

Вариант 1

стр. 1 из 6

ЗАДАНИЕ 1

1. Цивилизационный подход к изучению истории культуры. О. Шпенглер / А. Тойнби.
2. Восприятие западноевропейского искусства русской культурой Нового времени (XVIII-нач. XX вв.).

ЗАДАНИЕ 2

ЛЕКСИКО-ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИЙ ТЕСТ

You are going to read an article. For questions 1-10, read the text below and decide which answer (A, B, or C) best fits each gap.

One of the most fascinating personalities of late 19th century art, Whistler was flamboyant in his lifestyle, but subtle and deeply thoughtful in his approach to painting. Whistler led a cosmopolitan life: an American by birth, he lived in Russia as a boy and spent most of his career in London and Paris (he also worked memorably in Venice). The artist's mother, Anna McNeill Whistler (1804–81), (1) A in 1849. She left America in 1863 to escape the Civil War and moved to London to live with her son.

A few years after this, he began using musical terms—such as symphony, nocturne, or arrangement—in the titles of his paintings. This practice expressed his belief that painting was more concerned (2) with formal qualities—lines, shapes, colors—than the ostensible subject. Other artists of the time shared this view, but Whistler was a particularly strong and influential spokesman for the “art for (3) art's sake” doctrine because of his personal magnetism and his way with words. “As music is the poetry of sound, so is painting the poetry of sight, and the subject matter has nothing (4) to do with the harmony of sound or of color,” he wrote in 1878; and at the same time he commented on this work, “to me it is interesting as a picture of my mother; but what can or ought the public to care about the identity of the portrait?”

Arrangement in Grey and Black, No. 1 was first exhibited at the Royal Academy, London, in 1872. Initially the selection committee rejected it, but Sir William Boxall, the Director of the National Gallery, London, and a friend of Whistler, used his influence to have it (5) accepted. In general the portrait was poorly received, but it also had admirers, (6) notably the great writer Thomas Carlyle, who thought it had “massive originality.” Soon afterward, Whistler painted a portrait of Carlyle in a similar vein, *Arrangement in Grey and Black, No. 2* (1872–73). In 1891, it was bought by the City of Glasgow in Scotland, making it the first Whistler painting (7) acquired by a public collection. This was a milestone in Whistler's fortunes, and (8) that year the portrait of his mother was bought by the French state, which had made him a knight of the Légion d'Honneur in 1889.

He became one of the best-known figures in London's artistic and literary circles, partly because of his talent, but also because of his wit, dandyism, and love of controversy. Many critics thought that his work, which was atmospheric and restrained, looked unfinished, and in 1877 he sued one of them, the famous John Ruskin, for (9) accusing him of “flinging a pot of paint in the public's face.”

Whistler won the case, but the judge awarded him derisory (10) damages and the legal costs led to his bankruptcy in 1879. He recovered, however, and his reputation was restored.

1	A. widowed	B. was widowed	C. was widowing
2	A. with	B. to	C. about
3	A. art	B. arts	C. art's
4	A. to do	B. doing	C. done
5	A. to accept	B. accepting	C. accepted
6	A. noting	B. noted	C. notably
7	A. being acquired	B. to be acquired	C. having acquired
8	A. later	B. latter	C. late
9	A. to accuse	B. accusing	C. being accused
10	A. damaged	B. damage	C. damages

ФРАЗОВАЯ СВЯЗНОСТЬ

You are going to read an excerpt from a book. Read the text and fill in the blanks (1-10) with the words from the list. One word is extra.

- | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| adopting | 5 exposing | relates |
| 2 bemoaned | 10 matters | 7 rooted |
| 4 come | put | 3 sought |
| 1 evolved | 8 reflecting | |

Postmodernism is in many ways the post-positivist theory par excellence. It is an approach that is based above all on the questioning of knowledge claims, and focused on exposing the linkages between knowledge creation and power. For postmodernists like the critical theorists, knowledge and our understanding of the world are not neutral or 'common-sense' but reflect dominant power relations in society.

As an approach within International Relations, postmodernism is very much at the margins of the discipline. In part, this is because of the way in which it (1) exists outside of the social sciences in areas such as literary criticism and cultural studies. However, international relations has been especially hostile to the development of a postmodernist perspective. Critics have (2) bemoaned the usage of the highly theoretical language of postmodern analysis and have challenged the attack on scientific standards – asking how can rigorous theories that have practical applications in the 'real world' be developed without some attachment to basic social scientific principles. In response, postmodernists argue that postmodernism should not be judged by the same standards as the positivist and classical theories of IR that (3) sought to define certain 'facts' about the world.

For postmodernists the purpose of their intellectual project is not to (4) come up with a testable theory of how the world works, but rather to bring critical and normative concerns into the realm of IR by (5) exposing the power structures that produce the mainstream theoretical categories.

Central to the postmodernist approach, then, is an attack on something called metanarratives – theories tied to a particular set of 'truth claims' about the world. Postmodernists suggest that (6) is a foundational epistemology (a view of the world (7) rooted in such truth claims) is highly problematic. This is because they suggest that there can be no objective knowledge of the world – no basis upon which we can make these claims to a universal position of 'truth'. So the supposed objectivity of a theory such as neo-realism is exposed as (8) more the subjective biases,

assumptions and identities of those scholars who (9) put forward neo-realist theories of IR. That most neo-realist scholars were white middle class men based in North America (10) matter to postmodernists because this positioning as members of one of the most highly privileged groups in society plays a role in shaping their view of the world and their theoretical disposition towards it.

ЗАДАНИЕ 3

ПОНИМАНИЕ ПИСЬМЕННОГО ТЕКСТА

You are going to read an extract from an essay by George Orwell. For questions 1-10, read the text below and choose the answer (A, B, or C) which you think fits best according to the text.

Mr Wells, like Dickens, belongs to the non-military middle class. The thunder of guns, the jingle of spurs, the catch in the throat when the old flag goes by, leave him manifestly cold. He has an invincible hatred of the fighting, hunting, swashbuckling side of life, symbolised in all his early books by a violent propaganda against horses. The principal villain of his OUTLINE OF HISTORY is the military adventurer, Napoleon. If one looks through nearly any book that he has written in the last forty years one finds the same idea constantly recurring: the supposed antithesis between the man of science who is working towards a planned World State and the reactionary who is trying to restore a disorderly past. In novels, Utopias, essays, films, pamphlets, the antithesis crops up, always more or less the same. On the one side science, order, progress, internationalism, aeroplanes, steel, concrete, hygiene: on the other side war, nationalism, religion, monarchy, peasants, Greek professors, poets, horses. History as he sees it is a series of victories won by the scientific man over the romantic man. Now, he is probably right in assuming that a "reasonable", planned form of society, with scientists rather than witch-doctors in control, will prevail sooner or later, but that is a different matter from assuming that it is just round the corner. There survives somewhere or other an interesting controversy which took place between Wells and Churchill at the time of the Russian Revolution. Wells accuses Churchill of not really believing his own propaganda about the Bolsheviks being monsters dripping with blood etc, but of merely fearing that they were going to introduce an era of common sense and scientific control, in which flag-wavers like Churchill himself would have no place. Churchill's estimate of the Bolsheviks, however, was nearer the mark than Wells's. The early Bolsheviks may have been angels or demons, according as one chooses to regard them, but at any rate they were not sensible men. They were not introducing a Wellsian Utopia but a Rule of the Saints, which, like the English Rule of the Saints, was a military despotism enlivened by witchcraft trials. The same misconception reappears in an inverted form in Wells's attitude to the Nazis. Hitler is all the war-lords and witch doctors in history rolled into one. Therefore, argues Wells, he is an absurdity, a ghost from the past, a creature doomed to disappear almost immediately. But unfortunately the equation of science with common sense does not really hold good. The aeroplane, which was looked forward to as a civilising influence but in practice has hardly been used except for dropping bombs, is the symbol of that fact. Modern Germany is far more scientific than England, and far more barbarous. Much of what Wells has imagined and worked for is physically there in Nazi Germany. The order, the planning, the State encouragement of science, the steel, the concrete, the aeroplanes, are all there, but all in the service of ideas

appropriate to the Stone Age. Science is fighting on the side of superstition. But obviously it is impossible for Wells to accept this. It would contradict the world-view on which his own works are based. The war-lords and the witch-doctors MUST fail, the common-sense World State, as seen by a nineteenth-century liberal whose heart does not leap at the sound of bugles, MUST triumph. Treachery and defeatism apart, Hitler CANNOT be a danger. That he should finally win would be an impossible reversal of history, like a Jacobite restoration.

But is it not a sort of parricide for a person of my age (thirty-eight) to find fault with H.G. Wells? Thinking people who were born about the beginning of this century are in some sense Wells's own creation. How much influence any mere writer has, and especially a "popular" writer whose work takes effect quickly, is questionable, but I doubt whether anyone who was writing books between 1900 and 1920, at any rate in the English language, influenced the young so much. The minds of all of us, and therefore the physical world, would be perceptibly different if Wells had never existed. Only, just the singleness of mind, the one-sided imagination that made him seem like an inspired prophet in the Edwardian age, make him a shallow, inadequate thinker now. When Wells was young, the antithesis between science and reaction was not false. Society was ruled by narrow-minded, profoundly incurious people, predatory businessmen, dull squires, bishops, politicians who could quote Horace but had never heard of algebra. Science was faintly disreputable and religious belief obligatory. Traditionalism, stupidity, snobbishness, patriotism, superstition and love of war seemed to be all on the same side; there was need of someone who could state the opposite point of view. Back in the nineteen-hundreds it was a wonderful experience for a boy to discover H.G. Wells. There you were, in a world of pedants, clergymen and golfers and here was this wonderful man who could tell you about the inhabitants of the planets and the bottom of the sea, and who knew that the future was not going to be what respectable people imagined. A decade or so before aeroplanes were technically feasible Wells knew that within a little while men would be able to fly. He knew that because he himself wanted to be able to fly, and therefore felt sure that research in that direction would continue. On the other hand, even when I was a little boy, at a time when the Wright brothers had actually lifted their machine off the ground for fifty-nine seconds, the generally accepted opinion was that if God had meant us to fly He would have given us wings. Up to 1914 Wells was in the main a true prophet. In physical details his vision of the new world has been fulfilled to a surprising extent.

But because he belonged to the nineteenth century and to a non-military nation and class, he could not grasp the tremendous strength of the old world which was symbolised in his mind by fox-hunting Tories. He was, and still is, quite incapable of understanding that nationalism, religious bigotry and feudal loyalty are far more powerful forces than what he himself would describe as sanity. Creatures out of the Dark Ages have come marching into the present, and if they are ghosts they are at any rate ghosts which need a strong magic to lay them. The people who have shown the best understanding of Fascism are either those who have suffered under it or those who have a Fascist streak in themselves. A crude book like THE IRON HEEL, written nearly thirty years ago, is a truer prophecy of the future than either BRAVE NEW WORLD or THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME. If one had to choose among Wells's own contemporaries a writer who could stand towards him as a corrective, one might choose Kipling, who was not deaf to the evil voices of power and military "glory". Kipling would have understood the appeal of Hitler, or for that matter

of Stalin, whatever his attitude towards them might be. Wells is too sane to understand the modern world. The succession of lower-middle-class novels which are his greatest achievement stopped short at the other war and never really began again, and since 1920 he has squandered his talents in slaying paper dragons. But how much it is, after all, to have any talents to squander.

1. H. Wells is presented as

- A. an opponent of violence.
- B. an unsympathetic person.
- C. a supporter of the conservative British Party.

2. G. Orwell considers H. Wells to be

- A. close-minded.
- B. middle-brow.
- C. prone to a drastic change of views.

3. The world order that H. Wells keeps prophesying is

- A. is here to stay.
- B. a thing of the past.
- C. feasible but not immediately.

4. According to G. Orwell, the Soviet Union is an example of

- A. a religious democracy.
- B. a historical throwback rather than a leap forward.
- C. H. Wells' long-awaited prophesy uncannily coming true.

5. Which aphorism does the example of the airplane serve an illustration of in the text?

- A. The aeroplane has unveiled for us the true face of the earth.
- B. There are aphorisms that, like airplanes, stay up only while they are in motion.
- C. Technological progress is comparable to an axe in the hands of a pathological criminal.

6. G. Orwell believes that H. Wells, though against romanticism,

- A. ironically, is a romantic himself when it comes to his conviction that the good will prevail.
- B. feels that the disorder romanticism entails is not at odds with the order progress brings about.
- C. admired Napoleon and suspected that Hitler, Stalin and the likes of them were the last romantics.

7. H. Wells' vision of the future

- A. was progressive only to become reactionary around the turn of the century.
- B. was predominantly frowned upon by the young generation G. Orwell belonged to.
- C. predicted the exact date of World War I and included its crude details and outcome.

8. G. Orwell comes to a sad conclusion that

- A. H. Wells was right in his predictions.
- B. the old cruel world is back and is not loosening its grip on the power it has gained.
- C. the authors of dystopias are no longer accurate in their prophecies because they are not fascists.

9. From the comparison with H. Wells, it can be inferred that R. Kipling was

- A. a pacifist.
- B. a supporter of the political regime in the Soviet Union.
- C. not completely lucid or immune to the zest for war and power.

10. In the last paragraph of the text, it is implied that H. Wells is

- A. poor.
- B. rational but naïve.
- C. admired for his knack of wasting talent.