

**Тест Третьего сертификационного уровня по английскому языку
(Уровень C1 CEFR)
Центра языкового тестирования СПбГУ**

Тексты аудиозаписи

Task **B1-B10**

*You will hear Stephen Pyne talking about his experience **travelling to the Antarctic**. For questions **B1-B10**, complete the sentences by writing a word or a phrase **that you hear (no more than 17 characters)** in the spaces provided. You will hear the recording **twice**. You now have **45 seconds** to look at the questions.*

Now we are ready to start.

I'd never intended to go to the end of nowhere. I guess, even by Antarctic standards, the ice exploration camp which is known as Dome C, was at the back of beyond. Standing on about 3,500m of ice, it has the pleasure of being one of the coldest places on earth. And when I say cold, I mean cold. The average daily temperature is -50. But as Dome C is the heart of the Antarctic, I knew I'd end up there one day. After a trip to the National Science Foundation, where I pleaded my case to get funding, and then a layover at the Pole, where I had a couple of days to get used to the high elevation, I arrived at Dome C on New Year's Eve 1981.

The further you move into the interior of the Antarctic, the more dominant the ice and the more extraterrestrial the surroundings become. An ordinary person would say that there is 'nothing there', and I suppose to some extent they'd be right. Even the seasoned scientists who have spent years employed in the field characterise it as weird. I've always seen Antarctic scientists as our age's equivalent to the early explorers. It's just that rather than risking life and limb to find treasured minerals or spices; we struggle to discover precious data. Our discoveries might fetch less on the market, but their significance is just as valuable.

The only sad thing about Antarctic exploration is that, unlike Arctic missions, we don't have any way of connecting with the indigenous peoples, who can often help explorers by guiding or translating or simply having a first-hand knowledge of the area. In fact, in the Antarctic there is absolutely no way to immerse into another universe. I always think about how Robert Peary reached the North Pole in 1909. Rather than travelling as an isolated group, separate from those who had inhabited the area for centuries, he rode on sledges that were pulled by native dogs and guided by locals from the Inuit tribes. Compare this to Robert Scott's party to the South Pole four years later who tried to pull their own sledges without any help and died in the process.

The camp at Dome C was temporary — how could it be otherwise? Just getting here was hard enough. I remember a funny situation through years ago when an exploratory flights around the area had to be cancelled after the plane's wing cracked as it was taxiing down the runway. Then when another ski-equipped plane was sent to remove the crew, it succumbed to the same problem when one of the jet bottles broke loose on take-off, ripped down the side of the aircraft and left a hole in that plane's wing. One of the jet bottles that was needed to add thrust in the thin air broke loose. The bottle ripped through its wing, leaving a hole the size of a basketball. Finally a third flight managed to rescue the

stranded crewmen the next day.

I think there were a dozen of us that spent time at the camp that year; the French, the American teams, a cook, a couple of Navy mechanics. But there wasn't much that could be considered a society; just as there wasn't anything that could be considered a built camp as such. There wasn't even common dining, in fact, there was no collective experience at all, nothing that anyone had to do at any one time. In fact, If you discount the longing to go home or a desire for a nice warm bath, then the movies that arrived with the resupply flights were the only thing that brought us all together. Ironically though, it was the only thing that really caused us to fall out too, as often there were heated arguments over what to watch first. In fact I remember once feeling so tired of the beakering that i ended up asking people if they had any books to read instead, which didn't go down very well.

I think people on the outside assumed we rejoiced in the absence of rules at the camp. But I found that freedom is relative: at Dome C there was nothing to rebel against. Yes, you could do whatever you wanted. But the catch was, well, there was almost nothing worth doing. People survived by leaving. No one lived at Dome C. And those who did stay long sank into various pathologies. I suffered from insomnia: a 24-hour cycle of wakening followed by 12 hours of sleep. The main problem is that you slowed down. With very little to stimulate you, there was no reason to be busy. Stay for long, and a state of semi-hibernation set in. Stay too long, and people dissolved into a psychic whiteout.

I used to think a lot about the experiment the American explorer Richard Byrd attempted in 1934, when he tried to live alone in a winter. At first he became hallucinatory, but then things took a turn to the worst when he fell unconscious and nearly slipped into a coma. The official explanation was carbon monoxide poisoning from a faulty stove, but I personally believe that Byrd might suffer at the hands of an environment that was much too simplified. When I returned home, I craved contrasts. Even today I rejoice in the most mundane of sensations. I guess the Antarctic never leaves you.

You have 15 seconds to check your answers. (Pause 15 seconds.)

Now you will hear the text again. (Repeat)

You have 15 seconds to check your answers. (Pause 15 seconds)

This is the end of the task.

Task A1-A7

You will hear a lecture on **animal communication**. For questions **A1-A7**, choose the answer which you think best fits according to what you hear. You will hear the recording **twice**. You now have **1 minute** to look at the questions.

Now we are ready to start.

Morning. Today we're comparing animal communication systems and human language to determine if they are essentially the same in nature. So, I suppose we need to begin with the question "what is language"? Rogers and Kaplan defined language as requiring one individual to send a signal of some description, and another to receive that signal and interpret its meaning. Using this definition they showed how animals are able to communicate with one another using various signals in a range of forms. Take the wolf. It uses scent to mark hunting routes, and facial expressions to express dominance in the pack, yelps to warn of danger. Now, while this is undoubtedly true, does it really seem right that human language is just the emitting and receiving of signals? On this broad scope, even a television could be deemed to have language. It seems then that a definition of language needs to explain exactly *how* meaning is transmitted and interpreted.

Which brings us to our second definition and the most widely accepted to date. Although, it might not look as you'd think. Because rather than being a simple definition that sits nicely in the pages of the Oxford dictionary, it's a list. A list of the 16 fundamental design features of language designed by the linguist Charles Hockett. The list includes, amongst others, *creativity*, *semanticity* and *rapid fading*, but it's important to understand that none of the features on the list are essentially connected in anyway. It's only when they combine together that they form a comprehensive inventory of what is essential in language. And while Hockett's features do go a long way to expressing the nature of language, critics have still pointed out that it's not really obvious exactly how many "features" are absolutely necessary on such a list. What's more, even those that *are* included fail to encompass *all* types of language. For example, written text is obviously not "rapid-fading" but nevertheless we'd still want to include it in the sphere of language. But, despite these problems, Hockett's list does provide us with a good starting point for today's discussion.

So, how do animal communication systems fare when we compare them to the list? Perhaps we only need to look at the most famous example of animal communication to decide: the dance of the bees. Bees communicate the location of a pollen source by turning their bodies in complicated patterns that give exact directions to flowers. Infamously, this dance ticks off many of Hockett's criteria, including the advanced feature *semanticity*, as the dance is clearly meaningful to all the bees in the hive. What's more interesting though is that because the food source is never in the same place, the bee's dance is always different. And this, at first glance, might appear to mean that the bee's communication is *creative*. By *creative*, I mean that it can communicate a non-finite number of unique utterances — a core component of human language. Unfortunately though, while bees *do* create new instructions every time they return to the hive, that is the sum total of what they can talk about. So, surprisingly it's not the fact that it's in the form of a dance that it excludes bee communication from being language but that the dance itself

does not allow the bees to discuss new topics. Or, in other words, is not the form of communication that's the problem.

Now, there are many other examples of animal communication but, like the bees, none of them satisfy Hockett's entire list. But, if we accept that animals don't have *naturally occurring* language, does it follow that they're unable to *acquire* language? Well, recent work with primates suggests maybe not.

Over the past 60 years a number of attempts have been made to teach apes language. In the beginning, before it was realised that chimpanzees lacked the required vocal apparatus to produce phonological words researchers tried to teach an ape named Viki to actually speak. Viki, who, unlike most research chimps was hand-raised as though she was a human infant, made, well let's say, struggling attempts to master speech. By the time she was 6 it was agreed her progress had stopped at being able to mouth four words- *Mama, Papa, Up* and *Cup*. But it was obvious that Vicki could understand and respond to a great deal more words than she could voice.

The next generations of apes were therefore taught to communicate using American Sign Language. These apes learned a large vocabulary of signs, or 'words' and, exceeding expectation, actually began to combine signs to produce two or three sign sequences of their own invention. A chimp called Washoe made the most notable of these unique utterances when she instinctively signed "WATER BIRDS" the first time she saw a pair of swans. What made this instance so remarkable was that, unlike all her previous multi-sign sequences, Washoe had never been explicitly taught this one. Instead she had combined two signs from her existing vocabulary, WATER and BIRDS, to accurately describe the swans. Now, I should note that in future conversations she used the same multi-sign to also refer to ducks and geese, which suggests that the meaning of the multi-sign was not limited to a single referent, swan, but perhaps a general concept, a bird on the water. However, at the time it seemed that this was a real break-through. Here was evidence that apes could use language creatively. But, since then, numerous linguists have questioned how significant the achievement really was.

Firstly, it wasn't possible to tell if Washoe was making two unconnected signs whose meaning just happened to coincide with swan. For example, "that is water" followed quickly by "that is a bird". Or if she really had made one distinct two-sign sequence for the animal. Secondly, after video analysis, it appeared that every one of Washoe's multi-sign sequences, which I think amounted to 10 in total including WATER BIRD, were preceded by a similar utterance from her teacher. In this instance, video footage showed that Washoe's trainer had signed both WATER and BIRD in the 90 seconds leading up to Washoe's sign. And, although the trainer had signed the words in different contexts, it does beg the question, was Washoe talking or imitating? The most damaging argument though was the fact that none of her two-sign utterances exhibited regularities in word order. Washoe would sign both WATER BIRD, and BIRD WATER interchangeably to refer to the swan, a feature clearly outside of the rule book of human speech.

However, research work involving apes has come a long way since the 1960s. In particular, recent work with a Bonobo monkey named Kanzi has proved that the divide between man and ape might not be as wide as we originally thought. The training of primates has traditionally centred on language games that seek to impart a rule-based knowledge of language. Kanzi, however, was placed in a social setting where he was able to comprehend the meaning of

communication before he was expected to produce any himself. In other words, his language environment mirrored that of a human infant. As a result, it's claimed that not only is he now able to understand the meaning of words and sentences and use a lexical keyboard to "voice" his communications, but he can actually understand, although not yet produce, novel events and metaphor. A feat that would suggest that language isn't unique to humans after all.

You have 15 seconds to check your answers. (Pause 15 seconds.)

Now you will hear the text again. (Repeat)

You have 15 seconds to check your answers. (Pause 15 seconds)

This is the end of the task.

Task B11-B20

*You will hear 5 short abstracts in which various people talk about **why they are not currently working**. You will hear the recording twice. And while you listen you must complete both tasks. For questions **B11-15**, choose from the list (A-H) **the reason why the person speaking is not working**. For questions **B16-B20** choose from the list (A-H) **what each speaker feels about an employment issue**. You now have **40 seconds** to look at the questions.*

Now we are ready to start.

Speaker 1

It's a very touchy subject here at the moment. I mean, everybody knows the arrival of migrants has changed the face of Britain, but it's a difficult subject to talk about without coming across as prejudice, or, well, just down-right racist. I guess, it's hard for me to say one way or the other if it's been a good or a bad thing exactly, but I certainly feel for the youngsters leaving school today. You know, those without many qualifications entering a market full of people willing to work for minimum wage? That's what should be against the law- paying people too little. Well, it wasn't like that in my day. Things were a lot easier then. I managed to find a good job with a decent salary. In fact I loved it so much I kept it right up I decided to call it a day.

Speaker 2

There's been a lot of coverage in the press recently about benefit cheats. You often see them on the front page of the tabloids. Men and women who sue for damages after a car accident — claiming they had whiplash or spine issues that left them unable to walk or work — and then, hey presto, a few months later they're caught up a ladder cleaning windows or scuba-diving in the Tenerife. Of course, they wind up in jail eventually, which is where they belong. I suppose it would be funny if it wasn't for the fact that they create such a bad stereotype of people like me who are really in pain. For those of us out there who are really in a bad way, the joke sticks a bit at the back of the throat.

Speaker 3

Unlawful dismissal tribunals are the stuff of nightmares. You start off thinking that you have a fair case for a claim, but then by the time everybody's actions have been picked apart and retold and rehashed, it's impossible for anybody to work out what the truth is. Half of what happened to me took place in an empty office. Luckily I had the word of one of my colleagues to back me up. Their cubicle was next to mine and they'd overheard the worst of the abuse. And to think, their nosiness used to get on my nerves! In the end I won but it took forever to get a verdict and I had to pay all the lawyer's fees upfront myself, which wasn't cheap I can tell you. So, yes, at the end of the day I was awarded a year's salary in damages and my position was re-instated, but after everything that'd happened I couldn't face going to the office anyway so handed in my notice the following week.

Speaker 4

Even though I knew that the company was struggling for a while, it was still a shock when it finally went under. I suppose you could say I'm one of the lucky ones though. My payout will be enough to keep me going for a few more months and my skills are transferrable. But I'm still scared of what the future holds. What really gets me is hearing how wonderful modern technology is. It's non-stop in the news. *Digital revolution* this, *The age of Information* that. But what about what all this progress is doing to our country's industry? To the people whose lives have been turned around because the machine has replaced their skills. Who talks about that? Nobody. What our workers need is a voice because without that they've got no way of fighting the multinational profit-making companies protected by the gangs of corporate lawyers.

Speaker 5

When people ask me how I feel about not working, I tell them I don't miss it at all! But then again, I guess it's not forever- I have no idea how the jobless cope with endless days to fill. You know, there are still people out there who think that people like me are responsible for the failure of small businesses. I mean, those who reckon we put them under unnecessary financial strain because most of us will take at least one year off in our 20-s or 30-s. It's ridiculous. What they don't realise is that 90% of the money I am getting now is government statutory pay, and I'm returning to work in 6 months anyway. I suppose not every country has a social system like ours though. I have to say, it definitely helped having worked at the same place since leaving Uni — my boss is so supportive. God, it only seems like yesterday I was wearing a cap and gown, and now I'm stood here with a pram. Unbelievable.

You have 15 seconds to check your answers. (Pause 15 seconds.)

Now you will hear the text again. (Repeat)

You have 15 seconds to check your answers. (Pause 15 seconds)

This is the end of the task.

This is the end of the listening test.