph and avoid irrelevant generalities and storytelling.

### **For essay questions**

Teach candidates to read the question carefully and to plan. If a question has two aspects to discuss, make sure both are covered. Focus and read the essay title again and again so as not to lose sight of its point. Remind candidates of the instructions on the front of the question paper, 'You should write between 500 and 600 words for each answer'. There is no point at all in regurgitating a prepared essay, however sophisticated and detailed, as it will very rarely match the question and will not get more than a few marks.

Teachers should stress the need to refer to the question throughout the answer, not just at the start and the finish.

Teachers should train their candidates to check carefully that:

- They are answering a question on a text they have studied;
- They are answering **one question from each section** and one other; i.e. three questions altogether and no more;
- They are not answering two questions on the same text;
- They study the wording of the question carefully, so as not to answer a slightly different question, perhaps reusing material from an essay done before;
- They are aware that some questions have two parts. (Look out for the 'et' in the question.)

Candidates should:

- Follow the instructions on the front of the question paper, including writing in dark blue or black pen. Some candidates copy the question with one colour and answer it with another. This is not necessary, but is not a problem. However, editing work with pencil or a different colour of ink, or changing the handwriting, could give rise to suspicions of malpractice and should be avoided;
- Practise with past questions and think carefully about what the question is asking before starting to write;
- Note key words in the question and mention these in the introductory paragraph;
- Resist the temptation to tell the story – answer the question relevantly;
- Note that the highest scoring answers will be relevant, well-illustrated and developed, attempting to analyse and make comparisons;
- It is vital to label questions with the number, and passage-based questions with **(i)**, **(ii)** and **(iii)**. Candidates sometimes demonstrate a good knowledge of the text and background in **(i)** but become muddled in **(ii)** and **(iii)**, so do not fulfil the promise of the beginning of the response. If the confusion

is severe and the questions have not been labelled, it can look as though **(ii)** and **(iii)** were not attempted at all, making a particularly poor impression;

- Remember that 'soit ... soit' means 'either ... or' and should not be copied before question numbers;
- Finish with a concluding paragraph;
- Start each new essay on a fresh page.

### **General comments**

It is good to refer to the extracts as appropriate, but independent knowledge of the text should be shown, too. Please see the comments on specific questions, for example **Question 1(a)** for more on this. If candidates limit the content of their essays to the information in the passage, then they will give the impression that they have not read the whole text.

Candidates need to find a 'happy balance' between 'assuming that the Examiner knows nothing' and 'remembering that the Examiner has also read the text'. Although narration irrelevant to the question is not required, candidates should begin to answer the question at the beginning, but should not hold back from showing knowledge of the texts. This was successfully done by, for example, referring to characters initially by their surnames and thereafter varying the words, including the use of short, apt descriptions or quotations.

It was evident that Centres had used past questions when preparing their candidates, and detailed knowledge was shown in those areas. Candidates should select the question they choose to answer carefully, though, and ensure that their material is relevant. Sometimes the material was tailored efficiently and relevantly to this session's questions.

Some candidates did not identify which question they were answering and it was not clear until half way through, if at all. Candidates are advised to choose carefully either **(a)** or **(b)** and to provide as complete and relevant an answer to that one question as possible. If **(i)**, **(ii)** and **(iii)** are not written before each answer, and the language of the question is not used in the response, it will not be clear to the Examiner whether a relevant answer is being given or not, for example, see comments on **Question 4(a)**.

Repetition does not make a good impression if points are not developed on the second and subsequent occasions on which they are mentioned.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Section 1**

#### **Question 1**

Molière: *L'Avare*

- (a)** Candidates were not always sure that Frosine was a woman, despite the feminine adjectives in lines 11 and 20.

In **(i)**, some 'stated the obvious', writing that Frosine both wanted to talk about Mariane, and to be paid. More thoughtful responses observed that Frosine talked about Mariane to win Harpagon's attention and tried to persuade him to pay her while he was still listening, but as he lost interest, the subject of conversation would return to Mariane, beginning the circle all over again. In more detailed essays, candidates added the corresponding switches from 'sévère' to 'gai' to this discussion. Insufficient attention was paid to the phrase in the question, 'dans cet extrait' in **(i)** and 'dans cette scène' in **(ii)**.

Overall, there were sometimes harmless overlaps between responses to **(i)** and **(ii)**, although, as usual and as mentioned in the General Comments above, repetition within a script does not make a good impression unless points are developed further with each mention. The phrase 'Que pensez-vous...?' was important in **(ii)**: candidates were being asked to give their opinion of the characters' intentions more than simply to describe those intentions, although responses along the lines of, 'How do you interpret...?' were also accepted.

Three key phrases in (iii) were 'réactions d'Harpagon', 'ce que lui dit Frosine' and 'comportement ... comique'. Some candidates appeared to have seized too readily on the invitation to write about comedy at the expense of narrowing their answers down to what the question was really asking for.

The key was in the words 'sévère' and 'gai', so candidates who had mistaken Frosine for a man and thought that, 'Il prend un air sévère' referred to Frosine, disadvantaged themselves here. Many candidates had difficulty in explaining 'En quoi' the actions were funny, often being quicker to cite some categories of comedy than really to point out what causes us to laugh when we read or watch Molière's work. Simply to write that Harpagon was reluctant to pay did not seem to come close to answering this question. On occasions there was some good analysis, and it was pleasing to see some fine marks scored as a result.

- (b) This question about the extent to which the role of Harpagon's employees made Harpagon's 'aspect comique' stand out was often approached well, although some candidates appeared to identify the words 'employés' and 'comique' as the most important and proceeded to discuss comedy in other characters rather than 'celui-ci', namely Harpagon. In these cases, examples were even given which could have been discussed as an 'aspect comique d'Harpagon', but presumably candidates had not realised that the question requested this.

## Question 2

Maupassant: *Bel Ami*

Candidates appeared enthusiastic about this new text, and there was every indication that they had coped well with its length and had enjoyed the novel.

- (a) Most candidates could explain in (i) that *La Vie française* was the newspaper which enabled four of the five men present to work and make their living, and later also the fifth, Duroy. Some also mentioned that Madeleine Forestier was later revealed as something of a journalistic 'ghost writer' for both Charles Forestier and Georges Duroy.

Part (ii) was found most difficult by candidates. There was an occasional note of clarity that Duroy was elated that he had (finally) begun to integrate socially. His life had been characterised by poverty and loneliness as he, the young man from a rural background, who had enjoyed camaraderie in the military, had arrived in the big city. There was a lack of familiarity, however, with the definition of 'gris', meaning 'à moitié ivre'. A few pages before the extract, we read that, 'Duroy avait trouvé le Corton (Château-Laroze) de son goût et il laissait chaque fois emplir son verre...'

Occasionally candidates suggested that Madeleine Forestier had seated Mme de Marelle beside Duroy deliberately, although it was later that she encouraged him to visit her friend. 'Duroy se trouvait placé entre Mme de Marelle et sa fille' sounded like chance, but marked the beginning of an acquaintance that probably meant more to Duroy than any other of his liaisons.

- (b) There was a tendency for candidates to approach the question as one about a woman in the novel and to discuss similarities between Virginie Walter, Madeleine Forestier and Clotilde de Marelle, or sometimes Rachel, though not so often other bourgeois wives. Candidates could often recall significant details of Mme Walter and her involvement in the plot, particularly things that her husband, or other characters, said which would support the idea of her being naive and ridiculous. Although some wrote about Mme Walter's admission that she had harboured secret thoughts of Duroy before he pursued her, in general, issues of secrecy and common knowledge were overlooked. Some said that Mme Walter should have learned from other women's experience of Duroy, without questioning how much she would have known about that. Others took for granted that she 'devient ridicule', both for the reader (as may be) and for fellow characters (less likely), with no mention, for example, that Mme de Marelle found hair wound around Duroy's buttons, but did not find out that it was Mme Walter's hair, nor of Norbert de Varenne's authoritative interpretation about a 'skeleton in the cupboard' (in his words to Jacques Rival at Duroy's wedding to Suzanne Walter), that Mme Walter opposed the marriage, but Duroy secured it: 'il tenait le père par des cadavres découverts, paraît-il ... au Maroc'. Duroy took advantage of Mme Walter, and she annoyed him later. To say that he simply manipulated her for his own gain did not tell the full story.

### Question 3

Sartre: *Les Mouches*

- (a) There was a tendency to avoid giving a direct answer to the question, 'Le Pédagogue a-t-il raison...?', but a good number of candidates affirmed that he was and were able to give some background to the situation and to Jupiter in (i). The second part of the question was answered best. Although responses that exaggerated the 'friendship' or 'surrogate father/son relationship' between Oreste and Le Pédagogue were less successful, some answers gave a concise but useful summary of the key issues of the play in this section, as played out through these two characters. The emphasis needed to remain 'dans cet extrait', but the discussion could be developed from their differences as illustrated in the passage. The significance for Oreste of his comment, 'Je la vois pour la première fois' (line 18) and of further momentous developments for him throughout the play also gave candidates an opportunity to show in (iii) their understanding of Sartre's values as depicted in Oreste.
- (b) There were a small number of answers to this question that did little more than explain the festival without mentioning its *meaning*. Nevertheless, there were also some very well structured responses which recalled the power exerted over the people by Égisthe through the 'Fête des Morts' as well as commenting on the vengeance that the dead came back to wreak, and the people's remorse and conduct before, during and after the dead came back for the day.

### Question 4

Alain-Fournier: *Le Grand Meaulnes*

- (a) The first part of this question was the best answered, with candidates encountering little difficulty in explaining that the first two lines were about Augustin Meaulnes' restless sigh as he looked ahead to Easter (having taken the time since his adventure before Christmas to find a way back to Yvonne de Galais) and François Seurel's request that Meaulnes should write to him when he found his beloved.

Answers began to lack clarity in (ii) if they were not clearly labelled. Meaulnes sighed (line 1) and was 'triste' (line 8), typical of his behaviour at other times in the novel, as he tried to rediscover the innocence of young love. 'Mon compagnon et mon frère' (line 3) was also a familiar camaraderie, given descriptions elsewhere of his relationship with Frantz de Galais.

After Meaulnes' departure, Seurel was left reflecting that his youth had just departed for ever, with Meaulnes. Most candidates could express that the boys' short time together had certainly been a memorable one for Seurel, which he would look upon with sentimentality into adulthood.

- (b) There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

### Section 2

### Question 5

Mauriac: *Thérèse Desqueyroux*

- (a) Only a minority of candidates addressed the key phrase in the question, 'voué à l'échec', the rest either discussing marriage in general, or communicating little more than a general sense that Thérèse's marriage was a disappointment to her, particularly in the light of the love affair which Anne confided in her. It would have been desirable to see more acknowledgement that Thérèse married for property and pines, and to gain her best friend as a sister-in-law. The disappointments that she encountered, combined with a lack of meaningful support, caused Thérèse to give up hope in her marriage. Bernard and the family did not want the marriage to be seen to fail, so it was not simply 'voué à l'échec', depending on what candidates understood by 'échec'. Most did not specify, and it was even confused with the board game, 'échecs'.
- (b) Candidates tended to discuss death in the novel as Thérèse's suffocation or 'emotional death', which often formed the beginning of a promising answer, but was rarely fully developed. Examples of physical death were not much explored, whether Thérèse's loss of her mother at birth, or of

Tante Clara who had raised her, later in the novel; her distaste for shooting that Anne and Bernard so enjoyed. Bernard's nervousness about his health and, of course, his poisoning, and Thérèse's post-natal ill health, exacerbated by the solitary confinement imposed on her by Bernard might also have been covered.

### Question 6

Giraudoux: *La guerre de Troie n'aura pas lieu*

- (a) This question about a character, Andromaque, proved popular with candidates who could devote well illustrated paragraphs to Andromaque and 'la condition féminine', as well as to other women, principally Cassandre and Hélène, drawing out points of similarity and difference and leading to varied, but often well substantiated, conclusions regarding their opinions, which the question sought.
- (b) Some well prepared candidates answered this question, as well as some who were less well prepared and did not seem to have mastered the tragic nature of the play, particularly 'l'opposition de deux ordres de valeurs irréconciliables' in the question. Nevertheless, there were some sensitive treatments of the subject and some where candidates could see similar tragic opposition playing out in modern history. Thankfully only brief references were made to that as the focus always needs to be on the literary texts in hand, but it was encouraging to see that relevant contemporary applications of literary study had been grasped.

Candidates could identify two 'camps' in different ways, usually including Greeks and Trojans, optimists and pessimists, pacifists and warmongers, but also (in no particular order) 'la guerre aura/n'aura pas lieu', whether Hélène was worth going to war for, pacifism and fatalism, 'les vieillards et les jeunes', 'Andromaque et Hélène', 'Hector et Pâris', Hector/Andromaque and Pâris/Hélène, 'Hector et le destin', 'Hélène ni pour la guerre ni contre', and some degree of discussion along these lines was necessary, more than just a vague statement that 'the play is tragic'.

### Question 7

Bazin: *Au nom du fils*

- (a) There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.
- (b) There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

### Question 8

Joffo: *Un sac de billes*

- (a) The shortest, but by no means unimportant, word in this question was 'I', meaning that candidates were not being asked to account for changes in the 'épreuves subies par Jo', but to say how those 'épreuves' had changed *him*. Another misinterpretation involved overemphasis on the words, 'Dans quelle mesure ... Jo ... changé', illustrated, for example, by his gradual maturing and friendship with Françoise Mancelier, but not mentioning 'épreuves subies' in this regard. As in **Question 6(b)**, it was interesting to see candidates briefly but poignantly relating the depiction of war in the text to current affairs.
- (b) Candidates could generally draw on a variety of material to illustrate the impressions they gained from the novel of the collaboration of the French with the Nazis, ranging from the general danger to the Joffo boys whether in occupied France or the 'zone libre', to more 'specific' dangers, from school staff after they began to wear the 'étoiles jaunes', the risk from neighbours in Rosette's village, or the case of Ambroise Mancelier whose Nazi sympathies both protected and endangered him at different points. Some candidates tried to balance their essays with examples of resistance, which they appeared to have more readily at hand, but such material was rarely handled relevantly in this answer.

# FRENCH LITERATURE

---

Paper 8670/42

Texts

## Key messages

Teachers should think carefully about which texts to prepare as some present conceptual problems that are challenging for average and below average candidates.

### **For passage-based questions**

Read the passage carefully and focus on key words.

Briefly put the passage in context. Answer questions separately, not in a block essay form. Read the questions carefully and avoid repetition. Show knowledge of the text but only if it relates to the question. Go to the heart of the question in the introductory paragraph and avoid irrelevant generalities and storytelling.

### **For essay questions**

Teach candidates to read the question carefully and to plan. If a question has two aspects to discuss, make sure both are covered. Focus and read the essay title again and again so as not to lose sight of its point. Remind candidates of the instructions on the front of the question paper, 'You should write between 500 and 600 words for each answer'. There is no point at all in regurgitating a prepared essay, however sophisticated and detailed, as it will very rarely match the question and will not get more than a few marks.

Teachers should stress the need to refer to the question throughout the answer, not just at the start and the finish.

Teachers should train their candidates to check carefully that:

- They are answering a question on a text they have studied;
- They are answering **one question from each section** and one other; i.e. three questions altogether and no more;
- They are not answering two questions on the same text;
- They study the wording of the question carefully, so as not to answer a slightly different question, perhaps reusing material from an essay done before;
- They are aware that some questions have two parts. (Look out for the 'et' in the question.)

Candidates should:

- Follow the instructions on the front of the question paper, including writing in dark blue or black pen. Some candidates copy the question with one colour and answer it with another. This is not necessary, but is not a problem. However, editing work with pencil or a different colour of ink, or changing the handwriting, could give rise to suspicions of malpractice and should be avoided;
- Practise with past questions and think carefully about what the question is asking before starting to write;
- Note key words in the question and mention these in the introductory paragraph;
- Resist the temptation to tell the story – answer the question relevantly;
- Note that the highest scoring answers will be relevant, well-illustrated and developed, attempting to analyse and make comparisons;
- It is vital to label questions with the number, and passage-based questions with **(i)**, **(ii)** and **(iii)**. Candidates sometimes demonstrate a good knowledge of the text and background in **(i)** but become muddled in **(ii)** and **(iii)**, so do not fulfil the promise of the beginning of the response. If the confusion

is severe and the questions have not been labelled, it can look as though **(ii)** and **(iii)** were not attempted at all, making a particularly poor impression;

- Remember that 'soit ... soit' means 'either ... or' and should not be copied before question numbers;
- Finish with a concluding paragraph;
- Start each new essay on a fresh page.

### **General comments**

It is good to refer to the extracts as appropriate, but independent knowledge of the text should be shown, too. Please see the comments on specific questions, for example **Question 1(a)** for more on this. If candidates limit the content of their essays to the information in the passage, then they will give the impression that they have not read the whole text.

Candidates need to find a 'happy balance' between 'assuming that the Examiner knows nothing' and 'remembering that the Examiner has also read the text'. Although narration irrelevant to the question is not required, candidates should begin to answer the question at the beginning, but should not hold back from showing knowledge of the texts. This was successfully done by, for example, referring to characters initially by their surnames and thereafter varying the words, including the use of short, apt descriptions or quotations.

It was evident that Centres had used past questions when preparing their candidates, and detailed knowledge was shown in those areas. Candidates should select the question they choose to answer carefully, though, and ensure that their material is relevant. Sometimes the material was tailored efficiently and relevantly to this session's questions.

Some candidates did not identify which question they were answering and it was not clear until half way through, if at all. Candidates are advised to choose carefully either **(a)** or **(b)** and to provide as complete and relevant an answer to that one question as possible. If **(i)**, **(ii)** and **(iii)** are not written before each answer, and the language of the question is not used in the response, it will not be clear to the Examiner whether a relevant answer is being given or not.

Repetition does not make a good impression if points are not developed on the second and subsequent occasions on which they are mentioned.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Section 1**

#### **Question 1**

Molière: *L'Avare*

- (a)** Of all the passage-based questions in this paper, this was the one in which candidates showed least evidence of knowledge beyond the extract. They needed to show in **(i)** that they knew that Mariane had come to meet her potential husband, in order to demonstrate to Examiners that they had read the play.

To answer **(ii)** successfully, candidates needed to remember that Cléante wanted to court Mariane, but had no money with which to do so. In this extract, he amusingly exploited an opportunity to lavish an expensive gift on Mariane at his father's expense and against his will, with the excuse that his father's prospective wife was worthy of them. Cléante trapped Harpagon, who could not openly refuse the giving of the gifts (though he did 'à part') without spoiling the betrothal. Neither could Mariane really be rude enough to refuse the gifts. As Harpagon rebuked Cléante, the son apologised, but not for giving the gift, as Harpagon would have wanted, but for the difficulty he was experiencing in persuading Mariane to accept it! Unfortunately some candidates did not enter into the light-hearted spirit of the play, but reproached Cléante for bad behaviour, unworthy of a son. Some thought that Cléante primarily wanted to annoy Harpagon, going on to argue that this would cause him to become angry, upon which Mariane would reject him. Again this did not seem to reflect Cléante's good-natured conduct in this passage and the humorous tone of the play.

There was some overemphasis on potential 'comique de geste' in **(iii)** rather than seizing on the words: the ambiguity in the fact that Harpagon was too mean to give expensive gifts, but was

powerless to prevent it, despite his protests; Cléante had no money, so could not fund his own generosity, but was enabled to show generosity to his beloved by the circumstances, against the odds; Cléante could do this, pretending that he was trying to please his father – something that Harpagon could not really argue with for fear of deterring Mariane – while also speaking disarmingly frankly/honestly, that he did not want Harpagon and Mariane to marry (as did Mariane). That opposition, together with the exaggerated kindness that he was showing, supposedly on Harpagon's behalf, as well as the duality between Cléante's glee and Harpagon's annoyance, all contributed to the comedy of the situation.

- (b) Harpagon was afraid that the people around him would find his hidden money – which they did after he talked about it so much! But we laugh at the irony of this, not so much at his *fear*. Candidates found it easier to discuss comedy than to address the possibility of fear, particularly '*peur du monde*'. Some candidates discussed '*méfiance*' rather than '*peur*'. It was refreshing when candidates '*challenged*' the statement, releasing them from conforming to its parameters so that they could investigate, for example, that the readers/spectators laugh at more than just Harpagon and his situation, but also at his foibles, as well as the irony of wanting so much to keep a secret, but inadvertently '*leaking*' it.

## Question 2

Maupassant: *Bel-Ami*

Candidates appeared enthusiastic about this new text, and there was every indication that they had coped well with its length and had enjoyed the novel.

- (a) Despite the variety of women who had reason to speak angrily to Duroy at various points in the novel, in answer to (i) candidates correctly identified the woman in the extract as Clotilde de Marelle. They could also explain Mme de Marelle's outburst as following on from hearing the news from her husband of Duroy's impending marriage to Suzanne Walter, not even from Duroy himself, whom she accused of hiding the news from her for three months. Some thought that she was jealous and angry to be rejected, and she did suggest that she had been retained between Duroy's divorce and remarriage '*pour faire l'intérim*', but their liaison had survived his marriage to Madeleine. More thoughtful answers pointed this out, as well as her recovery from other previous '*outbursts*' (meeting Rachel, and finding Virginie Walter's hair wound around Duroy's buttons), although this time was acknowledged as the most angry.

Candidates extracted relevant points from the passage in answer to (ii). Duroy had told Mme de Marelle before that he would have married her if she had not already been married (2e Partie, Ch. I). Meanwhile, he stood to become very rich by marrying Suzanne, and had been able to settle the matter with her parents. This probably contributed to Duroy's confident, self-righteous, haughty attitude in this extract as he adopted the moral high ground, telling Mme de Marelle to mind her language (line 9) and threatening her with eviction (line 17). Duroy and Suzanne had '*eloped*' and '*vivaient dans une intimité libre et chaste*', but anyone would, like Mme de Marelle, assume the opposite. Her '*mensonge l'exaspérait*' after this, causing Duroy to react with anger and violence.

This conversation took place at rue de Constantinople, 127, which Mme de Marelle had initially rented and which Duroy could not afford to pay for (though he later did '*de temps en temps*'), so in answer to (iii) candidates tended to think that Mme de Marelle's indignation at being asked to leave was justified.

- (b) Candidates generally were able to describe how Duroy had little money at the start of the novel and much at the end, with some of the details of what happened in between. It was necessary to discuss the *importance* of money, though, and not just that '*the role of money was important*'. Of course, money was important to '*Du Roy*', and its interaction with power, political intrigue and social relationships sometimes forced him to moderate his greed. It was good to see the importance of money in the book considered, more than just that Duroy increased in wealth, but that money played an influential part in journalistic and political dealings, too. Furthermore, some candidates observed that Duroy's relationships with Rachel and Mme de Marelle suggested that money was not of ultimate importance.

### Question 3

Sartre: *Les Mouches*

- (a) The relations between Égisthe and the people were outlined in line 2 of the extract when he said, 'je ... les avais frappés de terreur', and he did this to keep them in slavery to remorse to maintain power. Égisthe forced his subjects to repent of the crime he had committed when he murdered Agamemnon, in an attempt to hold on to power. Candidates could usually explain this well in (i), making appropriate reference to the extract, although they sometimes did not pay attention to the final words of the question, 'dans cet extrait'.

Some attempts to analyse and compare were made in (ii) as it was pointed out that Clytemnestre was supportive of Égisthe, loyal to him and flattered him, including with his hateful attitude to her daughter, Électre. She was still capable of remorse, unlike Égisthe (lines 15-17).

Clytemnestre had asked Égisthe in line 4 whether 'all he was worried about' was that the people would give up their remorse in a flash. In lines 6-7 he said, 'je regrette d'avoir dû punir Électre', even though Clytemnestre replied in line 8, 'Il vous a plu de le faire', and 'Vous n'aimiez pas Électre' in line 11. As he said in line 12, Égisthe was weary, of the black clothes, etc., and envied Clytemnestre for her remorse (lines 16-17). He was also conscious of the king's presence (line 23). Occasionally there was some lack of care as candidates expanded on Égisthe's 'regret' in (iii). If it was equated with 'remords', this contradicted his utterance in line 17.

- (b) Candidates choosing this question proved themselves competent to address both parts of the question and to relate the issues to Sartre's own views and to what the author was seeking to communicate through this play.

### Question 4

Alain-Fournier: *Le Grand Meaulnes*

- (a) Most candidates handled (ii) well, mentioning that Seurel himself was surprised and curious about the mystery surrounding 'le bohémien' and thought that the others would be, too. It was interesting that, while some struggled to say much in answer to (i) or (iii), sometimes falling into the trap of storytelling rather than tackling the question, others, in simple ways, made quite sensitive comments, such as contrasting François, usually the quiet observer, as the one with stories to tell the 'compagnons' in the extract in (i), or noting François' mixed emotions as he feels that he has betrayed Meaulnes' confidence in (iii). Also his gratitude towards Frantz, who supplied more detail on the map and gave Meaulnes Yvonne's address in Paris, combined with frustration that things had been so mysterious, violent at times, and generally difficult with him.
- (b) Candidates almost always agreed with the statement in the question, that to criticise the impossibility of the situations and the absurdity of some characters was to ignore the value of the novel, yet it was good to see nuances in the essays, such that improbable situations (there was more on situations than on characters) were highlighted, but sometimes also defended as possible coincidences (Frantz de Galais and companions stumbling across Sainte-Agathe; Augustin Meaulnes meeting Valentine Blondeau; François Seurel piecing together Valentine's story from an aunt, and finally meeting Yvonne de Galais through another uncle; Meaulnes and Yvonne actually marrying). Definitions of 'critiquer' were not generally offered, but 'find fault with' seemed to be understood universally, rather than, 'pass judgement with respect to merits or faults'.

### Section 2

#### Question 5

Mauriac: *Thérèse Desqueyroux*

- (a) The description was 'challenged' by at least a quarter of candidates, who felt that Thérèse was not at liberty to rebel or revolt, and had no choice but to submit first to her father's wishes and then to her husband's. In terms of identifying 'révolte' in the novel, the question was approached in a wide variety of ways, with Thérèse seen, for example, as breaking out of:

- The expectations associated with her gender: reading, and smoking heavily, portrayed in the novel as 'unlike most women'
- The bourgeois society, preoccupied with property
- The family, as her forebear Julie Bellade had before her
- The intellectual limitations of the rural area, as her horizons were widened, evident in her conversation with Jean Azévédo
- An unloving marriage, fuelled by her jealousy at Anne's relationship

And even:

- The family reacting against Thérèse
- Bernard isolating her

The most detailed answers considered all of the points above and evaluated the extent to which the novel could be described as 'le roman de la révolte'.

- (b) This question was not that popular and most opted to answer (a) on this text. Throughout the novel, Thérèse experienced ups and downs: her transition into adulthood and a marriage which did not live up to her expectations marked a decline for her, which was exacerbated as she became jealous to learn of Anne's love. Her conversation with Jean left her inspired, but was followed by a period of isolation. Her ultimate destiny was uncertain as she started out in Paris at the end of the novel. The possibility was also there for candidates to define 'spiritual' in either a religious or intellectual aspect, or both.

### Question 6

Giraudoux: *La guerre de Troie n'aura pas lieu*

- (a) Some candidates wrote on 'destin' in general, sometimes without a single mention of 'victime piégée', which was required as evidence of having 'understood the demands of the question' for 14-15 marks.
- (b) There were few essays on Priam. He had a certain importance as king. Perhaps being too indulgent a father of Pâris might have been a more fitting criticism to level than this one: 'Priam n'est qu'un orgueilleux obsédé par sa propre importance'. These words might more suitably describe other characters.

### Question 7

Bazin: *Au nom du fils*

- (a) There was evidence of good knowledge of the text in the responses to this question about M. Astin's relationships with his twins, the academically successful son, Michel, and Louise, the insouciant daughter to whom the widower could be said to have had more difficulty relating. Candidates also wanted to discuss Bruno, but the most successful ones kept this to a minimum and would have done better to omit it altogether.
- (b) Marie Germin had said that she did not despise Daniel Astin – she pitied him. Daniel had not married her when they were younger because his mother opposed it. When they encountered each other later, he was again prevented from marrying her because of his children's opposition. It was expected that candidates might find it pitiable that Daniel had been manipulated by others at these key points in his life.

### Question 8

Joffo: *Un sac de billes*

- (a) On the subject of 'l'influence de l'église chrétienne', candidates could readily point out the help received by the boys from its representatives. More interesting points for contrast and comparison related, for example, to the Nazis' attitudes to the church, the Manceliers, who went to mass but were anti-semitic, or the 'dishonesty' of those who lied about Joseph and Maurice's connections with the Christian church, despite showing kindness and compassion to the children.

- (b) This was by far the more popular question of the two and it produced a number of fairly comprehensive responses.

Joseph and Maurice certainly lodged with people who would not have been sympathetic to their Jewish background if they had known about it. Even their sister did not feel able to shelter them. However they fell back on a lot of people in trust, and amazingly, things worked out for good for them.

Distrust was an indispensable attitude in the story (implying that the boys needed to be suspicious of others) where it was a matter of life or death, but not only because, 'les apparences sont souvent trompeuses'. Of course, the statement is true, though, and the boys themselves were able to mislead the police at moments when they came under suspicion, and to trust and receive the help of people who hid Jews.