

Test 3

Q.1. Make a precis of the following passage; also suggest a suitable title. (15+5 = 20)

We lawyers cannot write plain English. We use eight words to say what could be said in two. We use old, arcane phrases to express commonplace ideas. Seeking to be precise, we become redundant. Seeking to be cautious, we become verbose. Our sentences twist on, phrase within clause within clause, glazing the eyes and numbing the minds of our readers. The result is a writing style that has, according to one critic, four outstanding characteristics. It is: "(1) wordy, (2) unclear, (3) pompous, and (4) dull."

Criticism of lawyers' writing is nothing new. In 1596 an English chancellor decided to make an example of a particularly prolix document filed in his court. The chancellor first ordered a hole cut through the center of the document, all 120 pages of it. Then he ordered that the person who wrote it should have his head stuffed through the hole, and the unfortunate fellow was led around to be exhibited to all those attending court at Westminster Hall.

When the common law was transplanted to America, the writing style of the old English lawyers came with it. In 1817 Thomas Jefferson lamented that in drafting statutes his fellow lawyers were accustomed to "making every other word a 'said' or 'aforesaid,' and saying everything over two or three times, so that nobody but we of the craft can untwist the diction, and find out what it means."

In recent times criticism of lawyers' writing has taken on a new intensity. The popular press castigates lawyers for the "frustration, outrage, or despair" a consumer feels when trying to puzzle through an insurance policy or installment loan agreement. President Carter has ordered that new regulations of the federal executive agencies must be "written in plain English" that is "understandable to those who must comply" with them.' A recently enacted New York State statute requires consumer contracts to be written "in a clear and cogent manner using words with common and everyday meanings." Within the legal profession itself, the criticism has mounted. Attorney Ronald Goldfarb charges that, by writing as we do, we "unnecessarily mystify our work, baffle our clients, and alienate the public. We could change this, and we should."

Precise

Title "Criticism on the Lawyers' Writing"

The lawyers write complex and unambiguous English. **Therefore,** the readers are unable to read to understand it. Resultantly, they find it difficult and uninteresting. The Lawyers' writing ^{has} ^{been} subjected to criticism since 1800s.

Do not use such word For instance, Justice Marshall insulted a lawyer for his writing in the court. Similarly, Thomas Jefferson also highly criticized

lawyers' writing because people could not understand common law due to its writing style. In modern times, lawyers' writing is

still facing criticism. People cannot understand rules and policies regarding their business. This is the reason, President Carter has directed the federal executive agencies to write rules and regulations in simple and clear English. so,

people can easily understand it. The lawyers' writing is also criticized by its professionals, for instance, Attorney Ronald Goldfarb criticized it and demands reforms in it.

Precise your sentence

Ideas are fine

Follow the rules

do, we "unnecessarily mystify our work, barter our clients, and alienate the public." We should change this, and we should."

Q.2. Read the passage carefully and answer the questions that follow. (20)

When biologist Tibor Gánti died on April 15, 2009, at the age of 75, he was far from being a household name. Much of his career had been spent behind the Iron Curtain that divided Europe for decades, hindering an exchange of ideas. But if Gánti's theories had been more widely known during the communist era, he might now be acclaimed as one of the most innovative biologists of the 20th century. That's because he devised a model of the simplest possible living organism, which he called the chemoton, that points to an exciting explanation for how life on Earth began.

The origin of life is one of science's most perplexing mysteries, partly because it is several mysteries in one. What was Earth like when it formed? What gases made up the air? Of the thousands of chemicals that living cells now use, which ones are essential—and when did those must-have substances arise? Perhaps the hardest question is the simplest: What was the first organism? For scientists attempting to re-create the spark of life, the chemoton offers an attractive target for experiments. If non-living chemicals can be made to self-assemble into a chemoton, that reveals a pathway by which life could have formed from scratch. Even now, some research groups are edging startlingly close to this model.

And for astrobiologists interested in life beyond our planet, the chemoton offers a universal definition of life, one not tied to specific chemicals like DNA, but instead to an overall organizational model. "I think Gánti has thought deeper about the fundamentals of life than anybody else I know," says biologist Eörs Szathmáry of the Centre for Ecological Research in Tihany, Hungary.

Fascinated by the nature of living things, in 1966, Ganti published a book on molecular biology called *Revolution in Life Research*. The book asked whether science understood how life was organized and concluded that it did not. In 1971, Gánti tackled the problem head-on in a new book *The Principles of Life*. Published only in Hungarian, this book contained the first version of his chemoton model, which described what he saw as the fundamental unit of life. However, this early model of the organism was incomplete, and it would take him another three years to publish what is now regarded as the definitive version—again only in Hungarian, in a paper that is not available online.

Questions:

- 1) Does Ganti offer any clue to life beyond earth? (4)
- 2) What were the basic themes that Ganti dealt with in his books? (4)
- 3) Why could Ganti be known as an innovative biologist? (4)
- 4) What is Ganti's most important contribution to biology? (4)
- 5) Why are fundamentals of life important to scientists? (4)

Comprehension

1) Does Ganti offer any clue to life beyond earth?

Ans:

Yes, Ganti offers a clue to life beyond earth. Because his model named "Chemoton" gives universal definition of life and does not revolve just around chemicals like DNA. The biologist Eric Szathmari ^{appreciates} who is interested in Ganti's work.

2) Why were the basic themes that Ganti dealt with in his books?

Ans:

In 1966, Ganti wrote a book on molecular biology named "Revolution in Life Research" in which she concluded science remained fail to know how life was organized. In 1971, she published a book named "The principles of Life" that was based on his "Chemoton model."

3) Why could Ganti be known as an innovative biologist?

Ans:

Ganti was known as one of the most innovative biologist of

Begin from question statement and not from yes or no

Donot take phrases from the passage

Break answer into two sentences

the 20th century because of his model "Chomton" in which he explained the origin of life on the Earth.

4) What is Ganti's most important contribution to biology?

Ans

The Ganti's most important contribution to biology is his model Chomton in which he explained universal definition of life and pointed how life originated on the Earth.

5) Why are fundamentals of life important to scientists?

Ans.

Scientists consider cell is the fundamental of life. These cells are having thousands of chemicals like DNA.