

THE ENGLISH AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY
HYDERABAD 500 007



SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
M.A. English (Part I)

Course I: *ACADEMIC READING AND WRITING*
ASSIGNMENTS (2020 – 2021)

(This set of assignments has 18 printed pages)

Assignment I
(Based on Block I)

Read the Blocks carefully before you attempt the questions.
You may **refer to the Blocks** as you do the assignments, to understand what is expected.

- I**
- A. Write down the main point in each of the following paragraphs.**
 - B. Write down the topic sentence for each paragraph and explain the function of the other sentences in the paragraph.**

Paragraph 1:

Throughout the nineteenth century, theorists of democracy found it quite natural to discuss whether one country or another was “fit for democracy.”¹ This thinking changed only in the twentieth century, with the recognition that the question itself was wrong: A country does not have to be deemed fit *for* democracy; rather, it has to become fit *through* democracy.² This is indeed a momentous change, extending the potential reach of democracy to cover billions of people, with their varying histories and cultures and disparate levels of affluence.³

Paragraph 2:

Just having the words is not enough.¹ You have to stitch them together in an attractive garment of prose.² One of the worst things you can do is write a series of declarative sentences of roughly the same length.³ No matter how beautifully written, they will make your paragraph move with the boring, repetitive rhythm of a grandfather clock.⁴ Varying sentence length is important.⁵ And if you have too many declarative sentences strung together, it is not a bad idea to break the monotony by throwing in an interrogative or exclamatory sentence.⁶

Paragraph 3:

It is easy to believe that the twilight zone between the original text and the translated text is a space filled with the bumps and hollows of a silent performance.¹ Translators should therefore be given the status of performing musicians: they are composers, performers and improvisers all in the service of not themselves but a reality to which they are striving to give body and form.² They delve deep into the text they have selected and seek its truth led by the rhythm of the original something only they can interpret and reinterpret.³ In a successful translation the translator establishes an intense relationship with the text.⁴

II Read the passage below and divide it into paragraphs. Indicate the signposting devices and other features that helped you decide on the paragraphing.

We have curious ideas of ourselves. We think of ourselves as a body with a spirit in it, or a body with a soul in it, or a body with a mind in it. *Mens sana in corpore sano*. The years drink up the wine, and at last throw the bottle away, the body, of course, being the bottle. It is a funny sort of superstition. Why should I look at my hand, as it so cleverly writes these words, and decide that it is a mere nothing compared to the mind that directs it? Is there really any huge difference between my hand and my brain? Or my mind? My hand is alive, it flickers with a life of its own. It meets all the strange universe in touch, and learns a vast number of things, and knows a vast number of things. My hand, as it writes these words, slips gaily along, jumps like a grasshopper to dot an *i*, feels the table rather cold, gets a little bored if I write too long, has its own rudiments of thought, and is just as much *me* as is my brain, my mind, or my soul. Why should I imagine that there is a *me* which is more *me* than my hand is? Since my hand is absolutely alive, *me* alive. Whereas, of course, as far as I am concerned, my pen isn't alive at all. My pen *isn't me* alive. *Me* alive ends at my finger-tips. Whatever is *me* alive is *me*. Every tiny bit of my hands is alive, every little freckle and hair and fold of skin. And whatever is *me* alive is *me*. Only my finger-nails, those ten little weapons between me and an inanimate universe, they cross the mysterious Rubicon between me alive and things like my pen, which are not alive, in my own sense. So, seeing my hand is all alive, and *me* alive, wherein is it just a bottle, or a jug, or a tin can, or a vessel of clay, or any of the rest of that nonsense? True, if I cut it it will bleed, like a can of cherries. But then the skin that is cut, and the veins that bleed, and the bones that should never be seen, they are all just as alive as the blood that flows. So the tin can business, or vessel of clay, is just bunk. And that's what you learn, when you're a novelist. And that's what you are very liable *not* to know, if you're a parson, or a philosopher, or a scientist, or a stupid person. If you're a parson, you talk about souls in heaven. If you're a novelist, you know that paradise is in the palm of your hand, and on the end of your nose, because both are alive; and alive, and man alive, which is more than you can say, for certain, of paradise. Paradise is after life, and I for one am not keen on anything that is *after* life. If you are a philosopher, you talk about infinity, and the pure spirit which knows all things. But if you pick up a novel, you realize immediately that infinity is just a handle to this self-same jug of a body of mine; while as for knowing, if I find my finger in the fire, I know that fire burns, with a knowledge so emphatic and vital, it leaves Nirvana merely a conjecture. Oh, yes, my body, *me* alive, *knows*, and knows intensely. And as for the sum of all knowledge, it can't be anything more than an accumulation of all the things I know in the body, and you, dear reader, know in the body.

III Read the text below and answer the questions that follow.

A Saturday afternoon in November was approaching the time of twilight, and the vast tract of unenclosed wild¹ embrowned itself moment by moment. Overhead the hollow stretch of whitish cloud² shutting out the sky was as a tent which had the whole heath for its floor.

The heaven being spread with this pallid screen³ and the earth with the darkest vegetation their meeting-line at the horizon was clearly marked. In such contrast the heath wore the appearance of an installment of night⁴ which had taken up its place before its astronomical hour was come: darkness had to a great extent arrived hereon, while day stood distinct⁵ in the sky. Looking upwards, a furze-cutter would have been inclined to continue work; looking down, he would have decided to finish his faggot and go home. The distant rims⁶ of the world and of the firmament seemed to be a vision in time⁷ no less than a division in matter. The face of the heath by its mere complexion⁸ added half an hour to evening; it could in like manner retard the dawn,⁹ sadden noon, anticipate the frowning of storms scarcely generated, and intensify the opacity of a moonless midnight¹⁰ to a cause of shaking and dread.

A. Some of the words in the text have been underlined. How will the meaning of the text be changed if each of these words/phrases is replaced with the words given alongside them in the table below? Does the choice of words create a particular mood in the text and add detail to the description? (Consult a dictionary and a thesaurus to see the shades of meaning the words convey.)

| Word in Text | Alternative |
|-------------------------|------------------|
| unenclosed wild | wilderness |
| whitish cloud | white |
| pallid screen | colourless sky |
| an installment of night | a dark night |
| day stood distinct | clear day |
| distant rims | horizon |
| vision in time | very picturesque |
| by its mere complexion | looked as if |
| retard the dawn | stop the dawn |
| moonless midnight | black night |

B. Given below are some phrases from the text. Discuss in about 25 words how each phrase adds to the overall quality of the text, and how it helps one understand/appreciate the writer's style.

1. was approaching the time of twilight
2. the heath wore the appearance
3. their meeting-line at the horizon
4. darkness had to a great extent arrived hereon
5. anticipate the frowning of storms scarcely generated

IV A. Read the text below and present the content diagrammatically.

Ode is a type of lyrical stanza. A classic ode is structured in three major parts: the *strophe*, the *antistrophe*, and the *epode*. Different forms such as the *homostrophic ode* and the *irregular ode* also exist. It is an elaborately structured poem praising or glorifying an event or individual, describing nature intellectually as well as emotionally.

There are three typical forms of odes: the Pindaric, Horatian, and irregular. Pindaric odes follow the form and style of Pindar. Horatian odes follow conventions of Horace; the odes of Horace deliberately imitated the Greek lyricists such as Alcaeus and Anacreon. Odes by Catullus, as well as other poetry of Catullus, was particularly inspired by Sappho. Irregular odes are rhyming, but they do not employ the three-part form of the Pindaric ode nor the two- or four-line stanza of the Horatian ode.

B. Read the short notes below and rewrite the content in paragraphs.

Metre: Pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables in a line of poetry.
Number of stressed and unstressed syllables.

Symbols for stressed and unstressed syllables: / and X respectively

Metrical foot: Basic unit of metre

Kinds of metres:

iamb: X / (unstressed, stressed)

trochee: / X

anapest: XX /

dactyl: / XX

spondee: //

pyrrhic: XX

Metre of a poem determined by metrical foot and number of feet per line:

Monometre: one foot per line

Dimetre: two feet per line

Trimetre: three feet per line

tetrametre: four feet per line

pentametre: five feet per line

hexametre: six feet per line

heptametre: seven feet per line

octametre: eight feet per line

Examples of metres in poems: iambic pentameter; trochaic heptametre etc.

V Read the text given below. As you read it, underline the key points in the text. Then write a summary of the text. (Revise the characteristics of a summary before you start writing.)

The *Comedy of Errors* is probably Shakespeare's earliest work. The play was first performed at Gray's Inn on December 28, 1594, as part of the Christmas festivities.

The plot was not original, of course. Shakespeare, like most other playwrights and authors of that time, based his work on another, earlier work. In Shakespeare's case, he chose one of Plautus' most highly respected comedies, the *Menaechmi*. Significantly, he did not rely exclusively on rhymed couplets for his comedy; in fact, half the play is in blank verse, an exceptional accomplishment for a beginning playwright.

The plot was well known to the public of the time. The use of mistaken identities, as well as the confusion of twins, had long been popular in the Western theater tradition. While Plautus had only one set of twins, Shakespeare has two; thus, in his comedy, he increases to a great extent the possibility of confusion. The comedy was a huge success then, and it has continued to be popular. Indeed, even Broadway audiences were ecstatic over a spectacular musical adaptation of *Comedy of Errors* in 1938, entitled *The Boys from Syracuse*.

To begin with, the plot situation seems hopeless (a melodramatic and romantic touch): a father has lost a son and a wife, and his remaining son has gone in search of his long-lost twin brother, and the desolate father has not heard from his remaining son for a long time; thus, he sets out in search of his son and, by accident, arrives in a city that is a sworn enemy to his own city. Accordingly, he faces almost certain death; yet, by the close of the play, the entire family — servants included — are reunited, and marriages are in the offing.

In addition, Shakespeare introduces the character of Luciana, a foil-sister of the fiercely jealous Adriana. She, in turn, furnishes the love interest for Antipholus of Syracuse. As a result, even in this, Shakespeare's first attempt at satisfying the seasoned Elizabethan theater-goers with a sparkling comedy, is a vivid demonstration of both a high degree of genius and creativity in this young playwright.

He combines adventure, the comedy of human folly, romance, and suspense in a play that while not one of his masterpieces can be said to be both clever and original and still popular today.

ASSIGNMENT II
(Based on Block II, Units 3 and 4)

Read the Block carefully before you attempt the questions.
Refer to the Blocks as you do the assignments to understand what is expected.

- I** **Read the following review of a literary festival. Analyze it to identify the writer's point of view. What is the perspective on the event? Is it critical, appreciative, or neutral? Identify the words/phrases that indicate the writer's perspective.**

DO NOT REPRODUCE THE PASSAGE.

The sixth edition of the Jaipur Literature Fest has come and gone. What began in 2007 as an insane twinkle in the eye of its organisers has expanded to become one of the world's most exciting literary events. Around a lakh of people waded through Diggi Palace this year, sipping on the renowned *Diggipuri ki chai* and munching *pyaz ki kachoris*. And, if they were cooped up in the delegates and media tent, bacchanalian amounts of free wine. Over the five days under the literary hippodrome, Homi K Bhabha delivered his cultural sermons, Javed Akhtar opened his scholastic bag of knowledge on *ghazals*, Howard Jacobson and Zoe Heller squabbled over the idea of a multimedia novel with a history toggle, Sharmila Tagore dipped her perfectly manicured toes in the literary ocean, while artist Anish Kapoor and other marquee names went unexplained by their absence. While the highbrows exchanged notes, writers, publishers and agents found cosy meeting corners on the sidelines. Whether it was the Dalai Lama or Ruchir Sharma, the halls were packed and there was surprisingly similar exaltation. And the *twitteratis* almost lost their thumbnails while chirping their comments on everything from Dalai Lama's session to an author sneezing into his *khadi* kerchief.

Not only did the writers engage in ordinary literary festival activities — reading from their works, discussing their inspirations and answering the inevitable pen-or-pencil-preference question — but were also found wandering around the venue, ordering saffron-laced tea in the Red Sofa Lounge, turning convivial in Authors Lounge and buying signed copies of other authors in the book store, as a pleasantry. As I was told by a garrulous author whom I interviewed, "It's the highest prestige festival. It's the one writers want to go to. It's become a status thing. People get terribly distressed if they don't get invited to Jaipur." And those who don't get invited, point in case Taslima Nasreen tweet: "Never invited. I think it's for the agreeable, manageable, uncontroversial, unquestionable elite writers #jlf."

The festival has acquired a sheen of glamour over the years. It is supposed to have made literature sexy and a lot of writers ambled around basking in their five days of rock star status. The new charge has, in fact, even forced toughened soldiers to adapt: seven journalists from rival publications sat side by side to interview Gurucharan Das. But, at the end of the day, they realise that this is India. So when it comes to Bollywood stars — or anyone remotely connected to Bollywood — or a cricket star, the writers are quickly trodden under foot; Sharmila Tagore and the duo of Javed Akhtar and Shabana Azmi being this season's hot favourites.

Just one day at the fest could have you seesawing. On the one hand you had Delhi

aunties and their designer bags waging seat battles. They went everywhere, anywhere they could get a seat — it didn't seem to matter whether it was two Dalit writers in Tamil or Prasoon Joshi condemning item numbers or even Amish Tripathi. On the other hand, you had enthralling minds like the young archiver Vikram Sampath, who is struggling to make ancient Indian music free and accessible to all via his website; the quietly dazzling Anjan Sunderam who is being hailed as a young Kapuscinski by Pico Iyer; the insuppressibly witty Howard Jacobson; and the thrill of watching Ashis Nandy and Tarun Tejpal expressively disembowel ill-informed moderators and audacious questioners.

This gets us to the “question rounds between the panellists and authors, after the sessions” — the one way in which JLF flattens the differences. If you somehow manage to finagle the mike, you can also join the elitists in drawing the fundamentals of our society. Or, like I did, watch with horror and bemusement as a young girl in cashmere shawl and horn-rimmed intelligent-looking glasses, actually argue that the Amazon Kindle doesn't smell like a book.

- II** Read the following excerpts from three different reviews, or readings, of a text. Summarize the three points of view in your own words so as to clearly bring out the perspective/standpoint from which they are assessing the text. Each summary should be in about 125-150 words.

DO NOT REPRODUCE THE PASSAGES.

Review 'A'

Originally serialized in a paper *The Graphic*, Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* was first published as a book in 1891. This work was Hardy's second-to-the-last novel (*Jude the Obscure* being his final one). Set in rural England, the novel tells the story of a poor girl, Tess Durbeyfield, who is sent by her parents to a supposedly noble family in the hope of finding a fortune and a gentleman for a husband. The young girl is instead seduced and meets her doom.

Structure: *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*

The novel is divided into seven sections, titled as phases. While it may seem usual to many readers, critics have discussed the significance of this term in relation to the progress of the plot and its moral implications. Various phases of the novel have been named according to various life phases of Hardy's heroine: “The Maiden,” “Maiden No More,” and so on to the final phase, “Fulfillment.”

Tess of the d'Urberville is essentially a third-person narrative, but most of the events (all significant events, in fact) are seen through the eyes of Tess. The order of these events follows a simple chronological sequence, a quality that augments the ambience of a simple rural life. Where we see Hardy's real mastery is the difference in the language of people from the social classes (e.g. the Clares in contrast with the farm workers). Hardy also sometimes speaks directly to the readers to accentuating the effect of select events.

Tess is helpless against, and mostly submissive to, those around her. But, she suffers not only because of the seducer who destroys her, but also because her beloved does not save her. Despite her suffering and weakness in the face of her suffering, she demonstrates a long-suffering patience and endurance. Tess takes pleasure in toiling on the dairy farms, and she seems almost invincible to the trials of life. Given her enduring strength through all of her troubles, in some sense, the only appropriate ending was her death on the gallows. Her story became the ultimate tragedy.

Tess of the d'Urbervilles is rich in its involvement with several themes and issues. Like most other Hardy novels, rural life is a prominent issue in the story. The hardships and drudgery of rustic lifestyle are explored fully through the travel and work experiences of Tess. Religious orthodoxy and social values are questioned in the novel. The issue of fate vs. freedom of action is another important aspect of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. While the main storyline may sound fatalistic, Hardy does not miss the opportunity to point out that the darkest of tragedies could be prevented by human action and consideration. Humanity.

Review 'B'

When the iconic British writer Thomas Hardy, whose 85th death anniversary fell on January 11, first published *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* in 1891, he was lampooned by sections of British society unable to stomach his scathing criticism of Victorian attitudes towards women. Not least of all, several Britons were outraged by Hardy's view of his heroine, which he stated in the title itself. The title of the first edition was *Tess of the d'Urbervilles: A Pure Woman Faithfully Presented*. As per Victorian mores, a woman like Tess who loses her virginity before marriage could not be pure. That she had been raped was beside the point.

That Hardy's classic remains relevant in today's India is as irrefutable as it is depressing, especially in the wake of the brutal gang rape that shocked the nation in December. Alec's pursuit of the poor, naïve Tess is as objectionable as any instance of eve-teasing. His rape is well planned, and his belief that he can get away with it, which stems from his sense of superiority as a man and that, too, from the upper-class, all too familiar. Just as recognisable is the attitude of Angel, the man Tess loves. Angel confesses to Tess that he was once involved with an older woman but when Tess, emboldened by the confession, reveals that she is no longer a virgin, because of what happened with Alec, he is so appalled that he spends their wedding night alone on a couch. Unable to reconcile himself to Tess's loss of virginity before marriage, he separates from her soon thereafter. Such a double standard, with regard to sexual mores, can be found all over India.

In his preface to the fifth and later editions of *Tess*, Hardy addressed his critics by quoting from the letters the great German poet Friedrich Schiller wrote to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, best known for his play *Faust*: "They are those who seek only their own ideas in a representation, and prize that which should be as higher than what is...As soon as I observe that any one, when judging of poetical representations, considers anything more important than the inner Necessity and Truth, I have done with him."

The clash between the normative or what should be and the realistic or what is remains at the heart of all art. Given the conformist nature of our society, this conflict is especially relevant for an Indian artist. As successive Bollywood filmmakers have shown, there is great profit to be made in placing yourself on the normative side of the divide. Most recently, the likes of Ekta Kapoor and Karan Johar have overhauled this formula successfully by giving the normative a bold, modern look. A devout realist like Hardy would have balked at something like that.

Review 'C'

The 1891 publication of Thomas Hardy's penultimate novel, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles: A Pure Woman*, was met with a great deal of controversy. Having previously appeared in a censored, serialized form in *The Graphic*, early readers and critics were not ready for the full novel's portrayal of female sexuality, religious skepticism, and scandalous violence. It is a work filled with beautiful evocations of landscape and horrific descriptions of deaths, with acute psychological insight as well as the sense that individual psychology matters little when confronted with an impervious universe. The contemporary readers were right on one count: reading *Tess* for the first time is truly a disturbing experience.

As is so often the case in Hardy's fiction, theodicy is at the center of the novel. How is it, Hardy asks, that a person like *Tess*, so innocent and even noble, could suffer so horribly? How could a just and merciful God allow such a tragedy to occur? After *Tess's* rape, Hardy writes, "But, might some say, where was *Tess's* guardian angel? where was the providence of her simple faith? Perhaps, like that other god of whom the ironical Tishbite spoke, he was talking, or he was pursuing, or he was in a journey, or he was sleeping and not to be awaked." This, fundamentally, is the situation of the novel: God, whether He exists or not, has evacuated Himself from this world. We are left to fend for ourselves in a world that is dominated by Nature rather than divinity, by passion and impulse rather than reason or piety.

If God is not present, then what can serve as the foundation of our lives? To what can we look for meaning and purpose? Discussing spiritual matters with Alec D'Urberville, *Tess* expresses her hope that "you can have the religion of loving-kindness and purity at least, if you can't have—what do you call it—dogma" (410). Even if institutionalized religion is questioned, even if divine revelation is not believed in, *Tess* implies, a separate sphere for ethics and morality can still be maintained.

We can see why, as Sam Alexander reminds us here, D.H. Lawrence was so attracted to Hardy. For both, feminine sexuality is as natural and inevitable as the flourishing of seedlings; for both, one's experience is most passionately felt and most authentically real when there is an organic relation between self and nature, when vitality flows from environment to person to person; and for both, this vital sexuality finds itself hemmed in at all points by social convention. The social impinges upon the natural, and we are left feeling hollow, unfulfilled.

III Read the text below and respond to it from your point of view, in about 400 to 450 words. Write down the outline first.

Masculinity refers to the social roles, behaviours, and meanings prescribed for men in any given society at any one time. As such, it emphasizes gender, not biological sex, and the diversity of identities among different groups of men. Although we experience gender to be an internal facet of identity, the concept of masculinity is produced within the institutions of society and through our daily interactions.

Much popular discourse assumes that biological sex determines one's gender identity, the experience and expression of masculinity and femininity. Instead of focusing on biological universals, social and behavioural scientists are concerned with the different ways in which biological sex comes to mean different things in different contexts. *Sex* refers to the biological apparatus, the male and the female—our chromosomal, chemical, anatomical, organization. *Gender* refers to the meanings that are attached to those differences within a culture. *Sex* is male and female; *gender* is masculinity and femininity—what it means to be a man or a woman. Whereas biological sex varies very little, gender varies enormously. Sex is biological; gender is socially constructed. Gender takes shape only within specific social and cultural contexts.

The use of the plural—*masculinities*—recognizes the dramatic variation in how different groups define masculinity, even in the same society at the same time, as well as individual differences. Although social forces operate to create systematic differences between men and women, on average, these differences *between* women and men are not as great as the differences *among* men or *among* women.

The meanings of masculinity vary over four different dimensions; thus four different disciplines are involved in understanding gender—anthropology, history, psychology, and sociology.

First, masculinities vary across cultures. Anthropologists have documented the ways that gender varies cross-culturally. Some cultures encourage men to be stoic and to prove masculinity, especially by sexual conquest. Other cultures prescribe a more relaxed definition of masculinity based on civic participation, emotional responsiveness, and collective provision for the community's needs. What it means to be a man in France or among Aboriginal peoples in the Australian outback are so far apart that it belies any notion that gender identity is determined mostly by biological sex differences. The differences between two cultures' version of masculinity is often greater than the differences between the two genders.

Second, definitions of masculinity vary considerably in any one country over time. Historians have explored how these definitions have shifted in response to changes in levels of industrialization and urbanization, in a nation's position in the larger world's geopolitical and economic context, and with the development of new technologies. What it meant to be a man in seventeenth-century France or in Hellenic Greece is certainly different from what it might mean to be a French or Greek man today.

Third, definitions of masculinity change over the course of a person's life. Developmental psychologists have examined how a set of developmental milestones

leads to differences in our experiences and our expressions of gender identity. Both chronological age and life stage require different enactments of gender. In the West, the issues confronting a man about proving himself and feeling successful change as he ages, as do the social institutions in which he attempts to enact those experiences. A young single man defines masculinity differently than do a middle-aged father and an elderly grandfather.

Finally, the meanings of masculinity vary considerably within any given society at any one time. At any given moment, several meanings of masculinity coexist. Simply put, not all American or Brazilian or Senegalese men are the same. Sociologists have explored the ways in which class, race, ethnicity, age, sexuality, and region all shape gender identity. Each of these axes modifies the others. For example, an older, black, gay man in Chicago and a young, white, heterosexual farm boy in Iowa would likely have different definitions of masculinity and different ideas about what it means to be a woman. Yet each of these people is deeply affected by the gender norms and power arrangements of their society.

Because gender varies so significantly—across cultures, over historical time, among men and women within any one culture, and over the life course—we cannot speak of masculinity as though it is a constant, universal essence, common to all men. Gender must be seen as an ever-changing, fluid assemblage of meanings and behaviours; we must speak of *masculinities*. By pluralizing the term we acknowledge that masculinity means different things to different groups of people at different times.

**ASSIGNMENT III
(Based on Block III)**

Read the Block carefully before you attempt the questions.
Refer to the Blocks as you do the assignments to understand what is expected.

- I Write a critical appreciation of the poem reproduced below.** (Points to remember: Theme, Poetic devices, Subtlety of expression, Impact on the reader)

Love and Friendship

Love is like the wild rose-briar,
Friendship like the holly-tree—
The holly is dark when the rose-briar blooms
But which will bloom most constantly?

The wild rose-briar is sweet in spring,
Its summer blossoms scent the air;
Yet wait till winter comes again
And who will call the wild-briar fair?

Then scorn the silly rose-wreath now
And deck thee with the holly's sheen,
That when December blights thy brow
He still may leave thy garland green.

- II Study the following comparison between two differing points of view.**

- A. Comment on the organization of the essay.**
B. Identify the phrases that indicate the comparison explicitly.
C. Identify the elements that indicate similarities and differences between the two.

According to some theorists, the 20th century can be divided into two distinct periods; one characterized by the modernism movement and the other by postmodernism. Some believe that postmodernism was a response to modernism and hence consider them as two aspects of the same movement. There are some major differences between modernism and postmodernism. These distinctions make clear, the basic difference in the ways of thinking that led to these movements. The difference between modernism and postmodernism highlights the difference in the approaches towards life.

Modernism describes a collection of cultural movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It consists of a series of reforming movements in art, architecture, literature, music and applied arts. Modernism was characterized by a dramatic change of thought, whereby human intellect sought to improve the environment. There was a trend of improving every aspect of life by involving science and technology into it. Modernism brought about a reform in all spheres of life including philosophy, commerce, art and literature, with the aid of technology and

experimentation. It led to progress in all the aspects of life by changing the approach of mankind of looking at them.

Postmodernism means, 'after the modern.' It was a reaction to modernism and was influenced by the disenchantment brought about by the Second World War. Postmodernism refers to the state that lacks a central hierarchy and one that is complex, ambiguous and diverse. The developments in society, the economy and the culture of the 1960s were impacted by postmodernism.

Modernism began in the 1890s and lasted till about 1945. Postmodernism began after the Second World War, especially after 1968. Modernism was based on using rational, logical means to gain knowledge while postmodernism denied the application of logical thinking. Rather, the thinking during the postmodern era was based on unscientific, irrational thought process, as a reaction to modernism. A hierarchical and organized and determinate nature of knowledge characterized modernism. But postmodernism was based on an anarchical, non-totalized and indeterminate state of knowledge. Modernist approach was objective, theoretical and analytical while the postmodernism approach was based on subjectivity. It lacked the analytical nature and thoughts were rhetorical and completely based on belief. The fundamental difference between modernism and postmodernism is that modernist thinking is about the search of an abstract truth of life while postmodernist thinkers believe that there is no universal truth, abstract or otherwise.

Modernism attempts to construct a coherent world-view whereas postmodernism attempts to remove the difference between high and low. Modernist thinking asserts that mankind progresses by using science and reason while postmodernist thinking believes that progress is the only way to justify the European domination on culture. Modernist thinking believes in learning from past experiences and trusts the texts that narrate the past. On the other hand postmodernist thinking defies any truth in the text narrating the past and renders it of no use in the present times. Modernist historians have a faith in depth. They believe in going deep into a subject to fully analyze it. This is not the case with postmodernist thinkers. They believe in going by the superficial appearances, they believe in playing on surfaces and show no concern towards the depth of subjects. Modernism considers the original works as authentic while postmodernist thinkers base their views on hyper-reality; they get highly influenced by things propagated through media.

During the modernist era, art and literary works were considered as unique creations of the artists. People were serious about the purpose of producing art and literary works. These works were believed to bear a deep meaning, novels and books predominated society. During the postmodernist era, with the onset of computers, media and advancements in technology, television and computers became dominant in society. Art and literary works began to be copied and preserved by the means of digital media. People no longer believed in art and literary works bearing one unique meaning; they rather believed in deriving their own meanings from pieces of art and literature. Interactive media and Internet led to distribution of knowledge. Music like Mozart, Beethoven, which was appreciated during modernism became less popular in the postmodern era. World music, DJs and remixes characterized postmodernism. The architectural forms that were popular during modernism were replaced by a mix of different architectural styles in the postmodern times.

III Read the following text.

- A. Identify the language functions that you find in it. (Stating, Illustrating, etc.)**
B. List the functions and write down the numbers of the sentences in which you find them.

A poem is a composition written in verse (although verse has been equally used for epic and dramatic fiction). [1] Poems rely heavily on imagery, precise word choice, and metaphor; they may take the form of measures consisting of patterns of stresses (metric feet) or of patterns of different-length syllables (as in classical prosody); and they may or may not utilize rhyme. [2] One cannot readily characterize poetry precisely. [3] Typically though, poetry as a form of literature makes some significant use of the formal properties of the words it uses – the properties of the written or spoken form of the words, independent of their meaning. [4] Meter depends on syllables and on rhythms of speech; rhyme and alliteration depend on the sounds of words. [5]

Arguably, poetry pre-dates other forms of literature. [6] Early examples include the Sumerian *Epic of Gilgamesh* (dated from around 2700 B.C.), parts of the Bible, the surviving works of Homer (the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*), and the epics *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* from India. [7] In cultures based primarily on oral traditions the formal characteristics of poetry often have a mnemonic function, and important texts: legal, genealogical or moral, for example, may appear first in verse form. [8]

Some poetry uses specific forms. [9] Examples include the haiku, the limerick, and the sonnet. [10] A traditional haiku written in Japanese relate to nature, contain seventeen onji (syllables), distributed over three lines in groups of five, seven, and five, and should also have a kigo, a specific word indicating a season. [11] A limerick has five lines, with a rhyme scheme of aabba, and line lengths of 3,3,2,2,3 stressed syllables. [12] It traditionally has a less reverent attitude towards nature. [13] Poetry not adhering to a formal poetic structure is called “free verse”. [14]

Language and tradition dictate some poetic norms: Persian poetry always rhymes, Greek poetry rarely rhymes, Italian or French poetry often does, English and German poetry can go either way. [15] Perhaps the most paradigmatic style of English poetry, blank verse, as exemplified in works by Shakespeare and Milton, consists of unrhymed iambic pentameters. [16] Works for theatre traditionally took verse form. [17] This has now become rare outside opera and musicals, although many would argue that the language of drama remains intrinsically poetic. [18]

In recent years, digital poetry has arisen that takes advantage of the artistic, publishing, and synthetic qualities of digital media. [19]

**ASSIGNMENT IV
(Based on Block IV)**

Read the Block carefully before you attempt the questions.
Refer to the Blocks as you do the assignments to understand what is expected.

I Study the following factual narrative carefully. Comment on the organization of the content and the features that make it a factual narrative.

In the 18th century, the Enlightenment saw the intellectual maturation of the humanist belief in reason as the primary guiding principle in the affairs of humans. Through reason the mind achieved enlightenment, and for the enlightened mind, a whole new and exciting world opened up.

The Enlightenment was an intellectual movement for which the most immediate stimulus was the so-called Scientific Revolution of the 16th and 17th-centuries when men like Johannes Kepler, Galileo Galilei, and Isaac Newton, through the application of reason to the study of the natural world and the heavens had made spectacular scientific discoveries in which were revealed various scientific truths.

More often than not, these new-found truths flew in the face of conventional beliefs, especially those held by the Church. For example, contrary to what the Church had maintained for centuries, the ‘truth’ was that the Earth revolved around the sun. The idea that ‘truth’ could be discovered through the application of reason based on study was tremendously exciting.

The open-minded 18th-century thinker believed that virtually everything could be submitted to reason: tradition, customs, morals, even art. But, more than this, it was felt that the ‘truth’ revealed thereby could be applied in the political and social spheres to ‘correct’ problems and ‘improve’ the political and social condition of humankind. This kind of thinking quickly gave rise to the exciting possibility of creating a new and better society.

The ‘truth’ discovered through reason would free people from the shackles of corrupt institutions such as the Church and the monarchy whose misguided traditional thinking and old ideas had kept people subjugated in ignorance and superstition. The concept of freedom became central to the vision of a new society. Through truth and freedom, the world would be made into a better place.

Progressive 18th-century thinkers believed that the lot of humankind would be greatly improved through the process of enlightenment, from being shown the truth. With reason and truth in hand, the individual would no longer be at the mercy of religious and secular authorities, which had constructed their own truths and manipulated them to their own self-serving ends. At the root of this thinking is the belief in the perfectibility of humankind.

Enlightenment thinking pictured the human race as striving towards universal moral and intellectual self-realization. It was believed that reason allowed access to truth, and

knowledge of the truth would better humankind. The vision that began to take shape in the 18th century was of a new world, a better world. In 1762, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in his *Inquiry into the Nature of the Social Contract*, proposed that a new social system should rest on ‘an equality that is moral and legitimate, and that men, who may be unequal in strength or intelligence, become every one equal by convention and legal right.’ By joining together into civil society through the social contract, individuals could both preserve themselves and attain freedom. These tenets were fundamental to the notion of modernism.

Such declarations in support of liberty and equality were not only found in books. In the 18th century, two major attempts were made to put these ideas into practice. Such ideas, of course, were not popular with conservative and traditional elements, and their resistance had to be overcome in both cases through bloody revolution.

The first great experiment in creating a new and better society was undertaken in what was literally the new world and the new ideals were first expressed in the *Declaration of Independence* of the newly founded United States in 1776. It is Enlightenment thinking that informs such phrases as ‘we hold these truths to be self-evident’ and which underpins the notion ‘that all men are created equal.’ The document’s worldly character is reflected in its stated concern for man’s right to pursue happiness in his lifetime, which signals a shift away from a God-centered, Christian concentration on the afterlife to one focused on the individual and the quality of a person’s life. Fundamental, too, is the notion of freedom; liberty was declared one of man’s inalienable rights.

In 1789, another bloody revolution undertaken in France also attempted to create a new society. Its aim was to supplant an oppressive governmental structure centered around an absolute monarchy, an aristocracy with feudal privileges, and a powerful Catholic clergy, with new Enlightenment principles of citizenship, nationalism, and inalienable rights; the revolutionaries rallied to the cry of equality, fraternity, and liberty.

The French Revolution, however, failed to bring about a radically new society in France. Several changes of regime quickly followed culminating in Napoleon’s military dictatorship, the establishment of the Napoleonic Empire, and finally the restoration of the monarchy in 1814. Revolutionary activity continued, though, in 1830 and again in 1848. Mention can be made here of a third major attempt to create a new society along fundamentally Enlightenment lines that took place at the beginning of the 20th century. The Russian Revolution, initiated in 1915, perhaps the most idealistic and utopian of all, also failed.

It is in the ideals of the Enlightenment that the roots of Modernism, and the new role of art and the artist, are to be found. Simply put, the overarching goal of Modernism, of modern art, has been the creation of a better society.

II Study the following argumentative text.

- A. Draw an outline of the content.
- B. Describe the structure of the text.
- C. List the expressions that signpost the arguments.

There is a perpetual debate going on about the relation of art to morals, and whether the artist or the poet ought to attempt to teach anything. The answer is a very simple one. It is that art and morality are only beauty realised in different regions; and as to whether the artist ought to attempt to teach anything, that may be summarily answered by the simple dictum that no artist ought ever to attempt to teach anything, with which must be combined the fact that no one who is serious about anything can possibly help teaching, whether he wishes or no!

High art and high morality are closely akin, because they are both but an eager following of the law of beauty; but the artist follows it in visible and tangible things, and the moralist follows it in the conduct and relations of life. Artists and moralists must be forever condemned to misunderstand each other, because the votary of any art cannot help feeling that it is the one thing worth doing in the world; and the artist whose soul is set upon fine hues and forms thinks that conduct must take care of itself, and that it is a tiresome business to analyse and formulate it; while the moralist who loves the beauty of virtue passionately, will think of the artist as a child who plays with his toys, and lets the real emotions of life go streaming past.

This is a subject upon which it is as well to hear the Greeks, because the Greeks were of all people who ever lived the most absorbingly interested in the problems of life, and judged everything by a standard of beauty. Plato, as is well known, took a somewhat whimsical view of the work of the poet. He said that he must exclude the poets from his ideal State, because they were the prophets of unreality. But he was thinking of a kind of man very different from the men whom we call poets. He thought of the poet as a man who served a patron, and tried to gloze over his patron's tyranny and baseness, under false terms of glory and majesty; or else he thought of dramatists, and considered them to be men who for the sake of credit and money played skilfully upon the sentimental emotions of ordinary people; and he fought shy of the writers who used tragic passions for the amusement of a theatre.

Aristotle disagreed with Plato about this, and held that poetry was not exactly moral teaching, but that it disposed the mind to consider moral problems as interesting. He said that in looking on at a play, a spectator suffered, so to speak, by deputy, but all the same learned directly, if unconsciously, the beauty of virtue.

When we come to our own Elizabethans, there is no evidence that in their plays and poetry they thought about morals at all. No one has any idea whether Shakespeare had any religion, or what it was; and he above all great writers that ever lived seems to have taken an absolutely impersonal view of the sins and affections of men and women. No one is scouted or censured or condemned in Shakespeare; one sees and feels the point of view of his villains and rogues; one feels with them that they somehow could hardly have done otherwise than they did; and to effect that is perhaps the crown of art.

But nowadays the poet, with whom one may include some few novelists, is really a very independent person. I am not now speaking of those who write basely and crudely, to please a popular taste. They have their reward; and after all they are little more than mountebanks, the end of whose show is to gather up pence in the ring.

But the poet in verse is listened to by few people, unless he is very great indeed; and even so his reward is apt to be intangible and scanty; while to be deliberately a lesser

poet is perhaps the most unworldly thing that a man can do, because he thus courts derision; indeed, if there is a bad sign of the world's temper just now, it is that men will listen to politicians, scientists, men of commerce, and journalists, because these can arouse a sensation, or even confer material benefits; but men will not listen to poets, because they have so little use for the small and joyful thoughts that make up some of the best pleasures of life.

It is quite true, as I have said, that no artist ought ever deliberately to try to teach people, because that is not his business, and one can only be a good artist by minding one's business, which is to produce beautiful things; and the moment one begins to try to produce improving things, one goes off the line. But in England there has been of late a remarkable fusion of morality and art. Ruskin and Browning are clear enough proof that it is possible to be passionately interested in moral problems in an artistic way; while at the same time it is true, as I have said, that if any man cares eagerly for beauty, and does his best to present it, he cannot help teaching all those who are searching for beauty, and only require to be shown the way.

III Read the following text. Comment on how the description acts as a foil to the narration.

Why, Mr. Bounderby was as near being Mr. Gradgrind's bosom friend, as a man perfectly devoid of sentiment can approach that spiritual relationship towards another man perfectly devoid of sentiment. So near was Mr. Bounderby—or, if the reader should prefer it, so far off.

He was a rich man: banker, merchant, manufacturer, and what not. A big, loud man, with a stare, and a metallic laugh. A man made out of a coarse material, which seemed to have been stretched to make so much of him. A man with a great puffed head and forehead, swelled veins in his temples, and such a strained skin to his face that it seemed to hold his eyes open, and lift his eyebrows up. A man with a pervading appearance on him of being inflated like a balloon, and ready to start. A man who could never sufficiently vaunt himself a self-made man. A man who was always proclaiming, through that brassy speaking-trumpet of a voice of his, his old ignorance and his old poverty. A man who was the Bully of humility.

A year or two younger than his eminently practical friend, Mr. Bounderby looked older; his seven or eight and forty might have had the seven or eight added to it again, without surprising anybody. He had not much hair. One might have fancied he had talked it off; and that what was left, all standing up in disorder, was in that condition from being constantly blown about by his windy boastfulness.