

Nedenstående rubrikker udfyldes.

Efter prøven afleveres dette hæfte med din besvarelse til en tilsynsførende.

1stx131-ENG/B-27052013	
Skolens/kursets navn:	Frederiksborg Gymnasium
Elevens/kursistens navn:	Ellen Bjerre Koch
Klasse/hold:	2x
Elevens/kursistens nummer:	
Elevens/kursistens underskrift:	Ellen B. Koch
Tilsynsførendes signatur:	

Denne delprøve besvares uden brug af hjælpemidler.

Besvarelsen afleveres kl. 10.00

### Besvar opgaverne i A-D

#### A

Ret fejlene i følgende sætninger, og forklar på dansk dine rettelser. Der er kun én fejl i hver sætning. Skriv den korrekte sætning på linjerne nedenunder.

1. The text is written in a very informally way.

The text is written in a very informal way.

Ordklassefejl: informally er et adverbium og i denne sammenhæng skal ordet stå som et adjektiv, idet det siger noget om hvordan teksten er skrevet → lægger sig til 'way'.  
was

2. Only one of the prisoners were listed as extremely dangerous.

Only one of the prisoners was listed as extremely dangerous.

Kongruensfejl: Da der er tale om én fange skal verbet stå i 3. person ental → Altså bliver were til was

3. Nick claimed that he couldn't remember where he had ~~sleeped~~ last night.

Nick claimed that he couldn't remember where he had slept last night.

Bøjningsfejl: Da 'to sleep' er et uregelmæssigt/stærkt verbum skal det bøjes deretter → Der kan altså ikke komme -ed på i enden.

4. Finally admitted she that she had made a mistake.

Finally she admitted that she had made a mistake

Ordstillingsfejl: I normale fremsættende sætninger skal der være Uge frem ordstilling → Altså subjekt før verbal.

5. It is all about to find a balance in your life.

It is all about finding a balance in your life.

Verbfejl: i denne sammenhæng kan infinitiv ikke benyttes idet den korrekte form er lang tillægssform nemlig finding, altså -ing-formen.

6. After the incident Mark did not ~~spoke~~ with his parents for a whole week.

After the incident Mark did not speak with his parents for a whole week

Ret fejlene i følgende sætninger, og forklar på dansk dine rettelser. For at gøre det nemt, har jeg allerede rettet nogle af fejlene.

Omskrivning med 'to do': Når der i nægtende sætninger omskrives med 'to do' skal det følgende verbum stå i infinitiv.

7. No matter what, we have always remained true to <sup>ourselves</sup> ~~ourself~~.

No matter what, we have always remained true to ourselves.

Kongruensfejl: Da de pågældende personer står i flertal altså 'we have...' skal 'ourself' referere tilbage dertil. Altså skal 'ourself' være i flertal 'ourselves', da det er flere personer det drejer sig om.



## B

Indsæt de understregede verber (udsagnsord) i nedenstående skema, og udfyld de tomme felter som vist i eksemplet.

That night I wrote some more of my book and the next morning I took it into school so that Siobhan could read it and tell me if I had made mistakes with the spelling and the grammar.

Siobhan read the book during morning break when she has a cup of coffee and sits at the edge of the playground with the other teachers.

Mark Haddon, *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*, 2003

Infinitiv (navnemåde)	Præsens (nutid) 3. person	Præteritum (datid)	Perfektum participium (kort tillægsform)
to write	writes	wrote	written
to take	takes	took	taken
to read	reads	read	read
to make	makes	made	made
have	has	had	had
to sit	sits	sat	Sat

## C

Nedenstående tekstuddrag stammer fra Bibelen (tekst 1) og Wikipedia (tekst 2).  
Gør kort rede for forskelle og ligheder i den sproglige stil fx med hensyn til sætningsopbygning og ordvalg. Skriv dit svar på dansk.

### TEKST 1

4 Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. 5 It is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. 6 Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth. 7 It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres<sup>1</sup>.

[www.niv.scripturetext.com](http://www.niv.scripturetext.com)

### TEKST 2

Although the nature or essence of love is a subject of frequent debate, different aspects of the word can be clarified by determining what *isn't* love. As a general expression of positive sentiment (a stronger form of *like*), love is commonly contrasted with hate (or neutral apathy); as a less sexual and more emotionally intimate form of romantic attachment, love is commonly contrasted with lust; and as an interpersonal relationship with romantic overtones, love is sometimes contrasted with friendship, although the word *love* is often applied to close friendships.

[www.en.wikipedia.org](http://www.en.wikipedia.org)

Tekst 1 er i høj grad præget af poetiske toner, idet den er opbygget mere melodisk end tekst 2. Derudover kan man tilnærmelsesvis sammenligne tekst 1 med en remse fordi den består af mange gentagelser fx "it is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered..." Tekst 1 består udelukkende af ligefrem ordstilling hvilket underbygger den ransagtige klang teksten har.

<sup>1</sup> udholder alt

Tekst 2 er præget af høj stil / akademisk sprogbrug. Den er i højere grad en definition på Kærlighed rent teknisk mens Kærlighed i tekst 1 tilnærmelsesvis kan beskrives som en person eller noget andet en bare en følelse, idet Kærlighed tillægges en masse værdier og derfor adjektiver, som alt sammen er med til at personificere ordet. Dette står i stor kontrast til faktuelle snarere videnskabelige forklaring på ordet 'love'. Hertil er sætningerne langt mere komplekse. Et eksempel på personificering i tekst 1: "It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres."

Endvidere kan man sammenligne de to medier hvor tekst er trykt i: tekst 1 er trykt i biblen som generelt er præget af et lyrisk og metaforisk sprog hvorimod wikipedia efter sigende efterstræber at forholde sig nøjagtig og neutralt til forskellige aspekter. Derfor er det værd at bemærke at biblen er fortællinger og anekdoter, mens wikipedia er et opslagsværk. Begge medier prøver på hver sig måde at belære læseren.

D

Oversæt følgende sætninger til engelsk.

1. Vi skal til at gå, så I bliver nødt til at skynde jer lidt!

We are about to leave, so you need to hurry up a bit.

2. På trods af at politiet har arbejdet på sagen i flere år, er det ikke lykkedes at nå til bunds i den.

Despite the police have worked on the case for several years, they have not succeed in getting to the bottom of it.



- ✕ 3. Det nytter ikke noget at græde over den slags småting.

It does not do any good crying over spilled milk.

- ↗ 4. Overraskende nok var al maden blevet spist i løbet af ingen tid.

Surprisingly enough all the food had been eaten in no time.

# Section A

---

## 1. An outline of text 1 and text 2

In the article 'Proper Spelling? Its Tyme to Let Luce!' published on the website wired.com in January 2012 professor of rhetoric Anne Trubek expresses her opinion on the English way of spelling. She discusses whether or not correct spelling is important and reaches the conclusion that it is not; *"Instead of trying to get the letters right with imperfect tools, it would be far better to loosen our idea of correct spelling"*. According to Trubek the English spelling has to change in order to keep up with the technical development. With a starting point in misspelled tweets and autocorrecting gone wrong she states that it does not matter how you spell a word especially when the existing rules are not based on logic; *"English spelling is a terrible mess anyway, full of arbitrary contrivances and exceptions that outnumber the rules. (...) What is the logic behind ough in through, dough, and cough?"* She calls for a new set of tools which can provide a rougher and looser correction – a tool that can recognise more variations. As a response on Anne Trubek's article writer and editor at *WIRED* magazine Lee Simmons gives his opinion on the matter in the article 'Spelling: A Rebuttal From Wired's Copydesk'. He expresses contempt and surprise towards Anne Trubek's lack of insight in the world of editing and the importance of spelling rules. He agrees on the fact that *"English spelling is a terrible mess"*, but adds that *"I like to be able to understand what I read, without having to stop and puzzle over 'creative' spellings"*. Hereby he is saying that he believes that the English spelling system has to have a common denominator – a set of rules so everybody is able to read and understand what is written. In addition, he holds that the writer has to be aware of the audience to whom he addresses; *"So let's be clear: Are we saying that professional news sites should spell words in any way that strikes their mood or fancy? What exactly would be the benefit of that?"*.

## 2. Characterisation of the tone and style in text 2

The article 'Spelling: A Rebuttal From Wired's Copydesk' written by copy editor and writer Lee Simmons is as previously mentioned a response on an article dealing with the problems spelling rules cause. Throughout the article there is a patronizing tone towards people like Anne Trubek, who do not understand the importance of a set of rules concerning spelling. Simmons may be

harsh in his way of putting things but he has every right to be – if Trubek should be right then his profession would not be needed. Also his tone of voice may be considered as spoken language owing to the rhetorical questions he poses and the explicit comments such as “yeah”, “so let’s be clear” and “Ah!”. He is addressing his audience by including them in the debate; *“let’s concede (...)”*. By doing so the reader and Simmons become equals and like that his point reaches the reader more easily. In addition, Simmons argumentation consists of logic thinking such as *“To say that something is a mess and then conclude that we ought to remove all constraints and let it get even messier is, at the least, a paradox requiring a good, strong supporting argument”*. Thus he appeals through logos and tries to reach his audience by appealing to their minds and not their hearts. For instance he is explaining why words such as ‘sign’ are spelled with a ‘g’ when ‘wine’ is not. By letting the reader know that he is an editor and includes the reader in the purpose of editing he is using his own ethos. This makes him seem trustworthy and somebody worth listening to. In other words, he is establishing the setting for the article – it is his opinion as a professional and not as a private individual.

### 3. Discussion with text 3 as a starting point

Masha Bell, who is an English writer and commentator, explains in a comment on The Independent’s website in 2010 where the problem is concerning the English education system. She compares with Finns and believes that the source of the problem lies within the spelling rules. In Finland they only have one spelling for each sound and they never have spellings with more than one sound. This makes it a lot easier for the children to learn to read and write compared to the English spelling which allows multiple spellings and sounds. Also the English spelling *“(...) is so irregular that it makes the acquisition of those skills exceptionally difficult”*. I tend to agree with Bell. It is obvious that something must be done to improve the education system and this improvement, as said, can and according to Bell will be found in the way of spelling. It would be nice if the rules for spelling changed so it would become easier to navigate in the various sounds and spellings. On the other hand I am afraid that important and old words, spellings and meanings would be forgotten and in worst case ‘removed from the dictionary’. These words and spellings represent a specific time and carry a heritage which is the very pillars of how the language is today and how it will evolve. Another aspect of the matter is the problematic circumstances which have

to be taking into account. If the government were to change the spelling rules the conversion from one set of rules to another would last for at least one generation. This is because of the rules and ways of spelling are indoctrinated in every grown up. We spell automatically and do not think twice about it. But I guess that people would get used to it – I mean we accepted and learned the rules when they first were presented to us. Why would we not be able to do that again?