



Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca

PL0A -ESAMI DI STATO DI LICEO LINGUISTICO

Tema di: LINGUA STRANIERA

TESTO LETTERARIO – LINGUA INGLESE
(*comprensione e produzione in lingua straniera*)

The Road not Taken by Robert Frost

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both And
be one traveler, long I stood And
looked down one as far as I could To
where it bent in the undergrowth.

Then took the other, as just as fair, And
having perhaps the better claim, Because
it was grassy and wanted wear; Though
as for that the passing there Had worn
them really about the same.

And both that morning equally lay In
leaves no step had trodden black Oh, I
kept the first for another day! Yet
knowing how way leads on to way, I
doubted if I should ever come back.

I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence: two
roads diverged in a wood, and I-I took
the one less traveled by, And that has
made all the difference.

Comprehension

Answer the following questions:

1. Where is the poet in the first stanza?
2. What does the poet do when he comes to the two roads?
3. Why does he choose the road he does?
4. How different are the two roads, judging by the description given in the second stanza?
5. Does the poet think that he will ever go back and take the other road? Why/Why not?
6. What does the poet express with the word “sigh” in the last stanza?
7. Can the poet know what “difference” his choice will make? Why/Why not?
8. What makes “all the difference”?

Summarize the content of the passage in about 120 words.

Composition: Making choices is inevitable in life, so we all have roads “not taken”. What do you think is an appropriate attitude to take when faced with choices? Discuss your views on the topic by referring to your experience in a paragraph of some 300 words.



Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca

PL0A -ESAMI DI STATO DI LICEO LINGUISTICO

Tema di: LINGUA STRANIERA

TESTO DI ATTUALITÀ – LINGUA INGLESE
(*comprensione e produzione in lingua straniera*)

Legacy or lunacy?

London 2012 was supposed to be the austerity Olympics. In the wake of the Beijing spectacular of 2008 a consensus had emerged that the architectural bubble had burst. The seductive complexity of the Bird's Nest stadium, the massed ranks of drummers and fake fireworks, and the closure of Beijing's industrial plants to ameliorate the city's notorious counterpane of brown smog led to the kind of spectacular possible only under an authoritarian regime with plentiful cheap labour and a booming economy. Everything that followed, it was agreed, would have to be more modest in its ambition, more

unassuming in its architecture, more about the legacy than the fleeting spectacular. London's Olympics was going to be the greenest ever. But then a nervousness crept in, about being seen as cheap. The cost of staging the Games exploded from an initial estimate of £3bn to the current £9bn. London's original plan featured a single piece of spectacular starchitecture, the expressionistic aquatics centre by Zaha Hadid. This was undeniably a building that London demanded, as the city had barely any modern swimming facilities. There was also to be an economy stadium, a controversial horse course in Greenwich Park and a smattering of demountable boxes. In the event, the stadium cost more than half a billion, the equestrian events centre will cost an astonishing £42m and leave nothing at all in its wake (except a churned-up park) and there is, of course, the execrable ArcelorMittal Orbit, the biggest, ugliest work of public art the city has ever seen.

A look at the centrepieces, the stadia and the sports infrastructure helps us to understand what the city might inherit for its £9.3bn investment. The aquatics centre remains the most impressive structure. . The idea that this should become a municipal pool for a poor east London borough does inspire, and this is a facility that a city starved of Olympic-standard pools genuinely needs. It is a thing worth having. Perhaps the same cannot be said about the Olympic stadium itself. Billed as a cheap and cheerful work of pure engineering by stadium specialist architects Populous, this is a fine, functional stadium for a city that doesn't need it. At more than half a billion pounds it seems a shocking waste of money in a city littered with high-tech, high-capacity stadia. The biggest surprise is the £93m velodrome. Like the pool, this is a building type London has lacked

and the new creation by Hopkins Architects is a superb vessel.

This was a Games sold on its legacy and the critical question is exactly what legacy it will leave. Football clubs bickered over the unneeded stadium but it now looks like it will remain in sorely underused athletics mode at huge public expense. The aquatics centre will be the most expensive-to-maintain municipal pool in this – or perhaps any other – city. The argument for London's taxpayers was that this was a desired development made possible by, or at least accelerated by the Olympics: such resources would never have been marshalled otherwise. But, actually, what London has got is a huge park strewn with enormous chunks of blankly impenetrable structure. It seems odd for an architecture critic to complain of too much architecture but at a moment when buildings and facilities of real community engagement – from libraries to sport fields – are being closed, the question needs to be asked whether this huge expenditure can be justified for a few brief moments of national pride.



Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca

PL0A -ESAMI DI STATO DI LICEO LINGUISTICO

Tema di: LINGUA STRANIERA

TESTO DI ATTUALITÀ – LINGUA INGLESE
(*comprensione e produzione in lingua straniera*)

The detritus of recent Games, Beijing and Athens in particular, presents a forbidding wasteland. Nothing looks emptier than the rusting desolation of an abandoned fun park. If there is to be a worthwhile legacy of London's Olympics, the sporting architecture will not be it.

(Adapted from "Legacy or lunacy?" by Edwin Heathcote, January 20, 2012, © THE FINANCIAL TIMES LTD 2012, Printed from: <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/2/0e46376c-4071-11e1-8fcd-00144feab49a.html>).

Comprehension

Answer the following questions:

1. How was the London 2012 Olympic Games supposed to be different from the Beijing one?
2. Why was it widely believed that the architectural bubble had burst?
3. What do you think the expression "more about the legacy than the fleeting spectacular" means?
4. Why did the London Olympics organizers become nervous?
5. By how much has the initial cost increased?
6. What is meant by "a piece of spectacular starchitecture"?
7. In the author's opinion, what is wrong with the stadium and the aquatics centre?
8. Why is the author complaining about too much architecture?

Summarize the content of the article in about 150 words.

Composition:

Comment on the title of the article and express your views on the topic. Why do you think the Olympic Games appeals to people so much? What do you think it represents today? Write a 300-word essay.