INSTRUÇÕES DA AVALIAÇÃO

1. Esta prova possui 15 (quinze) questões objetivas, podendo ser de múltipla escolha com 5 (cinco) alternativas (A,B,C,D,E,) ou com 2 alternativas (verdadeiro ou falso).

2. A duração da prova será de 120 minutos.

3. Todas as questões possuem o mesmo peso.

4. Não será permitido utilizar materiais de consulta como dicionários. Candidatos que utilizarem material de consulta serão eliminados.

5. Uma vez que o candidato finalize a prova, não será possível retornar ao ambiente de prova.

6. É possível avançar e retornar nas páginas da prova. Não há limite de tempo estabelecido por cada questão.
II. Explanatory Arguments

If we begin with the idea that a narrative, unlike a chronicle, is a conjunction of explanatory statements like "The Moslem seizure of the Mediterranean Sea caused the breakdown of [what Pirenne calls] the Mediterranean Commonwealth of Europe," then one of the first problems to which we must address ourselves is the nature of the connection asserted in these explanatory statements. However, as I have already suggested and as we shall see in detail later on, this is not the only philosophical problem connected with narration. For if we think of a narrative as presenting a chain of linked statements about, say, a given country, then there are two fundamental problems that we may raise about that chain; and then we may ask about the relationship between this chain as a whole and thing of which it purports to be a history. The first inquiry is primarily an inquiry into the nature of statements made in answer to the question "Why did what happened happen?" and the second is primarily an inquiry into the nature of statements made in answer to the question "What happened?" We shall launch the first inquiry in this chapter, where we shall concentrate on the connection between the singular explanatory statements in a narrative and generalizations or laws. It will be convenient to begin by considering what is sometimes called the covering law, or regularity, theory of historical explanation. On this view an explanation of a war, a revolution, or an economic depression is similar in structure to an explanation of a fire. We may explain a particular fire, it is maintained, by deducing the statement that the fire has taken place from the statement that a spark has fallen into a wastebasket of dry paper surrounded by oxygen and from the law that whenever a spark falls into such a wastebasket under such conditions, a fire will take place. Some philosophers who accept this view contend that not only the truth of a singular explanatory statement in ordinary language, like "The lit cigarrette caused the fire" or "The bent rail caused the breakdown of the Mediterranean Commonwealth in Europe", is dependent on the truth of a law. Ever since Hume, such a theory has exerted a powerful hold on philosophers, even on those who recognize and emphasize the limits of historical speculation. The idea that we can intuitively see causal connections between historical events without appealing to inductively established laws, or that causes have unanalyzable powers to bring about their effects, has seemed indefensible to philosophers of an empirical turn of mind, and they have therefore been led to the view that causal statements are either disguised statements of laws or are in some way dependent upon them for their truth. Even though historians in their explanatory statements refer to particular events like the Civil War and the conflict between Northern and Southern economic interests, philosophers under the influence of Hume and Mill have maintained that such explanatory statements turn out
upon analysis to imply, involve, presuppose, or depend on general laws.

Often one gets the impression from some advocates of the covering law, or regularity, theory of explanation that an explanation of an individual historical event is neither more nor less than a deductive argument of the kind previously illustrated in the case of the fire. It follows, as least on what I shall call the standard version of the covering law theory, that the singular causal statement made by the historian, or even that made by the man who says that the fire was caused by a spark falling into the wastebasket, is not, strictly speaking, an explanation. On such a view it may be an incomplete explanation or an explanation-sketch; it may be elliptical for, or an inferior version of, a deductive argument containing laws and so-called statements of initial conditions and premises, but it is not a full-fledged explanation.

Now in my opinion this standard way is not the best way to state the logical connection between generalizations and what are usually called historical explanations, and a considerable part of my argument in a later part of this study will be devoted to showing why and to presenting an alternative view of that connection. But since the standard version of the regularity theory has been staunchly advocated by many distinguished philosophers and also unfairly attacked, I want to present the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffective arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical aim. After presenting the standard version in this chapter and also to consider some ineffectual arguments that have been leveled against it. Then, in the next chapter, I shall show how the covering law theory should be modified so as to meet certain other objections without abandoning its basic philosophical am
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After reading the text, which five key words would you choose as the best to mark it for further research?

a) Narrative, explanation, Hume, speculation, Law 

✓b) Narrative, explanation, covering laws, deduction, philosophy of History 

c) Narrative, philosophy of History, sparks, empiricism, explanation 

d) Explanation, causes, empiricism, Civil War, speculative Philosophy, Logics 

e) Logics, explanation, narrative, Hume, Mill, cause 
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Which of the alternatives below best paraphrases the text?

✓a) If we conceive a narrative as a chain of linked statements, we may face the need to explain the nature of those links, which will lead us to a discussion on the nature of explanation and its dependence, or not, on inductively established general laws. Historical explanation is a field of controversy concerning the notion of covering laws or regularities. Empiricist philosophers tend to conceive historical explanations as grounded on general laws that may simply be disguised in historians' mention to singular events as causes of others, whereas there is room for arguing that we may intuitively see causal connections between historical causes without relying on a general rule. 

b) Whenever we intend to provide a narrative purporting to be a historical explanation, we should answer two questions: "Why did what happen happen?" and "What happened?". These two guiding questions should enable us to conceive a narrative as a chain of linked statements ultimately linked to a covering law, a regularity, as have been traditionally proposed by philosophers such as Hume and Mill. 

c) Advocating the notion of a covering law, or that an explanation of a individual historical event is neither more nor less than a deductive argument which links particular events to general rules is no suitable for historical knowledge for it reduces narrative to causal chains which tend to make historical events something repetitive, which they are not. 

d) While explaining a war, a revolution or an economic depression, the historian is always seeking for covering laws. That means answering the question "Why did what happened happen?" and finding an causal explanation which can be applied to other historical event and circumstances, ultimately leading to a theory of explanation of a kind of events. That makes historical knowledge closer to scientific knowledge, as advocated by empiricist philosopher such as Hume. 

e) Narratives usually link statements within a relationship of cause and consequence. This way, narrating a fire is similar to narrating a war for they keep a similar structure. There is a chain of statements which are causally connected to one of them and their truth depends on the truth of this very causal statement. According to philosophers since Hume, this causal statement is an instance of a general rule, which should be called covering law.
4. FEMINIST EDUCATION FOR CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Before women's studies classes, before feminist literature, individual women learned about feminism in groups. The women in those groups were the first to begin to create feminist theory which included both an analysis of sexism, strategies for challenging patriarchy, and new models of social interaction. Everything we do in life is rooted in theory. Whether we consciously explore the reasons we have a particular perspective or take a particular action there is also an underlying system shaping thought and practice. In its earliest inception feminist theory had as its primary goal explaining to women and men how sexist thinking worked and how we could challenge and change it.

In those days most of us had been socialized by parents and society to accept sexist thinking. We had not taken time to figure out the roots of our perceptions. Feminist thinking and feminist theory urged us to do that. At first feminist theory was made available by word of mouth or in cheaply put together newsletters and pamphlets. The development of women's publishing (where women wrote, printed, and controlled production on all levels, including marketing) became the site for the dissemination of feminist thinking. While my first book, *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*, written in the 70's and published in 1981, was produced by a small socialist collective, South End Press, at least half of its members were feminist women, and all its members were anti-sexist.

Producing a body of feminist literature coupled with the demand for the recovery of women's history was one of the most powerful and successful interventions of contemporary feminism. In all spheres of literary writing and academic scholarship works by women had historically received little or no attention as a consequence of gender discrimination. Remarkably, when feminist movement exposed biases in curriculum, much of this forgotten and ignored work was rediscovered. The formation of women's studies programs in colleges and universities provided institutional legitimation for academic focus on work by women. Following in the wake of black studies, women's studies became the place where one could learn about gender, about women, from a non-biased perspective.

Contrary to popular stereotypes, professors in women's studies classes did not and do not trash work by men; we intervene on sexist thinking by showing that women's work is often just as good, as interesting, if not more so, as work by men. So-called great literature by men is critiqued only to show the biases present in the assessment of aesthetic value. I have never taken a women's studies course or heard about one where works by men were deemed unimportant or irrelevant. Feminist critiques of all-male canons of scholarship or literary work expose biases based on gender. Importantly, these exposures were central to making a place for the recovery of women's work and a
contemporary place for the production of new work by and about women. Feminist movement gained momentum when it found its way into the academy. In classrooms all over the nation young minds were able to learn about feminist thinking, read the theory, and use it in their academic explorations. When I was a graduate student preparing to write a dissertation, feminist thinking allowed me to choose to write about a black woman writer who was not widely read at the time, Toni Morrison. Very little serious literary scholarship had been done on works by black women writers prior to feminist movement. When Alice Walker acquired fame, she participated in the recovery of the work of writer Zora Neale Hurston, who shortly became the most canonized black woman writer in American literature. Feminist movement created a revolution when it demanded respect for women's academic work, recognition of that work past and present, and an end to gender biases in curriculum and pedagogy.

The institutionalization of women's studies helped spread the word about feminism. It offered a legitimate site for conversion by providing a sustained body of open minds. Students who attended women's studies classes were there to learn. They wanted to know more about feminist thinking. And it was in those classes that many of us awakened politically. I had come to feminist thinking by challenging male domination in our patriarchal household. But simply being the victim of an exploitative or oppressive system and even resisting it does not mean we understand why it's in place or how to change it. My conversion to feminist politics had occurred long before I entered college, but the feminist classroom was the place where I learned feminist thinking and feminist theory. And it was in that space that I received encouragement to think critically and write about black female experience.

Throughout the '70s the production of feminist thinking and theory was collaborative work in that women were constantly in dialogue about ideas, testing and reshaping our paradigm. Indeed, when black women and other women of color raised the issue of racial biases as a factor shaping feminist thought there was an initial resistance to the notion that much of what privileged class women had identified as true to female experience might be flawed, but over time feminist theory changed. Even though many white women thinkers were able to acknowledge their biases without doing the work of rethinking, this was still an important shift. By the late '80s most feminist scholarship reflected an awareness of race and class differences. Women scholars who were truly committed to feminist movement and feminist solidarity were eager to produce theory that would address the realities of most women.

While academic legitimation was crucial to the advancement of feminist thought, it created a new set of difficulties. Suddenly the feminist thinking that had emerged directly from theory and practice received less attention than theory that was metalinguistic, creating exclusive jargon; it was written solely for an academic audience. It was as if a large body of feminist thinkers banded together to form an elite group writing theory that could be understood only by an “in” crowd.
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In the phrase "Producing a body of feminist literature coupled with the demand for the recovery of women's history..." (3rd paragraph), the word 'coupled' could be replaced, without any change in meaning, with:

- a) combined
- b) disservered
- c) sundered
- d) split
- e) parted
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In the sentence "Remarkably, when feminist movement exposed biases in curriculum, much of this forgotten and ignored work was discovered." (3rd paragraph), the word 'biases' could be replaced without changes in meaning with any of the words below, EXCEPT:

- a) partiality
- b) tendentiousness
- c) prejudice
- d) favor
- e) objectivity

**Questão 8 - 2,0 pontos**
The sentence "But simply being the victim of an exploitative or oppressive system and even resisting it does not mean we understand why it's in place or how to change it." (7th paragraph) is suitably rewritten, without any change in meaning, in alternative:

- a) Simply being the victim of an exploitative or oppressive system and the resisting to it makes it to understand why it's in place and how to overcome it.
- b) We understand why exploitation and oppression are in place once we are victims or resist to them.
- c) Victims of exploitation or oppression do not necessarily understand why the system works the way it does.
- d) Unlike being the victim of an exploitative or oppressive system, people who have resisted it understand why it's in place.
- e) Not even the victims understand why an oppressive and exploitative system is in place.
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What can be inferred from the 9th paragraph?

- a) Academic legitimation is of questionable value to the feminist movement.
- b) The advancement of feminist thought owes largely to metalinguistic theory.
- c) Feminism has become an elite movement because of academic legitimation.
- d) Academic legitimation may have made feminist thought somewhat more distant from the crowd.
- e) Metalinguist theories cause more difficulties than theory and practice.
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All ideas below can be inferred from the text, EXCEPT:

- a) Understanding feminist issues and the grounds of oppression requires being a victim of exploitative dynamics.
- b) Feminist movement will benefit from a mass-based education movement instead of excessive academization.
- c) Most of us have been socialized to accept sexist thinking.
- d) Trashing work by men is a popular stereotype which does not reflect feminist thought.
- e) There is a growing need of producing feminist literature for the youth.
The next five questions are based on the text below.

CONCLUSION

BETWEEN 1623 and 1797 the political decline of Rome and Venice, the two most vital centres of Italian Baroque art, was almost continuous. In both cities, architects, sculptors and painters of the first rank were employed by those in authority - in Rome the constantly changing upholders of a theocratic absolutism, in Venice the old and new families that composed a rigid oligarchic aristocracy - to impress themselves and foreigners alike with illusions of power which had little basis in reality. The achievements of Bernini, Pietro da Cortona and Tiepolo are there to prove with what conviction and genius great artists can serve great patrons however unpromising the cause. Nor can it be denied (though many have tried to do so) that these achievements, and others of a similar nature represent the finest Italian contribution to the art of the period; and the significance of this is brought to light if we compare the situation with that of foreign artists. There are no Italian equivalents to Velasquez, Rembrandt, Vermeer, Louis Le Nain, Georges de la Tour, Poussin, Watteau of Chardin - all painters who expressed a private and individual outlook that is far removed from the 'public' masterpieces of the greatest Italians.

This may be due only to the fortuitous distribution of talent, but there are so many cases in Italian art during these two centuries where a fresh and original approach to life becomes buried under the pressing claims of society that the temptation to seek an answer other than the last resort of 'national character' becomes irresistible. One think of the bamboccianti who hover for a few years on the brink of a new dignified 'realism', only to fall into picturesque sentimentality; of Salvador Rosa, so bold to exploit his gifted temperament in the cause of artistic conformity; of Crespi, just able to carry 'humour' and raise genre painting to a more noble status; of Canaletto, who turned so soon from gazing with steady penetration at the backwaters of his native city to stereotyping shorthand versions of the familiar views to tourists; of Padre Lodoli, the 'scourge of society', who was yet honoured with an official government post and whose explosive writings were never even published.

Modern Italian historians have noted, and bitterly resented, the same kind of conformity in the writers of the time. Until detailed investigation has been made of the contrasting conditions elsewhere it will be difficult not to account for it, but such an investigation is not likely to reflect harshly on the Italian patrons. Where else in Europe can we find men more cultivated and more liberal? Was Philip IV more tolerant and better educated than Urban VIII and his nephews? Richelieu than Cassiano dal Pozzo? the Régent, Crozat or Mme Geoffrin than Grand Prince Ferdinand or Francesco Algarotti?

It is perhaps precisely in the broad culture and tolerance of Italian patrons that the answer should be sought. Like 'advanced' parents of the most humane opinions, who apply no direct pressure to children, yet whose views are all too parasingly communicated to them, the aristocracy, traditional and upstart, of Baroque Italy, may have stifled revolt through the very self-assurance of their inherited values. None of the artists mentioned above was deflected from his path by specific pressures; at no period in Italy did an orthodox Academy or a dominating religious organisation impose its artistic doctrines. Unorthodoxy was killed with kindness.

Such an attitude has its advantages as well as its drawbacks, if it is true that we miss a certain type of individual and withdrawn artist in Italy (Domenico Fetti is surely the most beautiful exception), it is also true that the general level of painting in Rome, Bologna, Naples and Venice - to name a few of the most important centres - was certainly higher than in almost any other town in Europe. The opportunities and encouragement given to architects, painters and sculptors have rarely, if ever, been equalled, and the debt of gratitude we owe to the liberal patrons of the time can be seen not only in Italy but in every art gallery of the world.

Yet the price to be paid was a high one. Artists so closely tied to the patronage of a particular society could not adapt themselves to new conditions when foundations of that society collapsed. The 'bourgeois' painting of England and France had no real roots in Italy, and the attempts made by bodies such as the Academy at Parma to promote a more modern and 'enlightened' type of art met with little success. Whereas in France and England painting took on a new and more glorious lease of life with the decline of the Church and the feudal aristocracy, the fall of Venice signified no less than the humiliating expiry of Italian art.
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In the next three questions, decide if the statements are true or false.

Patronage had paramount role in enduring a noticeable difference between the Italian art of 17th century and the art from other European regions.

a) True
b) False

Questão 12 - 2,0 pontos
Political and economical decline of Rome and Venice was not felt within the funding structure of Italian art due to the role of the patrons.

a) True
b) False
### Questão 13 - 2,0 pontos
The existence of highly cultivated class of patrons led to a more liberal context, in which artists performed a more expressive and individual-centered kind of art.

- a) True
- **✓** b) False

### Questão 14 - 2,0 pontos
In the phrase "but such an investigation is not likely to reflect harshly on the Italian patrons." (3rd paragraph), the expression 'not likely' means:

- **✓** a) improbable
- b) doubtless
- c) assumable
- d) presumable
- e) promising

### Questão 15 - 2,0 pontos
In the phrase "and the significance of this is brought to light if we compare the situation with that of foreign artists" (1st paragraph), the expression 'is brought to light' could be replaced, without change in meaning, with:

- a) is recalled
- b) is reprimanded
- c) is introduced
- **✓** d) is disclosed
- e) is produced