

CLAT English Language

Sample Paper – 3

Duration: 24 Minutes

Maximum Marks: 24

Instructions

- This paper contains **24** Multiple Choice Questions (Single Correct Answer), modelled on the English Language section of **CLAT** (Common Law Admission Test).
- Each correct answer carries **+1 mark**. There is a **negative marking of 0.25 marks** for every incorrect answer; unattempted questions carry no penalty.
- The paper has **four passages**, each followed by **six** questions. Only **one** option is correct; choose the most appropriate answer based only on the passage.
- CLAT is an offline pen-and-paper (OMR) test with no sectional time limit; attempt this practice paper in one timed sitting of about **24 minutes**.
- Use of mobile phones, calculators, dictionaries, or electronic gadgets is strictly prohibited.

Passage I

Directions (Q1–Q6): Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on what is stated or implied in the passage.

When a new virus slips from an animal into a human being, the clock starts running. The world learned this lesson at great cost during the outbreaks of the past two decades, from SARS to the influenza scares to the pandemic that emptied cities and closed borders. Each episode arrived as a surprise, yet none was truly unforeseeable. Scientists had warned for years that a fast-moving respiratory pathogen could circle the globe within weeks, and that the tools to blunt it, from surveillance to vaccines, would arrive only as fast as governments had prepared them in advance.

The uncomfortable truth is that preparedness is cheap and neglect is expensive, yet the incentives run the wrong way. Money spent on stockpiles, laboratories, and trained staff



produces nothing visible in an ordinary year; a health ministry that quietly prevents a crisis wins no applause. Politicians who face elections every few years find it hard to fund a defence against a threat that may not appear on their watch. So budgets are trimmed in calm years and lavished in panic once the danger is already loose, which is the least efficient moment to begin.

Cooperation between nations is just as fragile. A virus respects no border, and an outbreak anywhere is a risk everywhere, yet the instinct of frightened governments is to hoard. During recent crises, wealthy states bought up vaccines and protective equipment far beyond their needs while poorer countries waited, a strategy that was not only unjust but self-defeating, since uncontrolled spread abroad breeds new variants that return home. The logic of shared risk demands shared defence, but fear and nationalism repeatedly overpower that logic when it matters most.

None of this is cause for despair. The same outbreaks that exposed our weaknesses also showed what works: rapid data-sharing between laboratories, honest communication that treats the public as adults, and the astonishing speed at which vaccines can now be designed once the will and the funding exist. Countries that had rehearsed their response, kept their institutions strong, and trusted their citizens fared far better than those that improvised. Preparedness, in the end, is less a matter of technology than of memory and discipline, of refusing to forget the last emergency once the fear has faded. The next pandemic is not a question of whether but of when. Whether it becomes a manageable episode or a catastrophe will depend on choices made now, in the quiet years, by people willing to spend on a danger they cannot yet see.

Q1. Which of the following best captures the central argument of the passage?

- (A) Recent outbreaks prove that pandemics are entirely unforeseeable and cannot be prepared for at all.
- (B) Guarding against pandemics depends less on technology than on sustained preparation and international cooperation, which short-term incentives tend to undermine.
- (C) Wealthy nations should be legally forced to surrender all their vaccines to poorer countries.
- (D) The main obstacle to pandemic defence is the slow pace of vaccine science.

Q2. It can be inferred from the passage that wealthy states' hoarding of vaccines is "self-defeating" because:



- (A) leaving the virus to spread unchecked abroad allows new variants to emerge that reach the hoarding countries anyway.
- (B) vaccines lose their effectiveness whenever they are stockpiled for too long.
- (C) poorer countries would refuse to accept any vaccines offered to them later.
- (D) wealthy states cannot actually afford to buy more vaccines than they need.

Q3. The author’s overall tone in the passage is best described as:

- (A) cheerfully unconcerned.
- (B) bitterly cynical.
- (C) coldly detached.
- (D) gravely concerned yet ultimately constructive.

Q4. According to the passage, spending on preparedness is politically difficult chiefly because:

- (A) preparedness is genuinely more costly than responding to a crisis after it begins.
- (B) scientists have failed to warn governments of the danger in time.
- (C) money spent quietly preventing a crisis produces nothing visible and wins no political reward.
- (D) citizens actively oppose every form of public-health funding.

Q5. As used in the passage, the word “hoard” most nearly means:

- (A) to amass and hold back supplies for oneself.
- (B) to share supplies generously with others.
- (C) to destroy surplus goods deliberately.
- (D) to sell goods at a very high price.

Q6. Which of the following would make the best title for the passage?



- (A) “The Unstoppable Rise of New Viruses”
- (B) “Why Vaccine Science Will Always Fail Us”
- (C) “Preparing in the Quiet Years: The Real Test of Pandemic Defence”
- (D) “The Case Against International Cooperation”

Passage II

Directions (Q7–Q12): Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on what is stated or implied in the passage.

Few freedoms are praised more loudly, or defined more loosely, than the freedom of speech. Almost everyone claims to believe in it, and almost everyone would draw a line somewhere. The difficulty begins the moment we ask where. A right to speak that permitted absolutely anything, including direct incitement to murder or the fraudulent sale of poison as medicine, would be no foundation for a free society but a recipe for its collapse. The real debate has never been whether speech may be limited, only which limits a free people can accept without ceasing to be free.

The strongest case for open expression is not that speech is harmless, for plainly it is not. Words can wound, mislead, and inflame. The case rests instead on distrust of any authority granted the power to decide what others may hear. History is crowded with censors who silenced heresy, dissent, and inconvenient truth in the sincere belief that they were protecting the public. Once the machinery of suppression exists, it rarely stays confined to the villains it was built for; it is inherited by whoever holds power next. Better, the argument runs, to endure a great deal of foolish and offensive speech than to trust officials to sort the worthy from the worthless.

Yet the principle has limits that even its defenders concede. Speech that is not merely offensive but directly harmful, a threat, a targeted campaign of intimidation, the deliberate spreading of a lie that ruins a reputation, has long fallen outside protection, and few serious thinkers argue otherwise. The genuine disputes lie in the grey zone between offence and harm, where reasonable people disagree about when words stop being an idea to be answered and become a weapon to be restrained.

What makes the question harder in our own time is scale. A cruel remark once reached a handful of listeners; now it can be broadcast to millions and preserved forever. Harm that was once local and fleeting can be amplified beyond anything earlier generations imagined. This does not overturn the old principles, but it does strain them, forcing societies to ask whether rules written for the age of the pamphlet still serve the age of the global feed.

There is no formula that dissolves the tension, and anyone who offers one should be treated with suspicion. A free society does not choose between expression and safety once and for all; it argues about the balance continually, case by case, accepting that the line will always be contested. That argument is not a failure of the system. It is the



system working.

- Q7.** Which of the following best states the main idea of the passage?
- (A) Free speech should be absolute and subject to no limits whatsoever.
 - (B) All speech that offends anyone at all should be banned.
 - (C) The right to free speech has become entirely meaningless in the modern age.
 - (D) The real question about free speech is not whether it may be limited but where the limits fall, a balance a free society must continually contest.
- Q8.** The author warns that the power to censor is dangerous mainly because:
- (A) censors throughout history have always acted in deliberate bad faith.
 - (B) once created, the power to suppress speech can be inherited and turned to new purposes by later rulers.
 - (C) offensive speech never causes any real harm to anyone.
 - (D) modern technology has made all censorship completely impossible.
- Q9.** The author's attitude throughout the passage is best described as:
- (A) flippant and dismissive.
 - (B) outraged and alarmist.
 - (C) measured and judicious.
 - (D) nostalgic and sentimental.
- Q10.** According to the passage, the kinds of speech that even defenders of free expression concede fall outside protection include:
- (A) threats, targeted campaigns of intimidation, and deliberate reputation-destroying lies.
 - (B) any speech that some listener happens to find offensive.
 - (C) all political dissent and criticism of officials.



(D) any idea that challenges a widely held belief.

Q11. As used in the passage, the word “inflame” most nearly means:

- (A) to set something physically on fire.
- (B) to calm and soothe.
- (C) to clarify and explain.
- (D) to stir up strong or angry feeling.

Q12. The author’s main purpose in the passage is to:

- (A) prove that free speech should never be restricted under any circumstances.
- (B) argue that limits on speech are unavoidable and that a free society must keep debating where those limits lie.
- (C) recommend a single fixed formula for deciding what speech to ban.
- (D) show that modern technology has permanently settled the free-speech debate.

Passage III

Directions (Q13–Q18): Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on what is stated or implied in the passage.

Whenever a rocket company unveils plans to settle human beings on Mars, the same objection is raised, and it is a fair one. How can we justify spending fortunes to build a second home in the sky while the first one still has hungry children, flooded coasts, and unhealed wounds? To some, the ambition to colonise another planet is a vanity of the rich, a distraction dressed up as destiny, and the money would be better spent on the needs pressing in on us here and now.

The objection deserves a serious answer rather than a slogan. Its strongest form is not that space is worthless but that priorities matter, and that a civilisation which cannot feed everyone has not earned the right to plant flags on other worlds. There is moral force in the reminder that grand adventures have often been paid for by the poor and enjoyed by the few. Any honest defender of space exploration must begin by conceding that Earth’s suffering is real and that no Martian sunset excuses indifference to it.

Yet the choice is rarely as stark as the objection implies. The sums spent on space, though large in isolation, are tiny beside what the world spends on far less noble things, and



the notion that every rupee withheld from Mars would otherwise reach the hungry is a comforting fiction. More important, the pursuit of space has repeatedly returned unexpected gifts to Earth: the satellites that warn of storms, the sensors that track failing crops, the medical and material advances born of solving problems no earthbound laboratory had thought to pose. Looking outward has a long history of teaching us to see our own planet more clearly.

There is also a longer argument, harder to weigh but not easy to dismiss. A species confined to a single planet is a species one catastrophe from extinction. To spread life beyond the Earth is, in this view, not a luxury but a form of insurance for everything we value, an act of stewardship rather than escape. The danger is only that such reasoning becomes an excuse to abandon a damaged Earth rather than to protect it.

The wise course, then, is neither to worship the dream nor to forbid it, but to hold it to account. Space exploration can be pursued in a way that enriches life on Earth or in a way that mocks its suffering, and the difference lies not in the rockets but in the values of those who build them. The stars can wait; our judgement cannot.

Q13. The central idea of the passage is that:

- (A) humanity should abandon all plans to explore or settle space.
- (B) colonising Mars is an urgent necessity that outweighs every earthly need.
- (C) spending on space is defensible if it is held to account and made to enrich life on Earth rather than to excuse indifference to its suffering.
- (D) the only real value of space exploration lies in the satellites it produces.

Q14. By calling the idea that money withheld from Mars would otherwise feed the hungry “a comforting fiction,” the author implies that:

- (A) money not spent on space is always given directly to the poor.
- (B) space spending is the single largest cause of world hunger.
- (C) the hungry would refuse any money that was offered to them.
- (D) cancelling space programmes would not, in fact, reliably redirect the money to those in need.

Q15. The author’s attitude toward space exploration is best described as:



- (A) even-handed and reflective.
- (B) scornful and hostile.
- (C) starry-eyed and uncritical.
- (D) bored and indifferent.

Q16. The author supports the pursuit of space exploration partly by pointing out that it has:

- (A) already ended hunger and poverty on Earth.
- (B) yielded practical benefits such as storm-warning satellites and crop-tracking sensors.
- (C) proved beyond doubt that Mars is ready for human settlement.
- (D) reduced the cost of every government programme.

Q17. As used in the passage, the word “stewardship” most nearly means:

- (A) reckless abandonment of a duty.
- (B) profitable ownership of property.
- (C) responsible care and protection of what is entrusted to us.
- (D) forced surrender to a stronger power.

Q18. Which statement best captures the conclusion the author is driving toward?

- (A) Space exploration is always wrong so long as Earth still has needs.
- (B) The technology of the rockets alone determines whether space travel is good.
- (C) Earth’s problems can never be solved and are best ignored.
- (D) Whether space exploration is justified depends on the values guiding it, not on the rockets themselves.

Passage IV

Directions (Q19–Q24): Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on what is stated or implied in the passage.



In a world that moves at the speed of the scrolling thumb, poetry can look like a relic, a slow art stranded in a fast age. Novels at least tell stories; poems seem to withhold even that, asking a reader to pause over a handful of lines and puzzle at their meaning. Sales are thin, few can name a living poet, and the form survives mostly in classrooms where it is too often taught as a code to be cracked rather than a pleasure to be felt. And yet poetry refuses to die, surfacing at the very moments when ordinary language fails us: at funerals and weddings, in protest and in prayer.

That stubborn survival is a clue to what poetry is for. Prose is built to carry information efficiently, to get us from one point to the next; poetry is built to slow us down. It works by compression, saying in a few charged words what prose would spread across a page, and by music, using rhythm and sound to lodge meaning in the memory and the body. A good poem cannot be skimmed. It insists that we attend to each word, and in an age engineered to fracture our attention, that insistence is not a weakness but a rare and valuable discipline.

Poetry also does something prose struggles to manage: it holds contradiction without dissolving it. Life is full of feelings that resist plain statement, grief threaded with relief, love shadowed by fear, joy sharpened by its own brevity. The essay wants to resolve such tangles; the poem is content to hold them whole, to say two true things at once and let them vibrate together. This is why people reach for poems precisely when experience overflows the containers that ordinary speech provides.

None of this requires poetry to be difficult for its own sake, and much of the form's bad reputation comes from verse that mistakes obscurity for depth. The greatest poems are often the plainest, their simplicity earned rather than accidental. What they ask is not cleverness but attention, a willingness to sit with words until they open.

To defend poetry, then, is not to demand that everyone love it, only to insist that the hurried, prose-soaked world has not made it obsolete but more necessary. In teaching us to slow down, to weigh each word, and to hold the tangled truth of feeling without flattening it, poetry offers exactly what a distracted age has learned to do without and quietly needs. It is not a museum piece. It is a living tool for being human.

Q19. Which of the following best states the main idea of the passage?

- (A) Far from being obsolete, poetry is more necessary in a hurried, prose-dominated age because of what its slowness and compression offer.
- (B) Poetry has rightly become obsolete in the modern world.
- (C) Poetry matters only because it continues to be taught in classrooms.
- (D) The chief virtue of poetry is that it is difficult to understand.

Q20. It can be inferred that the author regards our own age as one that:



- (A) has far too much patience for slow, careful reading.
- (B) values poetry above every other art form.
- (C) tends to scatter and shorten our attention, which makes poetry's demand for focus valuable.
- (D) has no real use for language of any kind.

Q21. The tone of the passage is best described as:

- (A) mournful and defeated.
- (B) earnest and affirming.
- (C) sarcastic and dismissive.
- (D) coldly analytical.

Q22. According to the passage, one thing poetry does that prose struggles to manage is that it:

- (A) carries factual information far more efficiently than prose.
- (B) can always be skimmed quickly for its meaning.
- (C) avoids any use of rhythm and sound.
- (D) can hold contradictory feelings together without resolving them.

Q23. As used in the passage, the word “compression” most nearly means:

- (A) condensing much meaning into few words.
- (B) physically crushing a solid object.
- (C) repeating an idea many times over.
- (D) translating a work from another language.

Q24. Which of the following would make the best title for the passage?

- (A) “Why Poetry Deserves to Fade Away”
- (B) “Not a Museum Piece: Poetry for a Distracted Age”
- (C) “How to Decode Difficult Verse”
- (D) “The Triumph of Prose Over Poetry”



Detailed Solutions

Q1.

Solution

Concept — Main idea: The central argument is the one claim the whole passage is built to support, not a single detail within it.

Passage support: The passage says “preparedness is cheap and neglect is expensive,” that cooperation between nations is “just as fragile,” and closes that outcomes “will depend on choices made now, in the quiet years.” It even states that preparedness “is less a matter of technology than of memory and discipline.” So the theme is sustained preparation and cooperation, weakened by short-term incentives.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage says the outbreaks were “not truly unforeseeable,” so it does not call them unpreparable.
- Option C: Legally forcing nations to surrender vaccines is never proposed.
- Option D: Vaccine science is praised for its “astonishing speed,” not blamed for slowness.

Final Answer: Defence rests on sustained preparation and cooperation, undermined by short-term incentives ⇒ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q1](#)

Q2.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Read the stated reason hoarding backfires and restate it.

Passage support: Hoarding is called “self-defeating, since uncontrolled spread abroad breeds new variants that return home.” So the virus left loose overseas comes back to the very countries that hoarded.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: No claim is made that stored vaccines simply expire.
- Option C: Poorer countries refusing later offers is never mentioned.
- Option D: Wealthy states bought supplies “far beyond their needs,” so affordability is not the point.

Final Answer: Unchecked spread abroad breeds variants that reach the hoarders



anyway ⇒

[Go Back to Q2](#)

Q3.

Solution

Concept — Tone / attitude: Weigh the author’s seriousness about the danger against any hope offered.

Passage support: The author details “great cost,” fragile cooperation, and hoarding, yet insists “None of this is cause for despair” and lists what works. Grave warning joined to a constructive way forward is the mix.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Cheerfully unconcerned” ignores the stress on great cost.
- Option B: “Bitterly cynical” ignores the hopeful, solvable framing.
- Option C: “Coldly detached” ignores the urgent engagement with the problem.

Final Answer: Gravely concerned yet ultimately constructive ⇒

[Go Back to Q3](#)

Q4.

Solution

Concept — Argument / detail: Locate the stated reason preparedness is hard to fund.

Passage support: “Money spent on stockpiles, laboratories, and trained staff produces nothing visible in an ordinary year; a health ministry that quietly prevents a crisis wins no applause.” Politicians therefore struggle to fund a defence whose success is invisible.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage says preparedness is “cheap,” not costlier than crisis response.
- Option B: Scientists “had warned for years,” so warning is not the failure.
- Option D: Citizens opposing all health funding is never claimed.

Final Answer: Prevention yields nothing visible and wins no political reward ⇒



C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q4](#)

Q5.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Substitute each meaning into the sentence and keep the one that fits.

Passage support: “The instinct of frightened governments is to hoard,” immediately illustrated by states that “bought up vaccines . . . far beyond their needs.” So to hoard is to amass and keep supplies for oneself.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: “Share generously” is the opposite of the behaviour described.
- Option C: “Destroy” surplus is not implied.
- Option D: “Sell at a high price” is a different idea from keeping supplies back.

Final Answer: To amass and hold back supplies for oneself ⇒ **A**

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q5](#)

Q6.

Solution

Concept — Summary / best title: A good title names the whole argument, not one detail.

Passage support: The essay’s thrust is that pandemics are manageable if we prepare in advance, ending on “choices made now, in the quiet years, by people willing to spend on a danger they cannot yet see.” A title about preparing in the quiet years fits that exactly.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Unstoppable Rise” misses the passage’s manageable, solvable framing.
- Option B: Vaccine science is praised, not condemned as bound to fail.
- Option D: The passage urges cooperation, so a title against it inverts the point.

Final Answer: “Preparing in the Quiet Years: The Real Test of Pandemic Defence”



⇒ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q6](#)

Q7.

Solution

Concept — Main idea: Choose the option that spans the whole arc of the argument.

Passage support: The passage states “the real debate has never been whether speech may be limited, only which limits,” and closes that a society “argues about the balance continually . . . accepting that the line will always be contested.” Option D captures both the where-not-whether point and the continual contest.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Absolute speech is rejected as “a recipe for its collapse.”
- Option B: Banning all offensive speech is not advocated; offence alone is protected.
- Option C: The passage never says the right has become meaningless.

Final Answer: The question is where the limits fall, a balance to be continually contested ⇒ D

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q7](#)

Q8.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Read the warning about the “machinery of suppression” and draw out its point.

Passage support: “Once the machinery of suppression exists, it rarely stays confined to the villains it was built for; it is inherited by whoever holds power next.” So the danger is that a censorship power outlives its original purpose and is repurposed.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The censors acted “in the sincere belief” they helped, so not always bad faith.
- Option C: The passage admits speech “can wound, mislead, and inflame.”
- Option D: Scale strains the old rules; it does not make censorship impossible.



Final Answer: A suppression power, once built, can be inherited and turned to new ends ⇒ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q8](#)

Q9.

Solution

Concept — Tone / attitude: Judge how the author handles both sides of the argument.

Passage support: The author concedes speech “can wound” yet defends openness, marks out a “grey zone,” and warns that anyone offering a neat formula “should be treated with suspicion.” That careful weighing of both sides is measured and judicious.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Nothing is flippant about this careful treatment.
- Option B: The calm, balanced voice is the opposite of alarmist.
- Option D: There is no yearning for a lost past.

Final Answer: Measured and judicious ⇒ **C**

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q9](#)

Q10.

Solution

Concept — Argument / detail: Find the exact examples the passage places outside protection.

Passage support: Speech that is “directly harmful, a threat, a targeted campaign of intimidation, the deliberate spreading of a lie that ruins a reputation, has long fallen outside protection.” Option A lists precisely these.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: Merely offensive speech is protected, not banned.
- Option C: Dissent is what wrongful censors “silenced,” so it is protected.
- Option D: Ideas that challenge popular beliefs are exactly what free speech shields.

Final Answer: Threats, intimidation, and reputation-destroying lies ⇒ **A**



Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q10](#)

Q11.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Fit the meaning to “Words can wound, mislead, and inflame.”

Passage support: The verb sits in a list of harms speech can do, alongside “wound” and “mislead.” So “inflame” here means to stir up strong or angry feeling, not literal burning.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Setting something physically on fire is the literal, wrong sense.
- Option B: “Calm and soothe” is the opposite of a harm.
- Option C: “Clarify” does not belong in a list of harms.

Final Answer: To stir up strong or angry feeling ⇒ D

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q11](#)

Q12.

Solution

Concept — Author’s purpose: Ask what the whole essay is trying to do.

Passage support: It shows that unlimited speech would collapse a society, that some limits are conceded even by defenders, and that the balance “will always be contested” — “the system working.” The purpose is to argue that limits are unavoidable and the debate must continue.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Never restricted” is explicitly rejected.
- Option C: A fixed formula is met “with suspicion.”
- Option D: Technology strains the debate but has not settled it.

Final Answer: Limits are unavoidable and the balance must be debated continually ⇒ B

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q12](#)



Q13.

Solution

Concept — Main idea: Find the balanced claim the whole passage keeps returning to.

Passage support: The author concedes “Earth’s suffering is real,” notes space’s “unexpected gifts,” and concludes we should “neither . . . worship the dream nor . . . forbid it, but . . . hold it to account,” pursuing it to “enrich life on Earth.” That is a conditional defence, not a rejection or a crusade.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Abandoning all space plans is the view the author moderates, not adopts.
- Option B: The passage denies the choice is that “stark,” so it does not call Mars an overriding necessity.
- Option D: Satellites are one benefit, not the “only” value.

Final Answer: Space is defensible if held to account and made to enrich life on Earth ⇒

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q13](#)

Q14.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Unpack what calling an idea “a comforting fiction” means.

Passage support: The author calls it a fiction that “every rupee withheld from Mars would otherwise reach the hungry,” having just noted the world spends on “far less noble things.” So money saved from space would not dependably go to the needy.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: This is the very belief labelled a fiction.
- Option B: The passage never calls space the largest cause of hunger.
- Option C: The hungry refusing money is not stated.

Final Answer: Cutting space spending would not reliably redirect the money to the needy ⇒

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q14](#)



Q15.

Solution

Concept — Tone / attitude: Weigh how the author balances the objection against the defence.

Passage support: The author grants the objection “moral force” and concedes Earth’s suffering, then sets out benefits, ending “neither to worship the dream nor to forbid it.” Holding both sides fairly and thinking it through is even-handed and reflective.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: “Scornful and hostile” ignores the real defence offered.
- Option C: “Starry-eyed” ignores the warning against worshipping the dream.
- Option D: The careful engagement is far from indifferent.

Final Answer: Even-handed and reflective ⇒

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q15](#)

Q16.

Solution

Concept — Argument / detail: Locate the concrete benefits the author cites.

Passage support: Space “has repeatedly returned unexpected gifts to Earth: the satellites that warn of storms, the sensors that track failing crops.” Option B names these directly.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage never claims hunger has been ended.
- Option C: It does not claim Mars is proven ready for settlement.
- Option D: Reducing the cost of every programme is not stated.

Final Answer: It has yielded storm-warning satellites and crop-tracking sensors ⇒

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q16](#)



Q17.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Read “an act of stewardship rather than escape.”

Passage support: Spreading life is framed as “insurance for everything we value,” set against merely escaping “a damaged Earth.” So stewardship means responsible care and protection of what is entrusted to us.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Reckless abandonment” is the “escape” the author contrasts it with.
- Option B: Profitable ownership is not the caring sense intended.
- Option D: “Forced surrender” is the opposite of active care.

Final Answer: Responsible care and protection of what is entrusted to us ⇒

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q17](#)

Q18.

Solution

Concept — Author’s purpose / conclusion: Read the sentence the whole essay builds toward.

Passage support: “The difference lies not in the rockets but in the values of those who build them.” So whether space travel is justified turns on the values guiding it.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Always wrong” is the extreme the author explicitly rejects.
- Option B: Saying the rockets alone decide is the very view the sentence overturns.
- Option C: The author calls Earth’s suffering real and solvable, not to be ignored.

Final Answer: Justification depends on the values guiding it, not the rockets themselves ⇒

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q18](#)



Q19.

Solution

Concept — Main idea: Select the option that unites the passage's central claim.

Passage support: Against the view of poetry as a “relic,” the author insists the “prose-soaked world has not made it obsolete but more necessary,” calling it “a living tool for being human.” Option A states exactly that.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: “Obsolete” is the view the passage sets out to refute.
- Option C: Poetry “refuses to die,” surfacing well beyond the classroom.
- Option D: The passage faults verse that “mistakes obscurity for depth.”

Final Answer: Poetry is more necessary in a hurried, prose-dominated age ⇒

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q19](#)

Q20.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Read what the author assumes about the modern reader's attention.

Passage support: A good poem's insistence on each word matters “in an age engineered to fracture our attention,” where that insistence is “a rare and valuable discipline.” So the author sees our age as one that scatters attention, which makes poetry's focus valuable.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Too much patience” is the opposite of a fractured attention.
- Option B: Ranking poetry above all arts is never claimed.
- Option D: Having no use for language is far more extreme than the text implies.

Final Answer: An age that scatters attention, making poetry's demand for focus valuable ⇒

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q20](#)



Q21.

Solution

Concept — Tone / attitude: Gauge the emotional colour of the author's defence.

Passage support: The essay argues warmly that poetry “quietly needs” our attention and ends, “It is not a museum piece. It is a living tool for being human.” Sincere, warm advocacy is earnest and affirming.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Mournful and defeated” clashes with the confident defence.
- Option C: There is admiration, not sarcasm.
- Option D: The engaged, warm voice is not coldly analytical.

Final Answer: Earnest and affirming ⇒

[Go Back to Q21](#)

Q22.

Solution

Concept — Argument / detail: Find the specific power the author grants poetry over prose.

Passage support: “Poetry also does something prose struggles to manage: it holds contradiction without dissolving it,” saying “two true things at once.” Option D restates this exactly.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Carrying information efficiently is prose's job, not the poetic gift named.
- Option B: The passage says a good poem “cannot be skimmed.”
- Option C: Poetry works partly “by music, using rhythm and sound,” so it does not avoid them.

Final Answer: It can hold contradictory feelings together without resolving them ⇒

[Go Back to Q22](#)



Q23.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Read “It works by compression, saying in a few charged words what prose would spread across a page.”

Passage support: The clause itself defines the term: much meaning packed into few words. So “compression” means condensing a great deal into a little.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: Physically crushing an object is the literal, wrong sense.
- Option C: “Repeating many times” is the opposite of using few words.
- Option D: Translation is unrelated to the meaning here.

Final Answer: Condensing much meaning into few words ⇒ **A**

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q23](#)

Q24.

Solution

Concept — Summary / best title: A good title should carry the passage’s core claim.

Passage support: The essay defends poetry for “a distracted age” and closes, “It is not a museum piece. It is a living tool for being human.” A title drawn from that line fits the whole argument.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Deserves to Fade Away” is the opposite of the author’s case.
- Option C: “Decode Difficult Verse” runs against the warning about obscurity.
- Option D: “Triumph of Prose” inverts the passage’s defence of poetry.

Final Answer: “Not a Museum Piece: Poetry for a Distracted Age” ⇒ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q24](#)



Answer Key

Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans
1	B	2	A	3	D	4	C	5	A
6	C	7	D	8	B	9	C	10	A
11	D	12	B	13	C	14	D	15	A
16	B	17	C	18	D	19	A	20	C
21	B	22	D	23	A	24	B		

