

+1 лист А4

вход: 13:15
выход: 13:19
вход: 14:34
выход: 14:40
А4



МОСКОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ
имени М.В.ЛОМОНОСОВА

Вариант 1

ПИСЬМЕННАЯ РАБОТА

Олимпиада школьников по иностранному языку

по английскому языку

Рысевой Мишель Михайловны

фамилия, имя, отчество участника (в родительном падеже)

Дата

«8» февраля 2020 года

Подпись участника

Рысевой

Минимизация

40-00-84-14
(1.1)

Чистовик

Блок 1. Вариант 5

Аггирование

1. THE OPULENT CLOAK +
2. TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM +
3. A GREAT FEAST +
4. THIS FABULOUS AURA +
5. A GASP ECHOING +

158.

Блок 2. Варианты 5-6

Чтение

1. Caravaggio depicted the climax scene of an encounter between biblical characters: a ~~sp~~ shepherd boy named David and a Philistine giant Goliath, while the other painting shows Belshazzar's feast to us: he is a king of Babylon who decided to use the sacred vessels as tableware, ~~and~~ which was not approved by god. sp.

2. Caravaggio painted a young man holding ~~out~~ out a cut-off head of Goliath, which is presumably a self-portrait of the artist himself, and Belshazzar is centered, wearing a fantastic turban and an opulent cloak, while a god's hand is highlighted in the top ~~tr~~ right-hand corner of the painting.

Числовик

3. Both paintings are highly detailed and realistic, but Caravaggio also used the technique known as chiaroscuro, which consists in highlighting and darkening certain parts of the painting in order ~~to~~ to reach a more dramatic and theatrical effect. Vec.

4. The two paintings are absolutely marvellous and stunning, they mesmerize the audience: Caravaggio's piece of art is a bit horrifying but still hypnotizing, and while looking at Belshazzar's feast you can almost hear the ringing sound of the tableware and sense the silent intake of breath.

5. Both artists painted biblical scenes, but with completely different attitudes: David represents the significant role people can ~~to~~ play even when dealing with great powers, while Belshazzar is shown to us as an absolutely helpless and petty person, compared to the mighty hand of god.

148.

Честовик

Блок 3. Вариаум 10

- ①
1. THE FULL RANGE OF +
 2. ~~In~~ P IN PARTICULAR +
 3. NEW WORDS TO DESCRIBE +
 4. IN CONTACT +
 5. IN A NEGATIVE WAY +

- ②
1. Bicycles scored over other forms +
of transport in towns.
 2. They have agreed to postpone +
repayment of the loan to a future
unspecified date.
 3. The book is an expansion of +
a series of lectures given last
year.
 4. These plants need a moist +
fertile soil and sheltered position.
 5. In order ~~four~~ for our bubble
economy to continue expanding, +
Americans must continue spending. 105.

Блок 4. Вариаум 7

To my mind, the picture presented
as sample 1 could not have been
created by Banksy, since it is a highly
immoral racist advertising postcard, which
doesn't share Banksy's liberal views. At
the same time, ~~however~~, however,

the second ^{чистовик} sample ⁴⁰ does belong to the world-wide famous graffiti artist, since it questions the ethics of war and ⁶⁰ government's policies. Two soldiers are depicted in ⁷⁰ the graffiti: they are not willing to die or kill, they are fighting for peace. And that ⁸⁰ point of view applies to most soldiers ⁹⁰ of in any country: they don't want any murders to take place. But the ¹⁰⁰ point is that some governments will always ~~want~~ crave for money, power and territories they may gain through wars. ¹¹⁷

98.

Вариант 5. Бармант 1

- (A) 1. TO PUT IT SIMPLE -
 2. 4. HAS ERADICATED +
 8. TO REACH +
 9. LOOK OUT OF THE WINDOW -
 10. THE LATEST +

35.

~~Вариант 6. Бармант 13~~

~~WHICH TWO CHARACTERS REPRESENT~~

- (B) 1. TO -
 2. FOR -
 3. THAN +
 4. FOR -
 5. WAS -

15.

45.

Блок 6. Вармаит 13 Чистовик
WHICH TWO BOOK CHARACTERS
REPRESENT OPPOSING VIEWS ON ART?

The ethics and meaning of art have been questioned by many people for centuries before us, including Alexander Pushkin and his lyrical character, which represents the writer himself in the poem MONUMENT and Ivan Turgenev's Bazarov from FATHERS AND SONS, a young man considered to have been a nihilist.

~~Despite both of them~~
Despite the fact that they both belong to the 19th ~~age~~
centenary (the silver age or ^{Sp.} Russian literature), their realistic views on the role and importance of art differ widely.

Alexander Pushkin's lyrical character feels that he will always be loved by people for the art he created and for using his metaphorical lyre to evoke ~~the~~ kind feelings

in the hearts of his audience. ^{чужаков}
 This way, the hero implies that art in any form can affect people, alter their perception and their views on the outer world, making art both a cure for their ~~soult~~ souls and a treacherous weapon for their minds.

At the same time, Eugene Bazarov has a completely different point of view: being a \neq nihilist, he believes that art has no effect or impact on our lives. He considers it a waste of time. The only thing he claims to be worthy of his (and anyone's) attention is science: chemistry, biology, psychology - anything that a person can intellectually benefit from. Eugene claims that art is absolutely insignificant for those considering themselves clever and rational people.

Числовик

To my perspective, there is no completely right or wrong perception of the matter, but I feel closer to the lyrical character depicted by Alexander Pushkin, rather than to the grumpy nihilist of Ivan Turgenev. Undoubtedly, scientific researches are essential for our future prosperity, but our ~~eyes~~ eyes still have to rest and linger on something. To put it in other words, I believe that art in any of its forms (novels, tales, songs, melodies, paintings, graffiti, films, carvings or anything else) is an essential part of our lives, since if it were not to the artists of the past, we would ^{now} have absolutely no idea of the world as it used to be.

$$15 + 14 + 10 + 9 + 3 + 1 + 38 = 90$$

$$90 \times 10 = 900$$