

## PART-II

**Q. 2 Make a précis of the following passage and suggest a suitable title.**

**(15+5=20)**

Art, despite its religious and magical origins, very soon became a commercial venture. From bourgeois patrons funding art they barely understood in order to share their protegee's prestige, to museum curators stage-managing the cult of artists in order to enhance the market value of museum holdings, entrepreneurs have found validation and profit in big-name art. Speculators, thieves, and promoters long ago created and fed a market where cultural icons could be traded like commodities.

This trend toward commodification of high-brow art took an ominous, if predictable, turn in the 1980s during the Japanese "bubble economy." At a time when Japanese share prices more than doubled, individual tycoons and industrial giants alike invested record amounts in some of the West's greatest masterpieces. Ryoei Saito, for example, purchased van Gogh's Portrait of Dr. Gachet for a record-breaking \$82.5 million. The work, then on loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Modern Art, suddenly vanished from the public domain. Later learning that he owed the Japanese government \$24 million in taxes, Saito remarked that he would have the painting cremated with him to spare his heirs the inheritance tax. This statement, which he later dismissed as a joke, alarmed and enraged many. A representative of the Van Gogh museum, conceding that he had no legal redress, made an ethical appeal to Mr. Saito, asserting, "a work of art remains the possession of the world at large."

Ethical appeals notwithstanding, great art will increasingly devolve into big business. Firstly, great art can only be certified by its market value. Moreover, the "world at large" hasn't the means of acquisition. Only one museum currently has the funding to contend for the best pieces—the J. Paul Getty Museum, founded by the billionaire oilman. The art may disappear into private hands, but its transfer will disseminate once static fortunes into the hands of various investors, collectors, and occasionally the artist.



# Title: Great Art: A Business Enterprise

## Precis:

Great art has now evolved as a business enterprise. As the middle-class used art to rejoice elite's power, custodians of museum to boost their markets, the business tycons have long established a market to trade great art for their profits. The incident of Japanese economic meltdown in the 1980s have ~~the~~ changed the nature of art business. The influential heavily invested in art's masterpieces. For instance, the exorbitant purchase of Van Gogh's portrait by Ryoei Saito. It declares art as a global commodity. Despite this, the business of great art will expand. Having being its limited market purchase by few museums, devolution of the art market ~~in the hands~~ to the private sector will ensure its benefits to be enjoyed by artists also.

words in precis : 120

words in original passage : 313



**Q. 3 Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow.**

**(20)**

Colonel Claus Schenk von Stauffenberg, the man who, on 20 July 1944, placed a bomb next to Hitler in his east Prussian headquarters, the Wolf's Lair. The bomb failed to kill Hitler, merely blowing his trousers to ribbons. That night, when the coup was seen to have failed, Stauffenberg was shot in the courtyard of the army headquarters in Berlin on the orders of General Fromm, his superior, who was in on the plot and hoped - in vain - to save himself. The film 'Valkyrie' is true to most of the facts of the plot, but fails to convey any sense of the catastrophic moral and political vortex into which Germans were being drawn. Nor does it give much sense of the immense charisma of Stauffenberg, to whom generals and politicians deferred and who had for some time been tipped as a future chief of staff. And the film gives no indication at all of Stauffenberg's background and philosophy: he fitted perfectly into the German tradition of Dichter und Helden, poets and heroes. For a start, he looked the part, tall with classical features; he was often compared to a medieval statue of a knight. Even Hitler believed that Stauffenberg was the embodiment of a German hero. Stauffenberg's stroke of genius was to subvert the emergency plan for defending Berlin against insurrection, Valkyrie, into a plan for a putsch after Hitler had been killed. As Hitler became more paranoid, it seemed that Stauffenberg was the only one who had both the access and the resolve to kill him. He was fully aware that the chances of success were slim, but he felt that he needed to demonstrate to the world that there was a better Germany - what he thought of as secret Germany - and perhaps that he was the agent of history.

**Questions:**

1. Who was Stauffenberg?
2. How far was the movie 'Valkyrie' successful to present the true picture of Stauffenberg and his struggle?

---

3. Was the plot by Stauffenberg to kill Hitler justified in the opinion of the writer?
4. What kind of contrasted and complementary sentiments are evoked in this passage?
5. What would have happened if Stauffenberg had survived the War?



## Comprehension

Q1) Stauffenberg was an army general, who carried out an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate Hitler. He devised a plan to detonate a bomb to kill Hitler. This plan, ~~this~~ was devised to end the tyrannical oppression of the Germans. Stauffenberg with its high intellect wanted to liberate the Germans from the military coup, and emerged as a leader.

Q2) The movie remained quite unsuccessful in presenting the true picture of Stauffenberg and his struggle. Although, the plot was quite convincing in depicting Stauffenberg's assassination attempt to Hitler, ~~the~~ his values were not presented well. It failed to convey the moral and political turmoils of Germany. Besides Stauffenberg's persona, background and philosophical aspects were not presented in the film.



Q3)

In the opinion of the writer, the plot by Stauffenberg to kill Hitler was justified. Because he made an assassination attempt to save Germany from the destructive path Hitler had set. He opposed Hitler's authoritarianism and the suffering inflicted on Germans. In this context, the Stauffenberg's plot to kill Hitler was justified.

Q4)

In this passage, the contrasted sentiments presented were the Stauffenberg's plot to kill Hitler and his charismatic appearance as a German hero. While, the complementary sentiments were <sup>that</sup> despite Hitler's tyranny, it was Stauffenberg who was courageous enough to fight for oppressed Germans and to put an end to authoritarian rule of Hitler. In this way, contrasted and complementary sentiments were evoked in the passage.



Q5)

If Stauffenberg had survived the war, it's possible that he would have faced legal consequences for his involvement in the plot to assassinate Hitler. Or he could have been treated as a symbol of resistance against the tyrannical authoritarian rule of Hitler.

1. Access/ excess    2.wail/whale    3.goal/gaol    4.tyre/tire    5.hew/hue    6.minute/minute    7.bow/bow    8.moored/mood

**B. Rewrite the following passages, converting what is in direct speech into indirect, and what is in indirect speech into direct. (5)**

Just as we came in sight of the valley Jamil met us,--“yes, the valley is all very fine, but do you know there is nothing to eat?”

“Nonsense; we can eat anything here.”

“Well, the brown bread’s two months old, and there’s nothing else but potatoes.”

“There must be milk anyhow.”

“Yes, there was milk”, he supposed.

**Q 7 Translate the following into English by keeping in view any figurative /idiomatic expression (10)**



## Narration Passage :

Just as we came in sight of the valley, Jamil met us and said that the valley was all fine. He further asked us ~~whether~~ if we know there was nothing to eat. We replied it was foolish, we could eat anything there. He told us that the brown bread available was two months old. He further added that there was nothing to eat but potatoes. We asked if there would be milk anyhow. He replied supposedly it was available.