

Part 2
 Questions 34-40
 correspond to
 questions 2
 6-12 in your
 test

Image and the city

- 34 (D) The writer says that the pictures are *brutally exact* (accurate in a way that could be considered cruel) in the sense that they *reproduce every detail of a style of life* (the use of the indefinite article 'a' here means that the writer is referring to one of many different styles of life that exist). He is therefore saying that they show accurately a particular lifestyle, the lifestyle of some people who live in cities. He then lists some of the features of that lifestyle (the kind of cigarette-lighter such people use, the kind of jewellery they wear and what they have in their homes), his point being that these things are shown in the pictures in advertisements.
- A: He says that people who live in cities are *barraged by* (receive an enormous number of) certain kinds of image and that a *very large proportion of the urban* (of a city) *landscape is taken up* (occupied) by advertisements, and he then talks about the content of the kinds of advertisements that are common in cities. However, he does not compare different kinds of advertisements or say or imply that some kinds work better in cities than other kinds do.
- B: He describes the way in which some advertisements are worded as *pert* (cheerful) and *facetious* (intended to amuse but in fact inappropriate) and says that they are *comically drowning in their own hyperbole* (they contain so much exaggeration that they are funny in a way not intended). He therefore does not consider them particularly clever, and he makes no reference to any difference between the impression they may create superficially and how clever they really are if you think about them more carefully.
- C: He talks about advertisements showing images of *folk heroes* (people regarded as heroes by ordinary

people) and gives examples of two – a man who becomes a *sophisticated dandy* (an old-fashioned word meaning 'fashionable man') as a result of drinking the drink being advertised, and the girl who becomes a *femme fatale* (a very attractive woman who causes problems for men who fall in love with her) as a result of using a small amount of the perfume being advertised. Since these people are 'folk heroes', his point is that the advertisements show people who others do want to be like.

- (A) The writer says that the images *radically conflict with each other* and that if you *swap* (exchange) the *details about between the pictures*, they are *instantly made illegible* (impossible to read) – an image in one advertisement would not look appropriate in another. He then says that the characters shown in advertisements are so different from each other that none of them has an *individual claim to speak for society as a whole*, and lists the different kinds of character shown in advertisements. He then says that these characters *provide a glossy mirror of the aspirations* (hopes, desires, ambitions) of a *representative city crowd*. His point therefore is that these images reflect what typical city dwellers want to be like, but that city dwellers themselves consist of different kinds of people with different aspirations.
- B: His point is that different images appeal to different kinds of people but that no single image is representative of people in general, since it is *exceedingly hard to discern* (notice) a *single dominant* (more powerful than any other) *style, an image of how most people would like to see themselves*. He is therefore saying that no images have a general appeal.
- C: His subject here is the extent to which images in advertisements are representative of the people who live in cities and he is clearly saying that some of them may be influenced by certain images and others may be influenced by other images. However, he at no stage compares city dwellers with people who don't live in cities, with regard to advertisements or anything else.
- D: He says that no single image is representative of every city dweller's aspirations but he does not say or imply that any are intended to be. He lists the different images – *clean-cut* (smart, tidy) people, *shaggy* (untidy and with a lot of hair) people, *rakes* (an old-fashioned word meaning 'immoral but attractive men'), *innocents* (naive people who lack experience and believe what they are told), *brutes* (cruel people), *home-lovers*, *adventurers* and *clowns* (idiots) – but his point is that they are all different from each other, not that any of them are intended to be representative of city dwellers as a whole.
- 36 (D) The writer says that the portraits of previous generations of movie stars had a *degree of romantic unparticularity* (romantic images that were all similar to each other), as if they were *communal dream projections of society at large* (representations of the fantasies of society in general) and that the only exceptions to this were the portraits of movie stars

who were known for their appearances in certain specific kinds of film – *westerns* (films about cowboys in the Wild West), *farces* (comedy films based on ridiculous misunderstandings) and *gangster movies* (films about criminal gangs). These stars, he says, had *odd* (strange), *knobbly* (with bumps rather than smooth) *cadaverous* (pale and thin) *faces* and they played characters who fitted into the category of the *hero as loner* (main characters who operated alone rather than with others). Such characters *belonged to history or the underworld* (the criminal part of society), lived on the *perimeter* (edge) of society and reminded people of society's *dangerous edges*. His point therefore is that most portraits of movie stars showed romantic figures and the exceptions were those who reminded people that there were some dangerous elements in society, although these were only on the edge of society. He is therefore implying that most people at that time thought that they lived in a pleasant society in which they were safe and in which people who were dangerous were exceptions.

- A: He is implying that the portraits of most movie stars did not show *odd, knobbly cadaverous faces* but good-looking people with romantic images. However, he does not say or imply that these people looked in real life less attractive than they did in their portraits or that they took steps to ensure that they looked more attractive in their portraits than they did in real life.
- B: He says the portraits were *back-lit and soft-focus* (photographic techniques to produce attractive pictures) and that most of them showed romantic images of people who did not have *odd, knobbly cadaverous faces*, but he does not imply that people doubted whether they showed the stars as they really looked. He is saying that they made the stars look like romantic figures, but he is not implying that people felt the techniques employed had made the stars look different from how they really looked.
- C: He says that the portraits were *communal dream-projections of society at large*, which means that people admired the way the stars looked and may well have wanted to look like them. He is therefore implying that people felt they were less attractive than movie stars but he is not implying that they actually felt unattractive, or that the portraits depressed people by making them feel they themselves were rather ugly.

- 37 B The writer says that the voices of stars of the last decade are *strenuously* (involving a lot of effort) *idiosyncratic* (individual, different from others and perhaps strange) and that *whines* (high-pitched and unpleasant and annoying continuous sounds), *stammers* (speech impediments involving long pauses and frequently repeated beginnings of words because the person cannot speak properly) and *low rumbles* (deep, low, continuous sounds) are *exploited* (used to the maximum advantage) as *features of 'star quality'* (the qualities a person has that are considered the reasons why they have become or could become a star). He is therefore saying that they consciously try to speak in these ways, which are not pleasant to

listen to or easy to hear, in order to sound different from any other actor, and that the fact that their voices have a sound that is individual to them is part of what gives them 'star quality'.

- A: He says that the style of photography is no longer one that shows people as romantic figures but one which *searches out warts* (small, hard growths on the skin) and *bumps* (parts that are not smooth) in order to present each star as unique. His point is that the stars no longer look similar to each other but that they now look totally different from each other because features of their faces that would not have been visible in the portraits of the past are now made clearly visible. He does imply that these are features that would not have been considered attractive in the past, but he does not mention any attitude towards these pictures on the part of the stars themselves or imply that they are unhappy about pictures of them showing the *warts and bumps* on their faces.
- C: He says that the stars of the last decade play characters who are not *romantic heroes or heroines* but who have a *brutalist* (cruel), *hard-edged* (aggressive) *style in which isolation* (no interaction with other people) and *egotism* (total selfishness) are *assumed as natural social conditions*. His point is that it is assumed in these films that people in society live selfish lives that are separate from each other in a society in which people are cruel to each other, but he does not imply that people who see these films question their own behaviour and feel that perhaps they should behave more like the characters they see in films.
- D: He says that these stars have an image which is based on certain assumptions about what society is like but he does not say or imply that people seeing films doubt that society is really like that or know that it isn't. In fact, he implies that the stars of the films have that image because people do believe that *isolation and egotism are natural social conditions* and that the stars are reflecting what people commonly believe their society to be like.

- 38 A The writer says that it is possible to see when looking at a crowd on an underground platform a *honey-comb* (a complex thing full of small compartments) *fully-worked-out* (formed in every detail after careful thought) *worlds, each private, exclusive, bearing little comparison with its nearest neighbour*. The writer says that in a city *the isolate* (individual who keeps apart from everyone else) and *the eccentric* (strange but harmless) *push to the centre of the stage* (put themselves into a position in which others pay attention to them) and that such people *have as good a claim to the limelight* (the focus of attention) and *the future as anyone else*. His point therefore is that you can see on an underground platform all kinds of different people, each of whom has different characteristics and different attitudes to life and that each of these sees themselves as having as much importance or value as anyone else. Everyone is an individual, he is saying, and no one has much in common with anyone else.

- B: He says that there are *elaborate protocols and etiquettes* (complicated sets of rules about what is considered appropriate and acceptable behaviour) among individual *cults* (groups of people with a particular set of beliefs or who follow certain fashions not shared by others) and *groups* in a city but that not all cults and groups *subscribe to* (believe in, agree with) a common standard. In other words, individual groups in a city do have rules concerning how the members of the group should behave but these rules are different for each group.
- C: He does say that it is *doubtful* whether people ever really did live in a society in which people *all share the same values*, and that this idea is *beloved of nostalgia moralists* (people who make moral points based on an inaccurately favourable view of what things were like in the past). He says that *lip-service was paid to* (people said they agreed with it but did not actually behave in accordance with it) the idea and that the *pretence* that society was like that *was kept up* (maintained). He therefore does say that some people's view of society in the past is inaccurate. However, that is not what he uses the crowd on an underground platform as an example of.
- D: He says that people have little in common with each other, that *what is prized* (highly valued) *in one is despised* (hated) *in another* and that there are *no clear rules* that are common to everyone. However, he does not say or imply that people regret this and would like to have more in common with each other – in fact, he implies that people want life in a city to be like this and consciously contribute to the fact that it is.
- 39 C The writer says that a new arrival in a city realizes that *there are so many people he might become* and that if he buys certain things, this will *go some way* (make some progress) *towards turning him into a personage* (a person with distinct characteristics) *even before he discovers who that personage is*. In other words, new arrivals can start to get a certain image as a result of what they buy, before they have been living in the city long enough to know what the sort of people who have that image are really like.
- A: He says that new arrivals find that there is *disordered abundance* (plenty of things) in a city and that this fact is both *evident and alarming* (worrying). He says that new arrivals feel that they have *parachuted into a unfair of contradictory imperatives* (suddenly arrived in a place in which they are told there are a great many things they should do, but these things are in opposition to each other) and that *there are so many people they might become*. He is therefore saying that new arrivals discover that so many different things are available to them in a city, including the opportunity to be whatever kind of person they wish to be, and so he is saying that they can have any image they wish to have. However, he does not say or imply that some of them keep changing their image, only that they can choose to have a particular image if they wish.
- B: He says that *hitherto* (previously) people bought what they could afford and that a person's status was shown by their wealth – in other words, the more money you had, the higher your status was. However, he is saying that this is no longer the case and the situation is no longer as simple as that. His point is not that new arrivals don't realize how important it is to be rich in a city, it is that wealth is no longer the key issue with regard to status and that it is therefore not as important as it used to be.
- D: He says that there are now *such a quantity of different kinds of status* in a city that the enormous range of choice of what to buy and its *attendant* (accompanying, coming with it) *anxieties* have created a *new pornography of taste* (the question of what people's taste in various things is has become something the writer regards as disgusting). What he means is that status is not related only to wealth any more but can be acquired through many different things. Status now depends on the kind of things you buy, not whether they are expensive or not, and so people worry about whether they are buying the kind of things that will give them the kind of status they want. This problem is the same for new arrivals as for people already living in cities. His point therefore is that new arrivals worry about whether what they will buy will give them the status they want, not that they are not interested in status – they clearly are interested in it in his view, or they wouldn't worry about buying the right things to get it.
- 40 B The writer says that all the different things that people can see are available to them in cities *nag at* (continue to worry constantly) *the nerve of our uncertainty and snobbery* (desire to be superior to others). He says that this is because in cities, there is a *creeping imperialism of taste* (a situation is slowly developing in which people are made to feel that they are obliged to have certain tastes in certain things), according to which *more and more commodities* (things you can buy) *are made over to* (changed into) *being mere* (nothing more than) *expressions of personal identity*. He says personal identity is not simply related to objects you can buy but also to your taste in things such as art and literature and that all these things are *important not so much in themselves but for what they communicate about their owners*. His point therefore is that in cities people are conscious of the fact that what they buy and their taste in other things creates a certain impression of them to other people, and so they choose these things carefully because they know that their choices will form their personal identity in the eyes of others.
- A: He gives examples of things such as *Bauhaus chairs* and *the novels of Samuel Beckett*, and the implication is that these were popular among some people in the city he lived in when he wrote this piece. However, he uses them as examples of things that people living in cities may be unsure as to whether they should like or not. His point is that people know their personal identity depends on how others view the sort of things they like, and so they don't know whether they should like certain things or not, because of what kind of personal identity liking them will give them. It is whether they should like certain things or not that city

dwellers are unsure of, not why other people like them.

- C: His point is not that people in cities want to buy more and more things but that they want to buy the kind of things that will give them the kind of personal identity they want. He does mention a lot of things that people buy in cities, but these are not examples of people's desire to own a great many things, they are examples of how people's taste in things affects their personal identity.
- D: His point is not that people want to be ahead of others when it comes to liking something new, it is that they want to like things that will give them the kind of image they want. This includes things like literature and art, where the belief is that the works of a certain artist or writer *go with certain styles* of other things like *matching handbags*. He is saying that people want to like things that match other things they like, so that together all the things they like give them a certain personal identity. He does not say or imply that any of these things have to be new.

Part 3
Questions
1-6 and 13-18
correspond to
questions 13-24
in your test.

The US Bicentennial

- 1 (A) If you **drop** a plan, an idea, etc., you abandon it or decide not to proceed with it. The writer is saying that people in the US did not feel like celebrating in early 1976.
 - B: If you **quit** a job, you leave it by choice. If you quit a habit, you give it up by choice.
 - C: If you **renounce** something, e.g. violence, evil, a belief, etc., you reject it as being morally bad or say that you no longer believe it to be acceptable.
 - D: If you **desist from** doing something, you stop doing something that someone else doesn't like or which causes problems for someone else.
- 2 (D) **After all** = despite what happened or was the case before. The writer is saying that, although people had not previously been in the mood to celebrate, when the date for the celebration came, their situation did not seem so depressing.
 - A: **For that matter** = that is the case for a second thing as well as for the thing previously mentioned ('I don't know much about golf; I know don't much about any sport, for that matter').
 - B: **By the way** = incidentally, and is used to introduce a comment that is not directly related to what has previously been said.
 - C: **Whatsoever** = at all, and is used for emphasis after 'no + noun', 'nothing' or 'none' ('be no help whatsoever' / 'do nothing whatsoever').
- 3 (C) If you **rack your brains**, you try as hard as you can to think of or remember something. The writer is saying that people all over the US tried hard to think of plans for celebrating the bicentennial that would result in things that were useful permanently.
 - A: If you **wrench** a joint in your body, e.g. your shoulder, you injure it because it becomes twisted as a result of force being put on it.
 - B: If you **strain** part of your body, e.g. a muscle, your heart, your eyes, you put too much pressure on it as a result of an effort you are making, and it becomes weaker or damaged.
 - D: If you **sprain** your ankle or wrist, you injure it as a result of it twisting suddenly.
- 4 (B) A **stroke of genius** is a single example of a brilliant idea or exceptionally effective action. The writer is saying that it was an extremely good idea to arrange for the last great sailing-ships of the world to go to New York harbour as part of the celebrations.
 - A: A **blow** is a terrible event that happens suddenly and shocks and upsets someone.
 - C: A **blast** of air is a sudden strong movement of air, such as wind. A blast is also a single, loud sound made by a whistle or a brass musical instrument.
 - D: Someone or something's **stamp** is their mark or characteristic quality which makes it clear that something was done by them.
- 5 (D) A **mast** is an upright wooden or metal post that supports a ship's sails. The writer is saying that the masts on these particular ships were very tall.
 - A: A **spire** is a tall, narrow, pointed structure on the tower of a church.
 - B: A **rod** is a long, narrow strip of metal or wood that is used in machines, for a scientific purpose, or for fishing.
 - C: A **post** is a straight piece of wood or metal that is placed upright in the ground and used for supporting something, e.g. a fence or marking the boundaries of an area.
- 6 (A) A person's or a group of people's **morale** is how they feel at a particular time as a result of their circumstances, e.g. how happy or unhappy they are. The writer is saying that the whole celebration was something that made the whole nation feel happier.
 - B: Someone's **temper** is their state of mind at a particular time, with regard to whether they are angry or not. Temper also means 'anger' or 'the tendency to get angry'.
 - C: Someone's **frame of mind** is how they feel or their mood at a particular time.
 - D: The **complexion** of something is the general nature of a situation or what a situation is like at a particular time.

The Street Entertainers

- 13 (D) If a bell **tinkles**, it rings with a series of short, soft sounds. The writer is saying that the shells on the dancers' caps made a sound like a small bell when they moved, presumably because the shells hit against each other lightly.
- A: If something **clatters**, it makes a continuous, unpleasant loud noise, such as that made by heavy objects coming into contact with each other, a surface or the ground.
- B: If something **clunks**, it makes a dull sound, such as that made by something coming into contact with something else roughly rather than lightly or smoothly.
- C: If someone **titters**, they laugh with a series of short sounds, e.g. when they are trying to hide that they are laughing or when they are nervous.
- 14 (D) If you **admire** something, you think it is good and you approve of or respect it. The writer is saying that she thought the dancers were beautiful to watch because the movement of their wrists and ankles was elegant.
- A: If someone is **esteemed**, they are highly respected by others.
- B: If someone **reveres** someone or something, they have great respect for them and regard them as special and more worthy of admiration than others.
- C: If you **delight in** something or doing something, you get enormous pleasure from it.
- 15 (C) If a movement or sound is **in time to** something else, it happens with a rhythm which matches that of the other thing. The writer is saying that the dancers' cymbals were ringing at exactly the same time as the men's hands were hitting the drums.
- A: The **beat** of a piece of music is its main rhythm if this is strong, for example in music that can be danced to.
- B: The **tempo** of a piece of music is the speed at which it is played.
- D: If people or things are **in harmony with** each other, they go or act together well, they are in agreement with each other. In music, if one sound, voice or instrument is in harmony with another, the two produce different sounds at the same time which go together well to create a pleasant sound.
- 16 (B) If you **squat (down)**, you sit down on the back of your feet with your knees bent up and close to your body. The writer is saying that the girl came through the crowded place and sat on the floor next to her in this way, probably because there was not much space for her to sit in.
- A: If people **huddle** in a place, they get very close to each other in a small space, e.g. because they are cold or frightened.
- C: If someone **hunches** or hunches their shoulders, they move when they are already sitting or standing so that their shoulders, neck and back are raised and bent forwards.
- D: If someone **stoops (down)**, they bend forward and down when they are in a standing position but they do not actually sit.
- 17 (D) A **grin** is a big, wide smile. We know from the context that the girl is smiling and that when she does so, this reveals that she has teeth missing.
- A: A **grimace** is a twisted expression on the face caused by pain, effort, or a feeling of disgust.
- B: A **sneer** is an expression of contempt on the face, which involves the upper lip and nose being moved upwards at one side.
- C: A **scowl** is an angry expression on the face.
- 18 (A) If people **gather** in a place, they come together to form a group or assemble there. The writer says that a crowd was forming on the other side of the square, away from the dancers.
- B: If someone **stacks** things, they arrange them together into a neat pile or heap.
- C: If someone **heaps** things somewhere, they put them into that place in an untidy pile or piles.
- D: If something **draws** a crowd, it attracts the attention of a large number of people so that they come from different places and join together in the place where that thing is, for example to look at it.