

JUNIO 2015

PRUEBAS UNIFICADAS DE CERTIFICACIÓN

## COMPRENSIÓN DE LECTURA

Apellidos: .....

Nombre: .....

**Marca con una X lo que corresponda:**

- Alumno/a **OFICIAL** (Indica el nombre de tu profesor/a tutor/a durante el curso 2014-2015: .....)
- Alumno/a **LIBRE** Grupo: .....

**INSTRUCCIONES PARA LA REALIZACIÓN DE ESTE EJERCICIO:**

- Duración: **75 minutos**
- Este ejercicio consta de **dos tareas**. Deberás realizar las dos.
  - En la **tarea 1** deberás leer el texto de las páginas 2 y 3 y **completarlo con los enunciados que aparecen en la página 2**. Escribe la letra correspondiente a cada enunciado en el cuadro de respuestas. Hay dos enunciados que no debes usar. **Obtienes: 1 punto** por cada respuesta correcta; **0 puntos** por cada respuesta incorrecta o no dada.
  - En la **tarea 2** deberás leer el texto de las páginas 5 y 6, y **elegir la opción correcta** (A, B o C) para cada pregunta de la página 4. **Obtienes: 2 puntos** por cada respuesta correcta; **0 puntos** por cada respuesta incorrecta o no dada.
- **Muy importante: al final, comprueba que has elegido una sola opción (como en el ejemplo); si eliges dos opciones, se anula la respuesta a esa pregunta.**
- **No escribas en los cuadros** destinados a la calificación de las tareas.
- Sólo se admiten respuestas escritas con **bolígrafo azul o negro**.

**NO ESCRIBAS AQUÍ**

**PUNTUACIÓN DEL EJERCICIO: \_\_\_\_\_ / 30**

**CALIFICACIÓN:  Superado  No Superado**

C1

INGLÉS



**TAREA 1 - 14 puntos:** Read the text on pages 2 and 3. For gaps 1-14, choose the correct option from the list below. Note that capital letters and punctuation marks have been removed. There are TWO extra options you do not need to use. The first gap (0) is an example. Use the box provided.

A. and for targets use portraits of Russian leaders
B. appealed to the nation
C. can bring good by themselves
D. depicts a people
E. destroyed churches and shot priests
F. has an art film evoked such fierce debate
G. intersperses scenes from the film
H. is one of the most striking themes
I. like the state itself
J. may have gone, but
K. only leads to more disasters
L. part of a Kremlin crackdown on dissent
M. portrayal of modern Russia
N. the new church a Palace of Culture
O. to justify its sacred status
P. what a monster
Q. <del>which opened in Moscow earlier this month</del>

GAP	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
ANSWER	Q														
	✓														

PUNTOS: / 14

**Russian Leviathan**

Source: [www.economist.com](http://www.economist.com)

To those in the know, there are two Russian trailers for *Leviathan*, Andrei Zvyagintsev’s new film, 0. The official version nods at the praise that has already been showered on the film at the Cannes film festival and the Golden Globes, as well as its nomination for an Academy Award. It 1 with tributes and endorsements. “One of the few films that will stay in the history of cinema,” sang *Kommersant*, a Russian daily. “A masterpiece”, declared *Le Figaro*, a French one. “Zvyagintsev is one of the great directors of our time,” opined the *Irish Times*. The second trailer, posted on YouTube, is a spoof. The rolling credits state: “The Zionist Occupation Government, US State Department, CIA and the world anti-Russian alliance present...” “A film made according to the principle of ‘shitsky-rusky’,” says Vladimir Medinsky, the Russian minister of culture. A “film made for the Western elites,” preaches Father Vsevolod Chaplin. “This film is dangerous to show to the Russians,” rules Irina Yarovaya, a deputy in the Russian parliament, the Duma.

*Leviathan* may not break new artistic ground but it has a lot to say about the Putin era. Rarely since Soviet times 2. It has been denigrated as heresy and slander by supporters of the state and the church, and praised by liberals who recognize its truths.

The film is set in Russia's desolate north. The main character, Nikolai, is a soulful car mechanic who lives in a wooden house by the Barents Sea with his frustrated wife and a depressed teenage son from an earlier marriage. His house and land are being taken from him by the state, represented here by a drunken and corrupt mayor who is closely advised by an Orthodox priest. Nikolai's friend, a lawyer, travels from Moscow to help him fight the mayor. But that 3. In the end, Nikolai loses his wife, his freedom and his house, which, in a final twist is bulldozed to make space for a new church that is inaugurated by the mayor and the priest, who preaches about patriotism and love for the Russian state.

Laden with biblical metaphor, drawn especially from the Book of Job, *Leviathan* is a hyperrealistic 4. One can almost feel the sweaty mayor's breath, with its reek of vodka and onion. To the film-makers, corruption is a process of decay and erosion. Boats are shown rusting in the sea; a giant whale's skeleton rots on the beach. Life, faith and the state are all steeped in corrosion.

Russia is as politicised as it was at the end of Soviet rule. Had *Leviathan* been made then, the mayor would have been a local party boss, 5 and the priest a KGB general. It would have been an anti-Soviet picture; today, it is an anticlerical one. The Soviet Union 6 the reverence for the state as an almost sacred force in Russia remains. The role played by communist ideology has been largely replaced by that of the Orthodox church, which, 7, has turned into something of a monster.

This metamorphosis of religion into ideology 8 both of *Leviathan* and of contemporary Russian life. The transformation should not be such a surprise. The Bolsheviks 9, but they also adopted Orthodox Christianity, borrowing its imagery and language to sanctify their rule. Josef Stalin, who trained as a cleric, 10 when the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union using the biblical "brothers and sisters" and enlisted the church as an ally during the war. Many priests maintained a close relationship with the KGB. That interaction left its mark.

Like the KGB, the church has adopted the role of guardian of the state. Just as the communists' ideology became a form of religion, religion has become an ideology, used by the godless state 11 and its right to break its own laws. The priest in *Leviathan* tells the mayor who faces elections that "all power is from God". All the mayor needs to do, he says, is to show authority and force, crushing an individual like Nikolai.

A few days before the film was released in Russia, Kirill, the patriarch of the Orthodox church, took to the floor of the Duma. He praised the Soviet era for breeding "solidarity" in people and lashed out at the depravity of the West. Neither Western freedoms nor laws, he argued, 12 without the fundamental values generated by the state—whether the Soviet Union or Russia.

*Leviathan* shines a light on the entanglement of church and state. Kirill was one of the first to call for Pussy Riot to be punished three years ago after the punk band staged an anticlerical performance in a Moscow cathedral, which is referred to in the film. That same cathedral had once been blown up by the Bolsheviks. It was rebuilt by the former mayor of Moscow, Yury Luzhkov, who also gave a flat to Kirill in the House on the Embankment, which was originally built for the Bolshevik leaders.

Thomas Hobbes himself could barely imagine 13 church and state have become. One Russian liberal essayist wrote that *Leviathan* 14 who have fallen from God. In today's Russia it is not the people, but the church itself, the film concludes, that has fallen.



**TAREA 2 - 16 puntos:** Read the text on pages 5 and 6. Choose the correct option (A, B, or C) to complete each sentence. The first one (0) is an example.

<b>The Jaipur Literature Festival</b>		<b>ANSWER</b>
<p><b>Ex : 0. When the writer says he “had expected a scrimmage”, he means...</b>  <b>A. ...he found basically what he had expected.</b>                      B. ...he had expected many more spectators.                      C. ...he hadn't imagined there would be so many spectators.</p>	<b>A</b>	<b>✓</b>
<p><b>1. The writer had been asked to talk about...</b>                      A. ...cooking.                      B. ...current affairs.                      C. ...sport.</p>		
<p><b>2. What initially surprised the writer about the audience was...</b>                      A. ...their age and attitude.                      B. ...their reluctance to join in.                      C. ...the noise they made.</p>		
<p><b>3. The prestige of this year's festival was guaranteed by...</b>                      A. ...the excellence of the audience's contributions.                      B. ...the high-profile literary figures who attended.                      C. ...the international showbiz celebrities who came.</p>		
<p><b>4. For the writer, the amazing thing about Naipaul's appearance was...</b>                      A. ...hearing him deliver his speech.                      B. ...his rapport with the audience.                      C. ...the fact that he actually came.</p>		
<p><b>5. In its early days, the festival...</b>                      A. ...once posed a threat to public safety.                      B. ...reflected the public's interest in literature.                      C. ...was damaged by the sponsor's poor planning.</p>		
<p><b>6. The festival's popularity today is a sign of how...</b>                      A. ...India consistently rejects intellectuals.                      B. ...India is hungry for artistic refinements.                      C. ...India's middle class is developing.</p>		
<p><b>7. Scandals and polemics ... the festival's appeal.</b>                      A. ...do not affect...                      B. ...often damage...                      C. ...only increase...</p>		
<p><b>8. The dialogues that take place at question-time tend to focus on ... issues.</b>                      A. ...historical...                      B. ...political...                      C. ...sporting...</p>		

<b>PUNTOS:</b>	/ 16
----------------	------



Apellidos y Nombre: .....

### The Jaipur Literature Festival

Source: [www.economist.com](http://www.economist.com)

I had expected a scrimmage. The organisers of the annual *Jaipur Literature Festival (JLF)*, held this year between January 21st and 25th, advertise it as the world’s “largest free literary festival”. Moreover, the topic I had been invited to speak on, Indian cricket and cricket writing, is popular. For added spice, my co-pañellists, the writer and politician Shashi Tharoor, had been making the news in India—he was interviewed by the police this month over the suspected murder of his wife.

All the same, the heaving, barging, chattering throng of a thousand or so people, packing the aisles and testing the walls of the auditorium to which I had been assigned, was remarkable and exhilarating. It was a much younger, livelier and more euphoric crowd than literary festivals usually attract. It wanted to be provoked, was eager to laugh and fought to be heard: as the microphones went around for questions, eager hands snatched at them.

The vastness, youth and exuberance of the crowd is by far the most distinctive thing about the Jaipur festival, which is by far the biggest of the many literary festivals launched in India in recent years. It is, by any measure, a high-class confab, with this year Sir V.S. Naipaul and Paul Theroux among a host of foreign writers in attendance, and Amartya Sen, Amit Chaudhuri and Arundhati Subramaniam among a greater number of Indian ones. Bollywood stars, prominent lawyers, politicians, artists, musicians and economists were also present, and many of the debates, in-conversations-with, poetry readings and diatribes were worth hearing.

Ms Subramaniam reciting her lyrical poems was a special delight; so was Salil Tripathi speaking, with quiet moral force, on Bangladesh’s independence war. To see Sir Vidia (V.S.Naipaul) was thrilling; albeit that the frail octogenarian, carted on and off stage on a stretcher—in a way he would once have described caustically—is past his prime as an orator. Overriding this, however, was the crazy Jaipur crowd.

When the festival was started, a decade ago, by the authors Namita Gokhale and William Dalrymple, it drew a dozen or so spectators. This year it attracted an estimated 80,000. And on the fourth day, with 20,000 packed into the disorderly old palace complex where it is held, and the queues for entry still growing, the police abruptly closed the gates. They feared a stampede was coming. But who were these people? And what were they coming for? Not many will have been great readers, because not many Indians are. The Indian market for serious books is small; there are not 30 good bookshops in the country and a work of non-fiction that sells 5,000 copies in hard-back is a best-seller. The *JLF* bookshop, run by *Amazon*, was tiny, given the size of the event, and a mess.

Most of the festival-revellers, members of the emerging Indian middle-class and drawn from Gurgaon, Delhi and Jaipur itself, had come for the age-old love of being where the action is in a crowded country. They had come for the Hindi dance music that blared from the tea stalls, the prospect of seeing a Bollywood star and, for those who could squeeze into the VIP areas, lots of free booze. The *JLF* is more a *mela*—an Asian fair—than a meeting of literary minds.

Only a minority in the crowd that parted for Sir Vidia's stretcher would have known who he was. Far fewer will have read any of his books. Yet this odd mix of elite refinement and mass entertainment is characteristic of India. It is evident in centuries of back-and-forth borrowing between courtly and folk traditions, in music, dance and poetry, and, in more recent times, in films and cricket. But the crowd also signalled something new: the gigantic ambition to get on, argue a case and wield influence that India's development is unleashing.

Asked why they had come, many of the revellers said they wanted to learn something. They had come in record numbers, in spite of this year's festival failing to cause the sort of headline controversy which it has stirred in the past. It has in previous years been beset by arguments with Hindu nationalists over its hosting of Pakistani artists, and with irate Muslims over its (foiled) attempt to host Sir Salman Rushdie. Mr Tharoor's decision to brave the festival this year, despite his scrape with the law, was a much smaller drama.

Most of all, this mass curiosity was evident in the questions asked from the floor, which were often unpolished but urgent, and almost always on big issues. In my cricket discussion, these concerned not just the future of Indian spin-bowling, but the issues of corruption, fairness, accountability, democracy and gender that are pressing for India, in cricket and far beyond it. Something similar happened in many of the sessions. A discussion of Hindi and English poetry triggered an argument over the relative merits of English and other Indian languages. A session on India's imperial past was, for some in the audience, not really about the past, but about the cruel, sparsely functional Indian state of today. A closing debate over the role of culture in politics was a tense argument about the creeping Hinduist agenda of India's current government.

This is why the mess and clamour of the *JLF* is so appropriate. Few of the big ideas and dramatic stories discussed by the writers it hosts are bigger or more dramatic than the emerging India parading around them. This new India, milling around the tea-stalls and auditoriums, is vaster than the canon and stranger than fiction. Its emergence will help shape the culture, high and low, of the English-speaking world.