

1. Scientists have recently discovered what could be the largest and oldest living organism on Earth, a giant fungus that is an interwoven filigree of mushrooms and root-like tentacles **spawned** by a single fertilized spore some 10,000 years ago and extending for more than 30 acres in the soil of a Michigan forest.
- A. **extending**
B. extends
C. extended
D. it extended
E. is extending

The original sentence is correctly written. The giant fungus is described as an *interwoven filigree spawned ... some 10,000 years ago and extending for more than 30 acres*. The present participle *extending* parallels the past participle *spawned*.

A Correct. This sentence has the participles *spawned* and *extending* in a correct parallel construction. *Spawned* refers to something that happened in the past, while *extending* refers to something that continues into the present.

B *Extends* is a present tense verb, not the participle needed for parallel structure; the ostensible parallel between *extends* and the distant verb *is* is superficial and would result in an awkward and unclear sentence.

C *Extended* looks parallel to *spawned*, but this phrase would mean that the fungus extended only in the past when the fungus clearly lives on in the present.

D *It extended* is not parallel to *spawned* and indicates an event completed in the past.

E *Is extending* is the progressive form of the present tense verb, not the participle required for parallelism.

The correct answer is A.

2. First discovered more than 30 years ago, Lina's sunbird, a four-and-a-half-inch animal found in the Philippines and that resembles a hummingbird, has shimmering metallic colors on its head; a brilliant orange patch, bordered with red tufts, in the center of its breast; and a red eye.
- A. found in the Philippines and that resembles
B. found in the Philippines and that, resembling
C. **found in the Philippines and resembling**
D. that is found in the Philippines and it resembles
E. that is found in the Philippines, resembling

This question primarily concerns parallel construction: the two comparable elements of the original sentence are "found" and "that resembles". As originally expressed, these elements are not structured similarly - for "that resembles" to be correct, the earlier parallel element of the sentence would have to state "that is found." Since the original sentence contains a provable error, eliminate answer choice A and ANY OTHERS ANSWER CHOICES THAT REPEAT THE ORIGINAL ERROR.

- b. Parallel elements: "found" and "that, resembling" - Not parallel = Eliminate
c. Parallel elements: "found" and "resembling" - Parallel = Keep
d. Parallel elements: "that is found" and "it resembles" - Not parallel = Eliminate
e. Parallel elements: "that is found" and "resembling" - Not parallel = Eliminate

As choices b, d, and e contain similar errors in parallel construction, the correct answer is C.

the core of the sentence is
a bird has colors.

both 'found in the philippines' and 'resembling a hummingbird' are participial modifiers. one of them uses a past participle (actually a passive participle: the bird is found, passive voice) and the other uses a present participle (an active participle), but they are used in parallel.

nota bene: you have also now learned that the gmat is perfectly fine with placing a passive / past participial modifier in parallel structure with an active / present participial modifier. keep this in mind if you see another problem like this one!

A note about semicolon usage:

you can also use semicolons to separate the items in an unusually long list.

this usage is especially recommended if the list items themselves are long.
it is REQUIRED if the use of the usual commas creates ambiguity.

for instance,

"in her three grocery bags, Laura carried 3 cans of Pepsi and 2 cans of Coke; four bananas, two apples, and a pear; and 16 boxes of dinosaur-shaped pasta."

in this case, the use of semicolons is the only way to construct a sentence that properly breaks the groceries down into the contents of the 3 bags. if you just use commas, you don't know what's in which bag.

Q asked: Would A) be correct if it said "that is found and that was resembled"?

nope. wrong for 2 reasons.

(1) IN THIS CONTEXT, the verbs have to be in the same tense, because they're describing things that appear in exactly the same context.

in other words, BOTH of these are general facts about the sunbird. therefore, they should both be expressed in the present tense (this is what we do with general facts).

(2) you can't use "resembled" in the passive voice; that's just an incorrect construction.

you have to say "X resembles Y" (active voice). as far as i know, you're not allowed to say "Y is resembled by X" on the other hand, you HAVE to use "is found" in the passive voice here, because the bird itself is found (i.e., the bird is not finding anything, so the active voice would be inappropriate) in the philippines.

A note about the usage of "which"

the gmat tends to write sentences in which "which" stands for the ELIGIBLE noun that's closest to the comma.
by "eligible", i mean that the noun has to AGREE IN TERMS OF SINGULAR/PLURAL with the FOLLOWING VERB.

here's an example:

the box of nails, which is on the counter, is to be used on this project.

in this case, "which" CANNOT refer to "nails", since the verb "is" is singular. therefore, the nearest eligible noun is "box (of nails)". so, "which" unambiguously stands for that.

in our observation, the gmat has been VERY good about this.

whenever i've seen a "which" that refers to "X of Y" rather than just Y, it has ALWAYS been the case that X was singular and Y was plural (or X was plural and Y was singular), and the verb had a form that matched X and didn't match Y.

in this problem, "leading to" is a classic example of a COMMA + -ING modifier.

these modifiers refer to the subject and action of the preceding clause, and imply some sort of causal or resultant relationship between the modifier and the action in that clause.

for instance:

my brother took extra courses every semester throughout his college career, graduating in only three years.

--> correct. in this case, the modifier (graduating in 3 years) correctly describes an immediate consequence of the action in the main clause; furthermore, the subject of "graduating" is the same as the subject of that clause (i.e., my brother).

my brother ate frozen food every day throughout his college career, graduating in only three years.
--> incorrect. there are no grammatical issues with this sentence, but it's absurd in terms of meaning: there is no causal or consequential relationship between eating frozen food and graduating early.

that's a quick rundown on how to use COMMA + -ING.

--

Given its authoritative coverage of other science topics, the textbook's chapter on genetics is surprisingly tentative, which leads one to doubt the author's scholarship in that particular area.

- A. the textbook's chapter on genetics is surprisingly tentative, which leads
- B. the chapter of the textbook on genetics is surprisingly tentative, leading
- C. the textbook contains a surprising and tentative chapter on genetics, which leads
- D. the textbook's chapter on genetics is surprisingly tentative and leads
- E. the textbook is surprisingly tentative in its chapter on genetics, leading

lead/leads is a VERB.

you can use it in any context where there's a legitimate subject for it.

"lead" is plural; "leads" is singular.

in this problem, "leading to" is a classic example of a COMMA + -ING modifier.

these modifiers refer to the *subject and action of the preceding clause*, and imply some sort of *causal or resultant* relationship between the modifier and the action in that clause.

for instance:

my brother took extra courses every semester throughout his college career, graduating in only three years.

--> correct. in this case, the modifier (graduating in 3 years) correctly describes an immediate consequence of the action in the main clause; furthermore, the subject of "graduating" is the same as the subject of that clause (i.e., *my brother*).

my brother ate frozen food every day throughout his college career, graduating in only three years.

--> incorrect. there are no *grammatical* issues with this sentence, but it's absurd in terms of meaning: there is no causal or consequential relationship between eating frozen food and graduating early.

that's a quick rundown on how to use COMMA + -ING.

--

lead/leads is a VERB.

you can use it in any context where there's a legitimate subject for it.

"lead" is plural; "leads" is singular.

3. The increased popularity and availability of televisions has led to the decline of regional dialects, language variations which originate from diverse ethnic and cultural heritages and perpetuated by geographic isolation.
- A. which originate from diverse ethnic and cultural heritages and perpetuated
 - B. that originated from diverse ethnic and cultural heritages and perpetuated
 - C. originated from diverse ethnic and cultural heritages and perpetuated
 - D. **originating from diverse ethnic and cultural heritages and perpetuated**
 - E. originating from diverse ethnic and cultural heritages and perpetuating

This is a positive D.

This problem is similar to the Time Zones problem (Q. 4)

Well - between B and D, D is actually parallel because of the correct usage in D of participles (originating and perpetuated) even though they are structurally dissimilar.

if we were to use the structure of B -

variations that originated from should be paralleled by and that were perpetuated by.... then it would have been parallel.

Alternatively D uses

Variations ORIGINATING from (originating acts as an adjective modifying Variations) and perpetuated by (again perpetuated acts as an adjective modifying variations).

4. The growth of the railroads led to the abolition of local times, which was determined by when the sun reached the observer's meridian and differing from city to city, and to the establishment of regional times.
- A. which was determined by when the sun reached the observer's meridian and differing
 - B. which was determined by when the sun reached the observer's meridian and which differed
 - C. which were determined by when the sun reached the observer's meridian and differing
 - D. determined by when the sun reached the observer's meridian and differed
 - E. **determined by when the sun reached the observer's meridian and differing**

The only difference between choices D and E is differed/differing, and, as you've no doubt realized, the key issue is making the choice that's most parallel

to 'determined' (from the first half of the modifier).

Here's the key: 'Determined' isn't a verb here. It's a PARTICIPLE: a verb form that functions as an adjective. The local times were WEIRD (adjective).

The local times were DETERMINED (participle acting as adjective) by ...

So you need to pick the second half that's also 'participle acting as adjective'. Try them both:

D) The local times were DIFFERED: uh oh, that doesn't work.

E) The local times were DIFFERING from city to city. That works. It's a 'present participle' rather than a 'past participle', but it's the only one of the

two that's a participle at all.

In D and E, you can tell determined = participle, not verb, because (a) it immediately follows a comma and (b) there's no subject you could match up with

determined in a normal subject-verb configuration. Even if you match determined with the noun "times" (to which the clause is referring) "times, determined

by" is not proper subject-verb config.

The architecture exhibited in the Empire State Building and conveyed us an idea of the prevailing attitudes of the day is important for the historical and cultural value it represents.

It's a bit tricky to answer these questions sometimes, but the main idea behind whether to choose the -ing form or the -ed form this:

When we reduce a verb to its -ing or -ed form, we must look at one and only one thing: whether the noun that it will modify is the **subject** or **object** of that verb.

The -ing form is used for DOING the action, which means SUBJECT, which means ACTIVE voice.

The -ed form is used for RECEIVING the action, which means OBJECT, which means PASSIVE voice.

Before I go further, let me offer two examples that will make things clearer as we go along:

- speaking person (the -ing form)
- spoken words (the -ed form)

In this type of question, we always have two elements:

- a participle, which is either in the -ing or -ed form
- a noun that is modified by this participle

So, using the previous examples, **speaking** modifies **person** and **spoken** modifies **words**.

The next step is to realize that these participles all come from verbs--**speaking** and **spoken** both come from the

verb **speak**.

Now, using these examples, and applying them to the rules I mentioned at the beginning, we will notice that if we made a sentence, **person** would be the subject of the verb **speak** and **words** would be the object of the verb **speak**. Using this procedure, we can figure out whether should use the -ing or -ed form of a participle that modifies a noun. And that's it!!

Of course, this is easy when the vocab is easy, and we often get confused when we are using difficult vocab because we sometimes don't know whether something is the subject or the object of the verb, but this procedure that I have explained is the only sure way to get the right answer.

In our sentence here, **which** replaces **times**, and **times** is the **object** of **determined**, but it is the **subject** of **differed**.

In other words, we have something like this:

...somebody **determined times**...

but

times differed...

I know some of you have learned that we should only use the -ing form only for actions that are ongoing/in progress in the present, but that's simply not true. We do **occasionally** use them correctly for past actions that were ongoing/in progress.

Finally, everybody gets confused simply because the -ed form appears in the second one, making people think the -ed form should appear again when it's reduced. We need to realize that there is truly no connection between the two; it's **pure coincidence** that each has the -ed form in it!!!

5. As the etched lines on computer memory chips have become thinner and the chips' circuits more complex, both the power of the chips and the electronic devices they drive have vastly increased.

- A. the chips' circuits more complex, both the power of the chips and the electronic devices they drive have
- B. **the chips' circuits more complex, the power of both the chips and the electronic devices they drive has**
- C. the chips' circuits are more complex, both the power of the chips and the electronic devices they drive has
- D. their circuits are more complex, the power of both the chips and the electronic devices they drive have
- E. their circuits more complex, both the power of the chips and the electronic devices they drive have

Both A and B is plural. The key here is the conjunction and, if two singular subjects are joined by and, they combine to form a plural subject.

From the examples you gave, the subject has to be the Value of [Both A and B] to consider that a singular subject. The value [singular] of both A and B is...

Both [value of A] and [that of B] are.. would be correct. Realize that here, we are combining Value of A (singular) and that of B (singular) to form a plural subject.

Hope this makes it clearer.

B is my answer

it is the power that has increased

In other options we have

"power of chips and electronic devices they drive" have increased
which is wrong.

Besides,
few options lack parallelism

"computer memory chips have become thinner and the chips' circuits more complex" is the correct construction.

As the etched lines on computer memory chips have become thinner and the chips' circuits more complex, both the power of the chips and the electronic devices they drive have vastly increased.

(A) the chips' circuits more complex, both the power of the chips and the electronic devices they drive have

Changes the meaning of the sentence.

(B) the chips' circuits more complex, the power of both the chips and the electronic devices they drive has

(C) the chips' circuits are more complex, both the power of the chips and the electronic devices they drive has

not parallel.

(D) their circuits are more complex, the power of both the chips and the electronic devices they drive have

lacks parallelism
Tense problem

(E) their circuits more complex, both the power of the chips and the electronic devices they drive have

"their" has no clear referent
changes the meaning of the sentence

6. Twenty-two feet long and 10 feet in diameter, the AM-1 is one of the many new satellites that is a part of 15 years effort of subjecting the interactions of Earth's atmosphere, oceans, and land surfaces to detailed scrutiny from space.
- A. satellites that is a part of 15 years effort of subjecting the interactions of Earth's atmosphere, oceans, and land surfaces
 - B. satellites, which is a part of a 15-year effort to subject how Earth's atmosphere, oceans, and land surfaces interact
 - C. satellites, part of 15 years effort of subjecting how Earth's atmosphere, oceans, and land surfaces are interacting
 - D. satellites that are part of an effort for 15 years that has subjected the interactions of Earth's atmosphere, oceans, and land surfaces
 - E. satellites that are part of a 15-year effort to subject the interactions of Earth's atmosphere, ocean, and land surfaces

ONE of ... that.. PLURAL

So D or E.

15-year effort is definitely idiomatically correct... effort for 15 years is idiomatically wrong..

7. Although it claims to delve into political issues, television can be superficial such as when each of the three major networks broadcast exactly the same statement from a political candidate.
- A. superficial such as when each of the three major networks
 - B. superficial, as can sometimes occur if all of the three major networks
 - C. superficial if the three major networks all

- D. superficial whenever each of the three major networks
- E. **superficial, as when the three major networks each**

They're trying to get you to focus on "as" vs. "such as" and get hopelessly confused - and, in the meantime, they snuck a subject-verb error into answer A.

In the construction "each of the three major networks" each is the subject. Each is singular, so the verb has to be singular... but it isn't. The verb in A is "broadcast," which is plural.

In E, they move each - that one says "the three major networks each." Now, networks is the subject, and networks is plural, so the verb has to be plural... and it is!

each of the three major networks - singular
the three major networks each - plural

examples:

each of the students - singular
the students each - plural

generic pattern:

each (of the/pronoun/any determiner) [noun] - singular
[noun] each - plural

the problem with (c) is that its meaning differs from the *original* meaning, while choice (e) is faithful to that original meaning. you MUST choose an answer choice that preserves the meaning of the original; the only exception to this principle occurs if the original is total nonsense (in which case you have license to change it to something that isn't nonsense).

--

8. With its plan to develop seven and a half acres of shore land, Cleveland is but one of a large number of communities on the Great Lakes that is looking to its waterfront as a way to improve the quality of urban life and attract new businesses.
- A. is looking to its waterfront as a way to improve the quality of urban life and attract
 - B. is looking at its waterfront to improve the quality of urban life and attract
 - C. **are looking to their waterfronts to improve the quality of urban life and attract**
 - D. are looking to its waterfront as a way of improving the quality of urban life and attracting
 - E. are looking at their waterfronts as a way they can improve the quality of urban life and attract

In the sentence "...Cleveland is but one of a large number of communities on the Great Lakes that is .."

that acts as a relative pronoun for communities, so 'are' is required rather than 'is'

In D and E, the correct idiom should be WAY TO IMPROVE...

9. With its abundance of noun inflections, Icelandic is one of several Germanic languages that is compact when written but can lengthen considerably when translated into English.
- A. is compact when written but can lengthen considerably when translated into English
 - B. are compact when they are written, but they can lengthen considerably when they are translated in English
 - C. is compact when written but can lengthen considerably when being translated into English
 - D. **are compact when written but can lengthen considerably in English translation**
 - E. is compact when it is written but can lengthen considerably when translated in English

Yes, D is the best answer

This is a common pattern on GMAT SC:

SINGULAR NOUN of NOUNS that PLURAL VERB

For example:

She is one of the presidents who have high approval ratings.

D is parallel and more compact... B is not parallel. LANGUAGES that are compact... but can lengthen (here ARE and CAN LENGTHEN are parallel verbs).

- 10.** The global-warming effect of ocean white caps are one of the many aspects of the ocean environment that are not yet incorporated in any detail into the computer models used for predicting how rising greenhouse gas concentrations could affect climate.
- A. The global-warming effect of ocean white caps are one of the many aspects of the ocean environment that are not yet incorporated in any detail into the computer models used for predicting
 - B. The effect on global warming of ocean white caps are one of the many aspects of the ocean environment not yet incorporated in any detail into computer models, which they use to predict
 - C. The effect of ocean white caps on global warming is one of the many aspects of the ocean environment that are not yet incorporated in any detail into the computer models used to predict
 - D. That ocean white caps have an effect on global warming is one of the many aspects of the ocean environment not yet having been incorporated in any detail into the computer models that are used for predicting
 - E. That ocean white caps have an effect on global warming is one of the many aspects of the ocean environment not yet being incorporated in any detail into computer models, which they use to predict

ONE of the many THAT ARE... CORRECT

USED TO PREDICT... CORRECT.

- A. Effect ARE...
- B. Effect ARE
- D. USED FOR
- E. THEY is the problem

- 11.** Biologists believe that they have found one of the substances that tell individual genes both when to become active and when to remain quiescent in the earliest phases of an embryo's development.
- A. tell individual genes both when to become active and when to remain
 - B. tell individual genes both at which time they should become active or should remain
 - C. tells individual genes both when to become active or remain
 - D. tells individual genes both when to become active or when to remain
 - E. will tell an individual gene both about when it should become active and remain

One of the ... THAT... PLURAL... so C, D gone... both X and Y needs parallelism ... So A remains.

- 12.** Not one of the potential investors is expected to make an offer to buy First Interstate Bank until a merger agreement is signed that includes a provision for penalties if the deal were not to be concluded.
- A. is expected to make an offer to buy First Interstate Bank until a merger agreement is signed that includes a provision for penalties if the deal were
 - B. is expected to make an offer for buying First Interstate Bank until they sign a merger agreement including a provision for penalties if the deal was
 - C. is expected to make an offer to buy First Interstate Bank until a merger agreement be signed by them with a provision for penalties if the deal were
 - D. are expected to make an offer for buying First Interstate Bank until it signs a merger agreement with a provision for penalties included if the deal was
 - E. are expected to be making an offer to buy First Interstate Bank until they sign a merger agreement including a provision for penalties if the deal were

NOT ONE... singular... D/E out...
If the deal WERE... not was (hypothetical)

C... "be" cannot be used as there is no THAT before...

A is best

- 13.** Minnesota is the only one of the contiguous forty-eight states that still has a sizable wolf population, and where this predator remains the archenemy of cattle and sheep.
- A. that still has a sizable wolf population, and where

- B. that still has a sizable wolf population, where
- C. that still has a sizable population of wolves, and where
- D. where the population of wolves is still sizable;
- E. **where there is still a sizable population of wolves and where**

if it says *the only one of...*, then it's singular.

if it says *only one of...* (without *the*), then it's plural.

in the phrase "wolf population", *wolf* is actually an adjective, not a noun. you can't use a pronoun to stand for an adjective.

you can't say "such a wolf" or "this wolf" either; those constructions imply that you actually have some particular wolf in mind.

BASIC DOUBT:

in this similar sentence "A higher interest rate is only one of the factors, albeit an important one, that **keeps** the housing market from spiraling out of control, like it did earlier in the decade." **plural verb 'keep' is correct**

Punjab is the only one of the 33 contiguous states that still has a sizeable wheat production. **so here also 'have' should be correct**

no, you're missing the crucial difference between these two examples - namely, the presence or absence of the word ***the***. that makes all the difference.

remember, if you're going to consider a prepositional phrase disposable, then *the sentence WITHOUT the prepositional phrase has to make sense*. let's try that with the first one:

a higher interest rate is only one ... that keeps the housing market from spiraling out of control.

that doesn't make grammatical sense without *the* before 'only one'. therefore, we MUST consider all those words at the end to be part of the prepositional phrase starting with 'of the factors', so that 'factors' is the subject of the verb 'keep'.

now let's try it with the second one:

punjab is the only one ... that still has a sizable wheat production.

ok, that works - perfectly logical, even if we eliminate the prepositional phrase. therefore, 'only one' is the subject of 'has'.

so, as you can see, the presence/absence of 'the' makes all the difference in the world.

1) s-v agreement

a,b, and c violate s-v agreement(states... has) has should be replaced by 'have'

2) between d and e,

E holds up parallel structure

another error in D) is after a semicolon. Although the sentence after the semicolon is complete sentence. it suggests absolutely independent meanings.

when you use a semicolon between two sentences, the first one is more general statement, and the second one is more specific.

for example,

Mitzi keeps in good shape; Mitzi run 7 miles, swimming, or weight-lifting.

the first sentence is more generic, the second one tell you that how Mitzi keeps in shape by these workouts.

Let's revert to our D) after the semicolon, it is absolutely independent from the first sentence.

In choices A and C, the construction ***that still has ...***, and ***where*** modifies ***Minnesota*** with clauses that are not grammatically parallel. In choice B, the omission of ***and*** illogically makes the ***where ...*** clause modify ***wolf population*** rather than ***Minnesota***-that is, choice B says in effect that the wolf population is where the wolf remains the archenemy of cattle and sheep. Choice D is grammatically constructed, but it lacks a conjunction that

establishes a logical relation between the clauses; since **Minnesota** as a grammatical subject is separated from the clause following the semicolon, the statement there need not even pertain to Minnesota. In E, the best choice, the parallel construction of **where ... and where ...** allows both clauses to modify **Minnesota**.

14. Lacking information about energy use, people tend to overestimate the amount of energy used by equipment, such as lights, that are visible and must be turned on and off and underestimate that used by unobtrusive equipment, such as water heaters.

- A. equipment, such as lights, that are visible and must be turned on and off and underestimate that
- B. equipment, such as lights, that are visible and must be turned on and off and underestimate it when
- C. equipment, such as lights, that is visible and must be turned on and off and underestimate it when
- D. visible equipment, such as lights, that must be turned on and off and underestimate that
- E. visible equipment, such as lights, that must be turned on and off and underestimate it when

Choices A and B incorrectly use the plural verb **are** with the singular noun **equipment**. In B, C, and E, **when used by** does not parallel **amount... used by** and nonsensically suggests that the people are used by the equipment. D, the best choice, correctly parallels **the amount... used by** with **that used by**, in which **that** is the pronoun substitute for **amount**. Moreover, D solves the agreement problem of A and B by omitting the **to be** verb used with **visible** and placing **visible** before **equipment**; the phrase **visible equipment** is also parallel with **unobtrusive equipment**.

15. However much United States voters may agree that there is waste in government and that the government as a whole spends beyond its means, it is difficult to find broad support for a movement toward a minimal state.

- A. However much United States voters may agree that
- B. Despite the agreement among United States voters to the fact
- C. Although United States voters agree
- D. Even though United States voters may agree
- E. There is agreement among United States voters that

A is the best choice. Choices B, C, and D incorrectly omit **that** after **agree**; **that is** needed to create the parallel construction **agree that there is waste . . . and that the government... spends**. Choice E, though it retains **that**, is grammatically incorrect: because E starts with an independent rather than a subordinate clause and separates its two independent clauses with a comma, it creates a run-on sentence with no logical connection established between the halves. In B, **the agreement ... to the fact** is unidiomatic, and B, C, and E alter the sense of the original sentence by saying that voters **agree** rather than that they **may agree**.

16. Geologists believe that the warning signs for a major earthquake may include sudden fluctuations in local seismic activity, tilting and other deformations of the Earth's crust, changing the measured strain across a fault zone, and varying the electrical properties of underground rocks.

- A. changing the measured strain across a fault zone and varying
- B. changing measurements of the strain across a fault zone, and varying
- C. changing the strain as measured across a fault zone, and variations of
- D. changes in the measured strain across a fault zone, and variations in
- E. changes in measurements of the strain across a fault zone, and variations among

D, the best choice, describes *the warning signs* in parallel phrases. Despite surface appearances, the nouns *changes* and *variations* are parallel with *tilting*, but the verbal forms *changing* and *varying* in A, B, and C are not: *tilting*, one of the *deformations of the Earth's crust*, is used here as a noun that is parallel to *fluctuations*, whereas *changing* and *varying* are used as verbs indicating some action undertaken. Moreover, these verbs are used incorrectly because the sentence mentions no subject that is performing these actions. B and E illogically state that it is not the *strain* but the *measurements* that portend danger, and *among* in E wrongly suggests a comparison of different electrical properties rather than of different behaviors of the same properties.

17. One legacy of Madison Avenue's recent campaign to appeal to people fifty years old and over is the realization that as a person ages, their concerns change as well.

- A. the realization that as a person ages, their
- B. the realization that as people age, their
- C. to realize that when a person ages, his or her
- D. to realize that when people age, their
- E. realizing that as people age, their

In choice A, the plural pronoun **their** does not agree in number with the singular noun **person**. Choices C, D, and E can be faulted for failing to complete the construction **One legacy ... is** with a noun that matches the noun **legacy**; these choices use verb forms--the infinitive **to realize** or the present participle **realizing**--in place of a noun such as **realization**. Further, **when** in C and D is less precise than **as** in characterizing a prolonged and gradual process such as aging. B is the best answer.

18. New theories propose that catastrophic impacts of asteroids and comets may have caused reversals in the Earth's magnetic field, the onset of ice ages, splitting apart continents 80 million years ago, and great volcanic eruptions.
- A. splitting apart continents
 - B. **the splitting apart of continents**
 - C. split apart continents
 - D. continents split apart
 - E. continents that were split apart

The word **splitting** must function as a noun to parallel the other items in the noun series of which it is part: **reversals**, **onset**, and **eruptions**. In B, the best choice, the definite article **the** clearly signifies that **splitting** is to be taken as a noun. In A, **splitting** introduces a verb phrase that breaks the parallelism of the noun series. In C, the verb **split** is similarly disruptive. Choice D, grammatically vague, resembles C if **split** is a verb and E if **split** is an adjective. In E, **continents** illogically replaces **the splitting** in the series: although the **impacts** in question may have caused continents to split, they did not cause those continents that were split apart 80 million years ago to materialize.

19. Legislation in the Canadian province of Ontario requires of both public and private employers that pay be the same for jobs historically held by women as for jobs requiring comparable skill that are usually held by men.
- A. **that pay be the same for jobs historically held by women as for jobs requiring comparable skill that are**
 - B. that pay for jobs historically held by women should be the same as for a job requiring comparable skills
 - C. to pay the same in jobs historically held by women as in jobs of comparable skill that are
 - D. to pay the same regardless of whether a job was historically held by women or is one demanding comparable skills
 - E. to pay as much for jobs historically held by women as for a job demanding comparable skills

Choice A is best. In choice B, **should** is illogical after **requires**, or at least unnecessary, and so is better omitted; in choices B and E, **job** does not agree in number **with jobs**; and in choices B, D, and E, the wording illogically describes the **comparable skills** rather than **the jobs** as being "usually held by men." Choices C, D, and E produce the ungrammatical construction **requires of... employers to pay**, in which **of** makes the phrase incorrect. In C, the use of **in** rather than **for** is unidiomatic, and **jobs of comparable skill** confusedly suggests that the jobs rather than the workers possess the skills. In D, the phrase beginning **regardless ...** is awkward and wordy in addition to being illogical.

20. In one of the most stunning reversals in the history of marketing, the Coca-Cola Company in July 1985 yielded to thousands of irate consumers demanding that it should bring back the original Coke formula.
- A. demanding that it should
 - B. demanding it to
 - C. and their demand to
 - D. **who demanded that it**
 - E. who demanded it to

Choice D, the best answer, uses the grammatically correct expression **demanding that it bring back**, in which **demanding that it** is followed by the subjunctive verb **bring**. Choice A incorrectly uses **should bring** rather than **bring**; **demanding that** already conveys the idea of "should," and at any rate a modal auxiliary verb, such as **should** or **must**, cannot grammatically follow the expression **demanding that**. Similarly, B and E use the ungrammatical expression **demanding/demanded it to**. In C, the expression **yielded to... customers and their demand to bring...** unnecessarily states that the **company yielded** to the **customers** as well as to their **demand**. This expression also fails to specify that the **company** is expected to bring back the original formula.

21. Because of the enormous research and development expenditures required to survive in the electronics industry, an industry marked by rapid innovation and volatile demand, such firms tend to be very large.

- A. to survive
- B. of firms to survive
- C. for surviving
- D. for survival
- E. for firms' survival

The subject of the main clause (**such firms**) presumes a prior reference to the firms in question. Furthermore, the logical subject of to **survive** and the logical complement of **required** should be made explicit. All three demands are met by B, the best choice. Choices A, C, and D, with no reference to the firms in question, meet none of these demands. In choice E, the illogical and awkward use of a prepositional phrase (**for firms' survival**) buries the needed initial reference **to firms** in a possessive modifier.

22. One view of the economy contends that a large drop in oil prices should eventually lead to lowering interest rates, as well as lowering fears about inflation, a rally in stocks and bonds, and a weakening of the dollar.
- A. lowering interest rates, as well as lowering fears about inflation,
 - B. a lowering of interest rates and of fears about inflation,
 - C. a lowering of interest rates, along with fears about inflation,
 - D. interest rates being lowered, along with fears about inflation,
 - E. interest rates and fears about inflation being lowered, with

At issue is the need for logical and formal parallelism in a coordinate series. B, the best choice, clearly and correctly uses parallel noun phrases to list three effects of a drop in oil prices: **a lowering of..., a rally in ..., and a weakening of....** In place of the correct **lower before/fears**, choice A uses an incorrect participial adjective, **lowering**, that could cause confusion by seeming at first to function as a verb. A also violates parallelism. In C and D, the use of **along with** confuses meaning by making **fears about inflation** an independent effect, not an object of **lowering**. D and E violate parallelism by substituting an awkward gerund clause for the first noun phrase.

23. Despite protests from some waste-disposal companies, state health officials have ordered the levels of bacteria in seawater at popular beaches to be measured and that the results be published.
- A. the levels of bacteria in seawater at popular beaches to be measured and that the results be
 - B. that seawater at popular beaches should be measured for their levels of bacteria, with the results being
 - C. the measure of levels of bacteria in seawater at popular beaches and the results to be
 - D. seawater measured at popular beaches for levels of bacteria, with their results
 - E. that the levels of bacteria in seawater at popular beaches be measured and the results

In this sentence, English idiom requires one of two paradigms: ***x ordered y to be z'ed*** or ***x ordered that y be z'ed***. Choice E, the best answer, employs the second of these paradigms. Choice A mixes the two paradigms (***levels... to be measured*** and ***that the results be published***), producing a sentence that lacks parallelism. C and D use neither paradigm and are thus unidiomatic. Also, in D, the pronoun ***their*** has no logical and grammatical antecedent. Choice B unidiomatically employs the verb ***should*** (not in either paradigm); also, the pronoun ***their*** does not agree in number with ***seawater***, its most logical antecedent.

24. Manifestations of Islamic political militancy in the first period of religious reformism were the rise of the Wahhabis in Arabia, the Sanusi in Cyrenaica, the Fulani in Nigeria, the Mahdi in the Sudan, and the victory of the Usuli "mujtahids" in Shiite Iran and Iraq.
- A. Manifestations of Islamic political militancy in the first period of religious reformism were the rise of the Wahhabis in Arabia, the Sanusi in Cyrenaica, the Fulani in Nigeria, the Mahdi in the Sudan, and
 - B. Manifestations of Islamic political militancy in the first period of religious reformism were shown in the rise of the Wahhabis in Arabia, the Sanusi in Cyrenaica, the Fulani in Nigeria, the Mahdi in the Sudan, and also
 - C. In the first period of religious reformism, manifestations of Islamic political militancy were the rise of the Wahhabis in Arabia, of the Sanusi in Cyrenaica, the Fulani in Nigeria, the Mahdi in the Sudan, and
 - D. In the first period of religious reformism, manifestations of Islamic political militancy were shown in the rise of the Wahhabis in Arabia, the Sanusi in Cyrenaica, the Fulani in Nigeria, the Mahdi in the Sudan, and
 - E. In the first period of religious reformism, Islamic political militancy was manifested in the rise of the Wahhabis in Arabia, the Sanusi in Cyrenaica, the Fulani in Nigeria, and the Mahdi in the Sudan, and in

E, the best choice, uses parallel phrases for the two major coordinate members (***in the rise of... and in the victory of ...***) and also for the series listed in the first of these (***s in t, u in v, w in x, and y in z***). E's placement of the ***In... reformism*** phrase at the beginning of the sentence is direct and efficient. Choices A, B, C, and D omit ***and*** before ***the Mahdi***, the last element in the first series; thus, they incorrectly merge the second major member (***the victory of***) into the series listed under the first member (***the rise of***). Furthermore, in A and B the ***in... reformism*** phrase has been awkwardly set between the subject and verb of the sentence.

25. The first trenches cut into a 500-acre site at Tell Hamoukar, Syria, have yielded strong evidence for centrally administered complex societies in northern regions of the Middle East that were arising simultaneously with but independently of the more celebrated city-states of southern Mesopotamia, in what is now southern Iraq.
- A. cut into a 500-acre site at Tell Hamoukar, Syria, have yielded strong evidence for centrally administered complex societies in northern regions of the Middle East that were arising simultaneously with but
 - B. cut into a 500-acre site at Tell Hamoukar, Syria, have yielded strong evidence that centrally administered complex societies in northern regions of the Middle East arose simultaneously but
 - C. cut into a 500-acre site at Tell Hamoukar, Syria, have yielded strong evidence that centrally administered complex societies in northern regions of the Middle East were arising simultaneously but
 - D. cut into a 500-acre site at Tell Hamoukar, Syria, have yielded strong evidence of centrally administered complex societies in northern regions of the Middle East arising simultaneously but
 - E. cut into a 500-acre site at Tell Hamoukar, Syria, have yielded strong evidence that centrally administered complex societies in northern regions of the Middle East arose simultaneously with but

The last word in the underlined portion is BUT... so we look for parallelism

Simultaneously with BUT independently of ... PARALLEL

So A or E

Evidence THAT is better... also, continuous tense (were arising denotes a moment, not a period) so A is out. Ans. E

26. The 32 species that make up the dolphin family are closely related to whales and in fact include the animal known as the killer whale, which can grow to be 30 feet long and is famous for its aggressive hunting pods.
- A. include the animal known as the killer whale, which can grow to be 30 feet long and is
 - B. include the animal known as the killer whale, growing as big as 30 feet long and
 - C. include the animal known as the killer whale, growing up to 30 feet long and being
 - D. includes the animal known as the killer whale, which can grow as big as 30 feet long and is
 - E. includes the animal known as the killer whale, which can grow to be 30 feet long and it is

The subject of the sentence is *the 32 species that make up the dolphin family*, and the sentence makes two claims about them: They are closely related, and they include the killer whale. The relative pronoun *which* restates the object of the second verb, reintroducing *the animal known as the killer whale* as the subject of a relative clause followed by two parallel verbs: *can grow* and *is famous*.

A Correct. In this concise sentence, verbs agree in number with their subjects and the relative pronoun *which* indicates clearly that *the animal known as the killer whale* is the subject of the verbs in the dependent clause.
 B Changing the verb to the participial *growing* introduces ambiguity, because it could refer back to the subject of the sentence (*32 species*).
 C The participial *growing* might refer to *the 32 species*; the introduction of *being* is unnecessarily wordy and adds nothing in terms of meaning.
 D *as big as* is an idiomatically incorrect expression of the comparison; the plural verb form *include* is needed to match the plural subject *the 32 species*.
 E *It* simply restates the subject of the previous phrase, introducing more words but no additional meaning; the singular verb form *includes* should be the plural form *include*.

The correct answer is A.

27. Past assessments of the Brazilian rain forest have used satellite images to tally deforested areas, where farmers and ranchers have clear-cut and burned all the trees, but such work has not addressed either logging, which is the removal of only selected trees, as well as surface fires, burning down individual trees but do not denude the forest.
- A. which is the removal of only selected trees, as well as surface fires, burning
 - B. which removes only selected trees, or surface fires that burn
 - C. which removes only selected trees, along with surface fires that burn
 - D. removing only selected trees, or surface fires, burning
 - E. removing only selected trees, as well as surface fires that burn

Either OR... so A, C, E out

B is parallel... that burn down... but do not denude... D is not parallel.

28. Yellow jackets number among the 900 or so species of the world's social wasps, wasps living in a highly cooperative and organized society where they consist almost entirely of females—the queen and her sterile female workers.
- A. wasps living in a highly cooperative and organized society where they consist almost entirely of
 - B. wasps that live in a highly cooperative and organized society consisting almost entirely of
 - C. which means they live in a highly cooperative and organized society, almost all
 - D. which means that their society is highly cooperative, organized, and it is almost entirely
 - E. living in a society that is highly cooperative, organized, and it consists of almost all

This sentence identifies yellow jackets as one of 900 types of social wasps and provides an explanation of the term *social wasps*. In this explanation, the society or population—not the individual wasps themselves—consists almost entirely of females.

The three descriptors of social wasps (*cooperative*, *organized*, and *consisting almost entirely of females*) are most effectively expressed in parallel structures.

A *They*, referring to wasps, is an incorrect subject for *consist*.

B Correct. The three descriptors of the wasp society are in parallel form, and *consisting* properly modifies *society*.

C The sentence structure makes it unclear what *almost all females* describes.

D *And it is ...* violates the parallelism of the three descriptors of social wasps.

E *And it consists ...* violates the parallelism of the three descriptors.

The correct answer is B.

29. Floating in the waters of the equatorial Pacific, an array of buoys collects and transmits data on long-term interactions between the ocean and the atmosphere, interactions that affect global climate.

- A. atmosphere, interactions that affect
- B. atmosphere, with interactions affecting
- C. atmosphere that affects
- D. atmosphere that is affecting
- E. atmosphere as affects

Appositive modifier... so the "interactions" must repeat after the comma...

'array of buoys' is plural and needs 'collect' not 'collects'. Eliminate B and D.

In C: 'atmosphere that affects' - 'that' modifies 'atmosphere'. atmosphere is not the one that affects but the interactions b/w ocean and atmosphere.

In D: 'atmosphere as global climate' - changes the meaning.

30. The state has proposed new rules that would set minimum staffing levels for nurses, rules intended to ensure that at least one nurse is assigned for every four patients put through triage in a hospital emergency room.

- A. rules intended to ensure that at least one nurse is assigned for every four patients put through triage in a hospital emergency room
- B. rules with the intent of ensuring one nurse at least to be assigned for every four patients to be put through triage in a hospital emergency room
- C. rules intending to ensure at least one nurse is assigned for every four patients in a hospital emergency room put through triage
- D. with the intent of ensuring that at least one nurse should be assigned for every four patients in a hospital emergency room that are put through triage
- E. and this is intended to ensure one nurse at least to be assigned for every four patients put through triage in a hospital emergency room

Appositive modifier... so the "rules" must repeat after the comma...

"rules intending..." is incorrect, since the rules aren't intending to do anything. rules don't have intentions, although their authors do.

this is a passive type construction. the rules *are intended* to do x, y, and z, so you need "intended", not "intending".

"The rules intended to ensure that at least one nurse is assigned for every four patients put through triage in a hospital emergency room."

"Intended" can be two things (at least!): it can be the simple past form of the verb "to intend" or it can be the past participle of the verb "to intend." A past participle by itself is not a complete, conjugated verb form.

So, which is it here? Well, if we're going to use "intended" as the simple past tense form, then the subject has to be the person or thing that is intending to do something. For example:

"I intended to study last night, but then I fell asleep." I am the one doing the action: intending to do something.

What do we have as the potential subject in this case? The rules. Can the rules intend to do something?

Nope. *We* can intend to do something by making a rule. Rules can BE intended to do something. But the rules can't intend to do something themselves. If we want a conjugated verb here to make this a sentence, then we need to write this in passive voice. (Passive voice is used when the subject is not actually performing the action of the verb; instead, the subject is having that action performed on it by something or someone else.) For example:

"The rules *are* intended to ensure X." (Someone has made some rules and that someone intends for the rules to ensure X.)

"The rules *were* intended to ensure X." (Same thing as above, except in past tense.)

So, that bit after the comma is not a stand-alone sentence. It's a modifier. As a result, choice A is not a run-on.

31. While studying the genetic makeup of corn, a new class of mutant genes was discovered by Barbara McClintock, a discovery which led to greater understanding of cell differentiation.
- A. a new class of mutant genes was discovered by Barbara McClintock, a discovery which led
 - B. a new class of mutant genes in corn were discovered by Barbara McClintock, leading
 - C. Barbara McClintock discovered a new class of mutant genes, and it led
 - D. **Barbara McClintock discovered a new class of mutant genes, a discovery that led**
 - E. Barbara McClintock, who discovered a new class of mutant genes, leading

This is abstract noun modifying the entire clause construction.

So after the comma, there should be a noun (discovery)

So A or D.

A has 2 problems:

- 1. it is passive (was discovered)
- 2. discovery which led... which is wrong here (which can come as a non essential part only and should be followed by a comma here.

32. Possible long-term consequences of the "greenhouse effect," the gradual warming of the Earth's climate, may include melting the polar ice caps and a rising sea level.
- A. may include melting the polar ice caps and a rising sea level
 - B. may include the melting of polar ice caps and the rising sea level
 - C. may include polar ice caps that are melting and sea levels that are rising
 - D. include melting the polar ice caps and sea levels that are rising
 - E. **include melting of the polar ice caps and a rise in sea level**

possible is already mention in the sentence, you dont need 'may'..its redundant.

so A,B and C are out.

E maintain parallelism as well.

B is out because MAY is redundant.

B doesn't maintain parallelism.

the melting of polar ice caps and the rising sea level

Melting :- Gerund

Rising : Adjective.

E is parallel because of
melting of PIC (Gerund... equivalent to noun) || the rise in sea level :- NOUN.

33. Almost a decade after New York State passed laws to protect patients by reducing the grueling hours worked by medical residents, twelve hospitals have been investigated by state medical officials, finding that all twelve consistently break the laws, many residents work longer than 24 hours straight, and that more than half the surgical residents work more than 95 hours a week.
- A. twelve hospitals have been investigated by state medical officials, finding that all twelve consistently break the laws, many residents work longer than 24 hours straight, and that more than half the surgical residents work
 - B. an investigation by state medical officials of twelve hospitals have found all twelve consistently breaking the laws, that many residents work longer than 24 hours straight, with more than half the surgical residents working
 - C. **an investigation of twelve hospitals by state medical officials has found that all twelve consistently break the laws, that many residents work longer than 24 hours straight, and that more than half the surgical residents work**
 - D. twelve hospitals were investigated by state medical officials who found all twelve breaking the laws, with many residents working longer than 24 hours straight, and more than half the surgical residents work

E. an investigation by state medical officials has found that, of twelve hospitals, all twelve consistently break the laws, that many residents work longer than 24 hours straight, with more than half the surgical residents working

A: violates that ... that ... that parallelism ... also, wrong modifier.

B: SVA error ... investigation HAVE found... violates that ... that ... that parallelism ... also, wrong modifier.

D: Passive voice not needed... found THAT not present... not parallel.

E: violates that ... that ... that parallelism ... also, wrong modifier.

34. Minivans carry as many as seven passengers and, compared with most sport utility vehicles, cost less, get better gas mileage, allow passengers to get in and out more easily, and have a smoother ride.

A. Minivans carry as many as seven passengers and, compared with most sport utility vehicles, cost less,

B. Minivans, which carry as many as seven passengers, compared with most sport utility vehicles, they cost less,

C. Minivans carry as many as seven passengers, in comparison with most sport utility vehicles, and have a lower cost, they

D. Minivans, carrying as many as seven passengers, compared with most sport utility vehicles, cost less,

E. Minivans, which carry as many as seven passengers, compared with most sport utility vehicles the cost is lower, and they

In D, the modifier "...carrying..." seems to signify that the latter traits are only true of minivans when those minivans are actually carrying the requisite number of passengers. If they aren't, then all of a sudden those things aren't true anymore.

choice (a) correctly uses the conjunction "and", which implies that both things are true but don't necessarily have to do with each other (i.e., the # of passengers is independent of the other claims).

D has another mistake, because in D:

Minivans, carrying as many as seven passengers, compared with most sport utility vehicles, cost less,

The "compared with most sport utility vehicles" modify the nearer "passengers", but the original intention is to modify the "Minivans". So D is wrong

Minivans carry as many as seven passengers and, compared with most sport utility vehicles, cost less, get better gas mileage, allow passengers to get in and out more easily, and have a smoother ride.

Does "compared with most sport utility vehicles" modify Minivans? Because "and," ahead of "compared ...", so "compared ..." can only modify the "Minivans" rather than modify the "passengers"?

Yes, the "and" helps to clarify. While the general "rule" is that noun modifiers have to touch the nouns they modify, this is more of an art than a science. There are a few exceptions, and this is one. The other main exception is when you have multiple modifiers for the same noun: you cannot put them all next to the same noun, so you just line them up instead. For example, we can say: "a way of painting that became popular in the 1950's." It's not the "painting" that became popular, but rather the "way." The word "way" doesn't make much sense on its own, however, so we have to say "of painting" first before we modify it.

A student asked:

I still have a question of the parallelism in (A).

Minivans carry as many as seven passengers and, compared with most sport utility vehicles, cost less, get better gas mileage, allow passengers to get in and out more easily, and have a smoother ride.

if we drop "compared with most sport utility vehicles" ...so reduce to

Minivans V1 as many as seven passengers and V2 ,V3 ,V4, and V5.

Is there anything wrong in this kind of parallelism? Is the first "and" necessary here?

Isn't it a run-on sentence? (between V3, V4)

I used to think that S + V1, V2, V3, V4 ,and V5 is correct.

plz help me clarify~

Answer:

well, remember that parallelism is really of 2 types: GRAMMATICAL and LOGICAL.

in your case, v1 though v5 all happen to be in the same tense - present tense, because we're talking about unchanging features of minivans - but ONLY v2 through v5 are LOGICALLY parallel.

v1 describes the van's passenger seating capacity, which is NOT presented as a point of superiority over sport utility vehicles, while v2 through v5 specifically describe advantages of minivans over sport utility vehicles.

therefore, the sentence is written with v2 through v5 in list form, but, because v1 isn't in the same category as those others, it's (rightfully) excluded from that list.

the SC intended to compare only 4 features:

cost less, get better gas mileage, allow passengers to get in and out more easily, and have a smoother ride.

between Minivans and sport utility vehicles,
excluding the feature of
as many as seven passengers.

IF I place the comparison at the front, 5 features will be compared.

Question:

Is possible to have 2 "and" in a list???

"Minivans carryAND....cost less, get better..., allow....AND have....

I discarded A for this reason, but it is wrong!

Answer:

these two "and"s are not both in the list.
the list begins with "cost less".

analogy:

i went to the grocery store and bought food, got money from the ATM, and sampled dishes from the deli.

this is fine, since the list (3 things that i did at the store) STARTS with "bought food". "went to the store" is not part of the list.

these choices are run-on sentences: each contains a sentence that is written with two subjects.

eliminating modifiers from choice (b) yields "Minivans, they cost less..."

eliminating modifiers from choice (c) yields "Minivans, they get better gas mileage..."

eliminating modifiers from choice (e) yields "Minivans, the cost is lower..."

35. Building on civilizations that preceded them in coastal Peru, the Mochica developed their own elaborate society, based on cultivating such crops like corn and beans, the harvesting of fish and shellfish, and exploiting other wild and domestic resources.

A. based on cultivating such crops like corn and beans, the harvesting of fish and shellfish, and exploiting

B. based on the cultivation of such crops as corn and beans, the harvesting of fish and seafood, and the exploitation of

C. and basing it on the cultivation of crops like corn and beans, harvesting fish and seafood, and the exploiting of

D. and they based it on their cultivation of crops such as corn and beans, the harvest of fish and seafood, and exploiting

E. and they based it on their cultivating such crops like corn and beans, their harvest of fish and shellfish, and they exploited

Note that **you can solve this problem via parallelism alone.**

every single answer choice except (b) lacks proper parallel structure. since the problem contains a LIST of three things (one of the most obvious parallel structures), this is a nice gift.

a) based on cultivating such crops like corn and beans, the harvesting of fish and shellfish, and exploiting

"THE harvesting" isn't parallel to "exploiting".

("such crops LIKE..." is also a flagrant error; it must be "such crops as...")

b) based on the cultivation of such crops as corn and beans, the harvesting of fish and seafood, and the exploitation of

perfect parallelism.

from right to left:

the exploitation of...

the harvesting of...

the cultivation of...

c) and basing it on the cultivation of crops like corn and beans, harvesting fish and seafood, and the exploiting of

"harvesting" isn't parallel to "THE exploiting".

(also, "...and basing" is not a properly constructed modifier)

d) and they based it on their cultivation of crops such as corn and beans, the harvest of fish and seafood, and exploiting

worst parallelism ever.

no two of "THEIR cultivation", "THE harvest", and "exploiting" are parallel.

e) and they based it on their cultivating such crops like corn and beans, their harvest of fish and shellfish, and they exploited

"they exploited" isn't parallel to the other two.

36. In April 1997, Hillary Rodham Clinton hosted an all-day White House scientific conference on new findings that indicates a child's acquiring language, thinking, and emotional skills as an active process that may be largely completed before age three.

- A. that indicates a child's acquiring language, thinking, and emotional skills as
- B. that are indicative of a child acquiring language, thinking, and emotional skills as
- C. to indicate that when a child acquires language, thinking, and emotional skills, that it is
- D. **indicating that a child's acquisition of language, thinking, and emotional skills is**
- E. indicative of a child's acquisition of language, thinking, and emotional skills as

Not (A) since "new findings" is plural and "indicates" is singular

Not (B) b/c the use of "acquiring" instead of "acquisition"

(C) To indicate shows intention... wrong ... "that it is" is used incorrectly

Not (E) since "indicative of" is not right as "findings that" is always preferred. Also, "indicating that" is clause...

"indicative of" is a prepositional phrase... as per one of the VAN rules, clauses are preferred.

37. The results of two recent unrelated studies support the idea that dolphins may share certain cognitive abilities with humans and great apes; the studies indicate dolphins as capable of recognizing themselves in mirrors—an ability that is often considered a sign of self-awareness—and to grasp spontaneously the mood or intention of humans.

- A. dolphins as capable of recognizing themselves in mirrors—an ability that is often considered a sign of self-awareness—and to grasp spontaneously
- B. dolphins' ability to recognize themselves in mirrors—an ability that is often considered as a sign of self-awareness—and of spontaneously grasping
- C. dolphins to be capable of recognizing themselves in mirrors—an ability that is often considered a sign of self-awareness—and to grasp spontaneously
- D. that dolphins have the ability of recognizing themselves in mirrors—an ability that is often considered as a sign of self-awareness—and spontaneously grasping
- E. that dolphins are capable of recognizing themselves in mirrors—an ability that is often considered a sign of self-awareness—and of spontaneously grasping

- A. Indicates THAT is the preferred construction. Capable "of recognizing" and "to grasp" are not parallel.
- B. "Ability to recognize" is not parallel to "of spontaneously grasping"
- C. Indicates THAT is the preferred construction. Capable "of recognizing" and "to grasp" are not parallel.
- D. Ability OF is wrong idiom.

38. The greatest road system built in the Americas prior to the arrival of Christopher Columbus was the Incan highway, which, over 2,500 miles long and extending from northern Ecuador through Peru to Southern Chile.

- A. Columbus was the Incan highway, which, over 2,500 miles long and extending
- B. Columbus was the Incan highway, over 2,500 miles in length, and extended
- C. Columbus, the Incan highway, which was over 2,500 miles in length and extended
- D. Columbus, the Incan highway, being over 2,500 miles in length, was extended
- E. Columbus, the Incan highway was over 2,500 miles long, extending

The greatest road system built in the Americas prior to the arrival of Christopher Columbus was the Incan highway, which, over 2,500 miles long and extending from northern Ecuador through Peru to Southern Chile.

- A. Columbus was the Incan highway, which, over 2,500 miles long and extending
-though the modifier *which* correctly describes *highway*, the "sentence" is actually a sentence fragment, as the *which* needs to be followed by a verb (preferably "was")
- B. Columbus was the Incan highway, over 2,500 miles in length, and extended
-the use of *extended* in the absence of *which was* is incorrect; the proper construction should be *extending* (as *extended* gives the impression that the road was intentionally lengthened rather than simply existing between two points).
- C. Columbus, the Incan highway, which was over 2,500 miles in length and extended
-since the phrase *the Incan highway* is set off by commas, the entire introductory modifier is describing the Incan highway. As a result, the *which* is unnecessary since it creates a sentence fragment.
- D. Columbus, the Incan highway, being over 2,500 miles in length, was extended
-BEING IS BAD!!!!
- E. Columbus, the Incan highway was over 2,500 miles long, extending
-The introductory phrase *The greatest road system built in the Americas prior to the arrival of Christopher Columbus* properly describes *the Incan highway*. Furthermore, the subordinate phrase *extending from northern Ecuador through Peru to Southern Chile* provides additional information about the length of the highway in a manner that is grammatically correct.

Though tricky, the correct answer is E.

E should be correct

"extending from northern Ecuador..." is not used as verb. It's an adverbial modifier for "the Incan highway was over 2,500 miles long"

It's easier to think of adverbial modifier modifying the whole clause. But I think, specifically, it's modifying "was"
And adverbial modifiers links to the time frame of verb("was") it's modifying.

The -ing form as a modifier is NOT a verb. It is just modifying some verb or clause. In these cases, it usually functions in the same "time" as the verb/clause it modifies.

E is correct.

B is out because "extended" has nothing to match with. We would need to know that it was extended BY something or someone. Moreover, the comma before "extended" is unnecessary, as it breaks up two modifiers that ought to be parallel.

"was" is not a helping verb here; it's the main verb of the clause.

there are two requirements for the COMMA + -ING construction:

- (1) it should be adverbial, modifying the entire previous clause;
- (2) it should be attributed to the subject of the previous clause.

this -ing modifier (in choice e) satisfies both of these conditions, so we're good to go.

the "comma + ing" modifier should only be used when:

(A)
it MODIFIES THE ENTIRE ACTION of the preceding clause, and it APPLIES TO THE SUBJECT of that clause;

AND

(B)
one of the following is true:
(1) the "ing" action is SIMULTANEOUS with the main action;
- i ran down the sidewalk, flapping my arms wildly
(2) the "ing" action is a DIRECT CONSEQUENCE of the main action.
- i got a 100 on the most recent exam, bringing my average up to 91

other examples:

joe ran down the sidewalk, flailing his arms.
--> correct (simultaneous)

my cousin took extra classes every semester in college, graduating in three years.
--> correct, because the "ing" is an actual consequence of the first action.

my cousin ate frozen food every day in college, graduating in three years.
--> incorrect, because there is no relationship (in particular, the second thing is not a consequence of the first thing, and isn't simultaneous either).

C is a sentence fragment...

a sentence fragment is a *grammatical* problem. whether a construction is a fragment has *nothing* to do with whether its meaning is clear.

in choice (c), everything preceding "the incan highway" is an appositive-type modifier. everything following "the incan highway" is a "which" modifier.

if you eliminate these modifiers, you're left with just "the incan highway" as a sentence; that doesn't work.

one thing you need to get straight is that forms ending with -ING are not verbs.
therefore, -ING forms don't have a tense of their own. instead, they adopt the tense of the clause to which they are attached.

consider the following sentences, all of which are correct:

james fell down, fracturing his hand on the concrete.

james had fallen down, fracturing his hand on the concrete, when i saw him.

james falls down, fracturing his hand on the concrete (this version may be spoken by, e.g., a sports announcer)

james will fall down, fracturing his hand on the concrete

etc.

in all of those sentences, "fracturing" just adopts the tense of the main clause. other -ING modifiers behave similarly.

39. Seldom more than 40 feet wide and 12 feet deep, but it ran 363 miles across the rugged wilderness of upstate New York, the Erie Canal connected the Hudson River at Albany to the Great Lakes at Buffalo, providing the port of New York City with a direct water link to the heartland of the North American continent.
- A. Seldom more than 40 feet wide and 12 feet deep, but it ran 363 miles across the rugged wilderness of upstate New York, the Erie Canal connected
 - B. Seldom more than 40 feet wide or 12 feet deep but running 363 miles across the rugged wilderness of upstate New York, the Erie Canal connected
 - C. It was seldom more than 40 feet wide and 12 feet deep, and ran 363 miles across the rugged wilderness of upstate New York, but the Erie Canal, connecting
 - D. The Erie Canal was seldom more than 40 feet wide or 12 feet deep and it ran 363 miles across the rugged wilderness of upstate New York, which connected
 - E. The Erie Canal, seldom more than 40 feet wide and 12 feet deep, but running 363 miles across the rugged wilderness of upstate New York, connecting

The phrase *seldom...deep* is the first half of a modifier that describes *the Erie Canal*. However, because a comma incorrectly follows *deep*, this phrase appears to be the entire modifier, which must agree with the noun or pronoun that immediately follows it. This phrase cannot modify the conjunction *but*, and *it* has no referent; *but it ran* is not a logical or grammatical construction following the modifying phrase. Substituting *running* for *it ran* creates an adjective phrase parallel to the first adjective phrase (*seldom...deep*).

To contrast the small size reported in the first phrase with the great distance reported in the second, the two phrases may be joined with *but*; together they create a single modifier correctly modifying *the Erie Canal*. *The Erie Canal* is then the subject of the sentence and requires the verb *connected* to provide a logical statement.

A *But it ran* cannot logically or grammatically follow the modifying phrase.

B Correct. This sentence properly has the single modifier consisting of two contrasting parts.

C Neither *and* nor *but* acts as a logical connector; the use of *connecting* results in a sentence fragment.

D The paired concepts of width and depth should be joined by *and*, not *or*; this construction calls for two main clauses to be separated by a comma after *deep*; *which* is ambiguous.

E The two halves of the modifier should not be separated by a comma after *deep*; the subject is awkwardly and confusingly placed at a great distance from the predicate; the use of *connecting* rather than *connected* creates a sentence fragment.

Although this is a difficult SC question, your process should not vary: look for "splits," rely on your grammatical rules, and consider clarity of meaning and conciseness when grammatical issues have been exhausted.

In this case, choices A, B, and D use "connected," while choices C and E use "connecting." As "connecting" creates a sentence fragment (read C and E in their entirety; neither is a complete sentence), choices C and E can be eliminated.

Sticking with the "connected" split, answer choice D includes "which" before "connected," causing "which connected" to incorrectly describe New York rather than The Erie Canal. D is out.

The final two answer choices are close, but at least you now have a 50% chance rather than a 20% chance with a strategic guess. Grammatically, the antecedent of the pronoun "it" in choice A is somewhat ambiguous and the placement of it is awkward. Additionally, the simple past tense "ran" incorrectly seems to indicate that the Erie Canal no longer exists. Finally, "or" from choice B is preferential to "and" from choice A, since "and" indicates that both of these conditions must be met at the same time. It is more logical that the canal is infrequently 40 feet wide or 12 feet deep anywhere along its 363 mile length.

The correct answer is B.

40. Scientists have identified an asteroid, 2000 BF19, that is about half a mile wide and, if it strikes Earth, it can do tremendous damage to part of the planet but probably not cause planet-wide destruction.

- A. and, if it strikes Earth, it can do tremendous damage to part of the planet but
- B. and, if it would strike Earth, part of the planet could experience a tremendous amount of damage but it would
- C. and that, if it were to strike Earth, could do tremendous damage to part of the planet but would
- D. and that, if Earth is struck by it, can do part of the planet tremendous damage, but it would
- E. and that, if it strikes Earth, it could experience a tremendous amount of damage but

A: 'it' after the comma cannot be correct as it breaks the parallelism... if we remove "if it strikes Earth", IT is not parallel. Also, hypothetical sentences are better written as IF + WERE.

B. If it would... always wrong... "it" is ambiguous

D. Passive... "but it would" is not parallel. Also, hypothetical sentences are better written as IF + WERE. "it" is ambiguous

E. "it" is ambiguous... 'it' after the comma cannot be correct as it breaks the parallelism... if we remove "if it strikes Earth", IT is not parallel. Also, hypothetical sentences are better written as IF + WERE.

41. Researchers have found that individuals who have been blind from birth, and who thus have never seen anyone gesture, nevertheless make hand motions when speaking just as frequently and in virtually the same way as sighted people do, and that they will gesture even when conversing with another blind person.

- A. who thus have never seen anyone gesture, nevertheless make hand motions when speaking just as frequently and in virtually the same way as sighted people do, and that they will gesture
- B. who thus never saw anyone gesturing, nevertheless make hand motions when speaking just as frequent and in virtually the same way as sighted people did, and that they will gesture
- C. who thus have never seen anyone gesture, nevertheless made hand motions when speaking just as frequently and in virtually the same way as sighted people do, as well as gesturing
- D. thus never having seen anyone gesture, nevertheless made hand motions when speaking just as frequent and in virtually the same way as sighted people did, as well as gesturing
- E. thus never having seen anyone gesture, nevertheless to make hand motions when speaking just as frequently and in virtually the same way as sighted people do, and to gesture

The researchers have found (1) *that individuals... make hand motions...as sighted people do* and (2) *that they will gesture...with another blind person.* In

the original sentence, the two findings are reported in two parallel subordinate clauses introduced by *that*. The verb tenses are logical and parallel: *who have been blind* and *who have never seen* indicate a condition that began in the past and continues in the present; *make* and *do* refer to present actions. The verb *make* (*hand motions*) is correctly modified by the adverb *frequently* to show how the action of the verb is carried out. The emphatic future *will gesture* is properly used here with *even* to emphasize the extreme or the unexpected.

A Correct. Although the original sentence is complicated, the parallelism of its structure and phrasing allows its meaning to be clear and its expression effective.

B Verbs *saw* and *did* indicate action completed in the past; the simple past tense is not appropriate in either case; the adjective *frequent* cannot modify the verb; awkward and muddy.

C *Made* indicates past action, but the present tense is logically required; *as well as gesturing* violates the parallelism of the two subordinate (*that*) clauses; choppy and unclear.

D *Having seen* is not parallel to *have been*; *made* and *did* do not show ongoing action; *frequent* incorrectly modifies the verb; *as well as gesturing* destroys the parallelism of the two subordinate (*that*) clauses; awkward and unclear.

E Replacing the verb *make* with the infinitive *to make* results in an ungrammatical construction that fails to complete the sentence.

The correct answer is A.

42. In the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, the United States acquired 828,000 square miles for about four cents an acre, which more than doubled the country's size and that brought its western border within reach of the Pacific Ocean.
- A. In the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, the United States acquired 828,000 square miles for about four cents an acre, which more than doubled the country's size and that brought
- B. For about four cents an acre the United States acquired, in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, 828,000 square miles, more than doubling the country's size and it brought
- C. With the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the United States acquired 828,000 square miles for about four cents an acre, more than doubling its size and bringing
- D. The United States, in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, for about four cents an acre, acquired 828,000 square miles, more than doubling the country's size, bringing
- E. Acquiring 828,000 square miles in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, the United States bought it for about four cents an acre, more than doubling the country's size and bringing

Cause and Effect: so ING forms are required for all the effects.

A out

B out

D. "in the louisiana purchase" is placed AFTER "the united states". this placement implies that the united states itself is actually contained within the louisiana purchase.

* "for about four cents an acre" is placed in a place that is unclear.

E has a bigger issue of IT referring to an adjective (Louisiana)

43. Fossils of a whale that beached on an African shore more than a million years ago and was subsequently butchered by hominids have been recovered by paleontologists.
- A. that beached on an African shore more than a million years ago and was subsequently butchered by hominids have
- B. that beached on an African shore more than a million years ago and then was subsequently butchered by hominids has
- C. that beached on an African shore more than a million years ago, which was subsequently butchered by hominids, has
- D. having been beached on an African shore more than a million years ago and subsequently butchered by hominids, have
- E. having beached on an African shore more than a million years ago and then subsequently were butchered by hominids have

Fossils HAVE... B, C out

D.
Having been beached is passive action... something like having been imprisoned (somebody else imprisoned him/her)... this cannot be true for beaching...

E. WERE butchered is wrong (the whale was butchered, not fossils). Also, 'then' and 'subsequently' can not be used together.

44. Scientists have recently discovered that the ultrathin, layered construction of a butterfly's wings, the same as the one making some butterflies shimmer via the phenomenon of iridescence, are enabling the insect to control how much heat energy is absorbed by its wings and how much is reflected away.

- A. wings, the same as the one making some butterflies shimmer via the phenomenon of iridescence, are enabling
- B. wings, which is the same one that makes some butterflies shimmer via the phenomenon of iridescence, that also enables
- C. wings is the same as the one that makes some butterflies shimmer via the phenomenon of iridescence, enabling
- D. wings—the same construction that makes some butterflies shimmer via the phenomenon of iridescence—also enables
- E. wings—of the same construction that makes some butterflies shimmer via the phenomenon of iridescence—also enable

"Construction" singular... "are enabling" and "enable" are plural So A, E out.

B. same one marks is wrong... same X as or same X that are the right idioms. ... "that also enables" clearly wrong as there is nothing parallel.

C: "enabling" (Ing modifier) refers to the entire clause, whereas it should refer to "construction" only.

45. The artist Renoir's last word was "flowers," spoken as they arranged a bouquet of roses just picked from his garden in a vase on his bedroom windowsill.

- A. as they arranged a bouquet of roses just picked from his garden
- B. as a bouquet of roses had been just picked from his garden and was being arranged
- C. as a bouquet of roses just picked from his garden was being arranged
- D. during the arrangement of a bouquet of roses just picked from his garden
- E. while they arranged a bouquet of roses that had just been picked from his garden

A, E... "they" is wrong.

B. "AND" is absolutely wrong... "HAD Been" cannot be used as there are no two past actions.

D: "During" describes a period... this sentence is about a moment... to speak the word "flowers", one would not take more than a second.

46. Heavy commitment by an executive to a course of action, especially if it has worked well in the past, makes it likely to miss signs of incipient trouble or misinterpret them when they do appear.

- A. Heavy commitment by an executive to a course of action, especially if it has worked well in the past, makes it likely to miss signs of incipient trouble or misinterpret them when they do appear.
- B. An executive who is heavily committed to a course of action, especially one that worked well in the past, makes missing signs of incipient trouble or misinterpreting ones likely when they do appear.
- C. An executive who is heavily committed to a course of action is likely to miss or misinterpret signs of incipient trouble when they do appear, especially if it has worked well in the past.
- D. Executives' being heavily committed to a course of action, especially if it has worked well in the past, makes them likely to miss signs of incipient trouble or misinterpreting them when they do appear.
- E. Being heavily committed to a course of action, especially one that has worked well in the past, is likely to make an executive miss signs of incipient trouble or misinterpret them when they do appear.

This sentence explains that an executive who is blindly committed to a proven course of action is likely to overlook or misinterpret indicators that the plan may no longer be working. The sentence needs to make clear *who* may misinterpret these indicators.

A The passive construction causes the sentence to be wordy and confusing; the reference for *it* is ambiguous, leaving the reader with questions about who or what is likely to miss

these signs.

B The sentence structure indicates that the *executive*, not his or her strategy, causes signs to be overlooked; the modifier *when they do appear* is misplaced.

C The reference for the pronoun *it* is unclear because many nouns have intervened between the appearance of the logical referent (*course of action*) and *it*.

D *Misinterpreting* should be an infinitive verb form to parallel *miss*; the phrasing throughout the sentence is wordy and awkward.

E Correct. The grammatical structure of this sentence and the appropriate placement of modifiers expresses the meaning clearly and concisely.

The correct answer is E.

when you should *eliminate* "being"?

the answer to that question is, ROUGHLY, that you should avoid "being" when expressing the IDENTITY or CHARACTERISTICS of some individual or thing. this is because "being" is usually unnecessary in such cases; there are simpler modifiers (such as appositives) that, while absolutely impossible to use in spoken language, are better in written language.

example:

being a cigar aficionado, john has strong opinions on when to use single-guillotine cigar cutters rather than double-guillotine cutters. --> bad.

a cigar aficionado, john has strong opinions on when to use single-guillotine cigar cutters rather than double-guillotine cutters. --> good. notice that we can simply omit the "being" here.

you don't want to omit "being" here, because it's not expressing identity: in the context of (e), it's a necessary verbal. (nice litmus test: try omitting it and see whether the sentence is still viable, perhaps with minor modifications. here, it isn't.)

so, to sum up:

if "being" expresses IDENTITY or CHARACTERISTICS, then kill it.

otherwise, evaluate it on the same merits as you would any other verb.

A. Heavy commitment by an executive to a course of action, especially if it has worked well in the past, makes it likely to miss signs of incipient trouble or misinterpret them when they do appear.

much more importantly:

* makes it likely to miss...

this doesn't work.

technically, this would mean that "it" - an unspecified entity - is likely to miss the signs.

if you use the "it is ADJ..." construction, and the verb has a specific subject, you MUST include that subject in the construction. it is likely that the executive will miss...

Quote:

B. An executive who is heavily committed to a course of action ... makes missing signs of incipient trouble or misinterpreting ones likely when they do appear.

once that modifier is eliminated, notice that you have a sentence that says that the executive him/herself makes missing the signs likely.

"misinterpreting ones" is also wrong. this should be "them", not "ones".

C. "especially if it has worked well in the past" must be written immediately after "*course of action*"

D. Notice POSSESSIVE "executives' " ... we cannot use THEM

47. Even though Clovis points, spear points with longitudinal grooves chipped onto their faces, have been found all over North America, they are named for the New Mexico site where they were first discovered in 1932.
- A. Even though Clovis points, spear points with longitudinal grooves chipped onto their faces, have been found all over North America, they are named for the New Mexico site where they were first discovered in 1932.
- B. Although named for the New Mexico site where first discovered in 1932, Clovis points are spear points of longitudinal grooves chipped onto their faces and have been found all over North America.
- C. Named for the New Mexico site where they have been first discovered in 1932, Clovis points, spear points of longitudinal grooves chipped onto the faces, have been found all over North America.
- D. Spear points with longitudinal grooves that are chipped onto the faces, Clovis points, even though named for the New Mexico site where first discovered in 1932, but were found all over North America.
- E. While Clovis points are spear points whose faces have longitudinal grooves chipped into them, they have been found all over North America, and named for the New Mexico site where they have been first discovered in 1932.

Even though, although, and while introduce clauses that appear to be logically incompatible but in fact are not. In this sentence, the apparent incompatibility that must be clearly expressed is that although the spear points are named for a particular place in New Mexico, they are in fact found throughout North America. Because their discovery took place in 1932 and is not ongoing, the correct verb tense is simple past, not present perfect.

A Correct. The *even though* clause expresses clearly that the seeming incompatibility is between where the spear points have been found (*all over North America*) and the naming of the spear points for a single site in New Mexico.

B The sentence structure indicates that the expected incompatibility is between the geographically based name of the points and their physical properties, which makes no sense; *where discovered* is missing a subject—the correct form is *where they were first discovered*.

C *Have been first discovered* is the wrong tense, since the discovery is a discrete event completed in the past.

D The sequence of information in this sentence is confusing; *even though* and *but* both introduce information that is contrary to expectation, so to use them both to describe a single apparent contradiction is redundant and nonsensical.

E *While* introduces a description of Clovis points and suggests that this appears incompatible with their appearance all over North America, which makes no sense; *have been first discovered* is the wrong tense.

The correct answer is A.

WERE DISCOVERED is essential... it is only in choice A.

48. Although she had been known as an effective legislator first in the Texas Senate and later in the United States House of Representatives, not until Barbara Jordan's participation in the hearings on the impeachment of President Richard Nixon in 1974 was she made a nationally recognized figure, as it was televised nationwide.

- A. later in the United States House of Representatives, not until Barbara Jordan's participation in the hearings on the impeachment of President Richard Nixon in 1974 was she made a nationally recognized figure, as it was
- B. later in the United States House of Representatives, Barbara Jordan did not become a nationally recognized figure until 1974, when she participated in the hearings on the impeachment of President Richard Nixon, which were
- C. later in the United States House of Representatives, it was not until 1974 that Barbara Jordan became a nationally recognized figure, with her participation in the hearings on the impeachment of President Richard Nixon, which was
- D. then also later in the United States House of Representatives, not until 1974 did Barbara Jordan become a nationally recognized figure, as she participated in the hearings on the impeachment of President Richard Nixon, being
- E. then also later in the United States House of Representatives, Barbara Jordan did not become a nationally recognized figure until 1974, when she participated in the hearings on the impeachment of President Richard Nixon, which was

MODIFIER... although SHE... so after the comma, we must have the NAME **Barbara Jordan**.

Hearings WERE televised... So B is right.

"which" is fine in (b).

the gmat tends to write sentences in which "which" stands for the ELIGIBLE noun that's closest to the comma.

by "eligible", i mean that the noun has to AGREE IN TERMS OF SINGULAR/PLURAL with the FOLLOWING VERB.

here's an example:

the box of nails, which is on the counter, is to be used on this project.

in this case, "which" CANNOT refer to "nails", since the verb "is" is singular. therefore, the nearest eligible noun is "box (of nails)". so, "which" unambiguously stands for that.

in our observation, the gmat has been VERY good about this.

whenever i've seen a "which" that refers to "X + preposition + Y" rather than just Y, it has ALWAYS been the case that X was singular and Y was plural (or X was plural and Y was singular), and the verb had a form that matched X and didn't match Y.

in this sentence, "which were..." is plural and so can't refer to nixon. therefore it must refer to the hearings

- 49.** Combining enormous physical strength with higher intelligence, the Neanderthals appear as equipped for facing any obstacle the environment could put in their path, but their relatively sudden disappearance during the Paleolithic era indicates that an inability to adapt to some environmental change led to their extinction.
- A. appear as equipped for facing any obstacle the environment could put in their path,
 - B. **appear to have been equipped to face any obstacle the environment could put in their path,**
 - C. appear as equipped to face any obstacle the environment could put in their paths,
 - D. appeared as equipped to face any obstacle the environment could put in their paths,
 - E. appeared to have been equipped for facing any obstacle the environment could put in their path,

Because Neanderthals "disappeared," the verb describing their apparent abilities cannot be present tense, so *as equipped* must be changed to *to have been equipped*. The expression *equipped to face* is clearer and more direct than *equipped for facing*.

A *As equipped* indicates that Neanderthals still appear this way; *equipped* should be followed by an infinitive form instead of a prepositional phrase.

B Correct. The verb tense clearly indicates that the current evidence is about Neanderthals in the past.

C *As equipped* does not indicate that Neanderthals appeared this way in the past;

while individual Neanderthals may well have followed different paths, this sentence is about the single evolutionary path taken by Neanderthals as a species.

D Present-tense *appear* is needed to parallel present-tense *indicates* and to reinforce that this is current evidence about Neanderthals in the past; as in C, *paths* should be singular.

E *For facing* is an incorrect substitution of a prepositional phrase for an infinitive.

The correct answer is B.

Correct idioms are APPEAR TO and EQUIPPED TO, so B

50. A wildlife expert predicts that the reintroduction of the caribou into northern Minnesota would fail if the density of the timber wolf population in that region is more numerous than one wolf for every 39 square miles.

- A. would fail if the density of the timber wolf population in that region is more numerous
- B. would fail provided the density of the timber wolf population in that region is more
- C. should fail if the timber wolf density in that region was greater
- D. **will fail if the density of the timber wolf population in that region is greater**
- E. will fail if the timber wolf density in that region were more numerous

A prediction is made about a future event, which can be restated using the construction *y will happen if x happens first* (an alternate form is *if x happens, y will happen*). The subjunctive verb form *would* expresses remoteness and thus casts some doubt on the likelihood of *x*. The verb form *will fail* expresses the likelihood *x* with greater certainty. *Density* is not a countable quantity, so it cannot be modified by *more numerous*, which is used solely for countable quantities; *greater* is correct.

A *Would fail* expresses doubt about the future outcome; *density* should be modified by *greater*.

B This construction requires *will fail*, not *would fail*; *if* is preferred to *provided*; *density* should be modified by *greater*.

C *Will fail*, not *should fail*, is required; *timber wolf density* does not clearly refer to the population; the tense of the final verb is incorrect.

D Correct. The verb form *will fail* better expresses the certainty of the prediction; *density* is appropriately modified by *greater*.

E *Timber wolf density* does not clearly refer to the population; the tense and number of the final verb are incorrect; *density* cannot be modified by *numerous*.

The correct answer is D.

51. Although energy prices have tripled in the United States over the last two years, research indicates few people to have significantly reduced the amount of driving they do, nor are they making fuel efficiency a priority when shopping for cars.

- A. few people to have significantly reduced the amount of driving they do, nor are they making
- B. few people having significantly reduced the amount of driving they do or made
- C. that there are few people who have significantly reduced the amount of driving they do, nor having made

- D. that few people have significantly reduced the amount of driving they do and are not making
- E. **that few people have significantly reduced the amount of driving they do or made**

Indicates that... A, B out

C: not having made is not parallel to anything else.

Between D and E:

There's a problem of meaning here. Let me illustrate with an analogy.

Few of these animals eat or drink during the harsh daylight hours --> this sentence would mean that the animals do neither of these activities, in the main, during daylight hours.

few of these animals eat and avoid drinking during the harsh daylight hours --> the sentence would mean that there are few animals that do both of these things, but leaves open the possibility that many, or perhaps even a majority, do one or the other. Also, this wording is hopelessly awkward, but it probably takes a native speaker's ear to discern that fact.

the last two choices of the problem exhibit the same sort of issue. The intended meaning is that people are doing either of these activities, so (e) is the only one of these two choices to correctly represent this meaning

E says: that few people have significantly reduced the amount of driving they do or made
Here...

"have significantly **reduced**" OR "(have significantly) **MADE**"... May not look parallel but are absolutely parallel.

"The amount of driving they do" is just a NOUN... so don't try to make DO parallel to anything.

they're using it idiomatically here. you can "do a lot of driving", in the same way you can "do a lot of homework".

do notice that the identical construction appears in all five choices, so that it's actually irrelevant to the solution of the problem.

yes, "do that amount of driving" is the idea here.

- 52.** Since February, the Federal Reserve has raised its short-term interest rate target five times, and because of the economy's continued strength, analysts have been predicting for weeks that the target will be raised again in November.

- A. **because of the economy's continued strength, analysts have been predicting for weeks that the target will**
- B. with the economy's strength continuing, analysts predicted for weeks that the target
- C. because the economy continues strong, analysts predicted for weeks that the target would
- D. due to the economy's continued strength, analysts have been predicting for weeks that the target
- E. due to the fact of the economy's continued strength, analysts predicted for weeks that the target will

predictions should take the future tense, because they're predictions about ... the future!
the answer should be a.

B... predicted WOULD be fine. BE is not correct. Same for D.

B, C, and E: Predicted for WEEKS... as there is a period of time and we are talking about the present tense, we must use present perfect.

Also, 'due to' is not preferred.

the connection between "predicted" and "would" is just fine. However, we start the sentence with "Since February." This phrase indicates an ongoing action -- as a result, we want to use the present perfect tense: "have been predicting for weeks." Furthermore, to use the past tense "predicted" would indicate that they are no longer making such a prediction -- again, not what we want here, logically.

shouldn't be d; 'predict' doesn't go with this style of subjunctive. that's the *command subjunctive*, which goes with orders, requests, wishes, and the like, but not with predictions.

53. Today's technology allows manufacturers to make small cars more fuel-efficient now than at any time in their production history.

- A. small cars more fuel-efficient now than at any time in their
- B. small cars that are more fuel-efficient than they were at any time in their
- C. **small cars that are more fuel-efficient than those at any other time in**
- D. more fuel-efficient small cars than those at any other time in their
- E. more fuel-efficient small cars now than at any time in

You must have the word "any other"

Option D:

more fuel-efficient small cars than (more fuel-efficient small cars) at any other time in their

we cannot separate more fuel-efficient as it is an adjective to noun small cars

Whereas option C is correctly written:

Small cars that more fuel-efficient than small cars at any other time.....

"their" could refer either to "manufacturers" or "cars"; thus, we can eliminate any answer choices that include "their."

the primary error in (e) is redundancy - Because the sentence is discussing "today's" technology it is redundant to say "now." I also think that the meaning of (e) is ambiguous: are manufacturers making cars that are more fuel efficient, or are manufacturers simply making more cars (number of cars)?

the sentence is supposed to say that today's small cars are more fuel-efficient than *previous small cars* -- i.e., OTHER small cars.

this is important, because you can't use a "they"/"their" construction (which would illogically imply that you're talking about the *same* small cars mentioned in the first part of the sentence).

the use of "those" in (c), on the other hand, accomplishes this distinction nicely.

analogy:

sprinters in texas can run faster than they can in north dakota.

--> illogical; in this sentence, "they" would be taken to mean "sprinters in texas" (i.e., not just *sprinters*).

sprinters in texas can run faster than those in north dakota.

--> makes sense; "those" = sprinters, in this case.

same thing with "they/their" vs. "those" in these instances.

Yep Pronouns must have one, clear, unambiguous antecedent. Does their refer to manufacturers? Small cars? Clearly, I want it to refer to small cars (logically), but it could refer to manufacturers. Need to make this clear (which C does by just removing it from the equation).

It's also important to use the word "other" - technically, they're not more efficient than those at ANY time in production history - because part of that history includes right now, when they're more fuel-efficient. So, they're only more efficient than those at any OTHER time in history.

54. Like any star of similar mass would do, once the Sun has exhausted the hydrogen in its core, it expands into a red giant, eventually ejecting its outer envelope of gases to become a white dwarf.

- A. Like any star of similar mass would do, once the Sun has exhausted the hydrogen in its core, it expands into a red giant, eventually ejecting
- B. Like any star of similar mass, once the hydrogen in the Sun's core is exhausted, then it expands into a red giant and eventually ejects

- C. As in the case of any star of similar mass, once the hydrogen in the Sun's core is exhausted, it will expand into a red giant, and eventually ejecting
- D. As any star of similar mass would, once the hydrogen in the Sun's core is exhausted it will expand into a red giant and will eventually eject
- E. **As would be the case with any star of similar mass, once the Sun exhausts the hydrogen in its core, it will expand into a red giant and eventually eject**

A: Like followed by a VERB – wrong
 B, C: Possessive – it refers to core
 D: it refers to hydrogen

Also, REMEMBER this construction... AS is the case... as was the case... as would be the case... such constructions are always considered RIGHT on the GMAT.

Sentence is making a projection. So, future tense is needed. A and B are out. The 'its' after the underlined portion should refer back to Sun and not SUn's core. C and D have 'Sun's Core' and 'it' cannot refer to a possessive.

what's more important is to notice that, in choices C and D, "it" refers to "hydrogen" (the subject of the previous clause). This reference leads to the absurd idea that the _hydrogen_ will expand into a red giant AFTER IT'S ALL GONE. Choice C also exhibits a rather obvious parallelism defect, which also happens to be ungrammatical: "and eventually ejecting" not only fails to be parallel to "will expand," but is also, well, wrong.

Choice B is all kinds of wrong. Since "like any star of similar mass" doesn't have a subject, we need "the Sun" right after the comma (and it isn't there). Like choices C and D, this sentence mistakenly employs "it" to refer to hydrogen. eliminate choice "A" on the basis that it is starting a clause with "like"-----> **"Like** any star of similar mass would do".

like is limited to introducing nouns (or their equivalents, such as pronouns and noun phrases). you are correct to assert that *like* cannot introduce clauses.

- 55.** Push for greater integration of global economy is not, like earlier, guided by complicated philosophical questions about the global fraternity, but the practical matters of business: cost savings and efficiency.
- A. not, like earlier, guided by complicated philosophical questions about the global fraternity, but the practical matters of business
 - B. being guided by the practical matters of business, instead of complicated philosophical questions about the global fraternity, as it has been earlier
 - C. guided not by complicated philosophical questions about the global fraternity, as earlier, but by the practical matters of business
 - D. guided by the practical matters of business, not complicated philosophical questions about the global fraternity, which was the case earlier
 - E. **guided not by complicated philosophical questions about the global fraternity, as has been the case earlier, but by the practical matters of business**

NOT X but Y parallel

A, D not parallel.

B... there can be no comma before instead of.

B, C
 As told above, as is the case / as was the case / as has been the case / as would be the case etc. are considered better.

Also, notice that we are comparing trends... so the best way to denote trends is AS IT WAS ... or AS WAS THE CASE earlier.

- 56.** Used by many natural history museum curators in the preparation of animal skeletons for display, dermestid beetles feed on the decaying flesh of animal carcasses, pulling with its mouthparts to strip the bone of any residual fat or muscle tissue.
- A. dermestid beetles feed on the decaying flesh of animal carcasses, pulling
 - B. dermestid beetles feed on the decaying flesh of animal carcasses and pull
 - C. the dermestid beetle feeds on the decaying flesh of animal carcasses and pulls

- D. the dermestid beetle feeds on the decaying flesh of animal carcasses, pulling
E. the dermestid beetle feeds on the decaying flesh of animal carcasses and it pulls

The plural subject in the original sentence, "dermestid beetles," does not agree in number with the singular pronoun "its," which appears in the non-underlined part of the sentence. In order to correctly agree with "its," the subject must be singular: "the dermestid beetle."

(A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) The plural subject "dermestid beetles" does not agree in number with the singular pronoun "its," which appears in the non-underlined part of the sentence. In order to correctly agree with "its," the subject must be singular: "the dermestid beetle." Also, the present tense verb "pull" is incorrectly consistent with the present tense verb "feed." In this case, verb consistency is undesirable as it separates "feed" and "pull" into two independent and sequential actions: the beetles "feed on the decaying flesh" and "pull with...mouthparts." The logical meaning of the sentence, as dictated by the original version, is that the "pulling" occurs as part of the main verb "feed," not independent of it.

(C) While the singular subject "the dermestid beetle" correctly agrees in number with the singular pronoun "its," the present tense verb "pulls" is incorrectly consistent with the present tense verb "feeds." In this case, verb consistency is undesirable as it separates "feeds" and "pulls" into two independent and sequential actions: the beetle "feeds on the decaying flesh" and "pulls with...mouthparts." The logical meaning of the sentence, as dictated by the original version, is that the "pulling" occurs as part of the main verb "feeds," not independent of it.

(D) CORRECT. The singular subject "the dermestid beetle" correctly agrees in number with the singular pronoun "its." Also, the form "pulling" correctly implies that "pulling with its mouthparts" occurs as part of the main verb "feeds," not independent of it.

(E) The singular subject "the dermestid beetle" correctly agrees in number with the singular pronoun "its." However, the present tense verb "pulls" is incorrectly consistent with the present tense verb "feeds." In this case, verb consistency is undesirable as it separates "feeds" and "pulls" into two independent and sequential actions: the beetle "feeds on the decaying flesh" and "pulls with...mouthparts." The logical meaning of the sentence, as dictated by the original version, is that the "pulling" occurs as part of the main verb "feeds," not independent of it. Also, the use of the pronoun "it" is unnecessarily wordy; the subject of the verb "pulls," "the dermestid beetle," is clear without of the use of "it."

- 57.** Though now eaten in large quantities around the world and harmless, the tomato is a member of the generally toxic nightshade family, including belladonna, and was once thought to be poisonous itself as a result.
- A. Though now eaten in large quantities around the world and harmless, the tomato is a member of the generally toxic nightshade family, including belladonna, and was once thought to be poisonous itself as a result.
B. The tomato, though now eaten in large quantities around the world and harmless, is a member of the generally toxic nightshade family, which includes belladonna, and it was therefore once thought to be poisonous itself.
C. Once thought to be poisonous itself, the tomato is harmless and now eaten in large quantities around the world, and is a member of the generally toxic nightshade family, including belladonna.
D. Though now eaten in large quantities around the world and known to be harmless, the tomato was once considered poisonous because it is a member of the generally toxic nightshade family, which includes belladonna.
E. A member of the generally toxic nightshade family, including belladonna, the tomato was once considered poisonous even though it is harmless and now eaten in large quantities around the world.

The original sentence contains a lot of clauses in a confusing order. We need to find an answer choice that rephrases the sentence in a clear and concise manner. Also, the phrase "though now eaten in large quantities around the world and harmless" contains two elements that are not parallel. Moreover, "including belladonna" is incorrect left dangling. It should be "which includes belladonna." Finally, "itself" could refer either to "tomato" or to "belladonna". (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) The pronoun "it" is ambiguous as it could refer either to "the nightshade family" or "belladonna" or "tomato." Additionally, the phrase "though now eaten in large quantities around the world and harmless" contains two elements that are not parallel. (C) The phrase "including belladonna" does not properly modify anything. (D) CORRECT. The opening phrase contains the two parallel elements "eaten in large quantities . . ." and "known to be harmless." The phrase "which includes belladonna" correctly modifies the "nightshade family." Finally, the pronoun "it" unambiguously refers to the tomato. (E) The phrase "including belladonna" does not properly modify anything.

58. Based on accounts of various ancient writers, scholars have painted a sketchy picture of the activities of an all-female cult that, perhaps as early as the sixth century B.C., worshipped a goddess known in Latin as Bona Dea, "the good goddess."
- A. Based on accounts of various ancient writers
 - B. Basing it on various ancient writers' accounts
 - C. With accounts of various ancient writers used for a basis
 - D. By the accounts of various ancient writers they used
 - E. **Using accounts of various ancient writers**

The underlined phrase is a modifier; it functions as an adjective to describe the noun that immediately follows it. In this case, the phrase incorrectly modifies *scholars*, which does not make any sense. What are the scholars doing? When the modifier begins with *using*, it correctly links the scholars with the modifier that describes their activity.

A *Based on ...* incorrectly modifies *scholars*.

B The pronoun *it* does not have a clear reference.

C This choice is wordy and awkward.

D This choice is wordy and awkward.

E Correct. In this sentence, *using accounts of various ancient writers* correctly modifies *scholars* in a clear and concise expression of their activity.

The correct answer is E.

59. As a baby emerges from the darkness of the womb with a rudimentary sense of vision, it would be rated about 20/500, or legally blind if it were an adult with such vision.
- A. As a baby emerges from the darkness of the womb with a rudimentary sense of vision, it would be rated about 20/500, or legally blind if it were an adult with such vision.
 - B. A baby emerges from the darkness of the womb with a rudimentary sense of vision that would be rated about 20/500, or legally blind as an adult
 - C. As a baby emerges from the darkness of the womb, its rudimentary sense of vision would be rated about 20/500; qualifying it to be legally blind if an adult
 - D. **A baby emerges from the darkness of the womb with a rudimentary sense of vision that would be rated about 20/500; an adult with such vision would be deemed legally blind.**
 - E. As a baby emerges from the darkness of the womb, its rudimentary sense of vision, which would be deemed legally blind for an adult, would be rated about 20/500.

This sentence fails to convey its meaning because its construction is faulty. It begins with a subordinate clause, whose subject is *a baby*; the subject of the main clause, *it* appears to refer back to *baby*. However, reading the main clause reveals that *it* is intended to refer to the *sense of vision* the first time it is used and to the *baby* the second time. The whole sentence must be revised, and the relationships between the two parts of the sentence must be clarified.

A Repeated use of *it* creates confusion because the referent is not clear.

B The final phrase is awkwardly and ambiguously attached to the sentence.

C The use of a semicolon instead of a comma creates a sentence fragment.

D Correct. One independent clause describes a baby's vision, the other an adult's; the two independent but linked main clauses are correctly separated with a semicolon in this

version of the sentence.

E Subordinate clause beginning with *which* is awkward and ambiguous.

The correct answer is D.

60. More than thirty years ago Dr. Barbara McClintock, the Nobel Prize winner, reported that genes can "jump," as pearls moving mysteriously from one necklace to another.

- A. as pearls moving mysteriously from one necklace to another
- B. like pearls moving mysteriously from one necklace to another
- C. as pearls do that move mysteriously from one necklace to others
- D. like pearls do that move mysteriously from one necklace to others
- E. as do pearls that move mysteriously from one necklace to some other one

"JUMP" written in quotes means hypothetical... so LIKE

Like can not be followed by a VERB.. so like pearls DO in D is wrong.

Remember Like pearls moving... in this MOVING is an adjective (present participle), not a verb.

61. The hognose snake puts on an impressive bluff, hissing and rearing back, broadens the flesh behind its head the way a cobra does, feigning repeated strikes, but, having no dangerous fangs and no venom, eventually, if its pursuer is not cowed by the performance, will fall over and play dead.

- A. broadens the flesh behind its head the way a cobra does, feigning repeated strikes, but, having no dangerous fangs and no venom,
- B. broadens the flesh behind its head the way a cobra does and feigns repeated strikes, but with no dangerous fangs and no venom,
- C. broadening the flesh behind its head the way a cobra does and feigning repeated strikes, but it has no dangerous fangs and no venom, and
- D. broadening the flesh behind its head the way a cobra does and feigns repeated strikes, but with no dangerous fangs and no venom, and
- E. broadening the flesh behind its head the way a cobra does, feigning repeated strikes, but with no dangerous fangs and no venom, and

Parallelism Hissing... so broadening A, B out

D has broadening and feigns... not parallel.

It should be C. This choice has better parallelism than does choice E, and is phrased in a way that makes MUCH more sense. Choice E, while not strictly ungrammatical, is a 'garden path sentence' - one that reads incorrectly the first couple of times your eyes run over it, and that only makes sense if you go back and read it several more times. The specifics:

C:

The hognose snake puts on an impressive bluff, hissing and rearing back, broadening the flesh behind its head the way a cobra does and feigning repeated strikes, --
> note the parallelism between these two parts: both are in the form '(verb)ING and (verb)ING'

but it has no dangerous fangs and no venom, and eventually, if its pursuer is not cowered by the performance, will fall over and play dead. --> contains a key transition ('but'), and the start of a new clause (new subject & new verb), in just the right place - to mark the sudden transition/contrast between the stuff in the first half (all this intimidating behavior) and the stuff in the second half (it's all a big fake - snake oil, if you don't mind the pun).

E:

The hognose snake puts on an impressive bluff, hissing and rearing back, broadening the flesh behind its head the way a cobra does, feigning repeated strikes, but with no dangerous fangs and no venom,

These two items are falsely made to look like two more items in a series begun with 'hissing...' and 'broadening...'. In addition, there is NO emphasis on the transition 'but', because no new clause is begun at this point. That's bad, because there's a sudden huge shift in what the sentence is talking about at this point.
and eventually, if its pursuer is not cowered by the performance, will fall over and play dead.

62. Simply because they are genetically engineered does not make it any more likely for plants to become an invasive or persistent weed, according to a decade-long study published in the journal Nature.
- A. because they are genetically engineered does not make it any more likely for plants to
 - B. because it is genetically engineered does not make a plant any more likely to
 - C. being genetically engineered does not make it any more likely that plants will
 - D. being genetically engineered does not make a plant any more likely to
 - E. being genetically engineered does not make a plant any more likely that it will become

WEED singular so PLANT should be used... A, C out

this sentence has the following form: *X does not make...*

therefore, whatever goes in the 'x' slot has to be, or function as, a noun. this rules out a-b immediately (these are subordinate clauses, which can't function as nouns).

in choices c-d-e, the 'being' is a *gerund* (the -ing form that functions as a noun, as in the sentence *taking overdoses of vitamins isn't good for your health*). since gerunds function as nouns, that structure is permissible.

B violates a little known thing that the GMAT writers follow though it is not an official grammar rule - more a choice. It introduces a subject pronoun before the noun itself. Subject pronouns and nouns can be directly interchanged; as such, the test writers prefer to use the noun first and then later use a subject pronoun (if necessary). Note that I am specifically limiting this to subject pronouns, not object or possessive pronouns. Most people read a subject-pronoun-first situation as "awkward" though they don't really know why.

And just study D from the point of view of: this is one of the only ways to use "being" correctly, so familiarize yourself with it.

"will" is unnecessary in E.

You could either say

"... make it any more likely that a plant will become ..."

or

"... make a plant any more likely to become..."

You CANNOT combine them to get

"...make a plant any more likely that it will become ..."

That is, if you use 'plant' as the object of 'make', then it must take the complementary infinitive 'to become'.

63. In the major cities of industrialized countries at the end of the nineteenth century, important public places such as theaters, restaurants, shops, and banks had installed electric lighting, but electricity was in less than one percent of homes, where lighting was still provided mainly by candles or gas.
- A. electricity was in less than one percent of homes, where lighting was still
 - B. electricity was in less than one percent of homes and lighting still
 - C. there were less than one percent of homes with electricity, where lighting was still being
 - D. there was less than one percent of homes that had electricity, having lighting that was still
 - E. less than one percent of homes had electricity, where lighting had still been

There are at least the following 2 things wrong with choice E:

* The tense ('had still been') is wrong considering the context. 'Had still been' implies that lighting in homes was no longer provided by candles and gas at the time referenced in the sentence (past perfect means that event is over with and done, although it may still be in some way relevant to the CURRENT situation). But the sentence is supposed to say that home electricity was still being provided by these items.

* Misplaced modifier: The way this sentence is written, it implies that *electricity* is 'where lighting had still been provided ... blah blah blah'. But this description is clearly supposed to refer to homes.

C is bad because of the 'there were' construction. That construction is used, generally, in one of two ways:

- (1) You're postulating the general existence of something: 'There are only two ways to solve this problem.'
- (2) You're pointing out what is in a particular location: 'There are four cars in the street.'

You aren't doing either of these things here, so the construction is inappropriate.

Also, 'being' is pointless and redundant (note: 'being' is a HUGE red flag on GMAT problems; it's almost always redundant, and thus fatal to whichever answer choice it's in)

B: "and lighting still" is the major problem.

First, that last bit is supposed to be saying something about homes - in homes, lighting was still mainly provided by candles or gas.

"electricity was in less than one percent of homes and lighting still provided mainly by candles or gas" doesn't explicitly tell me that the "lighting still provided mainly by candles or gas" was *in homes*. Also, a verb is missing - it would, at the least, have to say "lighting *was* still provided..."

Either issue is enough to ding the answer choice.

D:

no, choice d still has major issues.

- 'there were' / 'there was' is a very common construction in *spoken* english, but its use in formal written language (such as the language of the gmat) is ordinarily restricted to discussion of the physical location of things (as in, those things literally *were there*, etc.) if it's not being used in this sense, it's considered wordy, because it can be replaced by more concise phrasing.

additionally, you only use this construction when you are actually *asserting the presence* of something/someone (where it is not already obvious). for instance, if you start a sentence with 'there are two cars in the street...', you're assuming that your reader does *not* already know that there are tow cars in the street. otherwise, you'd start with something like '*the* two cars in the street are...'

example:

there were less than 1 percent of homes with electricity

this is bad. first of all, we aren't using the sentence to assert the presence of the homes - they're already understood to be there. (also, it's not really clear where 'there' is.) second, we can easily rephrase this to 'less than 1% of homes had electricity', which is much nicer and more concise.

- 'having' is used incorrectly. if you use a participle like this, you're introducing an *adverb modifier*, which modifies the *action* of the preceding clause. unfortunately, the main action word of the preceding clause is 'was' (from 'there was'), so the modifier doesn't make sense. even if you are generous enough to let the modifier modify 'had electricity', it still doesn't make sense (as the modifier doesn't give the way in which the houses had electricity).

64. In some species of Cricket, the number of chirps per minute used by the male for attracting females rise and fall in accordance with the surrounding temperature, and they can in fact serve as an approximate thermometer.

- A. for attracting females rise and fall in accordance with the surrounding temperature, and they can in fact serve
- B. for attracting females rises and falls in accordance with the surrounding temperature, which can in fact serve
- C. in attracting females rise and fall in accordance with the surrounding temperature, in fact possibly serving
- D. **to attract females rises and falls in accordance with the surrounding temperature, and it can in fact serve**
- E. to attract females rises and falls in accordance with the surrounding temperature, in fact possibly serving

USED TO ATTRACT (right idiom)... so D or E

"It can in fact serve as an approximate thermometer" is also an independent clause - it can stand alone as a sentence. Also, "it" refers to the number of chirps per minute, which is appropriately singular.

I like D better here. E introduces the word "possibly" which has a different meaning than "it can serve." The "it can" means it is, really, while "possibly" means it might. Not the same thing. And the original sentence uses "can" so I want to preserve the meaning.

Also the construction "in fact possibly serving" is awkward.

"in fact possibly serving" is awkward; It would be better if it simply said "possibly serving."

In defense of D, I would argue that it's OK for the number of chirps per minute to serve as a thermometer, not unlike how expanding mercury in a glass tube serves as a thermometer.

"IT" can't refer to "thermometer" because "thermometer" appears later in the same clause.

analogy:

he threw the ball to steve.

here, we don't know who "he" is, but we know that "he" is *definitely* not steve.

- 65.** Each year companies in United States could save as much as \$58 billion annually by preventing illness among employees and gain as much as \$200 billion through improving performance of workers if they simply provided offices with cleaner air.
- A. annually by preventing illness among employees and gain as much as \$200 billion through improving performance of workers if they simply provided offices
 - B. annually if they prevented employee illness and gain as much as \$200 billion through worker performance improved by simply providing
 - C. annually in employee illness prevention and gain as much as \$200 billion through worker performance improved by simply providing
 - D. in employee illness prevention and gain as much as \$200 billion through improving performance of workers if they simply provided
 - E. by preventing illness among employees and gain as much as \$200 billion through improved worker performance if they simply provided

"Each year" is already used... so don't use "annually".

D or E

E uses Verb form preventing (D uses noun form prevention)... also,

The question is not just about "improved" vs. "improving," but about the context of these words. Each is preceded by the word "through." We cannot say "through improving," but rather "through the improved performance." We need a noun to follow "through." "Through" is a preposition - what is to be the object of this preposition unless a noun of some sort? The word "improving" is incorrect here.

Here are the only words that differentiate (D) and (E):

(D) in employee illness preventionimproving performance of workers...

(E) by preventing illness among employees improved worker performance...

I think this choice boils down to idiom, although parallelism could be useful:

(D) reads "companies could save \$58B in X...and gain \$200B through Y" The phrasing "save \$ in X" is not ideal...the only correct usage of this I can think of is "save \$ in banks" (i.e. to specify location of saved money). That is not the purpose here.

(E) reads "companies could save \$58B by preventing X...and gain \$200B through Y" where the correct idiom "save \$ by doing X" (i.e. to specify how money is saved) is used. Also, X and Y are parallel nouns (illness and performance) correctly completing the idioms "by preventing X (one thing) ...and through Y (some other thing)"

"They" refers to companies, not employees. Structure of the sentence: Companies could do X if they (the same companies) did Y. All of the stuff in X and Y is just detail, not part of the core.

- 66.** The spectacular disintegration of a comet last year in full view of ground- and space-based telescopes provided new insights into how comets form and may thus force a rethinking of the role of comets in the delivery of organic compounds to the evolving Earth.
- A. The spectacular disintegration of a comet last year in full view of ground- and space-based telescopes provided new insights into how comets form and may thus force

- B. The spectacular disintegration of a comet last year in full view of ground- and space-based telescopes, provided new insights into how comets form and thus possibly forcing
- C. When a comet's spectacular disintegration occurred in full view of ground- and space-based telescopes last year, it provided new insights into how comets form and thus may possibly force
- D. Last year, in full view of ground- and space-based telescopes, a comet's spectacular disintegration provided new insights into how comets form and thus possibly forcing
- E. Last year, in full view of ground- and space-based telescopes, the spectacular disintegration of a comet has provided new insights into how comets form and may thus force

B, D... "forcing" is not parallel (cannot refer to future tense in this way)

E... last year... has provided (wrong tense)

C uses sentence splits, wordiness, and an unnecessary pronoun IT for no reason... so must avoid such constructions.

Answer choice A puts the events in proper perspective:

* The comet disintegrated last year; this was a one-time event.

* It provided new insights. Since it was a one-time event, it's appropriate to say 'provided' (simple past tense), unless the same event has CONTINUOUSLY provided newer and newer insights, in which case 'has provided new insights' would be better. But there's no indication of the latter in this sentence.

* The 'forcing' is a possible future event.

According to choice E:

* The comet's disintegration produced new insights last year.

And, more absurdly,

* The disintegration produced those insights in full view of ground- and space-based telescopes!

"in full view of ground- as well as space-based telescopes" is an adverbial modifier (as are most prepositional-phrase modifiers); if you're telling *where* something happened, then that modifies the action, not the subject. therefore, it modifies the *action* of the clause: "...has provided..."

and that's the source of the problem. if the modifier just modified the subject ("disintegration"), then there'd be no problem at all, because the disintegration *did* occur in full view of the telescopes. the problem, though, is that it didn't *provide blah blah blah* in full view of those telescopes, which is the implication of the modifier.

67. In contrast to ongoing trade imbalances with China and Japan, the United States trade deficit with Mexico declined by \$500 million as a result of record exports to that country.

- A. In contrast to ongoing trade imbalances with China and Japan, the United States trade deficit with Mexico declined by \$500 million as a result of record exports to that country.
- B. In contrast to ongoing trade imbalances with China and Japan, the United States sold record exports to Mexico, reducing its trade deficit by \$500 million.
- C. When compared with ongoing trade imbalances with China and Japan, the United States sold record exports to Mexico, reducing their trade deficit by \$500 million.
- D. Compared with ongoing trade imbalances with China and Japan, the United States sold record exports to Mexico, reducing the trade deficit by \$500 million.
- E. Compared to ongoing trade imbalances with China and Japan, the United States sold record exports to Mexico, reducing the trade deficit by \$500 million.

In situations like these when no answer seems right gramatically, I use POE

B - comparing trade imbalances with record exports, thats not right

C - we do not want to compare trade imbalances with US

D - same as C

E - same as C

A remains.

In this particular problem, I agree that the term deficit *could* have been compared to another deficit, but this option was not provided. Since a deficit is a trade imbalance, however, answer choice A contains an arguably logical comparison; each of the other answer choices contains a provably illogical comparison. Thus, A is the best answer choice available.

'reducing' is ok in all three of those choices. in fact, participial modifiers have a great deal more freedom in their placement than do other types of modifiers.

* in choice c, 'their' is wrong (the united states must be singular - yes, i know this is confusing, because 'states' would be plural) and, in addition, this sentence literally says that the u.s. sold record exports to mexico *while* it was being compared with... (i.e., all the sales happened while some random analyst was making a comparison).

* choices d and e both fallaciously say that the u.s. is being compared directly to trade imbalances. that doesn't make a lot of sense.

"sold" is wrong in B, C, D, E

yeah, if you have an active clause with "sold", that's not really a direct comparison with a trade imbalance. (i.e., it's not a parallel comparison; the parallel comparison would seem to imply that the trade imbalance itself also sells things, an absurd thought.)

to be specific, choice e compares 'trade imbalances' to 'the U.S.', which is about as invalid as comparisons get.

for that matter, the other wrong answers (b, c, d,) ALL make the same invalid comparison as well. only choice a properly compares the ongoing *trade imbalances* to *the u.s. trade deficit*.

68. It was only after Katharine Graham became publisher of The Washington Post in 1963 that it moved into the first rank of American newspapers, and it was under her command that the paper won high praise for its unrelenting reporting of the Watergate scandal.

- A. It was only after Katharine Graham became publisher of The Washington Post in 1963 that it moved into the first rank of American newspapers, and it was under her command that the paper won high praise
- B. It was only after Katharine Graham's becoming publisher of The Washington Post in 1963 that it moved into the first rank of American newspapers, and under her command it had won high praise
- C. Katharine Graham became publisher of The Washington Post in 1963 and only after that did it move into the first rank of American newspapers, having won high praise under her command
- D. Moving into the first rank of American newspapers only after Katharine Graham became its publisher in 1963, The Washington Post, winning high praise under her command
- E. Moving into the first rank of American newspapers only after Katharine Grahame's becoming its publisher in 1963, The Washington Post won high praise under her command

B- "Had won" – wrong use of the perfect tense.

C: "that" should refer to a noun... there is no noun... only a clause to go back to.

D: is not a sentence as it contains no main verb... it is a fragment.

E: ONLY after KG's becoming is wrong... it should be only after KG BECAME

B uses past perfect incorrectly (simple past for "it was only after" and past perfect for "it had won high praise" which comes later chronologically than when KG became publisher)

C has a problematic pronoun (it) - logically refers to Wash Post but structurally could refer to KG or publisher. Also, this sentence indicates that it moved into the first ranks as a result of having won high praise. The original sentence doesn't indicate that meaning and we can't just change the meaning of the sentence.

D is a sentence fragment - there's no verb for Wash Post, which is the ostensible subject.

E "moving" and "becoming" indicate something that's going on right now - this should be in the past. And "after Katherine Graham's becoming its publisher" is horrible.

That leaves us with A (where the second "it" pronoun is fine, by the way, because both logically and structurally it refers to Wash Post).

there is an EXCEPTION to the principle that a pronoun must stand for an actual noun.
here is that exception:

in the construction

it is/was ADJ that...

or

it is/was ADV that...

or

it is/was ADVERB PHRASE that...

the "it" DOES NOT have to stand for an actual noun.

note that the "THAT" after the adjective/adverb/adverb phrase is absolutely necessary.

in this problem, "only after Katharine Graham became publisher of The Washington Post in 1963" is an adverb phrase, so this is the sort of construction in which IT doesn't have to stand for anything.

this is a complicated sentence, but you've probably seen the same principle at work in simpler sentences, such as *it is unlikely that he will show up on time.*

same sort of deal here.

in any case, the main problem i see with choice (c) isn't a pronoun issue; rather, it's the participial modifier beginning with "having". if you write "...*having won* high praise under her command", the implication is that the paper had *already* won high praise by the time it moved into the highest echelon of american newspapers - an implication that is at odds with the intended meaning, and is absurd to boot (the watergate crisis was 10-11 years after the mentioned date of 1963).

--

there's really no pronoun issue with choice (a), because two of the "it"s are a special construction in which they don't really have single-word antecedents. for example if i write

it was surprising to me that you would say something like that,

this is proper english. if you want to get technical, you could say that the pronoun "it" stands for the entire noun clause "that you would say something like that", but it's easier just to think of this as a special construction.

in choice (a), "*it was only after KG became...*" and "*it was under her command...*" are both examples of this type of construction, so the remaining "it" is the only pronoun that really deserves serious consideration.

Possessive pronouns CAN refer back to subject or object nouns - totally okay. However, subject and object pronouns CANNOT refer back to possessive nouns.

C.

In this sentence, "that" refers to "Katharine Graham became publisher of The Washington Post in 1963". Therefore this point is another mistake for C. because "that" and other pronouns must refer to noun, not sentences.

69. In human hearing, subtle differences in how the two ears hear a given sound help the listener determine the qualities of that sound.

- A. **in how the two ears hear a given sound help the listener determine**
- B. in the two ears hearing a given sound help the listener in determining
- C. in how a sound is heard by the two ears helps the listener determine
- D. between how the two ears hear a given sound helps the listener in determining
- E. between how a sound is heard by the two ears help the listener in determining

Difference between is wrong in this case (see below), D, E gone.

B – Difference ... help – Subject Verb Mismatch

C is passive... A is active... there is no reason to keep the passive here... so go with A.

First, it shouldn't be "help the listener to determine" (although that is how lots of people would say it). You don't need the "to" - and, if you don't need it, then it's not going to be in the correct answer!

Be careful about deciding based upon what sounds good or bad. The test will fool your ear. Go based upon the specific rules you KNOW are true.

You may read an original sentence and think it sounds awkward (in fact, this will happen quite a lot!), but if you cannot point to a specific area that you KNOW is an actual grammatical error, don't eliminate A. It stays in as a possibility.

The in vs. between issue is an idiom. I say differences in X (just one thing) or differences between X and Y (two things). This sentence has one thing: how the two ears hear a given sound. So, I need "differences in." Elim D and E.

B says "differences in the two ears hearing" - that makes it sound like the two ears themselves are different (as in, they look different or something), as opposed to a difference in the way the two ears perceive a sound. That's not the original meaning (and doesn't even make a lot of sense), so elim B.

C says "differences... helps" - that's a subj-verb mismatch. Elim C. (you can also use this to elim D, if you haven't already eliminated it).

Only A is left. (And, usually this will be the process for getting yourself to A. There won't be anything wrong with it but you'll be suspicious of it b/c 80% of the time there IS something wrong with it, so you'll find some reason to say it sounds bad. But DO NOT eliminate A unless you can point to a specific error. Leave it in and test the others.)

Question:

I am not sure how two ears is one thing? the difference between two twins is the height. --Is this wrong?

or do we say --Difference in two twins is their height.?

I am kind of confused please suggest.

ANSWER: you would say 'the difference between the two twins', because the two twins are two different people. more to the point, *if* you were actually differentiating between the ears themselves, you would indeed say: 'the difference *between the two ears* is...'

however, in this problem, you are not talking about the difference between the two ears; you're talking about the differences in one action - the *same* action - that's being performed by each of the two ears. therefore, you say 'the difference *in the way the two ears perform this function*.'

more illustrations:

the differences between the two twins are displayed in stark relief when they argue with each other.

the differences in the way the two twins play the violin are displayed in stark relief when they play duets together.

- 70.** The automobile company announced that the average price of next year's models would decrease four-tenths of one percent, amounting to about \$72, as compared with comparably equipped cars and trucks this year.
- A. The automobile company announced that the average price of next year's models would decrease four-tenths of one percent, amounting to about \$72, as compared with comparably equipped cars and trucks this year.
 - B. The automobile company announced that the average price of next year's cars and trucks would decrease four-tenths of one percent, or about \$72, from that of comparably equipped models this year.
 - C. The automobile company announced that there would be a decrease of four-tenths of one percent in next year's models price, or about \$72, below this year's comparably equipped cars and trucks.
 - D. Compared to comparably equipped models this year, the automobile company announced that the average price of next year's cars and trucks would decrease about \$72, less by four-tenths of one percent.
 - E. Contrasted with comparably equipped cars and trucks of this year, the automobile company announced that the average price of next year's models would decrease about \$72, or four-tenths of one percent.

A and C compare vehicles and prices... WRONG

D and E are wrong comparisons / modifiers... compared to / contrasted... must be models not company (after the comma)

When making a comparison, you must compare apples to apples. You can compare the price of next year's vehicles to the price of this year's vehicles, but you cannot compare the price of next year's vehicles to the actual vehicles themselves this year - that doesn't make sense. And that's what the original sentence tries to do.

You can't assume the "silent subject," as you call it, is there. It has to be stated explicitly in order to make a proper comparison.

The "that of" in B refers to the "average price" already mentioned earlier. So, now, we're comparing the average price

of next year's cars to the average price of this year's cars - that's a proper, apples-to-apples comparison.

Also, it's okay to say that the price will decrease from the current year's price, because in this case, that's the same thing as saying "as compared with" - the point is that, whatever the price is this year, it's going to go down a certain percentage next year - from this year's price to next year's price.

71. While Hans Holbein the Younger is most often identified with his English portraits, scholars have long been recognizing him as a superb draftsman and a remarkably versatile artist and who was fundamental in synthesizing the novelties of the Italian Renaissance with the rational tradition of Northern Europe.

- A. been recognizing him as a superb draftsman and a remarkably versatile artist and who
- B. been recognizing him for being a superb draftsman and a remarkably versatile artist and he
- C. recognized him as a superb draftsman and a remarkably versatile artist who
- D. recognized him as a superb draftsman and a remarkably versatile artist and he
- E. recognized him for being a superb draftsman and a remarkably versatile artist and who

A: AND WHO... is surely wrong

B: recognizing him FOR is the wrong idiom... AND HE is wrong

D: AND HE is wrong

E: recognizing him FOR is the wrong idiom... AND WHO is wrong

72. Many environmentalists, and some economists, say that free trade encourages industry to relocate to countries with ineffective or poorly enforced antipollution laws, mostly in the developing world, and that, in order to maintain competitiveness, rich nations have joined this downward slide toward more lax attitudes about pollution.

- A. that, in order to maintain competitiveness, rich nations have joined this downward slide toward more lax attitudes about pollution
- B. that, for maintaining competitiveness, rich nations join in this downward slide toward more lax attitudes about pollution
- C. that rich nations join this downward slide toward more lax attitudes about pollution because of wanting to maintain competitiveness
- D. that in rich nations, joining this downward slide toward more lax attitudes about pollution is a result of wanting to maintain competition
- E. that wanting to maintain competition is making rich nations join in this downward slide toward an attitude about pollution that is more lax

B: to maintain is the right idiom (to show intention)

C: "nations join" means present simple tense... shows eternal truth... not a recent phenomenon. "Because of wanting" is worse than "Because they want"

D, E are plain BAD. The major trouble is "WANTING to maintain".

here are a couple of problems with choice b:

- 'for maintaining competitiveness' is bad idiomatic usage: it's an incorrect way to express intent or purpose. (the construction in choice a is surprisingly wordy - *in order to* could be replaced with just *to*, with no loss of meaning - and might not make it onto the real exam.)

- 'rich nations *join in this downward slide*': fatal change in meaning. this wording implies that the rich nations are colluding with each other, metaphorically holding hands, deciding *together* to become more lax about pollution. (choice a expresses the correct meaning, which is that the slide is happening and that rich nations are individually joining it.)

- the simple present tense *join* implies that there is some sort of timeless truth about the statement being made. that's the wrong meaning: the sentence is meant to say that the rich nations *have begun to do this* as a result of current trends. if you don't understand the difference, consider the following analogous examples:

private universities have admitted more females than males --> meaning: this is an ongoing or cumulative trend, continuing into the present from some designated starting point

private universities admit more females than males --> meaning: this is a fundamental truth about the way private universities operate

73. The budget for education reflects the administration's demand that the money is controlled by local school districts, but it can only be spent on teachers, not on books, computers, or other materials or activities.

- A. the money is controlled by local school districts, but it can only be spent

- B. the money be controlled by local school districts, but it allows them to spend the money only
- C. the money is to be controlled by local school districts, but allowing it only to be spent
- D. local school districts are in control of the money, but it allows them to spend the money only
- E. local school districts are to be in control of the money, but it can only spend it

DEMAND THAT money BE controlled... subjunctive

The budget reflects the demand

The Subj-----verb-----object

In modern American English, the Simple Present Subjunctive is used in clauses beginning with the word *that* that express formal commands or requests. This construction requires the "bare infinitive," or the infinitive of the verb without the word "to."

This explains the need for *demand that the money be* in the correct answer choice: demand (expresses command) that (introduction to clause) the money (subject) be (bare infinitive).

* "is" should be "be".

since the sentence is describing a *demand*, it must use what's called the *command subjunctive*, which takes the same form as the infinitive (minus the initial "to").

this construction is used when requests, demands, stipulations, etc. are preceded by "that".

* the pronoun "it" is at best ambiguous, and at worst incorrectly predicated.

it could be viewed as ambiguous, because it could potentially refer either to "budget" or to "money" (or even to "demand"). alternatively, if you're going to be generous and assign a 'preferred' antecedent, then, unfortunately, the grammatically parallel antecedent is the wrong word: "it" is the SUBJECT of its clause, so we refer to the SUBJECT of the preceding clause, which is "the budget" (oops, wrong word).

notice that (b), the correct choice, has "it" as the subject of its clause and the CORRECT antecedent ("the budget") as the subject of the other clause.

this is generally the way these things work, by the way: first go for an entirely unambiguous pronoun, but, if that's unavailable, then go for the pronoun that's grammatically parallel to the intended antecedent.

74. Exceeding even the figures predicted by the most optimistic financial analysts, the automobile company had earnings in the first quarter that more than doubled the previous quarter.

- A. company had earnings in the first quarter that more than doubled
- B. company earned more than double in the first quarter what they were in
- C. company had first quarter earnings that more than doubled those in
- D. company's earnings in the first quarter were more than double
- E. company's earnings in the first quarter were more than double those of

Between D and E, the only difference is "those of" at the end of E (absent from D). So you ask yourself "what is being compared here?" The earnings in one quarter to the earnings in another quarter. The earnings to the earnings. So I have to mention both sets of earnings, even if I use some sort of pronoun or other referent the second time (which is what the test usually does).

D says the "earnings were more than double the quarter" - that's not the right comparison.

E says the "earnings were more than double the (other) earnings" - that's the right comparison.

In the other example you gave, you've got "earnings in X were two times more than in Y" - that one's okay because I've got something in the second part that refers to the first part: parallelism indicates earnings in X were more than (earnings) in Y.

You can't use the same reasoning for this problem. Try it: D would read the "earnings in the first quarter were more than double (earnings) the previous quarter. Where's the "in"?

A: yes, this says "doubled the previous quarter" - what doubled? The only noun in that half of the comparison is quarter, and the quarter itself doesn't double - that doesn't make sense.

B: Technically, were only needs to match they, so were is okay because they is plural. But they has to match company and it doesn't.

C: I assume that it's supposed to say "earnings" and "earning" is just a typo. But, if not, earning (without the s) is wrong. We have to match the opening part of the sentence (non-underlined portion). It says "exceeding even the figures predicted" - what would exceed some figures? Other figures? A company doesn't exceed figures - the company's *earnings* exceed figures. A, B, and C are all wrong for this reason.

You should note that, wherever they start and end the underline, you'll have at least one difference in the answer choices. So glance down there and see the 2-way split: company or company's. That's your clue to go look for whether you want the subject to be company or earnings... and in this case we want earnings.

Another problem with c

c) company had first quarter earnings that more than doubled those in

here those will refer to "first quarter earnings" n then sentence would be:

company had first quarter earnings that more than doubled "first quarter earning" in the previous quarter.

by contrast, you CAN cherry-pick (e), because there are parallel structures:

noun/pronoun + preposition + quarter

(earnings + in + the first quarter)

(those + of + the previous quarter)

--

is this really a GMATPREP problem? i'm a bit surprised that a real, official problem wouldn't use "in" both times.

but yes, (e) is definitely the best answer here.

75. Sunspots, vortices of gas associated with strong electromagnetic activity, are visible as dark spots on the surface of the Sun but have never been sighted on the Sun's poles or equator.

- A. are visible as dark spots on the surface of the Sun but have never been sighted on
- B. are visible as dark spots that never have been sighted on the surface of the Sun
- C. appear on the surface of the Sun as dark spots although never sighted at
- D. appear as dark spots on the surface of the Sun, although never having been sighted at
- E. appear as dark spots on the Sun's surface, which have never been sighted on

THIS is about meaning clarity. This sentence wants to show CONTRAST: Something is visible at one place but not at some other place.

A. CORRECT. Perfect parallelism (Sunspots ... are visible ... BUT ... have never been sighted). Also "**ON** the surface and sighted **ON** are both right here. Sighted **AT** the surface will indicate that someone who saw these was present at the surface of the sun.

B. "never have been sighted" should be "have never been sighted". Also, B is such a meaning distortion. Both "visible and "never been sighted" cannot be true for the same **DARK SPOTS**. If you read the non underlined portion, this choice will read... sighted on the surface of the Sun the Sun's poles or equator. COULDN'T be worse.

C. Clear lack of parallelism (Sunspots ... appear (VERB) ... ALTHOUGH ... never sighted (PARTICIPLE ADJECTIVE)). 'Sighted AT' is definitely not the intended meaning. "Although" usually introduces a subordinate clause... must have a subject and a verb. We don't have a subject for the word 'although' here... and 'never sighted' is not a verb. This is a participle (acts as an adjective / modifier).

Also, appear can have one more meaning: that they are not permanently there. Imagine the sentence: "He appeared on the stage". OR "The comet appears once a month".

D. Clear lack of parallelism (Sunspots ... appear ALTHOUGH never having been sighted at...). 'Sighted AT' is definitely not the intended meaning. Also, appear can have one more meaning: that they are not permanently there. Imagine the sentence: "He appeared on the stage". OR "The comet appears once a month".

"Although" usually introduces a subordinate clause... must have a subject and a verb. We don't have a subject for the word 'although' here... and 'having been sighted' is not a verb. This is a participle (acts as an adjective / modifier)

E. No CONTRAST shown here. Possessive forms are best avoided. The referent for the word 'which' is ambiguous.

The correct parallel structure in the original sentence emphasizes the contrast between where sunspots are found (*are visible ... Sun*) and where they are not (*have never been sighted ... equator*). *Sunspots* is the subject of the sentence; *are* is the verb of the first part of the contrast, and *have been sighted* is the verb of the second. (The adjective *visible* is a complement and is parallel to the past participle *sighted*.) Both parts of the sentence conclude with phrases indicating location. The contrast itself is indicated by the conjunction *but*.

A. Correct. This sentence clearly and correctly draws a contrast between where sunspots are found and where they are not.

B The modifying clause *that never ... Sun* distorts the meaning of the sentence; also, without punctuation, the phrase *on the surface of the Sun the Sun's poles or equator* is ungrammatical and makes no sense.

C *Although* typically introduces a subordinate clause, which has a subject and a verb, but here there is no subject and *sighted* is not a complete verb.

D *Although* usually introduces a subordinate clause, but there is no subject of the clause and *having been sighted* is not a complete verb phrase.

E This phrasing makes the sentence somewhat awkward and unclear.

76. Nikola Tesla, the inventor of alternating current, because he was excited with the prospects of harnessing Niagara Falls for producing electric power, he predicted in the mid-1890's that electricity generated at Niagara would one day power the streetcars of London and the streetlights of Paris.

- A. Nikola Tesla, the inventor of alternating current, because he was excited with the prospects of harnessing Niagara Falls for producing electric power, he
- B. The prospects of harnessing Niagara Falls to produce electric power was exciting to Nikola Tesla, the inventor of alternating current, and so he
- C. Excited about the prospects of harnessing Niagara Falls to produce electric power, Nikola Tesla, the inventor of alternating current,
- D. Nikola Tesla, the inventor of alternating current, excited about the prospects of harnessing Niagara Falls for the production of electric power and
- E. The inventor of alternating current, excited with the prospects of harnessing Niagara Falls for producing of electric power, Nikola Tesla

A: "because he was excited" has a wrong placement... HE is also wrong

B: prospects WAS exciting... wrong... AND SO is wrong

D, E: no parallelism (excited is participle adjective and predicted is verb ... the use of AND forces parallelism)

77. New hardy varieties of rice show promise of producing high yields without the costly requirements of irrigation and application of commercial fertilizer by earlier high-yielding varieties.

- A. requirements of irrigation and application of commercial fertilizer by earlier high-yielding varieties
- B. requirements by earlier high-yielding varieties of application of commercial fertilizer and irrigation
- C. requirements of application of commercial fertilizer and irrigation of earlier high-yielding varieties
- D. application of commercial fertilizer and irrigation that was required by earlier high-yielding varieties
- E. irrigation and application of commercial fertilizer that were required by earlier high-yielding varieties

The key is that the underlined phrase needs to reference both activities -- irrigation AND application. Hence, a compound subject requires use of a plural noun -- which draws us to 'were' instead of 'was.' "D" is incorrect, b/c it uses a singular verb "was" even though we're referring to multiple items.

E is the answer choice that best fixes this issue.

"without costly X" - that X should be whatever is costly, in this case irrigation and application of fertilizer. Putting "requirements" next breaks the flow of this statement. Eliminate A, B, C.

D says "application... and irrigation that was" - this should be plural (compound subject)

E correctly puts irrigation and application after costly and also correctly uses "were" to refer to the compound subject.

78. From studies of the bony house of the brain, which is the cranium, located in the back of the skull, come what scientists know about dinosaur brains.

- A. From studies of the bony house of the brain, which is the cranium, located in the back of the skull, come what scientists know about dinosaur brains.
- B. The knowledge that scientists know about dinosaur brains comes from studies of the bony house of the brain, located in the back of the skull, that is, the cranium.
- C. The knowledge of dinosaur brains that scientists have come from studies of the bony house of the brain, which is located in the back of the skull and is called the cranium.
- D. What scientists know about dinosaur brains comes from studies of the cranium, the bony house of the brain located in the back of the skull.
- E. Located in the back of the skull is the cranium, the bony house of the brain, and it is from studies of this that scientists know what they know about dinosaur brains.

A: SVA – COMES not come... what scientists know is singular... comes ... singular

B: knowledge and know... wrong...

C: knowledge COMES, not COME

E: KNOW and KNOW... wrong

79. Hans Christian Andersen wrote fairy tales, which have been some of the most frequently translated works in literary history, while he wrote plays, novels, poems, and travel books, as well as several autobiographies, which remained almost unknown outside his native Denmark.

- A. Hans Christian Andersen wrote fairy tales, which have been some of the most frequently translated works in literary history, while he wrote plays, novels, poems, and travel books, as well as several autobiographies, which remained
- B. Hans Christian Andersen wrote fairy tales, which, while among the most frequently translated works in literary history, his plays, novels, poems, and travel books, as well as several autobiographies remain
- C. Even as Hans Christian Andersen's fairy tales have been among the most frequently translated works in literary history, still his plays, novels, poems, and travel books, as well as several autobiographies, remain
- D. Unlike the fairy tales written by Hans Christian Andersen, which are some of the most frequently translated works in literary history, he wrote plays, novels, poems, and travel books, as well as several autobiographies, which remained
- E. Although Hans Christian Andersen wrote fairy tales that are among the most frequently translated works in literary history, his plays, novels, poems, and travel books, as well as several autobiographies, remain

A, B: 'which' denotes non-essential modifier... wrong here... also, 'while' is surely wrong. Again, the second 'which' in A is wrong.

C: still is WRONG

D: UNLIKE fairy tales ... he... fairy tales are compared with HE

C:

well, "still" is in an awkward position - it should come before the verb - but the real problem lies in the unidiomatic use of "even as".

"even as" is a transition used to imply *simultaneity*, and is usually used with *parallel tenses* (i.e., same tense in both parts of the parallel structure).

here's an example

even as his income has increased, joe has continued to feel less and less satisfied with his life

(C) Even as Hans Christian Andersen's fairy tales have been among the most frequently translated works in literary history, still his plays, novels, poems, and travel books, as well as several autobiographies, remain

(E) Although Hans Christian Andersen wrote fairy tales that are among the most frequently translated works in literary history, his plays, novels, poems, and travel books, as well as several autobiographies, remain

* first, the tenses should be parallel, since the descriptions are meant to be simultaneous.

* second, they should be the present tense, since the sentence is stating facts that are statistical truths.

choice (a) contains two modifiers blocked off by "comma + WHICH". these are *nonessential* modifiers, meaning that the sentence must still be sensible even if they are removed. let's try that and see what happens to choice a.

(A) Hans Christian Andersen wrote fairy tales, which have been some of the most frequently translated works in literary history, while he wrote plays, novels, poems, and travel books, as well as several autobiographies, which remained....

note that the nonessential modifiers have been colored yellow in the above text, rendering them effectively invisible. if we read the text that remains, we find that it doesn't fit the required context for the use of "while".

in particular:

"while" should be used in one of two circumstances: (1) if the first act takes place **during** the second act, or (2) if there is some sort of **contrast** between the two acts. since neither of the above applies to choice a, it is inappropriate to use "while" in that case.

by contrast, note that the two main acts contrasted in choice (c) *do* possess the contrast required for the use of "even as".

80. The Environmental Protection Agency's proposal to place restrictions on both diesel fuel and diesel engines has sparked a counterattack by the oil industry, saying that the move will exacerbate the nation's fuel supply problems.

- A. on both diesel fuel and diesel engines has sparked a counterattack by the oil industry, saying
- B. on both diesel fuel and engines have sparked the oil industry to counterattack, and they say
- C. on both diesel fuel and diesel engines has sparked a counterattack by the oil industry, which says
- D. both on diesel fuel and engines has sparked the oil industry to a counterattack, saying
- E. both on diesel fuel and diesel engines have sparked the oil industry to counterattack, and it says

Both X and Y...

Proposal HAS

Eliminate B, D, E

ING modifiers modify the entire clause... so eliminate A.

choice (a) uses a COMMA + -ING modifier -- a very common construction -- and uses it incorrectly.

the short version:

COMMA + -ING modifiers modify the ENTIRE PRECEDING CLAUSE (including the subject of that clause).

the long version:

see here

post30766.html#p30766

...so, according to this COMMA + ING modifier, it is actually "The Environmental Protection Agency's proposal" that is "saying that the move will exacerbate the nation's fuel supply problems", while (or because of) sparking a counterattack by the oil industry.

that doesn't make sense.

--

re: (c)

actually, "which" should indeed refer to the oil industry, because the oil industry is saying that the proposal will exacerbate the nation's fuel supply problems.

this is a *response* to the proposal, not the content of the proposal itself.

so, "which" is used totally correctly here.

81. With surface temperatures estimated at minus 230 degrees Fahrenheit, Jupiter's moon Europa has long been considered far too cold to support life, and with 60 square miles of water thought to be frozen from top to bottom.

- A. Europa has long been considered far too cold to support life, and with
- B. **Europa has long been considered far too cold to support life, its**
- C. Europa has long been considered as far too cold to support life and has
- D. Europa, long considered as far too cold to support life, and its
- E. Europa, long considered to be far too cold to support life, and to have

(a)

"and with ..." isn't parallel to anything.

AND sets up parallelism, so there must be something to which "with..." can be parallel (other prepositional phrase, or other adverbial modifier). there is no such thing.

(b)

correct.

this is a type of modifier with which you should be familiar. (i have no idea what it's called - sorry)

here's another example:

*john, **his arms flailing in the wind**, called out desperately for help.*

note that **the presence of frozen water SUPPORTS the claim that europa is "far too cold to support life", so it should be a MODIFIER.**

this is done here.

it's inappropriate to place these two things in parallel with AND.

(c)

AND is rhetorically inappropriate (see above).

"considered as" is unidiomatic here.

(d)

this is not a sentence. (the clause before "and" doesn't have a verb; "considered" is a participle, not a verb, here)

"considered as" is unidiomatic here.

(e)

i don't think "considered to be" is wrong, although it's wordier than just "considered..."

this sentence has no verb at all! the only verb forms present are participles and infinitives, none of which is eligible to be the main verb of the sentence.

82. Sound can travel through water for enormous distances, prevented from dissipating its acoustic energy as a result of boundaries in the ocean created by water layers of different temperatures and densities.

- A. prevented from dissipating its acoustic energy as a result of
- B. prevented from having its acoustic energy dissipated by
- C. **its acoustic energy prevented from dissipating by**
- D. its acoustic energy prevented from being dissipated as a result of
- E. preventing its acoustic energy from dissipating by

ABSOLUTE PHRASE CONSTRUCTION... similar to the above problem.

* take a look at this problem (along with its OA). take a look at the other problem.

* **note, and memorize, the pattern of each correct answer.**

* try to **create your own sentences with the same structure**, to reinforce your knowledge.

e.g.

*joe ran after the bus, **his arms flailing wildly as he attempted to capture the driver's attention**.*

83. Margaret Courtney-Clarke has traveled to remote dwellings in the Transvaal to photograph the art of Ndebele women, whose murals are brilliantly colored, their geometrical symmetries embellished with old and new iconography and in a style that varies from woman to woman and house to house.

- A. whose murals are brilliantly colored, their geometrical symmetries embellished with old and new iconography and in a style that varies from woman to woman and house to house
- B. whose murals are brilliantly colored, their geometrical symmetries are embellished with old and new iconography, and their style is varying among women and houses
- C. whose murals are brilliantly colored, their geometrical symmetries are embellished with old and new iconography, and they are in styles that vary from woman to woman and house to house

- D. with murals brilliantly colored, their geometrical symmetries embellished with old and new iconography, and their style varies among women and houses
- E. with murals that are brilliantly colored, their geometrical symmetries embellished with old and new iconography, and their styles vary among women and houses

One of the most difficult problems:

Here parallelism cannot be applied... 'whose' refers to women... 'their' refers to murals... SO 'are colored' and 'are embellished' can never be parallel as there are 2 different subjects... so B and C are out...

D ...
with murals brilliantly colored (**PHRASE**), their geometrical symmetries embellished with old and new iconography (**PHRASE**), and their style varies among women and houses (**CLAUSE**)... **not parallel**

E.
with murals that are brilliantly colored (**CLAUSE**) , their geometrical symmetries embellished with old and new iconography (**PHRASE**), and their styles vary among women and houses (**CLAUSE**) ... **not parallel**.

A uses Absolute phrase concept correctly...

- 84.** At the annual stockholders meeting, investors heard a presentation on the numerous challenges facing the company, including among them the threat from a rival's multibillion-dollar patent-infringement suit and the declining sales for the company's powerful microprocessor chip.
- A. including among them the threat from a rival's multibillion-dollar patent-infringement suit and the declining sales for
 - B. which includes the threat of a rival's multibillion-dollar patent-infringement suit and declining sales of
 - C. included among these the threat from a rival's multibillion-dollar patent-infringement suit as well as a decline in sales for
 - D. among them the threat of a rival's multibillion-dollar patent-infringement suit and the decline in sales of
 - E. among these the threat from a rival's multibillion-dollar patent-infringement suit as well as the decline in sales for

Decline in sales OF... elim A, C, E

B... which refers to challenges... so the verb cannot be 'includes'...Ans. D

- 85.** Now that so much data travels via light—i.e., is carried in glass fibers rather than by electrical current—one goal of semiconductor research is to develop a silicon chip that can transmit and receive light signals directly, a development that may one day lead to smaller, faster semiconductors.
- A. to develop a silicon chip that can transmit and receive light signals directly, a development that may one day lead
 - B. to develop a silicon chip with the capability of transmitting and receiving light signals directly, which may one day lead
 - C. the development of a silicon chip that has the capability of transmitting and receiving light signals directly, a development maybe one day leading
 - D. developing a silicon chip that can transmit and receive light signals directly, which may one day lead
 - E. developing a silicon chip with the ability to transmit and receive light signals directly, with this development maybe one day leading

GOAL is TO DEVELOP (intention)...

A also has Abstract noun ... always better than pronoun. Also, 'can' is always better than ability, able, capable, and capability.

- 86.** At the time of the Mexican agrarian revolution, the most radical faction, that of Zapata and his followers, proposed a return to communal ownership of land, to what had been a pre-Columbian form of ownership respected by the Spaniards.
- A. land, to what had been a pre-Columbian form of ownership respected by the Spaniards
 - B. land, a form of ownership of the pre-Columbians and respected by the Spaniards
 - C. land, respected by the Spaniards and a pre-Columbian form of ownership
 - D. land in which a pre-Columbian form of ownership was respected by the Spaniards
 - E. land that had been a pre-Columbian form of ownership respected by the Spaniards

This must be called a very difficult question... possibly one of the 10 most difficult questions that have ever been asked on the GMAT.

B: AND respected... there is nothing parallel to respected (adjective) in the previous part of the sentence. There must be another adjective to make it parallel.

C: 'respected' is an adjective... 'pre-Columbian form of ownership' is noun... not parallel.

D: We need to define 'communal ownership' here... definitely not the right answer...

**E: We need to define 'communal ownership' here... definitely not the right answer...
THAT can refer to return or to ownership or to land...
This is the difficult part...**

"At the time of the Mexican agrarian revolution, the most radical faction, that of Zapata and his followers, proposed a return to communal ownership of land"... if this is a complete sentence (in this case, it is), the other part of the sentence has to use a comma or a semicolon to define the first part... the second part is a filler (at best a description / an elaboration) of the first part... So option E cannot be the correct answer.

This question tests "appositive modifier"... something very difficult to notice here.

At the time of the Mexican agrarian revolution, the most radical faction, that of Zapata and his followers, proposed a return **to X (communal ownership of land), to AN ELABORATION of X (what had been a pre-Columbian form of ownership)** respected by the Spaniards.

This may sound very jarring... **Please read "appositives", "absolute phrases" and "abstract nouns for a clause"...**

The only way to make sure that "pre-Columbian form of ownership" parallel to "communal form of ownership" is to introduce a TO before communal **ownership of land... this will make it absolutely un-ambiguous.**

87. The computer company has announced that it will purchase the color-printing division of a rival company for \$950 million, which is part of a deal that will make it the largest manufacturer in the office color-printing market.

- A. million, which is part of a deal that will make
- B. million, a part of a deal that makes
- C. million, part of a deal making
- D. million as a part of a deal to make
- E. million as part of a deal that will make**

"Announced" means that the effect will take in future... so we need 'will'...

The use of 'which' is wrong here as 'which' refers to 950 million.

Ans. E

if you wanted to modify just the preceding noun, you'd use the following type of structure:

*three days ago he received a payment for \$1000, **part of** the long-overdue pension that had been delayed for various bureaucratic reasons.*

if you use the infinitive "to make", then the computer company is still the subject of the sentence. therefore, in this case you have to use the *reflexive pronoun*: **itself**. as an analogy, i can't look at me in the mirror, but i can look at *myself* in the mirror. same deal.

in choice (e), "...that will make..." shifts the role of subject to *deal*, so a reflexive pronoun is no longer needed. in fact, the reflexive pronoun would be absurd in this case, since a deal obviously can't make itself the largest manufacturer in the market.

when you have *noun* modifiers like these - called *appositives*, if you happen to care about terminology - they must tag the immediately preceding noun (in the same manner as would a modifier with a comma followed by "which", for example).
see [here](#).

according to this rule, then, choices (b) and (c) both declare that the actual amount of \$950 million is "(a) part of a deal..."

that's incorrect; it's the *purchase / acquisition* of the rival company's color printing division that's part of the deal. therefore, this is a misplaced modifier.

88. The number of people flying first class on domestic flights rose sharply in 1990, doubling the increase of the previous year.

- A. doubling the increase of**
- B. doubling that of the increase in
- C. double as much as the increase of

- D. twice as many as the increase in
- E. twice as many as the increase of

CAUSE and EFFECT... ING... so A, B remain. B is wrong as 'that of' doesn't have any antecedent.

you can't use "..., twice as many as...", because that's an appositive modifier. appositives must modify some noun that comes IMMEDIATELY before the comma, which in this case would have to be whatever figure is twice whatever other figure. since no such figure is given, you can't use this construction.

so, A, B or C

by contrast, the -ING FOLLOWED BY A COMMA modifies the entire action of the preceding clause. this is exactly what you want to happen, because the actual rising of the # of people flying first class is what "doubled the increase of...". there's no noun in there that pinpoints this concept, so you have to use a modifier that modifies the entire clause.

"the increase *in* X" means that X itself has increased. therefore, "the increase *in* the previous year" doesn't make sense, because the implication would be that the previous year itself had increased (what would that possibly mean?).

"the increase *of* TIME PERIOD", by contrast, means exactly what it should mean in this particular instance.

Also if B were "Doubling that of", will it be correct?

no.

if you did that, then there's no noun for which "that" can stand. you're trying to make "that" stand for "increase", but, unfortunately, "increase" isn't there.

nope. ironically, *this* is the adverbial modifier.

COMMA + -ING is ALWAYS an adverbial modifier, and ALWAYS modifies the entirety of the preceding clause (whether you want it to or not!)

in this case, that's precisely what we want to do, so this is the winner.

--

by the way, you can strike (d) and (e) without even seeing the prompt.

as soon as you see "twice as many as the increase...", these choices are automatically incorrect (since "increase" is not a countable quantity).

In B, what does "that of" refer to?

it doesn't refer to anything. that's one of the wrong answers!

in fact, you have probably happened upon the most salient reason why that choice is wrong.

89. According to surveys by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, about 20 percent of young adults used cocaine in 1979, doubling those reported in the 1977 survey.

- A. doubling those reported in the 1977 survey
- B. to double the number the 1977 survey reported
- C. twice those the 1977 survey reported
- D. twice as much as those reported in the 1977 survey
- E. twice the number reported in the 1977 survey

(C) twice those the 1977 survey reported

'Those' refers to 'young men'. You cannot have 'twice young men'. You have 'twice the number of young men'.

Twice is always used for comparison.

For example,

USA has roughly twice as many people as India (does)

However, the "in" split between C and E is significant for another reason:

(C) "...the 1979 survey reported..." makes the survey the subject of the verb reported. There's a logical flaw--surveys don't report. People can report, using survey data.

(E) "...reported (by someone) in the 1977 survey..."

90. The loan company announced it would soon lend money to borrowers with proven records of their not paying back their loans on time, collectively known as the subprime lending market.

- A. of their not paying back their loans on time,
- B. of not paying back their loans on time, a group
- C. of not paying back their loans on time, with such a group
- D. that they do not pay back their loans on time,
- E. that they do not pay back their loans on time, such a group

(d) and (e) are unidiomatic; you can't write "proven records that they..."

the pronoun is technically ambiguous, but, as the same ambiguity is present in *all five* of the answer choices (all of which contain "their", which has the same antecedent problems as "they"), you can safely ignore that ambiguity.

if you substitute "such a group" for "a group", then that's incorrect, because "such" wouldn't be referring to anything.

Placing a noun after a comma (or in this case an article - "a" - and then a noun), followed by a modifier of that noun, is a great way to describe an idea from the preceding clause. This structure is known as an absolute phrase.

Example:

The scientists discovered whale-fish bones in the Arctic, findings that prove the existence of whale-fish.

By placing a comma and then the word "findings," we are describing the discoveries. This same structure is used in the sentence above to describe the group. This is very handy when you want to describe something from earlier in the sentence but cannot simply start a modifier due to placement issues.

91. Because she knew many of the leaders of colonial America and the American Revolution personally, Mercy Otis Warren was continually at or near the center of political events from 1765 to 1789, a vantage point combining with her talent for writing to make her one of the most valuable historians of the era

- A. a vantage point combining with her talent for writing to make
- B. a vantage point, when combined with her talent for writing, that made
- C. a vantage point that combined with her talent for writing, and it made
- D. and this vantage point, which combined with her talent for writing to make
- E. and this vantage point, combined with her talent for writing, made

the noun modifier 'a vantage point' can stand for the entire concept of *at or near the center of political events from 1765 to 1789*. the gmat is surprisingly flexible with the use of noun modifiers; check out the correct answer to #79 in the verbal (purple) OG for another example. (i'm not allowed to reproduce that example here, so go look it up.)

you are thinking of the rule for RELATIVE PRONOUNS ('which', 'who', and the like) following a comma. that rule does indeed specify that the relative pronoun must refer to whatever follows the comma - but that rule does **not** apply to noun modifiers.

actually, in choice b, 'when' doesn't refer to anything - there's no time period to which it could logically refer - and that's the main issue with choice b. (if you interpret it literally, as you must, then it implies that (1) sometimes the vantage point was combined with the writing and sometimes it wasn't, and (2) it only made her valuable when it *was* combined with the writing talent. that doesn't make sense.)

you shouldn't have a comma before "that". **however, if the comma BELONGS TO A MODIFIER, then it can be fine.**

for instance:

this is the book that i bought at the store --> correct.

this is the book, that i bought at the store --> wrong.

this is the book, recommended to me by my brother, that i bought at the store --> correct. in this case, the commas

belong to the modifier; if you remove the modifier, the underlying structure of the sentence is like the first one (i.e., without the comma).

92. A group of paleontologists recently announced that a site in Utah has yielded fossils of some of the biggest armored dinosaurs ever found, and that they were at least 25 million years older than any similar dinosaur type previously found in North America.

- A. and that they were at least 25 million years older than any similar dinosaur type previously
- B. and they are at least 25 million years older than those of any similar dinosaur type that previously was
- C. and the fossils are at least 25 million years older than any similar dinosaur types that previously were
- D. fossils that are at least 25 million years older than those of any similar dinosaur type previously
- E. fossils at least 25 million years older than similar dinosaur types previously

B, C, and E are out because of wrong comparison of fossils with dinosaur types.

In A, 2 errors:

- 1. use of third person pronoun 'they' is ambiguous - fossils or dinosaurs.
- 2. They announced that X and that Y - latter that is missing in A

compare fossils with fossils..

fossils that are at least 25 million years older than **those of** any similar dinosaur type previously

In this question, two "splits" provide insight into the grammatical issues under consideration. First, the original sentence and answer choice B use the ambiguous pronoun "they," which can refer either to fossils (correctly) or to paleontologists or dinosaurs (incorrectly). Once choices A and B are eliminated, the remaining choices test parallel structure by focusing on similar comparison terms. Answer choices C and E incorrectly compare fossils to *dinosaur types*; however, the sentence must compare fossils to fossils rather than fossils to dinosaurs. Answer choice D, the credited answer, corrects this comparison by including the pronoun *those* to explicitly refer to fossils.

93. Women are expected to be the majority of student entering law school this fall, a trend ultimately placing more women in leadership position in politics and business.

- A. Women are expected to be the majority of student entering law school this fall, a trend ultimately placing
- B. The majority of students entering law school this fall are expected to be women, a trend that will ultimately place
- C. The majority of students entering law school this fall are expected to be women, which will ultimately place
- D. It is expected that the majority of students entering law school this fall will be women, a trend ultimately placing
- E. It is expected for the women to be the majority of students entering law school this fall, which will ultimately place

well, b is the correct answer, so there you have it: 'majority' is considered plural, at least when it refers to the majority of **countable** items/entities (like women).

notice that this isn't an issue in this particular problem (there are no choices using 'majority' in the singular), but take note (for future problems) that the plural is acceptable usage here.

by the way, make sure you copy problems correctly (you've rewritten several plural nouns as singular, without the -s on the end).

a is wrong because of the participle 'placing', which wrongly indicates that this trend is *already* placing more women in leadership positions.

c is wrong because the relative pronoun 'which' is placed in a position where it must refer to 'women'. this is wrong for 2 different reasons: (a) 'which' can't refer to people, and (b) according to the sentence, women don't place themselves in leadership positions; the trend does.

choice d has the same problem as choice a (the participle 'placing' is used in the same incorrect manner).

the error in choice e is very similar to that in choice c: the pronoun 'which' is used incorrectly again. the noun closest to this relative pronoun - 'this fall' - makes no sense in context.

the second part is not an independent clause. try reading it by itself; it's not a sentence (a trend THAT will ultimately...)

this second part is an example of an **appositive noun modifier**, a type of modifier that NEVER appears in spoken language but that appears on the gmat a lot. the reason is that, unlike relative pronouns such as 'which', these modifiers *don't have to touch their referent*.

for instance:

*the general tried to get his troops to retreat before being surrounded, **a strategy** that ultimately failed.*

same idea here.

lots of students don't like this structure at all when they first see it, but you have to get used to it - it's commonplace on the exam.

good point.

if you have an appositive modifier that's an **abstract noun** - such as "strategy", "figure", "statistic", "findings", "situation", "change", "difference", etc. - then such an appositive may be allowed to describe the **entire situation described in the previous clause**.

for instance, the example i gave above with "a strategy..."

also, for further examples, see #59 and #79 in the purple verbal supplement OG book.

in #79 this modifier is part of the underline and is useful in choosing the correct answer. in #59 it's not part of the underline, so you don't have to use it, but you're exposed to it so that you can use it later.

hmm.

"placing" is an -ING modifier.

-ING modifiers don't have a tense. they automatically adopt the tense of the clause to which they're attached.

in choice (d), this is illogical: the sentence means that the trend is "placing" the women in these positions *right now* (since the main clause is in the present).

this is not the intended meaning. the intended meaning is that the trend will place the women in these positions in the future, not now. therefore, you want a future-tense verb.

you also DON'T want parallelism, since these ideas are not parallel.

94. Soaring television costs accounted for more than half the spending in the presidential campaign of 1992, a greater proportion than it was in any previous election.
- A. a greater proportion than it was B. a greater proportion than C. a greater proportion than they have been
D. which is greater than was so E. which is greater than it has been

'which' does not have a logical reference so we prefer the noun... a greater proportion
In A, there is no logical reference for IT so B

95. According to some analysts, the gains in the stock market reflect growing confidence that the economy will avoid the recession that many had feared earlier in the year and instead come in for a "soft landing," followed by a gradual increase in business activity.
- A. that the economy will avoid the recession that many had feared earlier in the year and instead come
B. in the economy to avoid the recession, what many feared earlier in the year, rather to come
C. in the economy's ability to avoid the recession, something earlier in the year many had feared, and instead to come
D. in the economy to avoid the recession many were fearing earlier in the year, and rather to come
E. that the economy will avoid the recession that was feared earlier this year by many, with it instead coming

The original sentence successfully avoids the problems that may occur in a long sentence with multiple modifiers. Two subordinate clauses begin with *that*, and one of them is contained within another. *That many had feared earlier in the year* clearly defines *the recession*. *That the economy will avoid ... and instead (will understood) come...* is the subordinate clause that follows the main clause; its subject, *economy*, is followed by two parallel verbs, *will avoid* and (will understood) *come*. *Instead* before the second verb properly indicates contrast.

A Correct. This sentence contains two correct subordinate clauses introduced by *that*.

B *What* cannot replace *that*; *the economy to avoid the recession* is awkward and unclear; *rather to come* does not complete the second part of the sentence idiomatically.

C *Earlier in the year* should follow *many had feared*, rather than preceding it; *instead to come* does not complete the second part of the sentence idiomatically.

D *The recession* must be followed by *that*; *were fearing* is the wrong tense; *rather to come* does not complete the second part of the sentence idiomatically.

E The passive voice construction *that was feared ...* is weak and wordy; *with it instead coming* is awkward, wordy, and ungrammatical.

The correct answer is A.

96. To Josephine Baker, Paris was her home long before it was fashionable to be an expatriate, and she remained in France during the Second World War as a performer and an intelligence agent for the Resistance.
- A. To Josephine Baker, Paris was her home long before it was fashionable to be an expatriate,
B. For Josephine Baker, long before it was fashionable to be an expatriate, Paris was her home,
C. Josephine Baker made Paris her home long before to be an expatriate was fashionable,
D. Long before it was fashionable to be an expatriate, Josephine Baker made Paris her home,
E. Long before it was fashionable being an expatriate, Paris was home to Josephine Baker,

This is a compound sentence (consisting of two independent clauses joined by the coordinating conjunction *and*) would be most clearly expressed if Josephine Baker were the subject of the first

clause since *she* is the subject of the second clause: *Josephine Baker made Paris her home* would clearly parallel *she remained in France*. The adverb clause *long ... expatriate* is best placed before the main clause.

A *To Josephine Baker ... her* is redundant and awkward; the subject of the first main clause is *Paris* rather than *Baker*.

B *For Josephine Baker ... her* is redundant and awkward; putting two introductory elements together before the main clause is awkward.

C Inversion of the expected word order in *to be an expatriate was unfashionable* is awkward.

D Correct. The clearest, most economical order for this sentence is to put the adverb clause first, and make *Baker* the subject of the first main clause, parallel to *she* in the second.

E *Being* is awkward; *Baker* should be the subject of the first main clause, parallel to *she* in the second main clause.

The correct answer is D.

97. The nineteenth-century chemist Humphry Davy presented the results of his early experiments in his "Essay on Heat and Light," a critique of all chemistry since Robert Boyle as well as a vision of a new chemistry that Davy hoped to found.

A. a critique of all chemistry since Robert Boyle as well as a vision of a

B. a critique of all chemistry following Robert Boyle and also his envisioning of a

C. a critique of all chemistry after Robert Boyle and envisioning as well

D. critiquing all chemistry from Robert Boyle forward and also a vision of

E. critiquing all the chemistry done since Robert Boyle as well as his own envisioning of

The main objective of the sentence is to describe "Essay on Heat and Light" as Davy's presentation of his own experiments and to further explain that the essay served as both a critique of previous chemistry and a vision of a new kind of chemistry.

The clearest, most effective form for providing this explanation of the essay's function is to make *critique* and *vision* both appositives of "Essay on Heat and Light," and to present them in a parallel structure.

A Correct. The phrases describing the essay's function are presented in parallel form.

B *Critique* and *his envisioning* are not parallel; the phrase *and also his envisioning* is unnecessarily wordy; it is also unclear to whom *his* refers.

C The two descriptors are not parallel.

D The two descriptors are not parallel.

E The meaning is confused in the assertion that Davy critiqued his own vision of chemistry.

The correct answer is A.

98. One of the primary distinctions between our intelligence with that of other primates may lay not so much in any specific skill but in our ability to extend knowledge gained in one context to new and different ones.

A. between our intelligence with that of other primates may lay not so much in any specific skill but

B. between our intelligence with that of other primates may lie not so much in any specific skill but instead

C. between our intelligence and that of other primates may lie not so much in any specific skill as

- D. our intelligence has from that of other primates may lie not in any specific skill as
- E. of our intelligence to that of other primates may lay not in any specific skill but

When using the term *distinction* to indicate difference, the correct preposition to use is *between*. In this sentence, the distinction *may lie* in a certain ability that humans do not share with other primates. The verb *may lay* is transitive, requiring a direct object.

A *With* is the incorrect comparative term to follow *distinctions between*; *lay* is the incorrect verb.

B *With* is the incorrect comparative term to follow *distinctions between*.

C Correct. The preposition *between* and the intransitive verb *may lie* are correct in this sentence.

D *From* is the incorrect preposition to use with *distinction*; without *so much*, which is used in C, *as* seems to introduce a comparison for *specific skill* rather than a distinction.

E *Of* is the incorrect preposition to use with *distinction*, and *to* is an incorrect comparative term; *lay* is the incorrect verb.

The correct answer is C.

99. Originally developed for detecting air pollutants, a technique called proton-induced X-ray emission, which can quickly analyze the chemical elements in almost any substance without destroying it, is finding uses in medicine, archaeology, and criminology.

- A. Originally developed for detecting air pollutants, a technique called proton-induced X-ray emission, which can quickly analyze the chemical elements in almost any substance without destroying it,
- B. Originally developed for detecting air pollutants, having the ability to analyze the chemical elements in almost any substance without destroying it, a technique called proton-induced X-ray emission
- C. A technique originally developed for detecting air pollutants, called proton-induced X-ray emission, which can quickly analyze the chemical elements in almost any substance without destroying it,
- D. A technique originally developed for detecting air pollutants, called proton-induced X-ray emission, which has the ability to analyze the chemical elements in almost any substance quickly and without destroying it,
- E. A technique that was originally developed for detecting air pollutants and has the ability to analyze the chemical elements in almost any substance quickly and without destroying the substance, called proton-induced X-ray emission,

The original sentence successfully avoids the problems that may occur in a long sentence with multiple modifiers. The sentence opens with the modifier *originally developed for detecting air pollutants*. This participial phrase is immediately followed by the word *technique* that it modifies; *technique* is in turn followed by the phrase *called proton-induced X-ray emission*. Finally, the nonrestrictive clause *which ... destroying it* is correctly placed next to *emission* and set off from the rest of the sentence by a pair of commas.

A Correct. The modifiers are all correctly placed and punctuated; the meaning is clear.

B Placement of two long modifiers at the beginning of the sentence is awkward and makes it difficult to locate the subject; second modifier (*having...*) actually modifies the first modifier.

C *Called proton-induced X-ray emission* should be placed next to *a technique* and should not be set off by commas; relative clause

introduced by *which* incorrectly and illogically modifies *emission*.

D *Called proton-induced X-ray emission* should be placed next to *a technique* and should not be set off by commas; relative clause introduced by *which* incorrectly and illogically modifies *emission*; *has the ability to* is wordy.

E *Called proton-induced X-ray emission* should be placed next to *a technique* and should not be set off by commas; *has the ability to* is wordy.

The correct answer is A.

100. Construction of the Roman Colosseum, which was officially known as the Flavian Amphitheater, began in A.D. 69, during the reign of Vespasian, was completed a decade later, during the reign of Titus, who opened the Colosseum with a one-hundred-day cycle of religious pageants, gladiatorial games, and spectacles.

- A. which was officially known as the Flavian Amphitheater, began in A.D. 69, during the reign of Vespasian,
- B. officially known as the Flavian Amphitheater, begun in A.D. 69, during the reign of Vespasian, and
- C. which was officially known as the Flavian Amphitheater, began in A.D. 69, during the reign of Vespasian, and
- D. officially known as the Flavian Amphitheater and begun in A.D. 69, during the reign of Vespasian it
- E. officially known as the Flavian Amphitheater, which was begun in A.D. 69, during the reign of Vespasian, and

The main subject of the sentence is *Construction*, and it has two main verbs: *began* and *was completed*. These two verbs should be connected by the conjunction *and* to preserve their equal grammatical status. Both verbs should be in simple past tense.

A The conjunction is missing before the second main verb, *was completed*.

B *Begun* is the wrong verb form.

C Correct. The two verbs of the main clause are in simple past tense and are joined with *and*.

D There is no need to use the pronoun *it* as the subject of *was completed*, because *Roman Colosseum* (modified by phrases describing its name and the time it was begun) already serves as the subject of the final verb.

E The appearance of the relative pronoun as the subject of the main verbs deprives the term *construction* of a verb and makes this sentence a fragment.

The correct answer is C.