

PAPER 1 READING (1 hour 15 minutes)

Part 1

You are going to read three extracts which are all concerned in some way with names. For questions 1–6, choose the answer (A, B, C or D) which you think fits best according to the text.

What's in a name?

In England alone there are around 45,000 different surnames and the sources from which names are derived are almost endless: nicknames, physical attributes, the names of regions and trades. Anyone wishing to trace English ancestors should look through records containing these names, but it is not necessarily a straightforward matter.

Before 1066, people in England did not have hereditary surnames; they were known just by a personal name or nickname. When communities were small each person was identifiable by a single name, but as the number of inhabitants grew, it became necessary to identify people further, leading to names such as 'John the butcher' or 'Henry from Sutton'. Over time many names became corrupted and their original meaning is now not immediately obvious.

After 1066, the Norman rulers introduced surnames into England. Initially, the identifying names were changed or dropped, but eventually they began to stick and to get passed on. So, jobs, nicknames and places of origin became fixed surnames. By 1400, most English families had adopted the use of hereditary surnames.

Family history can be constructed going right back to those times by studying surnames, but it is unwise to place excessive emphasis on them. Many individuals and families have changed their names or adopted an alias at some time in the past, possibly for legal reasons, or simply on a whim. It is also important to be aware that names are subject to variations in spelling. In fact, standardised spelling did not really arrive until the 19th century, and even in the present day, variations occur.

- 1 The author explains that, in England, people began to have more than just one name as a result of
 - A the increase in bureaucracy.
 - B the increase in population.
 - C the desire to pass on family history.
 - D the need to register for work.
- 2 The aim of this text is
 - A to encourage readers to research their family history.
 - B to advise family researchers to go back to before 1400.
 - C to demonstrate how easy it is to change one's name.
 - D to warn researchers not to rely too heavily on surnames.

Naming your domain

You've come up with the invention of all time; you're going to conquer the world and make a fortune. Your next step is to set up a domain on the internet where you can start conducting your business. Now you just need to find the perfect name for it. You go to the internet and start punching in clever names, along with their many variations, only to find that all the good ones are seemingly taken.

Given that approximately 100 million .COM names are already registered, it's not surprising that all the short snappy names are taken. Your chances of hitting on a good three-letter name or acronym are close to zero. To get one of these, your only recourse would be to haggle with whoever has already registered the name you fancy and see if you could get them to hand it over – for a certain sum, of course.

It's even worse if you're thinking of a name with just two letters. If you want one of the 676 possible two-letter sequences, for an acronym or abbreviation for instance, you're out of luck; they're all taken. So you have to get smart. Think about adding a digit. The trouble is, quite often the look of it just doesn't work. So think about a dash. It can fit in with lots of clever designs for logos and so on. One company has a domain name with punctuation written out in words – 'full stop'. Rather confusing, don't you think? So, concentrate on the visual impact of your name.

- 3 According to the writer, the best way to get a good name with three letters is
- A to try to buy one from someone else.
 - B to think of something really unusual.
 - C to keep trying variations of the letters.
 - D to think of a clever acronym.
- 4 The writer recommends registering a name which includes
- A a dash.
 - B punctuation written as full words.
 - C letters and numbers.
 - D only two characters.

The nuts and bolts of writing

In Shakespeare's great play *Romeo and Juliet* at one point Juliet says: 'a rose by any other name would smell as sweet'. This may be so for flowers, but it doesn't apply to characters. How would Shakespeare's play have worked as *Howard and Brunhilda*? What if *Hamlet* had been *Tony* instead? Lacks a certain resonance, doesn't it?

A character's name is the first clue writers give the reader about an individual they want them to care about, to love, to hate – but above all, to follow. It is also perhaps the biggest clue. A number of studies have shown that a paper submitted to a panel of teachers will generally fare better if the student's name on it is a currently more popular name than the same paper with an unpopular or old-fashioned name.

A pregnant friend maintains that naming her child-to-be is more difficult than it is for me as a writer to name a character, because she doesn't know what kind of person her child will become.

There is some truth in what she says but the child will have the opportunity to mould the name to his/her personality and accomplishments, to go against our expectations.

Selecting names for characters, I maintain, is more difficult than naming a baby because writers are trying to convey not only what the person can become, but what s/he is and has been. That's a lot of weight for a few syllables to carry.

- 5 What point is the writer making when he quotes Shakespeare?
- A Shakespeare knew a lot about the names of flowers.
 - B Shakespeare was good at choosing names for his characters.
 - C Shakespeare changed the names of characters in his plays.
 - D Shakespeare favoured the use of names in the titles of his plays.
- 6 The aim of the text is to
- A draw authors' attention to the importance of the names of their characters.
 - B alert teachers to the dangers of favouring a child because of his name.
 - C advise parents-to-be to wait until a child is born before naming him.
 - D explain to readers that names change little over time.

Part 2

You are going to read an extract from a magazine article. Six paragraphs have been removed from the extract. Choose from the paragraphs **A–G** the one which fits each gap (7–12). There is one extra paragraph which you do not need to use.

Keeping up with the new English

The internet is destroying the English language. Well, isn't it? English as we used to know it was not the clumsy, misspelt English of email communication, in which speed takes precedence over spelling and punctuation. It was not the manic shouting in the online chat room, where large numbers of chatterers indulge in vast, overlapping conversations. And it was certainly not the abbreviations and symbols of many text messages.

7

Dr David Crystal, honorary professor of linguistics at the University of Wales in Bangor thinks the right choice is obvious. 'You can't avoid Weblish, for the simple reason that whenever a new variety of language comes along, it inevitably impacts on the language as a whole,' he says. 'These things won't be limited to internet nerds, they'll come to all of us.' You could argue that they already have.

8

Medicine and technology remain sources of change of course. It's just that these days, as Crystal points out: 'New technology is going round the world more rapidly than it ever could have done before. In the past, it would take years for a word to become common currency; these days, a word can make it into a dictionary in a few months. So the main impact of the internet lies not in the number of extra words that have come in, but in the speed with which they are spread.' In other words, just because a piece of internet jargon is unfamiliar to you today, does not mean that it will not be a part of common speech tomorrow.

9

Yet there is more to this new English than a mere expansion of vocabulary, and text messages are essentially a red herring, because they do little more than reduce communication to the smallest number of keystrokes possible, albeit with clever use of sound-alike words and numerals, as in

U R 2 good 2 B 4gotten (You are too good to be forgotten). It is more useful to look at the language used in email.

10

Such symbols and abbreviations placed inside angled brackets are inevitably a common element of keyboard banter in internet chat rooms, where one of the most common solecisms is the misuse of the acronym LOL. This generally stands for *Laughing Out Loud* to indicate an appreciative reaction, yet newbies (internet novices) tend to assume it means *Lots of Love*. If you are telling someone how sad you are about the pet hamster going missing, it would be better not to sign off with LOL. Other popular acronyms in chat rooms are FWIW (for what it's worth), IMHO (in my humble opinion) and WYRN (what's your real name) and, of course, TLA (three-letter acronym).

11

The trouble with keeping up with the new English is not just new words like those derived from acronyms but also that the old words no longer mean what we thought they did. In the past, if someone said they did not have Windows, you would have to assume they lived in a cave. These days, it is probably because they use Linux. Booting up is something you do to your computer when switching on, not when going for a walk in muddy terrain.

12

Misspellings, acronyms, new words, changing what words mean. Should we be worried by all this linguistic evolution? Not if you believe David Crystal. 'Every new technology has brought its prophets of doom,' he says. 'The internet is no exception. Language consists of dozens of different styles; I could speak to you in any one of them. This is not to say that I have lost my identity simply because I can switch into one or another.'

- A** One of the peculiarities of this format which for many of us has replaced letter-writing is that it often feels closer to a phone call than to a letter. So the opening salutation 'Hi' is replacing the standard 'Dear', even in some relatively formal communications. This might sound overfamiliar, but compare it with the Roman greeting 'Ave!' ('Hail!') and you see that we are simply back where we were 2,000 years ago. On the other hand, email lacks the tonality of spoken language, which led early senders to incorporate 'smileys' or 'emoticons' – little faces :-) made from punctuation marks – to emphasise or enhance the true sense of their messages.
- B** Spellings are changing as well as meanings. Not only is text-messaging playing havoc with verbs by removing vowels (hvc wth vrbs), but the conventions of email communication place little premium on correct spelling. Most intriguingly, some words are now intentionally misspelt, like *xtreme* (extreme) or *luv* (love).
- C** The change is happening at high speed, and if you do not know the difference between a cookie and malware, or between a worm and a wiki, the chances are that you are being left behind. Technology has always been the main source of new vocabulary entering the English language, whether from the industrial revolution or developments in medicine.
- D** Willingness to adapt – this is the key. The internet has not destroyed the English language, nor is it likely to. If we are to stay on top of our language, however, rather than watch it slowly being pulled like a rug from beneath us, it makes sense to try to keep abreast of developments rather than run them down.
- E** No, it wasn't but the English language is changing, and fast, thanks to the frenetic progress of technology. We all have a choice: either to bury our heads in the sand and wish for the past to come back, hoping that these sinister linguistic developments fade away. Or we can face reality, enter into the spirit of the internet age, embrace the new English (or Weblish, as it has been described), concede that the growth of the language is inescapable and become willing masters, rather than sulky victims, of its 21st-century possibilities.
- F** In an attempt to help us with this, there now exist such aids as internet dictionaries, explaining the meaning of words such as 'emoticon' and 'netiquette'. And as if to authorise the literary value of text messages, the BBC and TransWorld joined forces to publish a book called *The Joy of Text*, reflecting the mainstream popularity of this phenomenon, which sees over one billion messages being sent between UK mobile phones every week. It is no wonder that text-messaging is making its impact felt upon the English language.
- G** It is worth saying that computer acronyms have yet to be accepted in common speech. Some seem to go in and out of fashion in conversation. Wysiwyg (pronounced *wizzywig*, and short for 'what you see is what you get'), was in vogue at one time but is rarely heard now. LOL and OMG (Oh my god!) are sometimes used but who knows for how long?

Part 3

You are going to read a newspaper article. For questions 13–19, choose the answer (A, B, C or D) which you think fits best according to the text.

LIFE THROUGH A LENS

Angela Woods explores the role of the camera in life today

6 Nowadays most of us own a camera of some kind and we're generally quite tolerant whenever anyone starts snapping. Their use is no longer reserved for holidays and children's birthdays; the modern photographer has more grandiose ambitions. The desire to capture special moments for posterity persists, but the brief has been extended. Every moment seems special and, as a result, amateur snappers are busier than the professionals. Whether we're taking pictures of a hotel sink for a travellers' website or beating the paparazzi to a blurry shot of a minor celebrity in the street, we're constantly snapping rather than looking.

Oddly, although we take more pictures than we ever have, we spend less time actually looking at them. Some people blame digital photography for this. But is our disconnection from these images really because they're stored on computer, rather than in albums? We could print them out if we wanted to, or force bored family and friends to sit through computer slide shows. Surely our disengagement is not so much due to a shift in medium as to the fact that the images lack significance. In the past, our favourite photos went beyond surface likeness and captured the essence of a person or place. A picture could reveal something about a person even he or she wasn't aware of. Photos don't seem to do this anymore.

As well as bearing witness, photography once raised consciousness. When I was growing up, photographs often seemed more powerful and persuasive than words. The ones I've amassed on my hard drive in the last few years seem vacuous by comparison. My holiday snaps may be neatly composed following readily available expert advice, but they feel blank. The Florida sunsets seem like photographic clichés. The images of African landscapes speak blandly of a predictable taste for going off the beaten track in search of the ultimate photographic experience.

And what of the other side of the coin: being photographed ourselves? As a child and teenager, if it had been acceptable, I would have lashed out when someone pointed a camera at me. The resulting pictures would have been more authentic than those where I tried to cover up my horror of being photographed. I would strive to look deep, instead of angry, and gaze into the middle distance. Refusing to meet the camera's gaze was an attempt to retain control over how I was portrayed. Having since read the great Roland Barthes' book, *Camera Lucida*, I understand better what I was up to. Barthes shared

my desire to look intelligent in photos and he hoped his expression would convey 'an amused awareness of the photographic process'. Whether we succeeded, the underlying urge was surely to prevent the camera gaining possession of our identities.

When I first started in journalism, the writer's photo at the head of an article was invariably tiny. Things have changed however. Newspapers and magazines are now full of unattractive people looking wryly amused to find themselves pictured alongside politicians and celebrities. Journalists tend to look terrible in pictures, but editors believe this makes them more appealingly real than airbrushed celebrities. They are marketed as normal people who readers are meant to identify with, though they are usually far from normal. Some interpret this trend as a sign that journalists are more valued now, but the reality is that we have become low-grade operatives rather than creatives. Words are now used to illustrate the pictures rather than the other way round.

Magazines and newspapers with more and bigger photos in them appear to suit young people's enthusiasm for photography. Once upon a time, being seen with a camera was uncool. Now, you aren't really dressed without one. Most of my younger friends have hundreds of photos on their phones. The interesting thing is that they all seem attracted to subjects that would once have been deemed unworthy of being photographed. Avoiding clichés seems to be the impulse, though whether this is being achieved must be in question if they are all doing the same thing.

A colleague of mine recently showed me how he'd photographed a rather unpalatable plate of meatballs, rather than the grand old architecture of a restaurant. This was followed by his snaps of a holiday in Yosemite National Park in the USA. Not bothering with the spectacular mountain scenery, he had photographed signs about not feeding the wild bears. As he showed them to me, I felt I had seen them before somewhere.

I often wonder what the everpresent lens is doing to my children and their generation. Kids' TV programmes encourage children to send in photos of their parents in undignified positions or displaying a dubious sense of style. Reality programmes dominate TV schedules and online photo-sharing is now integral to much of social life. Adults might see through such things with a smug sense of detachment, but we don't know what the long-term effects on younger minds might be. Doesn't constant snapping reduce spontaneity? The world gets worn out by being photographed and its inhabitants, like me, do as well. Will my kids end up deeply jaded too, or because they are growing up behind and in front of the camera, will they have a natural immunity to it? It remains to be seen.

- 13 What do the words 'the brief' in line 6 refer to?
- A the number of people possessing cameras
 - B the things people take photographs of
 - C the convenience of modern cameras
 - D the willingness to be photographed
- 14 The writer thinks we spend less time looking at photos than in the past because
- A we don't feel they mean anything.
 - B we don't have time to look at them.
 - C we don't enjoy looking at photos on computer screens.
 - D we don't think digital cameras produce photos of high quality.
- 15 What does the writer say about herself as a photographer?
- A She doesn't like to take lots of pictures.
 - B She doesn't know what makes a good picture.
 - C She doesn't have interesting subjects to take pictures of.
 - D She doesn't come up with original ideas for her pictures.
- 16 What does the writer say about being photographed when she was younger?
- A She realised how powerful she could be.
 - B She used to copy the example of a well-known writer.
 - C She felt a need to protect herself.
 - D She found it difficult to hide her true feelings.
- 17 According to the writer, the tendency for newspapers to print more photos of journalists
- A helps newspapers to appear more attractive.
 - B makes journalists feel more vulnerable.
 - C appeals to a natural desire for attention.
 - D reduces the status of journalists.
- 18 In the seventh paragraph, the writer is
- A illustrating a point.
 - B introducing a new subject.
 - C summarising an argument.
 - D expressing a personal opinion.
- 19 Which word is used to describe the way the writer feels?
- A undignified (line 92)
 - B dubious (line 92)
 - C smug (line 95)
 - D jaded (line 100)

Part 4

You are going to read reviews of four science fictions films. For questions **20–34**, choose from the reviews **A–D**. The reviews may be chosen more than once.

About which of the films is the following stated?

The storyline is largely irrelevant.

20

It established certain commercial practices.

21

One of the leading actors gives an outstanding performance.

22

The true nature of a leading character is disputed.

23

Its characters have unremarkable lifestyles.

24

There is fierce debate about what it means.

25

It's often voted one of the best science fiction movies in history.

26

Key features of the film are scientifically unconvincing.

27

It poses questions that humans have always asked themselves.

28

One scene still shocks viewers today.

29

The director based it on something he'd read.

30

The special effects in it were ahead of its time.

31

Both versions of the film are highly regarded.

32

Some of the dialogue makes little sense.

33

It is too slow-moving for lots of people.

34

Great science fiction films

Terry Stevens reviews four great science fiction films.

A *Blade Runner* (1982)

Whether you prefer the original, rather theatrical release with its bored-sounding narrator or the director's cut of a few years later (without a narrator), *Blade Runner* is perennially placed in opinion polls among the top five movies ever made in the genre. Directed by Ridley Scott, who was broadly inspired by a Philip K Dick short story called *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*, the film revolves around Harrison Ford's policeman, Rick Deckard, and his hunt for four cloned humans, known as replicants, in an authoritarian city state some time in the future. Replicants, among them a fascinating character played by Rutger Hauer, have been declared illegal and Deckard is a 'blade runner', a specialist in exterminating them. Adding to the interest is the issue of whether Deckard himself is a replicant. This is never clearly resolved in the film, but fans continue to disagree over this point. When it first came out, the reception was muted, but it has grown in popularity and critics now lavish praise on it. 'It was groundbreaking in some ways,' says one prominent American writer on film, 'but what it's really about is something we've been interested in since the beginning of history: What is it to be human? Who are we? Where do we come from?' That's what makes it truly great.'

B *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968)

One of the most controversial films of any genre, *2001: A Space Odyssey* came from a collaboration between the director, Stanley Kubrick, and the science fiction writer, Arthur C Clarke. It's not an easy film to sum up. The plot is mostly beside the point. It involves a government cover-up of something called the Monolith, and a malfunctioning computer's efforts to preserve the integrity of a space mission. Almost independently of this are separate strands dealing with human evolution from prehistoric times to the space age. Many have attempted to try and pin down this work with explanations about its deeper significance and purpose, and to this day there are heated exchanges about this. But such attempts at analysis may be missing the point. What stays in the mind is the impact the film has on the senses. Even its strongest critics never forget it. There are long stretches where very little happens, and for many the pace, or lack of it, is too much to bear, but at the same time it is visually astonishing and has a soundtrack of often dissonant classical music played so loud that it often interferes with what characters say. Its visual style has probably had more lasting influence than anything else about it. The incredible attention to physical detail showed the way to other film-makers, and critics argue that despite modern computer graphics, some scenes have never been bettered.

C *Star Wars* (1977)

It is almost impossible to argue against the inclusion of *Star Wars* or its rather darker sequel *Empire Strikes Back*, in any list of top science fiction movies. Essentially westerns set in space, they cover the universal themes of good versus evil, while making the leading actors Harrison Ford, Mark Hamill and Carrie Fisher deliver lines of mind-boggling absurdity on a regular basis. The epic saga revolves around a battle between an authoritarian Empire led by the Emperor and his part-human, part-machine henchman Darth Vader on one side, and a small group of rebels on the other. The emphasis, however, is not on exploring deeper problems of the human condition. Nor, unlike some film-makers, do the creators of *Star Wars* trouble themselves with rooting their creations in the normal laws of physics; the force-wielding Jedi fight with theoretically impossible lightsabers and light-speed travel takes place in an implausible 'hyperspace'. But the first two *Star Wars* films have been the supreme blockbusters and paved the way in creating franchises for toys, games and replicas that no major science fiction film can do without nowadays.

D *Alien* (1979)

Alien is often remembered for the moment when an alien creature bursts out through the chest of one of the crew members on the spaceship. This iconic moment has the power to unnerve even the most cynical of contemporary audiences. The film has a lot more to it than that however. It is essentially an expertly made horror story set on board a spaceship. The alien lifeform which invades the spaceship is very sinister but it is made all the more so by the contrast with the portrayal of the ship's crew. They are a bunch of very average people who sit around eating pizza, playing cards and getting bored. This contrast between the crew's very mundane existence and the sheer awfulness of the alien is a very powerful one. Very striking too is Sigourney Weaver's portrayal of the reluctant hero Ellen Ripley. She is a compelling screen presence in this movie and it established her as one of the top film actresses of her time.