Passage 21

云里雾里 没有全文结构

1. It can be inferred that Rosalind Miles refers to the third millennium B.C. primarily in order to

A. present an overview of what the practice of history once entailed

选A

B. suggest that the origins of historical study are much earlier than had been previously though

没说

C. suggest why the third millennium B.C. has received so much attention from historians

没说

D. establish a contrast between men and women in terms of how long they have been recording history

没说

E. indicate how significantly the practice of history has changed since the third millennium B.C.

没什么变化

2. It can be inferred from the passage that the term herstory

A. was popular mainly in the nineteenth century

B. is an old term that feminist put to new uses

C. is controversial within the feminist community

D. is not especially useful to scholars

E. was invented to help make a particular point

选E　红色

3. Mary Astell is discussed by the author as an example of an eighteenth-century feminist　historian

A. who was representative of the intellectual interests of the woman historians of her time

B. who inspired many practitioners of herstory in the twentieth century

选B　two and half

C. who shared with modern herstorian’s a mistaken assumption regarding the writing of history

D. whose major work aroused much controversy at the time of its publication

E. whose major work still has not received the attention from scholars that it deserves

他忽略前面的

4. The author implies which of the following about Astell’s supposition?

A. It is likely to have arisen because of Astell’s unawareness of much of the historical work written by women.

提到

选Ａ

B. It was one that Astell reconsidered after she wrote her own historical work.

?

C. It was one that was not shared by other feminist historians of Astell’s time.

那时候没其他的

D. It was one that inspired Astell to write her own historical work.

没说原因

E. It directly contradicts one of the basic claims of herstory.

?

Received feminist wisdom has conceived of history as a male enclave devoid of woman　subjects and practitioners, particularly before the twentieth century. As Ann For Freedom put it　in 1972, from Herodout’s to Will Durant’s histories, the main characters, the main viewpoints　and interests, have all been male. Feminist accounts of the 1970s and 1980s viewed　historiography (the writing of history) as overwhelmingly his, coining the term herstory and　presenting it as a compensatory feminist practice. Herstory designated women’s place at the　center of an alternative narrative of past events. Rosalind Miles’s description restates the　popular view: Women’s history by contrast has only just begun to invent itself. Males gained　entry to the business of recording, defining and interpreting events in the third millennium　B.C.; for women, this process did not even begin until the nineteenth century. The herstorical　method provided a means for feminist historians to explore materials by and about women that　had previously been neglected or ignored. Herstory promoted curricular transformation in　schools and was used as a slogan on T-shirts, pencils, and buttons. Exposing historians tacit　and intentional sexism, herstorians set out to correct the record–to show that women had held　up half the historical sky.

Despite the great scholarly gains made behind the rallying cry, herstory’s popular myth–　particularly about the lack of women who have recorded history–require revision. Herstory may　accurately describe feminists efforts to construct female- centered accounts of the past, but　the term inadvertently blinds us to women’s important contributions to historical discourse　before the nineteenth century. Historiography has not been an entirely male preserve, though　feminists are justified in faulting its long-standing masculine contours. In fact, criticism of　historiography’s sexism is not of recent origin. Early eighteenth-century feminist Mary Astell protested that the Men being the Historians, they seldom condescend to record the great and　good actions of Women. Astell, like those who echoed her sentiments two and a half centuries　later, must be credited for admirable zeal in setting out to right scholarly wrongs, but her supposition that historians were only male is inaccurate. Her perception is especially strange　because she herself wrote a historical work, An Impartial Enquiry into the Cause of Rebellionand Civil War (1704). Astell’s judgment is at the same time understandable, given that much　historical writing by women of the late seventeenth century was not published until the nineteenth century. Despite their courage and their rightful anger, Astell and her descendants　overlooked early modern woman writer’s contributions to historiography.