



1. **Pre-Phrase:** Although poetry and fiction have largely been academically segregated, there's evidence that this may be reversing due to writers like Rita Dove that fuse the genres?

**Answers:**

- (A) We don't know that's the primary reason for why she was widely acclaimed. We just know that she was widely acclaimed for her poetry and her fiction, but it could just as easily have been the fictional elements that she put into her poetry that got her the acclaim. Or a whole bunch of other stuff.
- (B) Even if this was consistently true, this is way too focused on a particular aspect of Dove's work, when the main point was far broader.
- (C) This wasn't really about how much one enhanced the other, but simply about the fact that one can successfully use both.
- (D) We don't know that she doesn't rely on the traditional techniques – she might, she just blends them together. Moreover, the focus on the passage was far broader than simply what she does.
- (E) Perfect – essentially a paraphrase of the above.

**Best Answer:** (E)

2. **Pre-Phrase:** We're looking for something analogous to fusing two genres that were previously segregated?

**Answers:**

- (A) Maybe? In this case, however, the two things are fundamentally different – we have cooking methods combined with ingredients. In the original example, it was simply two genres.
- (B) This is just one person doing something different. There's no fusion.
- (C) There's no fusion of two things – there's just one thing being used to advance the interests of another.
- (D) Perfect – we have the denial of previous convention, and a fusion of two distinct genres.
- (E) There's no fusion of two genres here – it's all rock.

**Best Answer:** (D)

3. **Pre-Phrase:** ...that poetry and fiction should be segregated?

**Answers:**

- (A) This works – paragraph 1 is the one that discusses what poetry and fiction should have, and character and narrative are cited as elements of fiction (which should be segregated from poetry).
- (B) Neither is claimed to be more serious than the other – just that they should be studied and engaged in separately.
- (C) While this is arguably true, that's not what the belief is. The belief is simply that the two should be segregated – the fact that education has segregated them is simply a consequence of that belief.
- (D) No – if anything, the general belief would be that fiction should properly avoid lyrical elements.
- (E) If anything, it's US culture that's suspicious of generalists, and that's simply what the case happens to be – not something that is 'believed'.

**Best Answer:** (A)

4. **Pre-Phrase:** Unhappy with it?

**Answers:**

- (A) No – the author proposes a possible cause.
- (B) The author doesn't note that it was overlooked, and the author isn't really astonished.
- (C) Definitely not ambivalent.
- (D) If anything, the author is optimistic in this regards as he notes that “fortunately, there are signs that the bias against writers who cross generic boundaries is diminishing...”.
- (E) This works – the author definitely shows disapproval towards the ideas that the two should be segregated.

**Best Answer:** (E)

5. **Pre-Phrase:** Paragraph 2 highlights that a cause might be the US culture's suspicion of 'generalism' (the idea of expertise in numerous areas).

**Answers:**

- (A) No claims of superiority are mentioned.
- (B) No – it wasn't about the methods.
- (C) No – it wasn't about the publishers.
- (D) Perfect.
- (E) The two aren't compared in terms of which is more read or respected.

**Best Answer:** (D)

6. **Pre-Phrase:** Show a context in which fusing different types of genres is common (to show it works), and/or to show where she might have gotten her inspiration from?

**Answers:**

- (A) This wasn't about English-speaking vs. not (even though Germany happens not to be an English-speaking country).
- (B) This works pretty well (in terms of showing inspiration for her choice to fuse these things together).
- (C) The author doesn't claim that her strength as a writer derived from her German experience. Her German experience was never related to her strength as a writer.
- (D) This was never about 'human interest appeal'.
- (E) We don't know that this was the origin of her opposition.

**Best Answer:** (B)

7. **Pre-Phrase:** Nothing particular.

**Answers:**

- (A) The idea of one form being dominant over the other is a bit iffy here, but it's the only one that has any semblance of support (her works did contain elements of both, and unless it was a perfectly even split between poetry and fiction, it makes sense that one or the other of the genres would be more dominant in her works). Otherwise, in the last paragraph it does refer to how her poems have fictional aspects to them while her fiction has poetic aspects to it. In other words, the author is clearly defining them as one or the other with elements of both.
- (B) If anything, it would be both since it uses both?
- (C) We don't know this is unprecedented – she's just cited as an important example.

- (D) Aesthetic superiority is never claimed.  
(E) We don't know whether this 'often' happens. According to the 3rd paragraph we only know that it happens that 'poets write plays'.

**Best Answer:** (A)

8. **Pre-Phrase:** That it would allow for greater mingling between poetry and fiction?

**Answers:**

- (A) Perfect.  
(B) We don't know that the market for pure lyric poetry is small.  
(C) Why that as opposed to a sub-genre of poetry?  
(D) Er, if anything the passage is pushing for the opposite – that there would be more mixing.  
(E) We don't know that they'll necessarily lose their audiences – their audiences might stick around or just also read other things as well.

**Best Answer:** (A)



9. **Pre-Phrase:** Both seem to deal with music – the 2nd one doesn't really deal with language.

**Answers:**

- (A) The second passage mentioned this but this wasn't anywhere near its primary concern.
- (B) Passage A doesn't really mention such bonding behavior.
- (C) This works – passage B definitely deals with this, and passage A does as well (towards the end, it answers the question by noting that it likely 'developed on the coattails of language').
- (D) Passage B doesn't discuss language.
- (E) Passage B doesn't discuss language.

**Best Answer:** (C)

10. **Pre-Phrase:** Nothing particular.

**Answers:**

- (A) Passage A doesn't delve into the bonding process – that's exclusively passage B territory.
- (B) This works – it might be tough to find, but since it falls in line with both it's worth keeping in just in case. Passage A notes this in line 3, while passage B notes it in line 35.
- (C) Worth keeping in just in case, but only passage A really mentions neurological research.
- (D) This isn't something passage A deals with at all.
- (E) Use of tools is entirely out of the scope of passage B.

**Best Answer:** (B)

11. **Pre-Phrase:** Nothing necessarily particular – but chances are this will have to do with whether music was useful?

**Answers:**

- (A) Passage A made no comment on birth times, nor would this conflict with anything it does say.
- (B) Passage B doesn't comment on the similarities between music and language.
- (C) Both seem to agree with this (line 20 and line 52).
- (D) This works – passage A clearly notes that there's little adaptive value (line 25), while passage B believes there's great adaptive value (lines 33-35).
- (E) Passage A makes no comment on mother-infant bonding.

**Best Answer:** (D)

12. **Pre-Phrase:** Nothing particular?

**Answers:**

- (A) Passage A was never about infancy.
- (B) Passage A was never about any such bonds.
- (C) This works – both mentioned brain size, and both do mention that evolution of music came as a result (whether immediate or eventual) of an increase in brain size (line 20, line 52).
- (D) Neither really discussed new systems developing from it.
- (E) Only passage A discussed varied musical ability.

**Best Answer:** (C)

13. **Pre-Phrase:** Nothing particular.

**Answers:**

- (A) Neither really took into account nonhuman animals.
- (B) Passage A doesn't seem to believe music can be explained in terms of evolutionary advantage.
- (C) This is something that only passage A was concerned with.
- (D) Essence?
- (E) This works – passage A uses current humans as sources of evidence in lines 22-23, while passage B does so in lines 57-59.

**Best Answer:** (E)

14. **Pre-Phrase:** Passage B discusses one part of passage A, and disagrees with A's conclusion towards it?

**Answers:**

- (A) This works – they definitely draw divergent conclusions and their evidence is also entirely different.
- (B) No – passage A itself poses the questions it answers. Passage B doesn't really pose a question.
- (C) Passage B refutes passage A, if anything.
- (D) If anything, passage B seems more committed (passage A is a bit more on-the-fence with its “it would seem”).
- (E) They definitely have divergent conclusions.

**Best Answer:** (A)





15. **Pre-Phrase:** Changing copyright law for the benefit of the Web's content writers is ill advised for the reasons mentioned?

**Answers:**

- (A) This doesn't really go as far as we're looking for it to go in terms of concluding that changing copyright law is a bad idea, but it pretty much 'almost' gets there and covers the points pretty well. Worth noting the issue but not crossing off just in-case.
- (B) The passage never set a necessary condition for changes in copyright law.
- (C) True, but this is simply a supporting point – because they can restrict such access, links don't constitute copyright infringement and laws shouldn't be changed.
- (D) Too broad – the passage was limited to issues with the web (not any new forms of electronic media).
- (E) For one, this wasn't necessarily about 'radical' changes; for two, the passage didn't really engage in a cost/benefit analysis. It simply concluded that it shouldn't be done because it's not really an issue, and changing copyright law would impede on the web's purpose.

**Best Answer:** (A)

16. **Pre-Phrase:** Well, the contrast is provided in the next line where it notes that users complain about their access to content being restricted. In other words, 'strengthening' copyright law clearly seems to refer to making it more restrictive.

**Answers:**

- (A) Perfect.
- (B) No.
- (C) Not necessarily about penalties.
- (D) This was never about enforcement.
- (E) Its legitimacy was never in question.

**Best Answer:** (A)

17. **Pre-Phrase:** About documents placed on web-pages? Probably that they're put up for distribution and that linking to them thus isn't really an infringement?

**Answers:**

- (A) No – if anything the author believes copyright laws are fine as-is in this regard.
- (B) No – the author provides a method for protection (password) that the author claims would compromise the internet's openness only 'somewhat'.
- (C) No – the author provides a method for protection (password).
- (D) Not by altering legal codes – if anything the author believes that legal codes shouldn't be altered.
- (E) This works. Although it's a bit strong, the author does state that restricting access to the files would somewhat compromise the Web's openness. In other words, for them to fully contribute the author does seem to believe they should be unrestricted.

**Best Answer:** (E)

18. **Pre-Phrase:** The difference between people controlling something themselves, and having the law controlling it and giving parties the right to sue someone instead?

**Answers:**

- (A) No – both cases deal with restriction.
- (B) No – only one case dealt with outlawing something.
- (C) This works – we definitely have the parallel of self-control of something vs. legal prohibition.
- (D) No – only one of the solutions had to do with the law.
- (E) This has nothing to do with the law being used.

**Best Answer:** (C)

19. **Pre-Phrase:** Nothing particular.

**Answers:**

- (A) The passage makes no such claims nor does it imply this.
- (B) This works, but it's a bit subtle. It's potentially in line with the passage though, so it's worth keeping it just in case when going through the first time to see if there's anything else reasonable. Otherwise, in the last paragraph the author notes that we must determine who really is the distributor (lines 28-30), and then goes on to note, by analogy, that by making the content available the author makes it available for distribution. In other words, that it's not really the person linking to the content that's the distributor.
- (C) Way too strong – why do people that put things on the web completely lose privacy rights? Even regarding that content, the author notes that they can establish privacy restrictions like passwords on their content. Moreover, read literally this doesn't refer to people that put their content on the web – it refers to people that own content that have had their content put on the web. If it's an unauthorized third-party that put the content on the web, the passage makes no claims that the owners deserve no privacy.
- (D) No – the owner of the webpage itself has that control as they can set privacy controls like passwords if they wish.
- (E) No such claim is ever implied.

**Best Answer:** (B)

20. **Pre-Phrase:** The ability for anyone with the phone number to access that message?

**Answers:**

- (A) No – this might be true, but this wasn't relevant to the analogy.
- (B) No – this might be true, but this wasn't relevant to the analogy.
- (C) Is this even true? One has to dial the number, wait, listen to the dial tones and then listen to the message itself... Even if it was true, the relevant comparison was in the fact that it would be openly accessible.
- (D) Whether people care about anything has nothing to do with this.
- (E) Perfect.

**Best Answer:** (E)

21. **Pre-Phrase:** To show an analogous situation in which there really wouldn't be a need for increased protection?

**Answers:**

- (A) The point wasn't to 'compare and contrast' – the passage established they're similarities at the outset and used the comparison to draw a conclusion about the Web.

- (B) It didn't really illustrate both sides of the debate – only the author's position.
- (C) This was never about showing that legal problems based on technology are or aren't new.
- (D) Perfect – it did illustrate such a basic principle (that something put up for free distribution shouldn't be protected when others provide easy reference to it).
- (E) No – it definitely didn't go in the direction of showing legal issues with telephone use.

**Best Answer:** (D)

22. **Pre-Phrase:** Shouldn't be changed?

**Answers:**

- (A) No – authors might themselves restrict accessibility. The author doesn't believe this should be taken away.
- (B) No – the author's view was that the individual making the content available is the distributor.
- (C) This was never about profit.
- (D) This works. This answer is about what present copyright laws actually are as opposed to what should be done with them (which is what the above pre-phrase was about), but this definitely works (lines 19-23).
- (E) No – it definitely shouldn't be altered.

**Best Answer:** (D)



23. **Pre-Phrase:** Fossilized pollen grains can provide useful information about the Irish landscape, although its usability is limited in some ways?

**Answers:**

- (A) This works – this overlooks the limitations, but it otherwise hits the main point pretty well. Worth noting the oversight and looking for something better, but this works pretty well.
- (B) It wasn't the historical documents that led to the revision – it was just the pollen evidence. Moreover, this is just one point.
- (C) No – it's been useful in a broader setting of figuring stuff out about the landscape, not just for identifying the plant species.
- (D) We don't know about madder (that was the limitation); flax wasn't there when they thought it was.
- (E) The main point wasn't about 'severe' limitation (was the limitation really severe?).

**Best Answer:** (A)

24. **Pre-Phrase:** 3rd and 4th paragraphs are what pollen analyses have established.

**Answers:**

- (A) No – they might agree that that's when it was introduced, but they found out that cereal cultivation (and land tilling) started prior.
- (B) Yes – the evidence showed that it was cultivated prior as early as 400 AD (4th century).
- (C) We don't know anything about continuous cultivation since then – this might or might not have happened. We only know the pollen established the earlier points of its cultivation.
- (D) This was taken as true and used as evidence for the point in the 2nd paragraph.
- (E) We don't know this is when it began, only that it existed as far back as 400 AD.

**Best Answer:** (B)

25. **Pre-Phrase:** What is believed based on documentary sources at the time (originally referred to in line 3 – the standard evidence was historical documents).

**Answers:**

- (A) No – that's not based on documents.
- (B) No – that's not based on documents.
- (C) Current historians? No – this referred to documents from back then.
- (D) Line 9 does state that many records refer to military and commercial interests, which implies government and commercial records. This doesn't necessarily mean this was exclusively government and commercial records, so this is a bit iffy but it's the only one that refers to documents from the previous eras.
- (E) Same as (C) – this was about documents from back then, not documents by current historians.

**Best Answer:** (D)

26. **Pre-Phrase:** Nothing particular, but likely something established as a prior belief in the 2nd or 3rd paragraph.

**Answers:**

- (A) Nothing about flooding was noted.
- (B) Close, but the passage only notes that they didn't believe the soil in wasn't tilled, but tilling was a

requirements for cereal grains only in County Down.

- (C) No? The documentary record was fragmented – why would the historians believe it was well documented?
- (D) We don't know what they thought of Madder – it only noted that Madder happened to be a dye plant, not anyone's thoughts on it.
- (E) Yes – this falls in line with the general point of the 4th paragraph (lines 47-49 provide us with the evidence).

**Best Answer:** (E)

27. **Pre-Phrase:** The second paragraph highlights what pollen analysis can be used for, and the last paragraph highlights its limitations?

**Answers:**

- (A) No – last paragraph doesn't support the 2nd.
- (B) It doesn't have to be solved – it just presents limits to the method in paragraph 2.
- (C) This works – qualifies meaning it limits its applicability, and it definitely does that.
- (D) The author doesn't argue against paragraph 2.
- (E) The last paragraph doesn't supplement the 2nd.

**Best Answer:** (C)