

1.3055 It was not long after the 1930s commenced that such baritone singers as Bing Crosby and Russ Columbo contributed to the popularization of a type of romantic, soothing singing that came to be called “crooning.”

- It was not long after the 1930s commenced that such baritone singers as Bing Crosby and Russ Columbo contributed to
- Not long after the commencement of the decade of the 1930s, baritone singers such as Bing Crosby and also Russ Columbo ~~decided to participate in~~
- Not long after the commencement of the 1930s began, baritone singers ~~like~~ Bing Crosby and Russ Columbo contributed to
- Not long after the ~~beginning of the 1930s commencement~~, baritone singers such as Bing Crosby and Russ Columbo had contributed to
- It was not long after the 1930s commenced that baritone singers such as Bing Crosby and Russ Columbo had ~~decided to participate in~~

My explanation : Decided to participate in : wrong, like : wrong ;B,C,E :out.

Beginning = commencement : D out

A stands.

The original sentence correctly uses the simple past tense *contributed* to refer to an event that occurred in the past. Furthermore, the original sentence correctly uses *such as* to introduce examples of *baritone singers* who made a contribution to the popularization of the “*crooning*” style of singing. Note that it is acceptable to place words between *such* and *as* (*such baritone singers as*). In order to do this correctly, the intervening words (*baritone singers*) must be the category to which the examples (*Crosby and Columbo*) belong.

(A) **CORRECT.** As explained above, this choice uses the proper verb tense and is idiomatically correct.

(B) The 1930s is a decade, so it is redundant to state *of the decade*. Furthermore, *and also* is redundant—*and* means the same thing as *also* in this context.

(C) The *commencement of the 1930s began* is redundant; *commencement* and *began* convey the same meaning. In addition, the word *like* means similar to; the phrase *such as* should be used to introduce examples.

2.3052 Most present-day people would be shocked to learn that, in the early twentieth century, when colored baby clothing was first widely distributed to North American consumers, they marketed pink clothes primarily to boys and blue clothes mainly to girls.

- learn that, in the early twentieth century, when colored baby clothing was first widely distributed to North American consumers, they marketed pink clothes primarily
- learn that, when colored baby clothing was first widely distributed to North American consumers in the early twentieth century, pink clothes were marketed primarily
- learn, in the early twentieth century when colored baby clothing was first widely distributed to North American consumers, that primarily pink clothes were marketed
- learn when colored baby clothing was first widely distributed to North American consumers, in the early twentieth century, pink clothes, which were marketed primarily

- learn, in the early twentieth century, that when colored baby clothing was first widely distributed to North American consumers, they marketed primarily pink clothes

My explanation: Learn that : correct then C,D,E out.They in A doesnot make sense.B stands.

The sentence introduces a curious fact from marketing history: at the broad introduction of colored baby clothes, in the early twentieth century, the color pink was mainly associated with baby boys and the color blue with baby girls.

(A) Logically, the pronoun *they* is intended to refer to the marketers of baby clothing, but no plural noun exists in the sentence to refer to the marketers. The *present-day people* wouldn't be *shocked to learn* this fact if they were the ones marketing these clothes.

(B) CORRECT. The placement of *when...in the early twentieth century* after the word *that* is correct; this placement attaches the modifier to the following clause (*they marketed*). The sentence correctly places *pink clothes were marketed primarily to boys* and *blue clothes (were marketed) primarily to girls* in parallel.

(C) The placement of *in the early twentieth century when...consumers* before the word *that* is incorrect. This placement attaches the modifier to the preceding clause, illogically implying that *present-day people* could go back in time (to the early twentieth century) to learn this fact. *Primarily pink* indicates that the clothing was *primarily* (or mostly) pink, not that the clothing was *marketed primarily to boys*. The comparison no longer makes sense.

(D) The *when colored...consumers* modifier is incorrectly attached to the preceding clause, illogically implying that *present-day people* could go back in time (to the early twentieth century) to learn this fact. The portion after *learn* does not contain the necessary *that + subject + verb* structure (a correct example: she was *shocked to learn that her company filed* for bankruptcy). The rest of the sentence in this option is a fragment.

(E) The placement of *in the early twentieth century* before the word *that* is incorrect. This placement attaches the modifier to the preceding clause, illogically implying that *present-day people* could go back in time (to the early twentieth century) to learn this fact. Logically, the pronoun *they* is intended to refer to the marketers of baby clothing, but no plural noun exists in the sentence to refer to the marketers. The *present-day people* wouldn't be *shocked to learn* this fact if they were the ones marketing these clothes. *Primarily pink* indicates that the clothing was *primarily* (or mostly) pink, not that the clothing was *marketed primarily to boys*. The comparison no longer makes sense.

3.3051 Equally at ease scrambling up the craggiest and treacherous mountain landscapes as perching on a ready-made barnyard knoll; the goat is considerably more adaptable than its cousin, the sheep.

- Equally at ease scrambling up the craggiest and treacherous mountain landscapes as perching on a ready-made barnyard knoll; the goat is
- The goat, as comfortable scrambling up the craggiest, most treacherous mountain landscapes as to perch on ready-made barnyard knolls, it is
- As comfortable when scrambling up the craggiest, treacherous mountain landscapes as when perching on ready-made barnyard knolls, goats are

- Equally at ease scrambling up the craggiest and most treacherous mountain landscapes as they are perching on ready-made barnyard knolls, goats are
- As comfortable scrambling up the craggiest, most treacherous mountain landscapes as perching on ready-made barnyard knolls, the goat is

My explanation : the craggiest and most treacherous mountain :correct then A,C,out. 2 subjects 1 verb in B, B out. D: wrong comparison. E stands.

4. For all their usefulness in facilitating comparisons between cities of different sizes, per-capita statistics, especially crime rates, often shine an unfairly harsh light on small towns, in which a single incident can cause such figures to skyrocket.

- For all their usefulness in facilitating comparisons between cities of different sizes, per-capita statistics, especially crime rates, often
- Despite they are useful in facilitating comparisons between differently sized cities, per-capita statistics, ~~and~~ especially crime rates, often
- Because they are quite useful in facilitating comparisons between different sized cities, per-capita statistics, especially crime rates, ~~can~~ often
- Quite useful when facilitating comparisons between differently sized cities, per-capita statistics, ~~and~~ especially crime rates, ~~which frequently~~
- For their usefulness in facilitating comparisons between different sized cities, per-capita statistics, especially crime rates, frequently

This sentence points out a shortcoming of per-capita statistics: in spite of their usefulness in comparing larger and smaller cities, these statistics may unfairly highlight small towns, whose modest population sizes can cause anomalies in the data.

(A) **CORRECT.** The expression *For all their usefulness* is a proper idiom; it is used to introduce a contrast. (For all his studying, he performed poorly on the exam.) The overall sentence is grammatically legitimate, with a single main subject (*per-capita statistics*) and a single main verb (*shine*) amid a series of modifiers and subordinate clauses.

(B) *Despite* is a preposition and must be followed by a noun or noun phrase; it cannot be followed by a clause, as it is here. The word *and* is inappropriate between *per-capita statistics* and *especially crime rates*. The word *and* indicates that the two connected items are “separate but equal.” This isn’t the case; crime rates are a particular kind of statistic, not separate from the idea of the statistics.

(C) The word *because* is illogical. The statistics are generally useful *despite* the fact that they can sometimes be misleading, not *because* they are sometimes misleading. *Different*, an adjective, cannot be used to describe *sized*; the adverb *differently* should be used instead. Finally, *when facilitating* illogically implies that per-capita statistics themselves can facilitate comparisons between cities.

(D) *When facilitating* illogically implies that per-capita statistics themselves can facilitate comparisons between cities. In addition, this sentence is a fragment, consisting only of the noun *per-capita statistics* and modifiers.

(E) *For their usefulness* does not have the same meaning as the idiom *for all their usefulness*. The latter indicates a contrast; the former does not. *Different*, an adjective, cannot be used to describe *sized*; the adverb *differently* should be used instead.

5.3029. Transfer molding is a process in which polymer resins are superheated, compressed in a charger, and then they are injected into a closed mold cavity; it is used to produce plastic moldings with variable wall thicknesses, as well as fine surface detail, such as the exterior panels of buses and trolleys.

- molding is a process in which polymer resins are superheated, compressed in a charger, and then ~~they are~~ injected into a closed mold cavity; ~~it is~~ used to produce plastic moldings with variable wall thicknesses, as well as fine surface detail, ~~such as the exterior panels of buses and trolleys~~
- molding—a process in which superheated polymer resins are compressed in a charger, then ~~injecting~~ into a closed mold cavity—is used to produce plastic moldings, such as the exterior panels of buses and trolleys with variable wall thicknesses, as well as fine surface detail
- molding—a process in which superheated polymer resins compressed in a charger are then injected into a closed mold cavity—~~it is~~ used to produce plastic moldings, such as the exterior panels of buses and trolleys, with walls of variable thickness and surfaces of fine detail
- molding, a process in which superheated polymer resins are compressed in a charger and then injected into a closed mold cavity, is used to produce plastic moldings, such as the exterior panels of buses and trolleys, with variable wall thicknesses and fine surface detail
- molding is a process involving the compression of superheated polymer resins in a charger, and ~~then they~~ are injected into a closed mold cavity; this process, which is used to produce plastic moldings with variable wall thicknesses and fine surface detail, ~~such as the exterior panels of buses and trolleys~~

(A) The sentence presents a list of three things: *superheated, compressed, and then they are injected*. The third item is not parallel to the first two. The placement of the modifier *such as the exterior panels of buses and trolleys* illogically suggests that those panels are examples of *fine surface detail*, rather than examples of *plastic moldings* in general.

(B) The use of *injecting* is illogical, suggesting that the resins themselves actually inject some other chemical into the cavity; *injected* should be used instead, as the resins themselves are injected into the cavity. At the end of this choice, *such as the exterior panels of buses and trolleys with variable wall thicknesses* is written as a single example; if the example is cut out, the remaining part of the sentence (*is used to produce plastic moldings as well as fine surface detail*) is illogical.

(C) The core of the sentence contains two subjects without any conjunction between: *Transfer molding it is used to produce*. This is not an acceptable sentence.

(D) CORRECT. The core structure (*Transfer molding is used to produce*) is a proper sentence. The modifier *such as the exterior panels* correctly refers to *plastic moldings*, and the two features of those moldings (*variable wall thicknesses* and *fine surface detail*) are properly expressed in parallel.

(E) The construction *and they are injected* can only be considered parallel to *transfer molding is a process*. In a parallel construction using a pronoun for the second subject, the first expectation is that the pronoun *they* refers to the original subject, *transfer molding*. It does not; the pronoun *they* logically

refers to *resins*. Further, the portion following the semicolon is a sentence fragment, consisting only of a noun (*this process*) and modifiers.

6.3028 In 1983, using both ground-penetrating radar equipment—much of it constructed themselves— as well as clues from the autobiography of film director Cecil B. DeMille, the film enthusiasts Peter Brosnan and John Parker located and unearthed the massive set of DeMille's epic 1923 film *The Ten Commandments*.

- much of it constructed themselves—as well as clues from the autobiography of film director Cecil B. DeMille, the film enthusiasts Peter Brosnan and John Parker
- they constructed much of it themselves, and used clues from film director Cecil B. DeMille's autobiography—Peter Brosnan and John Parker, the film enthusiasts,
- constructing much of it themselves—and taking clues from film director Cecil B. DeMille's autobiography, Peter Brosnan and John Parker were film enthusiasts who
- they constructed much of it themselves, as well as clues from film director Cecil B. DeMille's autobiography—Peter Brosnan and John Parker were film enthusiasts who
- much of which they constructed themselves—and clues from the autobiography of film director Cecil B. DeMille, film enthusiasts Peter Brosnan and John Parker

According to this sentence, Brosnan and Parker used two things in finding the set of *The Ten Commandments*: radar equipment and clues from DeMille's autobiography. The sentence also notes that the two film buffs built much of the radar equipment themselves. The dashes set off text to convey an interesting detail that is only tangentially relevant to the core of the sentence.

(A) The structure *both X as well as Y* is unidiomatic; the correct idiom is *both X and Y*. *Themselves* modifies *constructed*, which in turn modifies *equipment*; the construction thus implies that *themselves* refers to the *equipment*; this is not only illogical but also ungrammatical, as *themselves* is plural and *equipment* is singular.

(B) If the section between dashes is removed, the remaining construction contains the first half of an idiomatic construction (*both X*), but not the second half (*and Y*). This is not acceptable; both halves should be together between the dashes OR together outside of the dashes. Further, the sentence loses meaning by placing *used clues* inside the dashes. They *used equipment to locate the film set*; as an aside, they *constructed much of the equipment themselves* and *they used clues*. What did they use the clues to do? The sentence doesn't say.

(C) In the construction *both ground-penetrating radar equipment and taking clues, equipment and taking* are not parallel. The core sentence reads: *using radar equipment, Brosnan and Parker were film enthusiasts who located the set of the film*. The two did not use the radar equipment *to be film enthusiasts*; rather, they used the radar equipment *to locate* the film set. The meaning is illogical.

(D) The structure *both X as well as Y* is unidiomatic; the correct idiom is *both X and Y*. If the section between dashes is removed, the remaining construction contains the first half of an idiomatic construction (*both X*), but not the second half (*and Y*). This is not acceptable; both halves should be together between the dashes OR together outside of the dashes. Further, the choice appears to say that *they constructed the equipment and the clues*. Finally, in the construction *both ground-penetrating radar equipment and taking clues, equipment and taking* are not parallel. The core sentence reads: *using radar equipment, Brosnan and Parker were film enthusiasts who located the set of the film*. The two

did not use the radar equipment *to be film enthusiasts*; rather, they used the radar equipment *to locate* the film set. The meaning is illogical.

(E) CORRECT. *Much of which* properly refers to *radar equipment*, and *they* and *themselves* point to Brosnan and Parker, who are mentioned later in the sentence. The sentence core, *using radar equipment, Brosnan and Parker located the set of the film*, is logical.

7.3025 The new house's front door is secured by an electronic lock; a feature that not only allows RESIDENTS to lock and unlock the door without physical keys, but also may prevent them from entering the house during a power outage.

- a feature ~~that~~ not only allows residents to lock and unlock the door without physical keys, but also may prevent
- a feature ~~allowing~~ residents without a physical key to lock or unlock the door, but also possibly preventing
- a feature allows residents ~~locking~~ or unlocking the door without physical keys, but also possibly preventing
- this feature allows residents to lock and unlock the door without a physical key, but may also prevent
- this feature not only allows ~~residents without physical keys~~ to lock or unlock the door, but also prevents

This sentence describes two effects of the electronic lock: one advantage (residents can lock and unlock the door without a physical key) and one disadvantage (they may not be able to get into the house when the power is out).

(A) The portion of this choice following the semicolon is a fragment, consisting only of *a feature* and modifiers. The idiom *not only X but also Y* is used to indicate that two ideas reinforce each other; its usage doesn't make sense for two contrasting ideas.

(B) The portion of this choice following the semicolon is a fragment, consisting only of *a feature* and modifiers. The modifier *without physical keys* is misplaced; the point is that the residents can *lock and unlock the door without* using a key, not (as this choice implies) that *residents without keys can lock and unlock a door* by some other, unexplained means.

(C) *Allows residents locking or unlocking* is unidiomatic; the sentence should say *allows residents to lock or unlock*. *Allows residents* is not parallel to *preventing them*.

(D) CORRECT. This choice contains complete sentences before and after the semicolon, as required. *This feature* is correctly used to refer to the immediately preceding *electronic lock*. The use of *but (also)*, without *not only*, correctly indicates the contrast between the two parallel elements. *Allows and may prevent* are parallel.

(E) The idiom *not only X but also Y* is used to indicate that two ideas reinforce each other; its usage doesn't make sense for two contrasting ideas. The modifier *without physical keys* is misplaced; the point is that the residents can *lock and unlock the door without* using a key, not (as this choice implies) that *residents without keys can lock and unlock a door* by some other, unexplained means.

8.3024 In La Plata, Argentina, one of the first cities that was offering the public complimentary wireless Internet access; anyone with a wireless-enabled device can ACCESS the Internet from virtually any location in the downtown area.

- that was offering the public complimentary wireless Internet access; anyone with a wireless-enabled device can
- has offered complimentary wireless Internet access to the public; with a wireless-enabled device, anyone can
- to offer complimentary wireless Internet access to the public, anyone with a wireless-enabled device may
- offering the public complimentary wireless Internet access, enabling anyone with a wireless-enabled device to
- offers to the public complimentary wireless Internet access, which, with a wireless-enabled device, allows anyone to

Offer sb st

Offer st

This sentence describes a noteworthy fact about the city of La Plata, Argentina: the city offers complimentary wireless Internet access to anyone with a wireless-enabled device.

(A) The portion of the sentence preceding the semicolon is a sentence fragment. The combination of the past-tense *was offering* and the present tense *can* is illogical: the first verb suggests that La Plata no longer offers the service described, while the second suggests the opposite.

(B) The combination of the present perfect *has offered* and the present tense *can* is illogical; the first verb suggests that La Plata offered the service in the past but not necessarily at present, while the second suggests that the service is still offered now. Note that a time marker would indicate that the action still continues in the present: La Plata has offered the services for three years. Without the time marker "three years," it's unclear whether La Plata still offers these services. In addition, the clause *In La Plata, one of the first cities has offered* no longer says that *La Plata* is the city that offers these services. Rather the structure describes a separate city contained within *La Plata*. Further, the designation *first* no longer makes sense: *one of the first cities* to do what?

(C) **CORRECT.** The idiomatic construction *one of the first to* is used correctly. The modifier is followed by an independent clause, and all parts of the sentence convey a logical meaning.

(D) This sentence is a fragment, consisting entirely of modifiers and lacking either a subject or a verb.

(E) The clause *In La Plata, one of the first cities has offered* no longer says that *La Plata* is the city that offers these services. Rather the structure describes a separate city contained within *La Plata*. Further, the designation *first* no longer makes sense: *one of the first cities* to do what? The modifier *with a wireless-enabled device* is placed incorrectly. The choice indicates that *wireless Internet access* possesses a wireless device; this is illogical.

9.3022. Stymieing the Armada's plans to meet up with the Duke of Parma's army off the coast of Flanders, the reason for the defeat of the Spanish Armada was not only due to gale winds that favored the British but also the sacrificing of eight war ships as "fire ships," vessels filled with flammable materials and sent downwind toward the closely-anchored Spanish fleet.

- Stymieing the Armada's plans to meet up with the Duke of Parma's army off the coast of Flanders, the reason for the defeat of the Spanish Armada was ~~not only due to gale winds that favored the British but also the sacrificing~~
- The defeat of the Spanish Armada, which stymied the Armada's plans to meet up with the Duke of Parma's army off the coast of Flanders, ~~was not only due to gale winds that favored the British but also the sacrifice~~
- The defeat of the Spanish Armada, which stymied the Armada's plans to meet up with the Duke of Parma's army off the coast of Flanders, ~~was not only due to gale winds that favored the British but also the sacrificing~~
- Stymieing the Armada's plans to meet up with the Duke of Parma's army off the coast of Flanders, ~~the reason~~ for the defeat of the Spanish Armada was not only gale winds that favored the British but also the sacrificing
- Stymieing the Armada's plans to meet up with the Duke of Parma's army off the coast of Flanders, the defeat of the Spanish Armada was due not only to gale winds that favored the British but also to the sacrifice**

The original sentence begins with an opening modifier: *Stymieing the Armada's plans... Flanders*. The subject following the modifier should be whatever stymied the Armada's plans, but *the reason* did not stymie its plans. Rather, *the defeat* of the Armada prevented it from later meeting up with the Duke of Parma's army.

(A) The opening modifier incorrectly modifies *the reason*. It is also redundant to write *the reason for X was due to Y*. Only one of the two (*reason* or *due to*) is needed.

(B) The X and Y elements in the idiom *not only X but also Y* must be parallel, but *due to gale winds* is not parallel to *the sacrifice*. Either *due to* must be placed before *not only* (*due to not only gale winds but also the sacrifice*) or it must be repeated for both elements (*not only due to gale winds but also due to the sacrifice*).

(C) The X and Y elements in the idiom *not only X but also Y* must be parallel, but *due to gale winds* is not parallel to *the sacrificing*. Either *due to* must be placed before *not only* (*due to not only gale winds but also the sacrificing*) or it must be repeated for both elements (*not only due to gale winds but also due to the sacrificing*).

(D) The opening modifier incorrectly modifies *the reason*.

(E) Correct. The opening modifier correctly modifies *the defeat*. The X and Y elements in *due not only to gale winds but also to the sacrifice* are parallel.

10.3021. In 1860, the Philological Society launched its effort to create a dictionary more comprehensive than the world had ever seen; although the project took more than 60 years to COMPLETE, the Oxford English Dictionary was born.

- took more than 60 years to complete, the Oxford English Dictionary was
- would have taken more than 60 years to complete, the Oxford English Dictionary had been
- took more than 60 years to complete, the Oxford English Dictionary was being
- would take more than 60 years to complete, the Oxford English Dictionary was
- took more than 60 years to complete, the Oxford English Dictionary was about to be

The sentence discusses several actions using the simple past tense: the *Society launched a project*, the *Dictionary was born*, and *the project took more than 60 years to complete*. Logically, these actions cannot all have happened at the same moment, so it is inappropriate to use the simple past tense for every action. The *birth* and *launch* are the same thing, and so took place at the same time, but the completion took place 60 years later. Look for a choice that indicates this difference in time.

(A) This choice is incorrect as it uses the simple past tense for actions that must have taken place at different times in the past.

(B) The first verb has changed to *would have taken*. This conditional form changes the meaning, implying that the book's completion was only hypothetical; it did not actually occur. Consider this example: the test normally would have taken 3 hours to complete, but she finished early.

(C) The present participle *being* is used with the progressive tense to indicate a continuing or ongoing action. Logically, however, the Dictionary's *start* must have been at a single point in time, rather than over the course of the book's development. The sentence also illogically implies that the *launched* and *took 60 years* actions occurred simultaneously.

(D) CORRECT. This choice uses an unusual (but completely acceptable) construction. *Would take* is an example of a future tense written from the point of view of the past. For example, consider this conversation: "I will go to the movies with you." "What? I didn't hear you." "I said I would go to the movies with you." In the last sentence, the word *would* is an example of a future tense from a past point of view: I said (in the past) that I would (in the future) go to the movies with you. This timeframe fits the actions given in the problem: the *Dictionary was born* (at a point in time in the past) and *would take more than 60 years* (from that point in time forward) to complete.

(E) This choice incorrectly adopts the construction *was about to be born*, which conflicts with the non-underlined portion of the sentence. The first half of the sentence indicates that the project was *launched* in 1860 in the past tense, making any reference to the book being *about to be born* at some future point in time incorrect.

11.3019 According to the writings of Thorstein Veblen, the economist, the most reliable signal of a truly wealthy individual is his or her ability and willingness to engage in "conspicuous consumption"—to spend it in a way that is patently absurd or irrational.

- ~~Thorstein Veblen, the economist~~, the most reliable signal of a truly wealthy individual is his or her ability and willingness
- ~~Thorstein Veblen, the economist~~, the most reliable signal that one is truly wealthy is whether one is ~~capable~~ and willing
- ~~economist Thorstein Veblen~~, the most reliable signal of one's true wealth is whether an individual is ~~capable~~ and willing
- the economist Thorstein Veblen, an individual's true wealth is most reliably signaled by ~~their~~ ability and willingness
- the economist Thorstein Veblen, the most reliable signal of true wealth is an individual's ability and willingness

Capable (A) of doing something

This sentence describes an assertion from the writings of the economist Thorstein Veblen: namely, that individual wealth is most reliably signaled by the ability and willingness to engage in "conspicuous consumption," a concept that the sentence then defines.

(A) The pronoun *it* in the phrase *spend it in a way* should logically refer to *wealth* or *money*; however, no such noun exists in the sentence (*wealthy* is an adjective).

(B) The pronoun *it* in the phrase *spend it in a way* should logically refer to *wealth* or *money*; however, no such noun exists in the sentence (*wealthy* is an adjective). *Whether* is also illogical, suggesting that *whether* someone is willing or is not willing to engage in "conspicuous consumption" is a signal of wealth. Rather, someone must have both the ability and the willingness to do so. Finally, in the parallel structure *capable and willing to engage*, the idiom *willing to + verb* is acceptable, but the idiom *capable to + verb* is not (the sentence should say capable of engaging).

(C) The shift from *one's* to *an individual* is unacceptable; it illogically suggests that the person possessing the wealth is not necessarily the same person who engages in "conspicuous consumption." *Whether* is also illogical, suggesting that *whether* someone is willing or is not willing to engage in "conspicuous consumption" is a signal of wealth. Rather, someone must have both the ability and the willingness to do so. Finally, in the parallel structure *capable and willing to engage*, the idiom *willing to + verb* is acceptable, but the idiom *capable to + verb* is not (the sentence should say capable of engaging).

(D) The plural pronoun *their* cannot refer to the singular noun *an individual's*.

(E) CORRECT. This sentence contains the singular noun *wealth*, which serves as a logical antecedent for *it*. Both *ability* and *willingness* combine idiomatically with *to + verb*.

12.3018 In recent years, scholars of psychology have begun to examine more seriously the notion, first proposed by John Keats, of "negative capability"—the idea that maintaining calmness amid uncertainty and doubt, rather than experiencing an anxious urge to find solutions, is a genuine talent and possibly even a therapeutic tool.

- In recent years, scholars of psychology have begun to examine more seriously the notion, first proposed by John Keats, of "negative capability"—the
- Proposed first by John Keats, the notion of "negative capability," which scholars of psychology ~~began to examine more seriously in recent years~~; this is the
- The notion of "negative capability," which John Keats first proposed and scholars of psychology ~~recently began to take more seriously—the~~
- Proposed first by John Keats, and ~~recently~~ scholars of psychology ~~began~~ to take it more seriously, the notion of "negative capability" is the
- First proposed by John Keats, ~~scholars~~ of psychology have recently begun to take the notion of "negative capability" more seriously; this is the

The sentence notes that John Keats's idea of "negative capability" has **RECEIVED** more attention from scholars in recent years, and then goes on to provide a definition of that term.

(A) **CORRECT.** The modifier *first proposed by John Keats* properly describes *the notion*, and the explanation set off by the dash is properly placed next to *"negative capability,"* the term that it defines. In addition, if the explanation following the dash is removed, the remaining portion is a **COMPLETE** sentence as required.

(B) The portion of the sentence preceding the **COLON** is a fragment, consisting only of *the notion* and modifiers.

(C) The portion of the sentence preceding the **COLON** is a fragment, consisting only of *the notion* and modifiers. The explanation set off by the dash is unnecessarily far away from *"negative capability,"* the term it is intended to define.

(D) In this sentence, a modifier (*Proposed first by John Keats*) is placed improperly in parallel with a complete clause (*scholars of psychology began to take it more seriously*). In addition, the sentence contains a run-on structure: *scholars began to take it seriously, the notion of "negative capability" is the idea*. It's incorrect to connect two independent clauses by a comma without any conjunction.

(E) The opening modifier *First proposed by John Keats* is followed by *scholars of psychology*, illogically suggesting that Keats somehow "proposed" the scholars themselves.

13.3017 With brains shaped by evolution to respond primarily to immediate physical peril, individual human beings often ignore or underestimate the gravity of more nebulous threats, such as climate change, yet are no less menacing.

- individual human beings often ignore or underestimate ~~the gravity of more nebulous threats, such as climate change, yet are no less menacing~~
- individual human beings are prone to ignore, or else to underestimate, the gravity of more

nebulous yet no less menacing threats, such as climate change

- individual human beings, often ~~ignoring or underestimating~~ the gravity of more nebulous threats, such as climate change, are no less menacing
- ~~the gravity of threats~~, such as climate change, that are more nebulous yet no less menacing are often ignored, or else underestimated, by individual human beings
- ~~the gravity of more nebulous threats~~, such as climate change, are no less menacing, yet are often ignored or underestimated by individual human beings

This sentence presents an unfortunate consequence of the evolution of the human brain: Because the brain evolved to respond to immediate physical threats, humans are less likely to appreciate the seriousness of threats that are less immediately apparent.

(A) The core structure of this sentence is *individual human beings often ignore or underestimate ... yet are no less menacing*. According to the first portion of the sentence, the *human beings* are responding to *threats*; they are not themselves the threats. This choice illogically conveys that the humans themselves, rather than the nebulous threats, are *no less menacing*.

(B) **CORRECT.** *To ignore* and *to underestimate* are properly parallel, as are *more nebulous* and *no less menacing*. The opening modifier *With brains* is correctly placed to modify the subject *individual human beings*, and the modifier *such as climate change* is properly positioned after *threats*.

(C) The core structure of this sentence is *individual human beings... are no less menacing*. According to the first portion of the sentence, the *human beings* are responding to *threats*; they are not themselves the threats. This choice illogically conveys that the humans themselves, rather than the nebulous threats, are *no less menacing*.

(D) The opening modifier *With brains* seems to describe *the gravity of threats*; this is illogical, as *gravity* does not have *brains*. In addition, the singular subject *the gravity* does not agree with the plural verb *are ignored*.

(E) The opening modifier *With brains* seems to describe *the gravity of more nebulous threats*; this is illogical, as *gravity* does not have *brains*. The singular subject *the gravity* does not agree with the plural verb *are*. Finally, even if that verb were changed to *is*, the sentence would still not make sense, since the *threats* themselves, not *the gravity of those threats*, are *menacing*.

14. When ethnic groups intermarry, it is likely to result in cognitive benefits; INDEED, perhaps already having contributed to the Flynn effect, which has been the worldwide rise in average IQ score by as much as three points per decade over most of the past century.

- When ethnic groups intermarry, it is likely to result in cognitive benefits; indeed, ~~perhaps having contributed to the Flynn effect, which has been~~
- The intermarriage of ethnic groups is likely to result in cognitive benefits and may indeed have contributed to the Flynn effect,
- When ethnic groups intermarry, ~~they are likely to result~~ in cognitive benefits and may indeed have contributed to the Flynn effect, ~~the name given to~~
- Ethnic groups that intermarry ~~will likely result in~~ cognitive benefits; indeed, possibly having

contributed to the Flynn effect,

- The intermarriage of ethnic groups, ~~likely to result~~ in cognitive benefits, indeed have possibly contributed to the Flynn effect, ~~the name given to~~

This sentence describes a likely positive consequence of the intermarriage of ethnic groups: specifically, such intermarriage is likely to produce cognitive benefits for the resulting offspring. The sentence then goes on to speculate that the intermarriage of ethnic groups may also be one of the causes of the "Flynn effect," the recent global increase in average IQ.

(A) The pronoun *it* has no antecedent. In context, that pronoun is clearly intended to refer to the intermarriage of ethnic groups, but the noun *intermarriage* is not present in the sentence. The portion of the sentence following the semicolon is not a **COMPLETE** sentence—it contains neither a subject nor a verb—and so the sentence as a whole is a fragment.

(B) CORRECT. The sentence properly uses a compound verb construction (*is likely ... and may*) to describe two possible facts about the kind of intermarriage described. The noun modifier *the worldwide rise* is properly used to explain what the Flynn effect is. Finally, the sentence is accurate in meaning: the *intermarriage* of ethnic groups, not the ethnic groups themselves, is *likely to result in cognitive benefits*.

(C) This sentence illogically states that the *ethnic groups* themselves, rather than the intermarriage between them, *are likely to result in cognitive benefits*. The combination of a *cause* in the present tense (*are likely to*) and its *effect* in the present perfect (*have contributed*) is illogical, implying that the effect somehow preceded the cause. Finally, the phenomenon *may have contributed* to the *Flynn effect* itself; the phenomenon did not contribute to the *name* given to the effect.

(D) This sentence illogically states that the *ethnic groups* themselves, rather than the intermarriage between them, *will likely result in cognitive benefits*. The portion of the sentence following the semicolon is not a complete sentence—it contains neither a subject nor a verb—and so the sentence as a whole is a fragment.

(E) The singular subject *the intermarriage* does not agree with the plural verb *have contributed*. Finally, the phenomenon *may have contributed* to the *Flynn effect* itself; the phenomenon did not contribute to the *name* given to the effect.