

READING PASSAGE 3

*You should spend about 20 minutes on **Questions 27-40**, which are based on Reading Passage 3 below.*

What is social history?

Ever since its elevation to the status of an academic discipline, history has been very largely concerned with problems of its own making. These may be gaps which the young researcher is advised by supervisors to fill; or established views which he or she is encouraged to challenge. In either case, the need for the researcher to provide new insights in order to gain professional advancement often counts for more than the intrinsic interest of the topic.

Social history is quite different. It touches on, and arguably helps to focus, major issues of public debate. It mobilises popular enthusiasm and engages popular passions. It prides itself on being concerned with everyday things rather than sensational events and is directed against the 'Great Man' theories that originally characterised history, and the tedious focus on bureaucratic issues that subsequently dominated the 1920s and 30s. This is also reflected in the way it is taught, through the adoption of multi-disciplinary perspectives rather than a narrow historical interpretation.

Social history emerged, both as a popular enthusiasm and as a scholarly practice, from the cultural revolution of the 1960s in North America and Europe, and reproduces its leading inspirations. The spirit of social history was pre-eminently a modernising one, as reflected in its choice of subject matter. Whereas traditional history had focused on the 12th to 17th centuries, social history was apt to make its historical homeland in the 19th century. Latterly, it has even begun to extend its inquiry up to contemporary events and movements.

The subject matter favoured by the new social history, with its move away from the aristocracy and the establishment, corresponds to other cultural manifestations of the 1960s, such as New Wave British cinema, with its working-class protagonists, or 'Pop art', with its use of everyday artefacts. Similarly, the anti-institutional bias of the new social history—the renewed determination to write the history of 'ordinary' people as against that of statecraft—could be said to echo a much more widespread collapse of social deference, and a questioning of authority figures of all kinds.

Another major 1960s influence on the new social history—very different in its origins and effects—was the 'nostalgia industry', which focused on the sale of memorabilia and artefacts from recent history. This emerged as a kind of negative counterpart to the otherwise dominant modernisation of the decade and reflected a disenchantment, no less apparent on the Left of the political spectrum than on the Right, with post-war social change.

Industrial archaeology, an invention of the 1960s, elevated disused factories and mills to the status of national monuments. Following in the same track, property restorers turned houses built for 19th-century factory workers—once emblems of poverty, overcrowding, and ill-health—into picturesque residences. In another sphere, one could point to the proliferation of folk clubs and the discovery of industrial folk songs, prefiguring one of the major themes of the new social history—the dignity of labour.

So far as historical work was concerned, by the 1970s the sense of disenchantment had crystallised into an idealised view of the past, fostering a nostalgic regard for disappearing communities. The restoration of vanished components of ‘the world we have lost’ became a major impetus in historical writing and research. The dignity of ordinary people could be said to be the unifying theme of this line of historical inquiry and retrieval—a celebration of everyday life, even, perhaps especially, when it involved hardship and suffering.

Despite the novelty of its subject matter, social history reproduces many of the characteristic biases of its predecessors. Social historians are good at amassing details on household artefacts, budgets, daily purchases, but at times the evidence is assumed to speak for itself, and the simple reproduction of fact masquerades as explanation. The facts accumulated may leave no conceptual space for the great absences, for the many areas where the documentary record is silent.

The indulgence which social historians extend towards their subjects, and the desire to establish ‘empathy’—seeing the past in terms of its own values rather than those of today—can also serve to flatter our self-esteem, making history a field in which, at no great cost to ourselves, we can demonstrate our enlarged sympathies and benevolence. Recognising our kinship to people in the past, and tracing, or discovering, their likeness to ourselves, we are flattered in the belief that underneath we are all lovable; eccentric perhaps and even absurd, but large-hearted, generous and frank. This sense of integration with the past can thus serve as a comfortable alternative to critical awareness and self-questioning, allowing us to dignify the present by illegitimate association with the past.

Social history, if it is to fulfil its subversive potential, needs to be a great deal more disturbing. If it is to celebrate a common humanity, and to bring past and present closer together, far more weight needs to be given to the effects of insecurities and emergencies—the fears that shadow the growing up of children, the oppositions we encounter during our lives—experiences which may be hard for an individual to categorise but which nevertheless have a significance which goes beyond that individual.

Perhaps too we might recognise that there is a profound condescension in the notion of ‘ordinary people’—that unified totality in which social historians are apt to deal. Implicitly it is a category from which we tend to exclude ourselves, although in fact we are exceptional only by our privilege of hindsight. ‘There are ... no masses,’ Raymond Williams wrote, ‘only ways of seeing people as masses.’ It is perhaps time for historians to scrutinise the term ‘ordinary people’ in the same way.

Questions 27–31

Complete the summary using the list of words, **A–H**, below.

Write the correct letter, **A–H**, in boxes 27–31 on your answer sheet.

How is social history different from historical study?

Since it became an academic discipline, historical study has been too concerned with a search for **27** _____ by researchers who want to develop their careers. Social history, however, is more closely related to the **28** _____ of the public. It avoids history's traditional focus on **29** _____, and its later concentration on **30** _____, and it is also different from traditional history in its teaching **31** _____, which is derived from different academic subjects.

A methodology

B needs

C originality

D important people

E accuracy

F interests and feelings

G explanation

H organisational matters

Questions 32–35

Do the following statements agree with the claims of the writer in Reading Passage 3?

In boxes 32–35 on your answer sheet, write:

YES

if the statement agrees with the claims of the writer

NO

if the statement contradicts the claims of the writer

NOT GIVEN

if it is impossible to say what the writer thinks about this

32 The rise of social history led to the cultural revolution of the 1960s.

33 Social historians tend to study a later period of history than traditional historians did.

34 British cinema in the 1960s lacked any working-class characters.

35 The loss of respect for authority in the 1960s was a leading cause of social problems.

Questions 36–40

Choose the correct letter, **A**, **B**, **C**, or **D**.

Write the correct letter in boxes 36–40 on your answer sheet.

- 36** What point is made about the ‘nostalgia industry’?
- A** Its products were not always genuine historical items.
 - B** It led to the abandonment of modernisation.
 - C** Its origins were political rather than industrial.
 - D** It opposed the dominant trend of the time.
- 37** In the sixth paragraph, the writer makes the point that in the 1960s
- A** construction workers gained greater status.
 - B** there was a new interest in traditional industrial buildings.
 - C** architects applied industrial techniques to home design.
 - D** many older homes were unsuitable as places of residence.
- 38** By the 1970s, historians had come to believe that
- A** researchers should focus on the immediate past.
 - B** modern life is not necessarily an improvement on the past.
 - C** they should not overemphasise the difficulties of life in the past.
 - D** there was a need for more ‘ordinary’ people to do research into the past.
- 39** One problem related to the use of detail by social historians is that
- A** the wrong types of facts are collected.
 - B** some information may be hard to categorise.
 - C** more important issues may be ignored.
 - D** some of the data may be incorrect.
- 40** The writer recommends that to be effective, social history must
- A** explore the negative emotions that are part of daily life.
 - B** build on what has already been established by historians.
 - C** try to provide an objective view of the recent past.
 - D** offer solutions to the pressing problems of our day.

一、概要填空 (27–31)

题号	答案	题干翻译	精确定位 (第 X 段 + 关键词/引文)	解析 (同义改写 & 选项排除)
27	C) originality	自成学科后, 传统史学过分追求研究者为升职而进行的“某种追求”。	第1段: “the need for the researcher to provide new insights ... to gain professional advancement”	“provide new insights (提出新的见解)”= originality (原创性/新意)。A 方法论、B 需求、E 准确性、G 解释、H 组织事务均不对应“新见解”。
28	F) interests and feelings	社会史与公众的兴趣与情感联系更紧密。	第2段: “It mobilises popular enthusiasm and engages popular passions.”	“popular enthusiasm / passions (热情/情感)”对应 interests and feelings。B needs “需求”不如 F 贴切。
29	D) important people	它避开历史学传统的对重要人物的关注。	第2段: “directed against the ‘Great Man’ theories”	“Great Man theories (伟人史观)”= 关注重要人物。
30	H) organisational matters	也避开后来对官僚/组织事务的关注。	第2段: “the tedious focus on bureaucratic issues”	“bureaucratic (官僚的)”对应 organisational matters。
31	A) methodology	并且在教学方法上也不同, 来自多学科。	第2段: “through the adoption of multi-disciplinary perspectives”	多学科视角=不同学科滋养的方法论/教学法。C 原创性已用于 27; E 准确性、G 解释不吻合“教学”。

二、判断题 (32–35)

题号	答案	题干翻译	精确定位 (第 X 段 + 关键词/引文)	解析 (为何 YES/NO/NG)
32	NO	社会史的兴起引发了 20 世纪 60 年代的文化革命。	第3段: “Social history emerged ... from the cultural revolution of the 1960s”	原文是“社会史出自于 60 年代文化革命”, 非“导致/引发”。与题干因果相反 ⇒ NO。
33	YES	社会史学家研究的时期晚于传统历史学家。	第3段: “traditional history ... 12th to 17th centuries, social history ... 19th century ... contemporary”	清晰对比: 传统 12–17 世纪 vs 社会史偏 19 世纪并延至当代 ⇒ YES。
34	NO	20 世纪 60 年代英国电影没有任何工人阶级角色。	第4段: “New Wave British cinema, with its working-class protagonists”	原文明确“工人阶级的主角”存在。题干说“没有”, 与原文相反 ⇒ NO。
35	NOT GIVEN	60 年代对权威的不尊重是社会问题的主要原因。	第4–5 段提及 “collapse of social deference (礼敬衰落)” “disenchantment (失望)”	文章只描述了对权威的质疑/礼敬的崩塌和“怀旧产业”的出现, 但未声称这是“社会问题的主要原因” ⇒ NG。

三、单选题 (36–40)

题号	答案	题干翻译	精确定位 (第 X 段 + 关键词/引文)	详细解析 (同义改写 & 选项排除)
36	D	关于“怀旧产业 (nostalgia industry)”说了什么?	第5段: “This emerged as a kind of negative counterpart to the otherwise dominant modernisation of the decade”	D “opposed the dominant trend of the time (反对当时主导趋势)”与“negative counterpart to ... dominant modernisation”同义。A 未谈真假; B “导致放弃现代化”过度; C “政治起源”无据。
37	B	第6段指出 60 年代发生了什么?	第6段: “Industrial archaeology ... elevated disused factories and mills to the status of national monuments.”	B “对传统工业建筑的新兴趣”精准契合。A 工人地位未提; C 建筑技术未提; D 老房“不适合居住”与原文“被修复为宜居住宅”相反。
38	B	到了 70 年代, 历史学家相信什么?	第7段: “sense of disenchantment ... idealised view of the past, fostering nostalgic regard for disappearing communities”	这些措辞表明他们认为当代并不一定优于过去 ⇒ B。A “应聚焦近期”未提; C “不要强调过去的艰难”相反, 原文说“甚至在有艰辛时更要颂扬”; D “需要更多普通人做研究”未提。
39	C	社会史使用大量细节的一个问题是?	第8段: “simple reproduction of fact masquerades as explanation ... facts accumulated may leave no conceptual space for ... areas where the record is silent”	大量事实挤占了对更大议题/缺席之处的概念空间 ⇒ 易忽视更重要问题 ⇒ C。A/B/D 均与原文不符。
40	A	作者建议社会史要有效, 必须?	第10段: “far more weight ... insecurities and emergencies—the fears ... the oppositions we encounter”	要更“令人不安”, 重视恐惧/不安/冲突 (负面情绪) ⇒ A。B/C/D 皆非作者主张。