

## English ECAT Pre Engineering Chapter 8 Comprehension Online Test

Sr	Questions	Answers Choice
1	<p>The history of literature really began was the earliest of the arts. Man danced for joy round his primitive camp fire after the defeat and slaughter of his enemy. He yelled and shouted as he danced and gradually the yells and shouts became coherent and caught the measure of the coherent and caught the measure of the dance and thus the first war song was sung. As the idea of God developed prayers were framed. The songs and prayers became traditional and were repeated from one generation to another, each generation adding something of its own. As man slowly grew more civilized, he was compelled to invent some method of writing by three urgent necessities. There were certain things that it was dangerous to forget and which, therefore, had to be recorded. It was often necessary to communicate with person who were some distance away and it was necessary to protect one's property by making tools, cattle and so on, in some distinctive manner. So man taught himself to write and having learned to write purely for utilitarian reasons he used this new method for preserving his war songs and his prayers. Of course, among these ancient peoples, There were only a very few individuals who learned to write, and only a few could read what was written.</p> <p>Before man invented writing</p>	<p>A. Literature was passed on by word by mouth            B. Prayers were considered literature            C. Literature was just singing and dancing            D. There was no literature</p>
2	<p>At the time Jane Austen's novels were published – between 1811 and 1818 – English literature was not part of any academic curriculum. In addition, fiction was under strenuous attack. Certain religious and political groups felt novels had the power to make so-called immoral characters so interesting that young readers would identify with them; these groups also considered novels to be of little practical use. Even Coleridge, certainly no literary reactionary, spoke for many when he asserted that "novel-reading occasions the destruction of the mind's powers."</p> <p>These attitudes towards novels help explain why Austen received little attention from early nineteenth-century literary critics. (In any case a novelist published anonymously, as Austen was, would not be likely to receive much critical attention.) The literary response that was accorded to her, however, was often as incisive as twentieth-century criticism. In his attack in 1816 on novelistic portrayals "outside of ordinary experience," for example. Scott made an insightful remark about the merits of Austen's fiction.</p> <p>Her novels, wrote Scott, "present to the reader an accurate and exact picture of ordinary everyday people and places, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Flemish painting." Scott did not use the word 'realism', but he undoubtedly used a standard of realistic probability in judging novels. The critic Whately did not use the word 'realism', either, but he expressed agreement with Scott's evaluation, and went on to suggest the possibilities for moral instruction in what we have called Austen's 'realistic method' her characters, wrote Whately, are persuasive agents for moral truth since they are ordinary persons "so clearly evoked that we feel an interest in their fate as if it were our own." Moral instruction, explained Whately, is more likely to be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters than when imparted by a sermonizing narrator. Whately especially praised Austen's ability to create character who "mingle goodness and villainy, weakness and virtue, as in life they are always mingled." Whately concluded his remarks by comparing Austen's art of characterization to Dickens', starting his preference for Austen's.</p> <p>Yet, the response of nineteenth-century literary critics to Austen was not always so laudatory, and often anticipated the reservations of twentieth-century literary critics. An example of such a response was Lewes complaint in 1859 that Austen's range of subject and characters was too narrow. Praising her verisimilitude, Lewes added that, nonetheless her focus was too often only upon the unlofty and the commonplace. (Twentieth-century Marxists, on the other hand, were to complain about what they saw as her exclusive emphasis on a lofty upper middle class.) In any case having being rescued by literary critics from neglect and indeed gradually lionized by them, Austen steadily reached, by the mid-nineteenth century, the enviable pinnacle of being considered controversial.</p> <p>How would you describe the synonym of the word "Verisimilitude"?</p>	<p>A. False            B. Wrong            C. Exaggerated            D. Appearing true</p>

At the time Jane Austen's novels were published – between 1811 and 1818 – English literature was not part of any academic curriculum. In addition, fiction was under strenuous attack. Certain religious and political groups felt novels had the power to make so-called immoral characters so interesting that young readers would identify with them; these groups also considered novels to be of little practical use. Even Coleridge, certainly no literary reactionary, spoke for many when he asserted that “novel-reading occasions the destruction of the mind's powers.”

These attitudes towards novels help explain why Austen received little attention from early nineteenth-century literary critics. (In any case a novelist published anonymously, as Austen was, would not be likely to receive much critical attention.) The literary response that was accorded to her, however, was often as incisive as twentieth-century criticism. In his attack in 1816 on novelistic portrayals “outside of ordinary experience,” for example. Scott made an insightful remark about the merits of Austen's fiction.

Her novels, wrote Scott, “present to the reader an accurate and exact picture of ordinary everyday people and places, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Flemish painting.” Scott did not use the word ‘realism’, but he undoubtedly used a standard of realistic probability in judging novels. The critic Whately did not use the word ‘realism’, either, but he expressed agreement with Scott's evaluation, and went on to suggest the possibilities for moral instruction in what we have called Austen's ‘realistic method’ her characters, wrote Whately, are persuasive agents for moral truth since they are ordinary persons “so clearly evoked that we feel an interest in their fate as if it were our own.” Moral instruction, explained Whately, is more likely to be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters than when imparted by a sermonizing narrator. Whately especially praised Austen's ability to create character who “mingle goodness and villainy, weakness and virtue, as in life they are always mingled.” Whately concluded his remarks by comparing Austen's art of characterization to Dickens', starting his preference for Austen's.

Yet, the response of nineteenth-century literary critics to Austen was not always so laudatory, and often anticipated the reservations of twentieth-century literary critics. An example of such a response was Lewes complaint in 1859 that Austen's range of subject and characters was too narrow. Praising her verisimilitude, Lewes added that, nonetheless her focus was too often only upon the unlofty and the commonplace. (Twentieth-century Marxists, on the other hand, were to complain about what they saw as her exclusive emphasis on a lofty upper middle class.) In any case having being rescued by literary critics from neglect and indeed gradually lionized by them, Austen steadily reached, by the mid-nineteenth century, the enviable pinnacle of being considered controversial.

The author would most likely agree to which of the following as the best measure of a writer's literary success?

- A. Inclusion of the writer's work in an academic curriculum
- B. Publication of the writer's work in the writer's own name
- C. Existence of debate among critics about the writers's work
- D. Praise of the writer's work by religious and political groups

At the time Jane Austen's novels were published – between 1811 and 1818 – English literature was not part of any academic curriculum. In addition, fiction was under strenuous attack. Certain religious and political groups felt novels had the power to make so-called immoral characters so interesting that young readers would identify with them; these groups also considered novels to be of little practical use. Even Coleridge, certainly no literary reactionary, spoke for many when he asserted that “novel-reading occasions the destruction of the mind's powers.”

These attitudes towards novels help explain why Austen received little attention from early nineteenth-century literary critics. (In any case a novelist published anonymously, as Austen was, would not be likely to receive much critical attention.) The literary response that was accorded to her, however, was often as incisive as twentieth-century criticism. In his attack in 1816 on novelistic portrayals “outside of ordinary experience,” for example. Scott made an insightful remark about the merits of Austen's fiction.

Her novels, wrote Scott, “present to the reader an accurate and exact picture of ordinary everyday people and places, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Flemish painting.” Scott did not use the word ‘realism’, but he undoubtedly used a standard of realistic probability in judging novels. The critic Whately did not use the word ‘realism’, either, but he expressed agreement with Scott's evaluation, and went on to suggest the possibilities for moral instruction in what we have called Austen's ‘realistic method’ her characters, wrote Whately, are persuasive agents for moral truth since they are ordinary persons “so clearly evoked that we feel an interest in their fate as if it were our own.” Moral instruction, explained Whately, is more likely to be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters than when imparted by a sermonizing narrator. Whately especially praised Austen's

- A. Assurance felt by many people that novels weakened the mind
- B. Certainty shared by many political commentators that the ranges of novels was too narrow
- C. Lack of interest shown by some critics in novels that were published anonymously
- D. Fear exhibited by some religious and political groups that the novel had the power to portray immoral characters attractively

ability to create character who “mingle goodness and villainy, weakness and virtue, as in life they are always mingled.” Whitely concluded his remarks by comparing Austen’s art of characterization to Dickens’, starting his preference for Austen’s.

Yet, the response of nineteenth-century literary critics to Austen was not always so laudatory, and often anticipated the reservations of twentieth-century literary critics. An example of such a response was Lewes complaint in 1859 that Austen’s range of subject and characters was too narrow. Praising her verisimilitude, Lewes added that, nonetheless her focus was too often only upon the unlofty and the commonplace. (Twentieth-century Marxists, on the other hand, were to complain about what they saw as her exclusive emphasis on a lofty upper middle class.) In any case having being rescued by literary critics from neglect and indeed gradually lionized by them, Austen steadily reached, by the mid-nineteenth century, the enviable pinnacle of being considered controversial.

According to the passage, the lack of critical attention paid to Jane Austen can be explained by all of the following nineteenth-century attitudes towards the novel

At the time Jane Austen’s novels were published – between 1811 and 1818 – English literature was not part of any academic curriculum. In addition, fiction was under strenuous attack. Certain religious and political groups felt novels had the power to make so-called immoral characters so interesting that young readers would identify with them; these groups also considered novels to be of little practical use. Even Coleridge, certainly no literary reactionary, spoke for many when he asserted that “novel-reading occasions the destruction of the mind’s powers.”

These attitudes towards novels help explain why Austen received little attention from early nineteenth-century literary cities. (In any case a novelist published anonymously, as Austen was, would not be likely to receive much critical attention.) The literary response that was accorded to her, however, was often as incisive as twentieth-century criticism. In his attack in 1816 on novelistic portrayals “outside of ordinary experience,” for example. Scott made an insightful remark about the merits of Austen’s fiction.

Her novels, wrote Scott, “present to the reader an accurate and exact picture of ordinary everyday people and places, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Flemish painting.” Scott did not use the word ‘realism’, but he undoubtedly used a standard of realistic probability in judging novels. The critic Whitely did not use the word ‘realism’, either, but he expressed agreement with Scott’s evaluation, and went on to suggest the possibilities for moral instruction in what we have called Austen’s ‘realistic method’ her characters, wrote Whitely, are persuasive agents for moral truth since they are ordinary persons “so clearly evoked that we feel an interest in their fate as if it were our own.” Moral instruction, explained Whitely, is more likely to be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters than when imparted by a sermonizing narrator. Whitely especially praised Austen’s ability to create character who “mingle goodness and villainy, weakness and virtue, as in life they are always mingled.” Whitely concluded his remarks by comparing Austen’s art of characterization to Dickens’, starting his preference for Austen’s.

Yet, the response of nineteenth-century literary critics to Austen was not always so laudatory, and often anticipated the reservations of twentieth-century literary critics. An example of such a response was Lewes complaint in 1859 that Austen’s range of subject and characters was too narrow. Praising her verisimilitude, Lewes added that, nonetheless her focus was too often only upon the unlofty and the commonplace. (Twentieth-century Marxists, on the other hand, were to complain about what they saw as her exclusive emphasis on a lofty upper middle class.) In any case having being rescued by literary critics from neglect and indeed gradually lionized by them, Austen steadily reached, by the mid-nineteenth century, the enviable pinnacle of being considered controversial.

It can be inferred from the passage that Whitely found Dickens’ characters to be

- A. Especially interesting to young readers
- B. Ordinary persons in recognizably human situations
- C. Less liable than Jane Austen’s characters to have a realistic mixture of moral qualities
- D. More often villainous in recognizably human situation

At the time Jane Austen’s novels were published – between 1811 and 1818 – English literature was not part of any academic curriculum. In addition, fiction was under strenuous attack. Certain religious and political groups felt novels had the power to make so-called immoral characters so interesting that young readers would identify with them; these groups also considered novels to be of little practical use. Even Coleridge, certainly no literary reactionary, spoke for many when he asserted that “novel-reading occasions the destruction of the mind’s powers.”

These attitudes towards novels help explain why Austen received little attention from early nineteenth-century literary cities. (In any case a novelist published anonymously, as Austen was, would not be likely to receive much critical attention.) The literary response that was accorded to her, however, was often as incisive as twentieth-

century criticism. In his attack in 1816 on novelistic portrayals “outside of ordinary experience,” for example. Scott made an insightful remark about the merits of Austen’s fiction.

Her novels, wrote Scott, “present to the reader an accurate and exact picture of ordinary everyday people and places, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Flemish painting.” Scott did not use the word ‘realism’, but he undoubtedly used a standard of realistic probability in judging novels. The critic Whately did not use the word ‘realism’, either, but he expressed agreement with Scott’s evaluation, and went on to suggest the possibilities for moral instruction in what we have called Austen’s ‘realistic method’ her characters, wrote Whately, are persuasive agents for moral truth since they are ordinary persons “so clearly evoked that we feel an interest in their fate as if it were our own.” Moral instruction, explained Whately, is more likely to be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters than when imparted by a sermonizing narrator. Whately especially praised Austen’s ability to create character who “mingle goodness and villainy, weakness and virtue, as in life they are always mingled.” Whately concluded his remarks by comparing Austen’s art of characterization to Dickens’, starting his preference for Austen’s.

Yet, the response of nineteenth-century literary critics to Austen was not always so laudatory, and often anticipated the reservations of twentieth-century literary critics. An example of such a response was Lewes complaint in 1859 that Austen’s range of subject and characters was too narrow. Praising her verisimilitude, Lewes added that, nonetheless her focus was too often only upon the unlofty and the commonplace. (Twentieth-century Marxists, on the other hand, were to complain about what they saw as her exclusive emphasis on a lofty upper middle class.) In any case having being rescued by literary critics from neglect and indeed gradually lionized by them, Austen steadily reached, by the mid-nineteenth century, the enviable pinnacle of being considered controversial.

The passage suggest that twentieth-century Marxists would have admired Jane Austen’s novels more if the novels, as the Marxists understood them, had

- A. Described the values of upper-middle class society
- B. Avoided moral instruction and sermonizing
- C. Depicted ordinary society in a more flattering light
- D. Portrayed characters from more than one class of society

At the time Jane Austen’s novels were published – between 1811 and 1818 – English literature was not part of any academic curriculum. In addition, fiction was under strenuous attack. Certain religious and political groups felt novels had the power to make so-called immoral characters so interesting that young readers would identify with them; these groups also considered novels to be of little practical use. Even Coleridge, certainly no literary reactionary, spoke for many when he asserted that “novel-reading occasions the destruction of the mind’s powers.”

These attitudes towards novels help explain why Austen received little attention from early nineteenth-century literary critics. (In any case a novelist published anonymously, as Austen was, would not be likely to receive much critical attention.) The literary response that was accorded to her, however, was often as incisive as twentieth-century criticism. In his attack in 1816 on novelistic portrayals “outside of ordinary experience,” for example. Scott made an insightful remark about the merits of Austen’s fiction.

Her novels, wrote Scott, “present to the reader an accurate and exact picture of ordinary everyday people and places, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Flemish painting.” Scott did not use the word ‘realism’, but he undoubtedly used a standard of realistic probability in judging novels. The critic Whately did not use the word ‘realism’, either, but he expressed agreement with Scott’s evaluation, and went on to suggest the possibilities for moral instruction in what we have called Austen’s ‘realistic method’ her characters, wrote Whately, are persuasive agents for moral truth since they are ordinary persons “so clearly evoked that we feel an interest in their fate as if it were our own.” Moral instruction, explained Whately, is more likely to be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters than when imparted by a sermonizing narrator. Whately especially praised Austen’s ability to create character who “mingle goodness and villainy, weakness and virtue, as in life they are always mingled.” Whately concluded his remarks by comparing Austen’s art of characterization to Dickens’, starting his preference for Austen’s.

Yet, the response of nineteenth-century literary critics to Austen was not always so laudatory, and often anticipated the reservations of twentieth-century literary critics. An example of such a response was Lewes complaint in 1859 that Austen’s range of subject and characters was too narrow. Praising her verisimilitude, Lewes added that, nonetheless her focus was too often only upon the unlofty and the commonplace. (Twentieth-century Marxists, on the other hand, were to complain about what they saw as her exclusive emphasis on a lofty upper middle class.) In any case having being rescued by literary critics from neglect and indeed gradually lionized by them, Austen steadily reached, by the mid-nineteenth century, the enviable pinnacle of being considered controversial.

- A. Refute the literary opinions of certain religious and political groups
- B. Make a case for the inferiority of novel to poetry
- C. Give an example of a writer who was not a literary reactionary
- D. Indicate how widespread the attack on novels was in the early nineteenth century

At the time Jane Austen's novels were published – between 1811 and 1818 – English literature was not part of any academic curriculum. In addition, fiction was under strenuous attack. Certain religious and political groups felt novels had the power to make so-called immoral characters so interesting that young readers would identify with them; these groups also considered novels to be of little practical use. Even Coleridge, certainly no literary reactionary, spoke for many when he asserted that “novel-reading occasions the destruction of the mind's powers.”

These attitudes towards novels help explain why Austen received little attention from early nineteenth-century literary critics. (In any case a novelist published anonymously, as Austen was, would not be likely to receive much critical attention.) The literary response that was accorded to her, however, was often as incisive as twentieth-century criticism. In his attack in 1816 on novelistic portrayals “outside of ordinary experience,” for example. Scott made an insightful remark about the merits of Austen's fiction.

Her novels, wrote Scott, “present to the reader an accurate and exact picture of ordinary everyday people and places, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Flemish painting.” Scott did not use the word ‘realism’, but he undoubtedly used a standard of realistic probability in judging novels. The critic Whately did not use the word ‘realism’, either, but he expressed agreement with Scott's evaluation, and went on to suggest the possibilities for moral instruction in what we have called Austen's ‘realistic method’ her characters, wrote Whately, are persuasive agents for moral truth since they are ordinary persons “so clearly evoked that we feel an interest in their fate as if it were our own.” Moral instruction, explained Whately, is more likely to be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters than when imparted by a sermonizing narrator. Whately especially praised Austen's ability to create character who “mingle goodness and villainy, weakness and virtue, as in life they are always mingled.” Whately concluded his remarks by comparing Austen's art of characterization to Dickens', starting his preference for Austen's.

Yet, the response of nineteenth-century literary critics to Austen was not always so laudatory, and often anticipated the reservations of twentieth-century literary critics. An example of such a response was Lewes complaint in 1859 that Austen's range of subject and characters was too narrow. Praising her verisimilitude, Lewes added that, nonetheless her focus was too often only upon the unlofty and the commonplace. (Twentieth-century Marxists, on the other hand, were to complain about what they saw as her exclusive emphasis on a lofty upper middle class.) In any case having being rescued by literary critics from neglect and indeed gradually lionized by them, Austen steadily reached, by the mid-nineteenth century, the enviable pinnacle of being considered controversial.

The passage supplies information to suggest that the religious and political groups (mentioned in the third sentence) and Whately might have agreed that a novel.

- A. Has little practical use
- B. Has the ability to influence the moral values of its readers
- C. Is of utmost interest to readers when representing ordinary human characters
- D. Should not be read by young readers

At the time Jane Austen's novels were published – between 1811 and 1818 – English literature was not part of any academic curriculum. In addition, fiction was under strenuous attack. Certain religious and political groups felt novels had the power to make so-called immoral characters so interesting that young readers would identify with them; these groups also considered novels to be of little practical use. Even Coleridge, certainly no literary reactionary, spoke for many when he asserted that “novel-reading occasions the destruction of the mind's powers.”

These attitudes towards novels help explain why Austen received little attention from early nineteenth-century literary critics. (In any case a novelist published anonymously, as Austen was, would not be likely to receive much critical attention.) The literary response that was accorded to her, however, was often as incisive as twentieth-century criticism. In his attack in 1816 on novelistic portrayals “outside of ordinary experience,” for example. Scott made an insightful remark about the merits of Austen's fiction.

Her novels, wrote Scott, “present to the reader an accurate and exact picture of ordinary everyday people and places, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Flemish painting.” Scott did not use the word ‘realism’, but he undoubtedly used a standard of realistic probability in judging novels. The critic Whately did not use the word ‘realism’, either, but he expressed agreement with Scott's evaluation, and went on to suggest the possibilities for moral instruction in what we have called Austen's ‘realistic method’ her characters, wrote Whately, are persuasive agents for moral truth since they are ordinary persons “so clearly evoked that we feel an interest in their fate as if it were our own.” Moral instruction, explained Whately, is more likely to be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters

- A. Emphasise the need for Jane Austen to create ordinary, everyday characters in her novels
- B. Give support to those religious and political groups that had attacked fiction
- C. Give one reason why Jane Austen's novels received little critical attention in the early nineteenth century
- D. Suggest the superiority of an

be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters than when imparted by a sermonizing narrator. Whitely especially praised Austen's ability to create character who "mingle goodness and villainy, weakness and virtue, as in life they are always mingled." Whitely concluded his remarks by comparing Austen's art of characterization to Dickens', stating his preference for Austen's.

D. Suggest the superiority of an informal and un-systematized approach to the study of literature

Yet, the response of nineteenth-century literary critics to Austen was not always so laudatory, and often anticipated the reservations of twentieth-century literary critics. An example of such a response was Lewes complaint in 1859 that Austen's range of subject and characters was too narrow. Praising her verisimilitude, Lewes added that, nonetheless her focus was too often only upon the unlofty and the commonplace. (Twentieth-century Marxists, on the other hand, were to complain about what they saw as her exclusive emphasis on a lofty upper middle class.) In any case having being rescued by literary critics from neglect and indeed gradually lionized by them, Austen steadily reached, by the mid-nineteenth century, the enviable pinnacle of being considered controversial.

The author mentions that English literature "was nor part of any academic curriculum" in the early nineteenth century in order to

At the time Jane Austen's novels were published – between 1811 and 1818 – English literature was not part of any academic curriculum. In addition, fiction was under strenuous attack. Certain religious and political groups felt novels had the power to make so-called immoral characters so interesting that young readers would identify with them; these groups also considered novels to be of little practical use. Even Coleridge, certainly no literary reactionary, spoke for many when he asserted that "novel-reading occasions the destruction of the mind's powers."

These attitudes towards novels help explain why Austen received little attention from early nineteenth-century literary critics. (In any case a novelist published anonymously, as Austen was, would not be likely to receive much critical attention.) The literary response that was accorded to her, however, was often as incisive as twentieth-

century criticism. In his attack in 1816 on novelistic portrayals "outside of ordinary experience," for example. Scott made an insightful remark about the merits of Austen's fiction.

Her novels, wrote Scott, "present to the reader an accurate and exact picture of ordinary everyday people and places, reminiscent of seventeenth-century Flemish painting." Scott did not use the word 'realism', but he undoubtedly used a standard of realistic probability in judging novels. The critic Whitely did not use the word 'realism', either, but he expressed agreement with Scott's evaluation, and went on to suggest the possibilities for moral instruction in what we have called Austen's 'realistic method' her characters, wrote Whitely, are persuasive agents for moral truth since they are ordinary persons "so clearly evoked that we feel an interest in their fate as if it were our own." Moral instruction, explained Whitely, is more likely to be effective when conveyed through recognizably human and interesting characters than when imparted by a sermonizing narrator. Whitely especially praised Austen's ability to create character who "mingle goodness and villainy, weakness and virtue, as in life they are always mingled." Whitely concluded his remarks by comparing Austen's art of characterization to Dickens', stating his preference for Austen's.

Yet, the response of nineteenth-century literary critics to Austen was not always so laudatory, and often anticipated the reservations of twentieth-century literary critics. An example of such a response was Lewes complaint in 1859 that Austen's range of subject and characters was too narrow. Praising her verisimilitude, Lewes added that, nonetheless her focus was too often only upon the unlofty and the commonplace. (Twentieth-century Marxists, on the other hand, were to complain about what they saw as her exclusive emphasis on a lofty upper middle class.) In any case having being rescued by literary critics from neglect and indeed gradually lionized by them, Austen steadily reached, by the mid-nineteenth century, the enviable pinnacle of being considered controversial.

The passage supplies information for answering which of the following questions?

- A. Was Whitely aware of Scott's remarks about Jane Austen's novel?
- B. Who is an example of a twentieth-century Marxist critic?
- C. Who is an example of a twentieth-century critic who admired Jane Austen's novels?
- D. What is the author's judgement of Dickens?