

**PROCEDIMIENTO SELECTIVO PROFESORES ESCUELAS OFICIALES DE
IDIOMAS (Resolución 2 de febrero 2022)**

PRUEBA PRÁCTICA. PRIMER EJERCICIO

PROCEDIMIENTO SELECTIVO PROFESORES ESCUELAS OFICIALES DE IDIOMAS (Resolución 2 de febrero 2022)

PRUEBA PRÁCTICA. PRIMER EJERCICIO (80 minutos)

TEXT ANALYSIS

What ought we to do with great art made by monstrous people?

J.J. Charlesworth

A new book explores the dilemma of the fan in the age of cancel culture, weighing up moral outrage against a plea for redemption

- 1 In the current ‘cancel culture’, the work of canonical artists and authors becomes
‘problematic’ by dint of the personal failings of these (mostly male) creators; artists
who have done or (particularly in the wake of #MeToo) are accused of having done
terrible things, behaved awfully, abused and hurt people, are, in short, ‘monsters’. In
5 her book of the same name, American critic and essayist Claire Dederer tries to
answer the seemingly intractable question that continues to plague this debate: ‘what
ought we to do about great art made by bad men?’

- To her credit, Dederer takes on the problem from the perspective of the ‘fan’, and
Monsters is a sensitive, sometimes overwrought read, for Dederer’s intense
10 personalisation of her subjective investment in both artworks and the artists who
make them. Starting from Roman Polanski’s conviction for having sex with a
thirteen-year-old girl in 1977, she wends her way through different artists and
different forms and degrees of ‘monstrosity’: the abuse and alleged abuse of children
and women (Woody Allen, Michael Jackson, Picasso, Hemingway), the virulent or
15 petty antisemitism of Richard Wagner or Virginia Woolf, and the habitual racism of
authors of onetime American ‘classics’, such as in Laura Ingalls Wilder’s Little House
on the Prairie books (1932–43).

- That sense that things are not getting better underpins the political and emotional
handwringing of Monsters, written in the wake of the generational frustration that
20 defined #MeToo and the Black Lives Matter protests, and which bracketed the
Trump years. Dederer can’t fully side with the vengefulness and rage of the ‘cancel
culture’ period (much as she’d like to admit the just cause of women against the
patriarchy), because however well she articulates the case against the ‘monsters’, her
heart always returns to artworks she repeatedly insists she loves.

- 25 Dederer is a perceptive and engaging critic – the middle, and in a sense pivotal,
chapter on Vladimir Nabokov’s writing of Lolita (1955) beautifully sets out how
Nabokov must have necessarily inhabited the character of the monstrous paedophile

30 Humbert Humbert, in order to reveal both his evil and mediocrity. But because
Dederer never finds a way to separate the work from the artist, she can only solve her
dilemma ethically, with a plea for redemption, since we are all flawed –
‘monstrousness applies to everyone’ – who are we to judge? Finally grating against
the self-righteousness of ‘cancel culture’, she concludes that ‘the way you consume
art doesn’t make you a bad person, or a good one’. True enough, but her trouble is
35 really one of how the claim for ‘cancelling’ bad individuals distorts the question of
how art criticism – how to value the artwork, rather than the artist – doesn’t
necessarily align with morality or politics. In the end, we shouldn’t be interested in
artists for being bad or good people either; one’s moral outrage at their monstrosity
fades, artists die and all that’s left is the artwork. Which is the only thing that was
ever worth talking about in the first place.

Monsters: A Fan’s Dilemma, by Claire Dederer. Sceptre, £20 (hardcover)

www.artreview.com

Read the text, and answer the following questions:

1) Can you provide a short explanation and two synonyms or near-synonyms for each of the following words or phrases? [0.4 points]

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| a) In the wake of (line 3, line 19) | b) Overwrought (line 9) |
| c) Wends her way (line 12) | d) Underpin (line 18) |

2) How would you explain the meaning of the word *petty* (line 15) to your students? Give some contexts and expressions in which it can be used. [0.2 points]

3) a) The phrasal verb “set out” is used in the text (line 26). What does it mean in this context? [0.2 points]

b) There are other meanings of the phrasal verb “set out”. Write two or three sentences clearly illustrating some of these other meanings. [0.2 points]

4) Rephrase each of the following sentences in a different way: [0.2 points]

- “Dederer can’t fully side with the vengefulness and rage of the “cancel culture”.”
- “Dederer is a perceptive and engaging critic”:

- 5) Explain the use of *worth* (line 39). Compare it to the word *worthy* (differences in pronunciation and use). [0.4 points]
- 6) Provide a phonemic transcription for the following words from the text: [0.2 points]
- a) Alleged b) Patriarchy c) Paedophile d) Ethically
- 7) The word *paedophile* (line 27) belongs to a group of words (*Caesar, Phoebe, diarrhea, anaesthesia, archaeology, gonorrhoea, paediatrician, gynaecology, Phoenix, amoeba*) which share some characteristics in origin, pronunciation and spelling. Briefly explain these characteristics as if you were asked in a C1 classroom. [0.2 points]
- 8) What type of text is this, and what can you say about its structure and communicative purpose? Do you think it is effective in its purpose? Provide evidence to support your answer. [0.4 points]
- 9) What are the stylistic and sociolinguistic features of this text? Provide examples to support your answer. [0.6 points]
- 10) How would you explain to students the meaning and grammar of “much as she’d like to admit” (line 22) and “however well she articulates the case” (line 23)? [0.5 points]
- 11) How would you explain to a C1 student the function in the text of “True enough, ...” (line 33) in terms of grammar and deixis? [0.5 points]

**PROCEDIMIENTO SELECTIVO PROFESORES ESCUELAS
OFICIALES DE IDIOMAS (Resolución 2 de febrero 2022)**

PRUEBA PRÁCTICA. SEGUNDO EJERCICIO

PROCEDIMIENTO SELECTIVO PROFESORES ESCUELAS OFICIALES DE IDIOMAS (Resolución 2 de febrero 2022)

PRUEBA PRÁCTICA. SEGUNDO EJERCICIO (50 minutos)

AUDICIÓN DE UN TEXTO ORAL

You will listen to part of a program.

PART 1 (2 points) DO TASKS A AND B AT THE SAME TIME

TASK A. Read through the sentences below and choose the option (a, b or c) which best completes them according to what you hear. Sentence 0 has been done as an example.

[5 x 0.2 points]

New Rule: The Misinformation Age *Real Time with Bill Maher (HBO)*

0. When we talk about misinformation, we always focus on...

- a. *the consumers.*
- b. *the content of the news.*
- c. **the producers.**

1. Lies...

- a. can usually spread as fast as truth.
- b. spread faster than truth.
- c. used to spread even faster than nowadays.

2. Whenever a new means of communication comes along...

- a. people in the center try to keep it in the bottom.
- b. right-wing people try to have control over it.
- c. some people try to censor its contents.

3. Bill Maher finds it extremely naïve for people to believe...

- a. Orson Wells' Martian Drama.
- b. that Martians invaded Earth.
- c. the place the Martians decided to invade.

4. Maher thinks we should...

- a. have fact-checked news.
- b. learn to live with lies.
- c. wipe lies out of media.

5. According to Bill Maher, Conservatives...

- a. and Democrats can be equally misinformed.
- b. believe all kind of crazy theories.
- c. have more misinformation channels.

TASK B. Fill in the gaps in the following sentences with the exact word(s) you hear (between one and four words). [5 x 0.2 points]

1. Bill Maher: "we always focus on the producers, never the consumers, as if we're all _____ ready to believe anything".
2. "...it's so ridiculous! It's like fact checking the graffiti on the bathroom wall _____".
3. "In 1487, the Pope issued an order to stop the misuse of the printing press for the _____. You know...".
4. "This is what I was talking about. Lies are _____ and, in that way, they're quite analogous to germs..."
5. "... the quarter truth? and wait! _____ people in the world believe that what really matters is your truth?"

PART 2 (1 point)

[1 point]

Now summarize the contents of the program, mentioning the points you personally agree and disagree with (250 words).

**PROCEDIMIENTO SELECTIVO PROFESORES ESCUELAS
OFICIALES DE IDIOMAS (Resolución 2 de febrero 2022)**

PRUEBA PRÁCTICA. TERCER EJERCICIO

PROCEDIMIENTO SELECTIVO PROFESORES ESCUELAS OFICIALES DE IDIOMAS (Resolución 2 de febrero 2022)

PRUEBA PRÁCTICA. TERCER EJERCICIO (50 minutos)

TRADUCCIÓN INVERSA Y DIRECTA

PART 1

Translate into English:

[1,5 points]

Severo, tranquilo, disfrutaba de ser, al menos por el momento, el único emperador de Roma. Pero la felicidad iba a durar poco. Pronto llegaron mensajeros de Oriente con noticias preocupantes: los guerreros, aprovechando la debilidad romana en la región por causa de la guerra civil, se habían rebelado y atacado las guarniciones romanas. La situación de Nísibis, en particular, era muy delicada. Se trataba del destacamento romano más importante al este del Éufrates y estaba bajo asedio enemigo. Los partos, dirigidos por Vologases V, aún no habían intervenido directamente, pero observaban a la espera de la reacción de Severo para decidirse a atacar y apoderarse de toda Mesopotamia norte, que durante los últimos decenios había estado, de un modo u otro, bajo la influencia del Imperio romano. Solo necesitaban ver una muestra de debilidad por parte del emperador romano para decidirse a lanzar una ofensiva a gran escala.

- ¡Atacaremos! ¡No podemos permitirnos abandonar a toda una guarnición romana sin hacer nada!

No dijo más, pero también pensaba que aquella podía ser una buena oportunidad para restañar heridas entre las legiones del Danubio, pues al obligarlas a luchar juntas contra un enemigo exterior común se fortalecería, de nuevo, lo que las unía a todas: Roma.

Extracto de *Yo, Julia* (2018), de Santiago Posteguillo

PART 2

Translate into Spanish:

[1,5 points]

A boy is coming down a flight of stairs.

He takes each step slowly, sliding himself along the wall, his boots meeting each tread with a thud.

Near the bottom, he pauses for a moment, looking back the way he has come. Then, suddenly resolute, he leaps the final three stairs, as is his habit. He stumbles as he lands, falling to his knees on the flagstone floor.

It is a close, windless day in late summer, and the downstairs room is slashed by long strips of light. The sun glowers at him from outside, the windows latticed slabs of yellow, set into the plaster.

He gets up, rubbing his legs. He looks one way, up the stairs; he looks the other, unable to decide which way he should turn.

The room is empty, the fire ruminating in its grate, orange embers below soft, spiralling smoke. His injured kneecaps throb in time with his heartbeat. He stands with one hand resting on the latch of the door to the stairs, the scuffed leather tip of his boot raised, poised for motion, for flight. His hair, light-coloured, almost gold, rises up from his brow in tufts.

There is no one here.

Except from *Hamnet* (2020), by Maggie O'Farrell.