

1. **Baroque.** Because the description of “short, declarative sentences” matches up with the word spare in the first part of the sentence, you need something in the blank that matches up with “flowery,” meaning “full of elaborate literary words or phrases.” Boring is judgmental, and floral just means “of flowers.” Baroque, meaning “highly ornate and extravagant in style,” fits your sentence.
2. **Leitmotifs, figurative.** A theme that reappears throughout a work of art is called a leitmotif (simony — attempting to “to purchase salvation with money” — is not a thesis in Dubliners, nor is it a character). You are told that simony is literal in some stories, and then the final sentence begins with “in other stories,” signaling a change in direction. The opposite of literal is figurative.
3. **Ephemera, wanderlust.** “Old maps and sheet music” are not devices, nor are they fake (apocrypha). Rather, they are ephemera, printed matter not intended to be saved. If you knew the more common ephemeral (fleeting), you could work this out. In the second blank, wanderlust describes a love of travel.
4. **Noxious, incentivize.** If the government is rightly interested in curtailing the use of a product, this tells you that the product is somehow harmful, or of a noxious nature, so that’s the first blank. (The other words are both positive, and the government can’t have a rightful interest in limiting the use of such products.) By taxing such products, the government gains a profit from their consumption. That the government is threading a thin line suggests that there is a conflict: on the one hand, the government then has an interest in increasing profits, on the other hand it has an interest in curtailing the use of the taxed substance. So the problem is that the profit gives the government an incentive to encourage use of the product, meaning that the taxes incentivize the government to support the product.
5. **Proclivities, penchant, mitigation of suffering.** The clue for the first two blanks is given in the claim that authors successfully navigated the gray area between simple self-justification and genuine apologia. Apologia means “defense,” so you know that the authors were defending eating meat. But they did not allow their desires or tendency to eat meat to derail their arguments. The first two blanks require something like “tendency,” and both proclivity and penchant mean that. The third blank requires something can “blunt the evils” of eating meat, and that goes along with the eradication of factory farming and the return to natural feed, so you are looking for something that contributes to the well-being of or detracts from the harms done to animals raised for food. Mitigation of suffering fits this bill.
6. **Apologist, retrograde, revisionist.** For the first blank, you want a word that means “a defender.” Surprisingly, that’s precisely what apologist means (the word apology once meant a speech offered to defend or justify). For the second blank, we’d like something similar to “reactionary,” but even stronger and more negative. Since reactionary means “opposed to change,” you want a word that means “very opposed to change.” Retrograde will do, since it suggests a retreat to some earlier state (the word also has technical meanings in biology, music, and astronomy). The third word describes an approach that recasts history, or challenges a conventional history. That sort of “recasting” is called revisionist.
7. **(C).** To properly answer this question, you must first determine who is being “roused.” The beginning of the sentence states that conclusions are rendered all the more potent. The group drawing the conclusions is the general public. The implication of the sentence is thus that the general public is eager to leap to conclusions involving malicious intent, and also eager to catch scientists in their own hypocrisy. The correct answer is therefore (C).

8. **II only.** The author of the passage argues that erroneous findings will be eventually corrected via the process of scientific natural selection through being subjected to scrutiny the very practices of hypothesis-testing and scientific replication are in place precisely to redress such concerns. The first statement is incorrect, since there is no such scrutiny — no one else will read the researcher’s logbook. The third statement is incorrect because the scientist tweaks his data deliberately — this is more like the “fraudulent practices” described earlier in the passage than the “healthy science” described later — and because no scrutiny takes place.

9. **(D).** The passage primarily points out that the discovery of erroneous findings could be seen as malfeasance by researchers, then goes on to show how these same findings are actually a healthy and natural part of the scientific process. (A) isn’t correct because the author does not develop a scientific hypothesis; (C) isn’t correct because generating dialogue is not the author’s primary concern — it is, rather, to dispel misguided notions.

10. **(D).** The mayor claims the law is a success because the accident fatality rate has dropped nearly 30 percent since the law passed. Opponents claim the law is a failure because more people have suffered from severe head injuries since the law passed. To strengthen the mayor’s conclusion, you need to rebut the opponents’ claim, or somehow weaken its effect. While (A) may be true, it does not address the mayor’s claim that the helmet law in particular has been successful in its goal to protect bicycle riders. If anything, (A) could weaken the mayor’s claim, because the mayor bases the law’s success on the lower fatality rate. If those people who don’t die instead suffer from permanent brain damage, it is difficult to claim success in “protecting” the population. (B) is tempting because it is a compelling reason why the town might want to enact a helmet law in the first place. The question does not ask you to address this, however; the helmet law has already been enacted. Rather, you need information that will point to the law as a success, and this choice does not provide any information allowing you to assess the success (or failure) of the helmet law. Furthermore, (B) introduces “motor vehicles,” which are not mentioned in the argument. (C) may be tempting because the goal of the law is to protect the town’s youth, and, presumably, it is desirable to limit all kinds of injuries. There are two problems, however. First, because the focus of the argument is on a helmet law, the focus is also on injuries associated with the area where a helmet is worn: the head. As such, other injuries are out of scope. Second, even if other types of injuries were within the scope of the argument, this choice does not provide any information allowing you to assess the success of the helmet law. Choice (D) is correct — when bicyclists suffer serious head injuries, the chances of dying are twice as high for those not wearing helmets. The converse is that people with head injuries are less likely to die from those injuries if they were wearing a helmet. In other words, the decreased fatality rate is actually responsible, at least partially, for the increase in injuries: some of the injured would have been on the fatality list instead had they not been wearing helmets. This supports the mayor’s case by showing that the premise used by the mayor’s opponents does not actually indicate a failure in the law. Regarding choice (E), the fact that the results are similar in other towns means merely that the outcome is predictable in some way; it does not necessarily indicate success. In fact, if all towns experienced a sharp increase in fatalities after enacting a particular law, the outcome could be described as typical, but hardly a success.

11. **I and III only.** You are told that ultraviolet radiation is in the range of 290–400 nm, so energy with a wavelength of 2,000–2,500 nm would not fall in that range (in fact, it would fall into the range of infrared radiation. You are told that UVA rays intensify UVB damage and can aid in cancer formation, but you cannot infer that UVA rays are necessary for cancer to form. Finally, since ultraviolet radiation has a

wavelength in the range of 290 to 400 nanometers and infrared radiation is in the range of 760 to 3,000 nm, ultraviolet radiation is not a form of infrared radiation.

12. **I only.** The fact that UVA rays can intensify sunburn and aid in cancer formation “provides a factual basis” for the recommendation in the next sentence, that sunscreens block both UVB and UVA rays. The highlighted sentence does not “undermine an argument” — in fact, no “argument” exists in the passage, which is informative and factual. Finally, the third statement is the opposite of what you were told: UVA (above 320 nm) “exacerbates the carcinogenic properties” of UVB (below 320 nm), not the other way around. Keep in mind that while it may seem logical that if UVA could make the cancer-causing properties of UVB worsen, it would work the other way around — both things cause cancer, after all, right? You should not make this kind of assumption. The question did NOT ask, “What’s true in real life?” It asked what role the highlighted sentence was playing. Make sure you answer exactly the question being asked.

13. **Flummox, unnerve.** You rely largely on the context of the sentence for a hint as to this blank’s meaning. Very experienced performers have so much difficulty with some of Rachmaninoff’s music that it sometimes seems as though the music was designed to “confuse, baffle, bewilder,” or flummox, or unnerve.

14. **Solecisms, lapses.** That which we can scarcely suppose is false, so distinctively Indian constructions are not errors. The words you want must mean “errors.” Lapses mean errors, and solecisms means specifically “errors in grammar.”

15. **Self-styled, soi-disant.** The most important words here are forced and unconvincing, used to describe Brawnson’s account of his adventures. That means that Brawnson is decidedly NOT Indiana Jones, so you need a word for the blank that will in some way negate “adventurer.” Soi-disant and self-styled both imply that Brawnson may call himself an adventurer, but other people might not. Traitorous is far too extreme.

16. **Plenary, sweeping.** The key here is that the power to grant pardons can negate months or years of criminal litigation “in an instant.” That implies the power is quick and absolute. Both plenary and sweeping correctly capture the absolute nature of this power. Tyrannical is too judgmental, and executive wouldn’t mean much of anything (all presidential powers are, technically, executive).

17. **(E).** In the first paragraph, the author outlines the political role of royal mistresses and goes on to discuss the virtues and pitfalls of this system. (A) is incorrect and out of scope, as the author avoids moral judgments. (B) is too narrow; popular opinion is a detail, one of the pitfalls. (C) is wrong because the passage does not contrast the mistresses — about whom there is very little information — but rather their effect on French politics. (D) is incorrect (and too extreme) because the author does not say it was the main cause.

18. **(C).** This issue is largely discussed in the second paragraph, which provides support for the other four choices. (C) is correct because, while the author does mention the number of Louis XIV’s illegitimate children, the passage does not mention the number for Louis XV or compare those numbers.

19. **(B).** In the first paragraph the author states that the Bourbons brought a unique flair to the French custom of royal mistresses. Regarding (A), the passage discusses the success and skill of Louis XIV; mistakes are only attributed to his successors. Choice (C) is unsupported — in the last paragraph, the

passage notes that Louis XVI did not write his own mythology but Louis XV is not mentioned. (D) and (E) are wrong for similar reasons—the passage compares the number of and problems caused by the mistresses of Louis XIV and Louis XV. But nothing is mentioned in that regard for Louis XVI.

20. **II only.** In the last paragraph, the passage describes the success of Louis XIV by writing his own mythology and compares that to the less satisfactory attempts by his successors. The first statement is out of scope as the author only states that it was a staple of the French court, not all courts. Similarly, no indication is given of Louis' opinion of his successor.