

## 武汉科技大学

### 2007 年硕士研究生入学考试试题

考试科目代码及名称：336 专业综合（基础英语占三分之二，语言学占三分之一）

共 9 页（不包括答题页）

说明： 1. 适用招生专业：外国语言学及应用语言学

2. 答题内容写在答题纸上，写在试卷或草稿纸上一律无效。

#### Section One ADVANCED ENGLISH (90%)

I. Explain each of the following cultural figures or terms briefly: (15%)

1. Winston Churchill
2. Pablo Picasso
3. National Geographic Magazine
4. The Declaration of Independence
5. Norman Conquest

II. Identify the figures of speech used in the following underlined parts of the sentences. (10%)

1. I see the German bombers and fighters in the sky, still smarting from many a British whipping, delighted to find what they believe is an easier and a safer prey.
2. Seldom has a city gained such world renown, and I am proud and happy to welcome you to Hiroshima, a town known throughout the world for its—oysters.
3. Mark Twain gained a keen perception of the human race, of the difference between what people claim to be and what they really are.
4. Beautiful she was. She was not yet of pin-up proportions, but I felt sure that time would supply the lack.
5. There is a limit to what flesh and blood can bear.

III. Vocabulary (10%)

For each of the italicized items, there follow four choices. Choose the one that most closely represent the meaning of the italicized word.

您所下载的资料来源于 kaoyan.com 考研资料下载中心  
获取更多考研资料，请访问 <http://download.kaoyan.com>

1. *aborigines*

- |                          |             |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| A. first designs         | B. concepts |
| C. primitive inhabitants | D. finales  |

2. *clandestine*

- |           |             |
|-----------|-------------|
| A. secret | B. tangible |
| C. doomed | D. approved |

3. *dubious*

- |             |             |
|-------------|-------------|
| A. external | B. straight |
| C. sincere  | D. doubtful |

4. *decimate*

- |           |             |
|-----------|-------------|
| A. kill   | B. disgrace |
| C. search | D. collide  |

5. *tenacious*

- |                 |                 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| A. intentional  | B. collecting   |
| C. holding fast | D. fast running |

6. *robust*

- |              |               |
|--------------|---------------|
| A. violent   | B. villainous |
| C. voracious | D. vigorous   |

7. *pious*

- |              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| A. historic  | B. devout        |
| C. fortunate | D. authoritative |

8. *pariah*

- |            |               |
|------------|---------------|
| A. village | B. outcast    |
| C. disease | D. benefactor |

9. *incentive*

- |                |               |
|----------------|---------------|
| A. objective   | B. simulation |
| C. stimulation | D. beginning  |

10. *reiterate*

- |           |            |
|-----------|------------|
| A. revive | B. repeat  |
| C. return | D. revenge |

IV. Reading Comprehension (55%)

Passage One

The following passage is followed by 4 multiple-choice questions. Read the passage and decide on the best answer (8%):

The conflict between good and evil is a common theme running through the great literature and drama of the world, from the time of the ancient Greeks to all the present. The principle that conflict is the heart of dramatic action when illustrated by concrete examples, almost always turns up some aspect of the struggle between good and evil.

The idea that there is neither good nor evil—in any absolute moral or religious sense—is widespread in our times. There are various relativistic and behavioristic standards of ethics. If these standards even admit the distinction between good and evil, it is as a relative matter and not as whirlwind of choices that lies at the center of living. In any such state of mind, conflict can at best, be only a pretty matter, lacking true universality. The acts of the evildoer and of the virtuous man alike become dramatically neutralized. Imagine the reduced effect of *Crime and Punishment* or *The Brothers Karamazoc* had Dostoevsky thought that good and evil, as portrayed in those books, were wholly relative, and if he had had no conviction about them.

You can't have a vital literature if you ignore or shun evil. What you get then is the world of Pollyanna, goody-goody in place of the good. *Cry, The Beloved Country* is a great and dramatic novel because Alan Paton, in addition to being a skilled workman, sees with clear eyes both good and evil, differentiates them, pitches them into conflict with each other, and takes sides. He sees that the native boy Absalom Kumalo, who has murdered, cannot be judged justly without taking into account the environment that has had part in shaping them. But Paton sees, too, that Absalom the individual, not society the abstraction, committed the act and is responsible for it. Mr. Paton understands mercy. He knows that this precious thing is not evoked by sentimental impulse, but by a searching examination of the realities of human action. Mercy follows a judgment; it does not precede it.

One of the novels by the talents Paul Bowles, *Let It Come Down*, is full of motion, full of sensational depravities, and is a crashing bore. The book recognizes no good, admits no evil, and is coldly indifferent to the

moral behavior of its characters. It is a long shrug. Such a view of life is nondramatic and negates the vital essence of drama.

1. In our age, according to the author, a standpoint often taken in the area of ethics is the \_\_\_\_\_.
  - A. relativistic view of morals
  - B. greater concern with religion
  - C. emphasis on evil
  - D. greater concern with universals
2. The author believes that in great literature, as in life, good and evil are \_\_\_\_\_.
  - A. relative terms
  - B. to be ignored
  - C. constantly in conflict
  - D. dramatically neutralized
3. When the author uses the expression "it is a long shrug in referring to Bowles's book, he is commenting on the \_\_\_\_\_.
  - A. length of the novel
  - B. indifference to the moral behavior of the characters
  - C. monotony of the story
  - D. sensational depravities of the book
4. In the opinion of the author, *Cry, The Beloved Country* is a great and dramatic novel because of Paton's \_\_\_\_\_.
  - A. insight into human behavior
  - B. behavioristic beliefs
  - C. treatment of good and evil as abstractions
  - D. willingness to make moral judgments

#### Passage Two: Lucidity, Simplicity, Euphony

I have never had much patience with the writers who claim from the reader an effort to understand their meaning.(1) You have only to go to the great philosophers to see that it is possible to express with lucidity the most subtle reflections. You may find it difficult to understand the thought of Hume, and if you have no philosophical training its implications will doubtless escape you; but no one with any education at all can fail to understand exactly what the meaning of each sentence is. Few people have written English with more grace than Berkeley. There are two sorts of obscurity that you find in writers. One is due to negligence and the other to wilfulness. People often write obscurely because they have never taken the trouble to learn to write clearly. This sort of obscurity you find

too often in modern philosophers, in men of science, and even in literary critics. Here it is indeed strange. You would have thought that men who passed their lives in the study of the great masters of literature would be sufficiently sensitive to the beauty of language to write if not beautifully at least with perspicuity. (2) Yet you will find in their works sentence after sentence that you must read twice to discover the sense. Often you can only guess at it, for the writers have evidently not said what they intended.

Another cause of obscurity is that the writer is himself not quite sure of his meaning. He has a vague impression of what he wants to say, but has not, either from lack of mental power or from laziness, exactly formulated it in his mind and it is natural enough that he should not find a precise expression for a confused idea. This is due largely to the fact that many writers think, not before, but as they write. The pen originates the thought. (3) The disadvantage of this, and indeed it is a danger against which the author must be always on his guard, is that there is a sort of magic in the written word. The idea acquires substance by taking on a visible nature, and then stands in the way of its own clarification. (4) But this sort of obscurity merges very easily into the willful. Some writers who do not think clearly are inclined to suppose that their thoughts have a significance greater than at first sight appears. It is flattering to believe that they are too profound to be expressed so clearly that all who run may read, and very naturally it does not occur to such writers that the fault is with their own minds which have not the faculty of precise reflection. (5) Here again the magic of the written word obtains. It is very easy to persuade oneself that a phrase that one does not quite understand may mean a great deal more than one realizes. From this there is only a little way to go to fall into the habit of setting down one's impressions in all their original vagueness. Fools can always be found to discover a hidden sense in them. There is another form of willful obscurity that masquerades as aristocratic exclusiveness. The author wraps his meaning in mystery so that the vulgar shall not participate in it. His soul is a secret garden into which the elect may penetrate only after overcoming a number of perilous obstacles. But this kind of obscurity is not only pretentious; it is short-sighted. For time plays it an odd trick. If the sense is meager time reduces it to a meaningless verbiage that no one thinks of reading. (6)

Simplicity is not such an obvious merit as lucidity. I have aimed at it because I have no gift for richness. Within limits I admire richness in others, though I find it difficult to digest in quantity. (7) I can read one page of Ruskin with delight, but twenty only with weariness. The rolling period, the stately epithet, the noun rich in poetic associations, the subordinate clauses that give the sentence weight and magnificence, the grandeur like that of wave following wave in the open sea; there is no doubt that in all this there is something inspiring. Words thus strung together fall on the ear like music. The appeal is sensuous rather than intellectual, and the beauty of the sound leads you easily to conclude that you need not bother about the meaning. But words are tyrannical things, they exist for their meanings, and if you will not pay attention to these, you cannot pay attention at all. Your mind wanders. This kind of writing demands a subject that will suit it. It is surely out of place to write in the grand style of inconsiderable things.

But if richness needs gifts with which everyone is not endowed, simplicity by no means comes by nature. (8) To achieve it needs rigid discipline. So far as I know ours is the only language in which it has been found necessary to give a name to the piece of prose which is described as the purple patch; it would not have been necessary to do so unless it were characteristic. English prose is elaborate rather than simple. It was not always so. Nothing could be more racy, straightforward and alive than the prose of Shakespeare; but it must be remembered that this was dialogue written to be spoken. We do not know how he would have written if like Corneille he had composed prefaces to his plays. It may be that they would have been as euphuistic as the letters of Queen Elizabeth. But earlier prose, the prose of Sir Thomas More, for instance, is neither ponderous, flowery nor oratorical. It smacks of the English soil. To my mind King James's Bible has been a very harmful influence on English prose. I am not so stupid as to deny its great beauty. It is majestic. But the Bible is an oriental book. Its alien imagery has nothing to do with us.

Those hyperboles, those luscious metaphors, are foreign to our genius. (9) I cannot but think that not the least of the misfortunes that the Secession from Rome brought upon the spiritual life of our country is that this work for so long a period became the daily, and with many the only, reading of our people. Those rhythms, that powerful vocabulary, that grandiloquence, became part and parcel of the national sensibility. The

plain, honest English speech was overwhelmed with ornament. Blunt English men twisted their tongues to speak like Hebrew prophets. There was evidently something in the English temper to which this was congenial, perhaps a native lack of precision in thought, perhaps a naïve delight in fine words for their own sake, an innate eccentricity and love of embroidery, I do not know; but the fact remains that ever since, English prose has had to struggle against the tendency to luxuriance. When from time to time the spirit of the language has reasserted itself, as it did with Dryden and the writers of Queen Anne, it was only to be submerged once more by the pomposities of Gibbon and Dr. Johnson. (10) When English prose recovered simplicity with Hazlitt, the Shelley of the letters and Charles Lamb at his best, it lost it again with De Quincey, Carlyle, Meredith and Walter Pater. It is obvious that the grand style is more striking than the plain. Indeed many people think that a style that does not attract notice is not style. They will admire Walter Pater's but will read an essay by Mathew Arnold without giving a moment's attention to the elegance, distinction and sobriety with which he set down what he had to say.

The dictum that the style is the man is well known. It is one of those aphorisms that say too much to mean a great deal. Where is the man in Goethe, in his birdlike lyrics or in his clumsy prose? And Hazlitt? But I suppose that if a man has a confused mind he will write in a confused way, if his temper is capricious his prose will be fantastical, and if he has a quick, darting intelligence that is reminded by the matter in hand of a hundred things, he will, unless he has great self-control, load his pages with metaphor and simile. There is a great difference between the magniloquence of the Jacobean writers, who are intoxicated with the new wealth that had lately been brought into the language, and the turgidity of Gibbon and Dr. Johnson, who were the victims of bad theories. I can read every word that Dr. Johnson wrote with delight, for he had good sense, charm and wit. No one could have written better if he had not wilfully set himself to write in grand style. He knew good English when he saw it. No critic has praised Dryden's prose more aptly. He said of him that he appeared to have no art other than that of expressing with clearness what he thought with vigor. And one of his *Lives* he finished with the words: "Whoever wishes to attain an English style, familiar but not coarse, and elegant but not ostentatious, must give his days and nights to the volumes

of Addison.” (11) But when he himself sat down to write it was with a very different aim. He mistook the orotund for the dignified. He had not the good breeding to see that simplicity and naturalness are the truest marks of distinction.

Whether you ascribe importance to euphony, the last of the three characteristics that I mentioned, must depend on the sensitiveness of your ear. A great many readers, and many admirable writers, are devoid of this quality. Poets as we know have always made a great use of alliteration. They are persuaded that the repetition of a sound gives an effect of beauty. I do not think it does so in prose. It seems to me that in prose alliteration should be used only for a special reason; when used by accident it falls on the ear very disagreeably. But its accidental use is so common that one can only suppose that the sound of it is not universally offensive.(12) Many writers without distress will put two rhyming words together, join a monstrous long adjective to a monstrous long noun, or between the end of one word and the beginning of another have a conjunction of consonants that almost breaks your jaw. These are trivial and obvious instances. I mention them only to prove that if careful writers can do such things it is only because they have no ear. Words have weight, sound and appearance; it is only by considering these that you can write a sentence that is good to look at and good to listen to.

1. Paraphrase the underlined sentences in the article. (30%)

2. Write a summary of the passage in Chinese (Word limit: 160 words) (17%)

## Section Two LINGUISTICS (40%)

I. Define the following terms briefly: (20%)

1. syntax
2. context
3. diachronic linguistics
4. register
5. the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis:

II. It is widely recognized that language change is inevitable, constant and universal. With examples, provide explanations for some major factors that trigger language change. (20%)

---

**Section Three LANGUAGE TEACHING (20%)**

*What attitudes are there towards learners' errors in foreign (or second) language teaching? What do they think language teachers should do in the face of learners' errors?*

