

HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
Written Examination for Junior Grade Translator
Total Marks - 100
Time – 3 hours

Part I 15 Marks [1 for each correct answer]

Fill in the blanks with the proper form of the Adjectives:

1. Iron is than any other metal (useful)
2. Africa is the of the five Continents. (hot)
3. This is the flower I have even seen. (pretty)
4. I have never seen work than this. (neat)

Supply the most suitable tense, for each of the following sentences :

5. He is busy now; he (write) a letter.
6. I usually (not take) sugar in my tea.
7. We (not play) tennis together since last may.
8. He (sit) in the garden when the storm broke.
9. He (go) out five minutes ago.

Fill in each blank with one of the following Verbs :

built, enjoyed, found, left, lost, permitted, promised, returned, tried, was, were.

10. The floods.....bad last year because the trees had been cut down.
11. The birds because they could not find any trees to build their homes in.
12. The loggers their jobs cutting down trees.
13. Their job as forest rangers to protect the trees and animals of the forest.
14. The timber companies hard to change the law so that they could cut down trees again.
15. In the end, the government them to continue doing a little logging.

Part II 15 Marks [1 for each correct answer]

Write only the answer. Answer in complete sentence is not required.

1. Who betrayed Jesus to the Romans?
2. Whose nose grew when he told a lie?
3. What is a baby rabbit called?
4. Who wrote Gulliver's Travels?
5. Which Athenian philosopher wrote nothing - immortalised by Plato?
6. What is the National Bird of India?
7. Which city is the world's largest carpet manufacturer?

8. SOS - the distress message stands for what?
9. Who wrote the poem Kubla Khan?
10. What word from the Persian means perfume?
11. The religious text Tripitaka comes from which religion?
12. Mumbai is the modern name of which city?
13. Which vault in Gymnastics is known as 'Death Vault'?
14. In Macbeth which witch speaks first?
15. Which is the venue for 2020 Olympics?

Part III

20 Marks

Make a précis of the text below [in 150 words]

How many times have we been tortured by the clichés of the uninitiated, veteran or novice, that translation is never equal to the original, that languages differ from one another, that culture is "also" involved with translation procedures, that when a translation is "exact" it tends to be "literal" and hence loses the "spirit" of the original, that the "meaning" of a text means both "content" and "style," and so on. Not to speak of such approaches where norms are either overtly or covertly stated, i.e., where we are told how translations should look or how they should be conceived of in terms of one or another evaluative norm. This does not happen only at such conferences where innocent translators, never before exposed to contemporary knowledge, rediscover with great amazement time-honoured commonplaces. It may very well occur even when so-called professionals meet together. Obviously, this is caused partly by simple ignorance: as with medicine, literature and child psychology, everybody is an expert without even suspecting that there are things to be studied. Advanced translation studies are accessible as yet only to a relatively small number of professionals. But when we speak of "translation theory today," it does not seem valuable to waste time reviewing everything that is being published in the field. It is rather that body of hypotheses which is now crystallizing and which may constitute a more developed theory that I believe worthwhile to consider, no matter how little known it may be. There has recently evolved a set of hypotheses which analyzes translation in the context of the sign-system mechanism of human production rather than in terms of isolated verbal, literary, stylistic or cultural types. Moreover, it seems that a kind of functional approach is gaining ground in which the aggregate of hypothesized functions within the verbal sign. In contrast, the a-historical concept of system (structure), as isolated from other semiotic co-systems, and analyzed in terms of homogeneity seems to be gradually losing ground. As a result new questions arise, and, what is more important, old questions can be asked again. Doing this does not mean to tediously perpetuate that ceremonial act where one always starts from the very beginning, as if nothing has been done before. As we know, there is a difference between innocent questions and those produced by previous knowledge. The possibility of raising such

questions in translation studies seems in itself to be a sign of some advancement, and must be taken as such rather than as a desire to revolutionize the field just for the fun of it. On the other hand, research carried out with the more advanced hypotheses has disclosed how many riddles there are yet to be solved once the old concepts are given up. Thus, the reformulation of theoretical concepts obviously does not stay within the borders of theory alone: It has immediate bearings on the object of studies, and clearly should be appreciated on that basis. Rewriting now for tenth time my private version of translation theory, several questions turned up in my problem file. I intend to discuss some of them briefly in this paper in the hope that this may contribute to our knowledge in regard to where we stand. At least I would like to know where I stand, if at all. II Our accumulated knowledge about translation indicates more and more that translational procedures between two systems (language/literatures) are in principle analogous, even homologous, with transfers of various kinds within the borders of the system. As systems are no longer conceived of as homogeneous, static structures, transfer mechanisms, that is, the procedures by which textual models in one system are transferred to another, from canonized to non-canonized literature for example, constitute a major feature of systems. This has been, at least generally, formulated before, notably by Jakobson (1959), but no consequences were ever drawn for translation theory. Can we stick to this practice, or would it be wiser to acknowledge the implicit practice whereby translation is discussed in terms of transfer and vice versa? In other words, would it be profitable to establish a transfer theory, and if so, where will inter-systemic translation be located, and with what consequences? My answer is that even if we are unaware of the fact that we discuss translation in terms of transfers and vice versa, sooner or later it will turn out to be uneconomical to deal with them separately. When, for instance, we say in translation theory that under certain circumstances secondary models are more likely to be operating with literary translation because more often than not translated literature occupies a peripheral position within the literary PS and more often than not peripheries use secondary models, the problem of what we will call the "secondarization" of primary models is also present. If we are fond of terminological games, we could then easily say that "secondarization" is clearly involved with translational procedures while, on the other hand, translation involves "secondarization" of primary models. But aside from proverbial beauty thus achieved, it does not seem to be very illuminating, not because it does not point at any valid hypotheses but because they are not logical (or empirical) opposites. As a consequence, the lack of an explicitly formulated transfer theory simply creates the following situation: (a) One section of phenomena homologous with another is dealt with as an object of study while the other is not recognized as such and therefore is taken casually, as if belonging to an altogether different semiotic set; (b) general procedures, valid in various co-systems, are conceived of as particular, i.e., pertaining only to an officially recognized section. This results not only in exaggerated non-proportional perspectives but hinders the discovery of what the particular procedures, after the general ones have

been eliminated, really are. On the other hand, there is always the danger that by making generalizations too gross, and if a transfer theory is developed from translation theory, the relatively solid body of questions already in existence will be lost. Maybe it would be better then to stick to our reduced theory, knowing it is not adequate; the alternative may be worse.

Part IV

10 Marks

Translate into Bengali

As we stood there I noticed four or five men were squatting in front of us. They were relieving themselves. I glanced around me: what I had taken to be the droppings of dogs was, I realized, all human excreta. It was outside the hovels, it was bedside their only well...no wonder the people were ridden by disease and the children pocked with sores. Gandhi stood silent. A look of intense pity and sorrow came into his face. There was no anger. He did not step forward and give them a lecture on hygiene or modern sanitation. He did not plead, cajole or reprimand. But with the same expression of abject humility as though he himself was personally to blame for all this suffering and filth, began to scavenge the excreta and bury it with his own hand. As we did this together, the villagers at first stood by and watched. Then the example of their beloved Mahatmaji worked upon them. He was clearing their filth away without a look or a word of complaint. Within a few minutes the villagers began to follow his example. Gandhi's act of selfless action, of service, had achieved in a moment what coercion or teaching could not have done in a century. Here was an example of practical politics, of applied religion, an excellent introduction to philosophy. I had come to India to talk to Gandhi – but this incident taught me more than all the discussions we had.

Part V

10 Marks

Write a note on difficult factors in translating [in 50 words]

Part VI

30 Marks

Translate into English

(ক) মহামান্য হাই কোর্ট আদালতের অত্র নোটিস জারীর জন্য অধীনের প্রতি হাওলা হইলে পর অদ্য ৩/২/২০০০ ইং সং নোটিশের লিখিত ঠিকানায় যাইয়া নোটিশের লিখিত বিবাদীদ্বয়কে বাড়িতে না পাওয়ায় একামত্বুক্ত ভাতিজাকে পাইয়া নোটিশের মর্ম অবগত করাইয়া পক্ষে দস্তখাত গ্রহণে জারি করি। জারী অন্তে ফেরৎ দাখিল করিলাম।

(খ) সবিনয় নিবেদন এই যে, বিগত ৪-৯-০৬ ইং তারিখে রাত্রি অনুমান ৯-৩০ মি: ঘটিকায় চেবরী নিবাসি শ্রী সুভাষ দেব পিতা মৃত মহাদেব দেব ধারালো অস্ত্র নিয়ে আমার স্বামী শ্রী শঙ্কর রায় এর উপর আঘাত করিতে থাকে। আমার স্বামীকে রক্ষা করিতে আমার দেবর শ্রী গকুল রায় এবং প্রতিবেশী প্রবীর রায় এগিয়ে আসিলে উক্ত সুভাষ দেব তার হাতে থাকা ভোজালী দিয়ে তাদেরকেও ক্রমাগত আঘাত করিতে থাকে। ফলে আমার স্বামী শ্রী শঙ্কর রায় সহ শ্রী গকুল রায় ও প্রবীর রায় গুরুতর আঘাত প্রাপ্ত হয়ে বর্তমানে জিবি হাসপাতালে চিকিৎসাধীন অবস্থায় আছে। প্রকাশ থাকে যে, উক্ত ঘটনা চেবরী মাছবাজার সন্নিহিত পাণ্ডব রায় এর দোকানের সামনে ঘটে। জিবি হাসপাতালে আমার স্বামীর চিকিৎসার কারণে এজাহার করিতে বিলম্ব হইল। বর্তমানে উপরোক্ত আহত ব্যক্তিগণ জিবি হাসপাতালে আশঙ্কাজনক অবস্থায় চিকিৎসাধীন।

অতএব মহোদয়ের নিকট বিনীত প্রার্থনা এই যে, মহোদয় যেন সুষ্ঠু তদন্তক্রমে প্রয়োজনীয় পদক্ষেপ গ্রহণ করেন।

(গ) সবিনয় নিবেদন এই যে, ৮ বৎসর পূর্বের বিবাদীর সঙ্গে সামাজিক ভাবে আমি বিবাহের বন্ধনে আবদ্ধ হইয়াছি। বর্তমানে ২ টি সন্তানের মা। বিবাহের পর থেকে বিবাদী আমার উপর টাকা পয়সা বাপের বাড়ী থেকে নেওয়ার চাপ সৃষ্টি করে। পরে আমি অল্প টাকা আনি। আরো বেশি টাকা নেওয়ার জন্য আমার উপর প্রচণ্ড চাপ সৃষ্টি করে। আমার বাবা খুবই গরিব। খুবই কষ্ট করে আমাকে বিয়ে দিয়েছে। প্রথমে আমি দেবদারু ও পূর্ব রেকচাই পঞ্চায়েতের দ্বারস্থ হই। অনেকবার শালিশের মাধ্যমে বিবাদী প্রতিশ্রুতি দিয়ে আমাকে নেয়, কিন্তু কিছুদিন পর থেকে আবার আমার উপর অত্যাচারের মাত্রা বাড়াতে শুরু করে। আগে শুধু গাঁজা খেত, পরে মদ ও গাঁজা দুইটি নেশা করে। সাথে বিক্রিও করে। গত ২২/৪/০৭ ইং ও ২৩/৪/০৭ ইং সকাল প্রায় ৮ টার সময় প্রচণ্ড ভাবে মারধর শুরু করে বাড়িতে বাহির করে দেয়। এতে আমার শ্বশুর ও শাশুড়ী কোন প্রতিবাদ করেনি। পরে সহ্য করতে না পেরে, পূর্ব রেকচাই, বিকর্ণ বৈদ্য পাড়ায় আমার পিত্রালয়ে চলে আসি। বর্তমানে আইনের আশ্রয়ের দ্বারস্থ হইলাম।