

CLAT English Language

Sample Paper – 7

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 vaccine is proven to work, the first doses almost never reach the people who need them most. They flow instead to the countries that can pay, and pay in advance. During recent global health emergencies, wealthy nations signed contracts for far more doses than their populations required, some ordering enough to inoculate every citizen several times over, while poorer countries waited months, and sometimes years, for supplies that trickled in only after the rich were safe. To many observers this looked less like a market at work than a moral failure on a planetary scale.

The reasons are not mysterious. Vaccines are expensive to develop and manufacture, and the firms that make them answer to shareholders rather than to humanity at large.



A government that can guarantee payment and absorb the risk of a failed candidate is a far more attractive customer than one that cannot. Manufacturing capacity, moreover, is concentrated in a handful of rich countries, so that geography compounds wealth, and the doses are made where the buyers are. None of this is illegal, and much of it is the ordinary logic of commerce. Yet that ordinary logic produces an outcome few would defend if asked to state it plainly, namely that the length of a person's life may depend on the accident of where they were born.

Defenders of the present system point out that it was private investment, spurred by the promise of profit, that produced the vaccines so quickly in the first place. Strip away the reward, they warn, and the next vaccine may arrive too late to save anyone. There is force in this argument. But it does not follow that the rewards must be distributed exactly as they are now. Advance-purchase funds pooled by many nations, agreements to share technology and license production in poorer regions, and public money to expand manufacturing could all widen access without destroying the incentive to invent. The choice is not simply between a cruel market and no vaccines at all.

The deepest objection to vaccine nationalism is not even that it is unfair, though it is. It is that it is self-defeating. A virus that keeps circulating anywhere can mutate into a form that evades the very vaccines the rich have hoarded, so that the walls they build around themselves offer only temporary shelter. In an interconnected world, no country is truly safe until all are. Charity and self-interest, so often opposed, here point in the same direction. The task is to build the institutions that let us act on both before the next emergency arrives, rather than after it has once again exposed how unready we were.

- Q1.** Which of the following best captures the central argument of the passage?
- (A) Vaccines should never be sold for profit under any circumstances.
 - (B) The speed of recent vaccine development proves the current system works well for everyone.
 - (C) Life-saving vaccines reach rich countries first for commercial reasons, an outcome both unjust and self-defeating yet open to reform.
 - (D) Poor countries are themselves to blame for their slow access to vaccines.
- Q2.** It can be inferred that when the author notes wealthy nations ordered “enough to inoculate every citizen several times over,” the point is that:
- (A) rich countries secured far more doses than they needed, leaving less for others.



- (B) the vaccines were weak and required many repeated doses.
- (C) poorer countries had refused the doses that were offered to them.
- (D) manufacturers had deliberately produced too few vaccines.
- Q3.** The author’s attitude toward the present system of vaccine distribution is best described as:
- (A) enthusiastically approving.
- (B) critical yet pragmatic.
- (C) coldly indifferent.
- (D) bitterly despairing.
- Q4.** According to the passage, defenders of the present system argue that:
- (A) vaccines are cheap and easy to manufacture.
- (B) poorer countries simply lack the infrastructure to store vaccines.
- (C) sharing technology would improve the quality of vaccines.
- (D) the promise of profit is what produced the vaccines quickly, and removing it could delay the next one.
- Q5.** As used in the passage, the word “hoarded” (“the very vaccines the rich have hoarded”) most nearly means:
- (A) accumulated and kept from others.
- (B) freely distributed to all.
- (C) carefully tested for safety.
- (D) quickly used up.
- Q6.** Which of the following would make the best title for the passage?
- (A) The Miracle of Rapid Vaccine Development.
- (B) Why Markets Always Fail.
- (C) Vaccine Inequity: Unjust, Unsafe, and Not Inevitable.



(D) The Case Against All Pharmaceutical Companies.

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.

A court that decides cases to please those in power is not really a court at all. It may wear the robes and occupy the building, but it has surrendered the one quality that gives a judgement its authority: the promise that it was reached by law rather than by favour. This is why every serious constitution tries, in one way or another, to wall the judiciary off from the politicians of the day. Judges are given secure tenure, salaries that cannot be cut in retaliation, and protection from removal except for grave misconduct. The aim is not to pamper them but to free them, so that a judge who rules against the government need not fear for her career.

The principle is easy to state and surprisingly hard to defend against a patient assault. An ambitious executive rarely abolishes the courts outright, since that would be too obvious. Instead it packs them with loyalists, floods them with cases, starves them of funds, or simply ignores the rulings it dislikes and dares anyone to enforce them. Each step can be dressed up as reform, as efficiency, as the will of the majority against unelected judges. And there lies the deepest tension, for judicial independence is, in a sense, undemocratic: it lets a handful of appointed officials overrule the elected representatives of the people. Critics ask why they should have such power at all.

The answer is that democracy is more than the counting of votes. A majority that could rewrite the rules of the game whenever it lost would soon cease to be one majority among many and become a permanent ruler. Courts exist partly to hold the majority to the promises it made when it was uncertain who would win: that elections would be fair, that minorities would keep their rights, that power once lost could be regained. An independent judge is not the enemy of the people's will but its trustee across time, defending the choices of the citizens of yesterday and tomorrow against the passions of today.

None of this makes judges infallible; they can be timid, biased, or wrong, and a wise system leaves room to criticise and correct them. But there is a difference between correcting a court and capturing it. The health of the rule of law is measured not when the courts agree with the government, which proves nothing, but when they do not, and their rulings are still obeyed. That obedience cannot be written into any document. It rests, finally, on a shared conviction that the law binds even those who make it, a conviction that takes generations to build and only a few careless years to squander.

Q7. Which of the following best expresses the central idea of the passage?

(A) Courts should always defer to the elected government of the day.



- (B) An independent judiciary, though it may seem undemocratic, is essential to the rule of law and must be guarded against subtle attack.
- (C) Judges are infallible and should never be criticised.
- (D) The chief threat to courts is that governments abolish them outright.

Q8. It can be inferred from the passage that a court whose rulings always favour the government:

- (A) is clear proof of a well-functioning legal system.
- (B) must therefore be the most efficient kind of court.
- (C) has successfully resisted political pressure.
- (D) reveals nothing about whether it is truly independent.

Q9. The author's tone in describing the threats to judicial independence is best described as:

- (A) light-hearted and amused.
- (B) neutral and purely descriptive.
- (C) earnest and cautionary.
- (D) sarcastic and dismissive.

Q10. According to the passage, critics object to judicial independence mainly because it:

- (A) lets a handful of appointed officials overrule the elected representatives of the people.
- (B) makes trials far too slow and expensive.
- (C) allows judges to be removed too easily.
- (D) forces judges to please the government.

Q11. As used in the passage, the word "squander" ("a few careless years to squander") most nearly means:

- (A) strengthen steadily.



- (B) carefully preserve.
- (C) openly celebrate.
- (D) waste or throw away.

Q12. Which statement best captures the author's concluding point?

- (A) Judges are always right and beyond reproach.
- (B) The rule of law ultimately rests on a shared conviction that the law binds even the powerful, which is slow to build and easy to destroy.
- (C) Courts matter only when they agree with the government.
- (D) A written constitution alone is enough to guarantee judicial independence.

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.

By the middle of this century the world will hold nearly ten billion people, and each of them will expect to eat. Feeding that many mouths would be challenge enough on its own. The harder truth is that we must do it without leaning on the very methods that made past abundance possible, for those methods are quietly exhausting the ground beneath them. Decades of intensive farming have stripped soils of nutrients, drained aquifers faster than rain can refill them, and relied so heavily on chemical fertiliser that rivers and coasts now choke on the run-off. The land that fed us is tired, and simply pushing it harder will not work for much longer.

The temptation is to look for a single rescue, a miracle seed or machine that will lift yields at no cost. History warns against such faith. The green revolution of the last century did feed billions, and deserves the credit, but its gifts came bundled with the very problems we now face. What is needed this time is less a breakthrough than a patient rethinking of how farming treats the land it depends on. Techniques that were once dismissed as backward, such as rotating crops, planting cover between harvests, and returning organic matter to the soil, turn out to rebuild fertility that chemicals only borrow.

This does not mean turning the clock back to some imagined age of the plough. The most promising farms marry old wisdom to new tools. Sensors can tell a farmer exactly where water and nutrients are needed, so that nothing is wasted; satellite images can spot a struggling field before the eye can; carefully bred and, where accepted, engineered crops can resist drought and pests with fewer sprays. Precision, not brute force, is the theme.



Used well, technology can make a lighter footprint possible, letting a field yield more while taking less from the soil.

Yet the obstacles are as much political as agricultural. Subsidies still reward farmers for the volume they produce rather than the soil they preserve, and a hungry world understandably fears any change that might, even briefly, lower output. Persuading societies to invest now in a harvest their grandchildren will reap is the oldest difficulty in politics. The encouraging fact is that healthier soil and higher long-term yields need not be enemies; the same practices that store carbon and hold water also, in time, grow more food. The future of farming will belong to those who stop treating the land as a mine to be emptied and start treating it as a system to be kept alive.

Q13. The central idea of the passage is that:

- (A) the world must feed a growing population by farming in ways that restore rather than exhaust the land, combining old practices with new technology.
- (B) there are simply too many people, and population growth must be halted.
- (C) the green revolution was a mistake that produced no real benefits.
- (D) modern technology alone will solve every problem of food supply.

Q14. When the author says old techniques “rebuild fertility that chemicals only borrow,” it can be inferred that:

- (A) chemical fertiliser is completely useless.
- (B) chemicals are always cheaper than organic methods.
- (C) chemical fertiliser boosts yields only temporarily, without truly restoring the soil.
- (D) farmers should never use any fertiliser at all.

Q15. The author’s attitude toward the future of farming is best described as:

- (A) carefree and unconcerned.
- (B) concerned yet constructive.
- (C) hopeless and resigned.



(D) angry and accusatory.

Q16. According to the passage, one political obstacle to better farming is that:

(A) farmers refuse to learn any new techniques.

(B) technology has become too cheap to be profitable.

(C) scientists cannot agree on which crops to plant.

(D) subsidies reward the volume produced rather than the soil preserved.

Q17. As used in the passage, the word “exhausting” (“quietly exhausting the ground”) most nearly means:

(A) tiring out physically.

(B) thoroughly cleaning.

(C) draining and using up.

(D) greatly enriching.

Q18. Which of the following would make the best title for the passage?

(A) Farming’s Future: Feeding More by Working the Land Wisely.

(B) The End of Agriculture.

(C) Why Population Growth Must Stop.

(D) Machines Against the Soil.

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.

There is something faintly embarrassing about the personal essay. To write one is to stand in public and say, in effect, look at me, at my small confusions and private doubts, as if a stranger should care. The novelist hides behind invented characters and the historian behind documents, but the essayist has only herself, and offers that self as the whole of the evidence. It is the most exposed of literary forms, and perhaps for that reason the most easily mocked. Yet it has survived for centuries, and readers keep returning to it, which suggests that its apparent weakness is also its secret strength. The form was more or less invented by Montaigne, a French nobleman who, four hun-



dred years ago, retired to his tower and began writing about whatever crossed his mind: friendship, fear, the way he ate, the death of those he loved. He called the pieces essays, meaning attempts or trials, and the word matters. An essay in this original sense is not a finished argument marshalled to a conclusion but a mind caught in the act of thinking, following a thought to see where it leads and honest enough to admit when it leads nowhere. The reader is invited not to receive a verdict but to keep company with someone as they work something out.

This is harder to do well than it looks. The danger at one extreme is self-absorption, the diary that interests no one but its author; at the other is a false universality, the writer who hides behind grand statements and never risks anything of himself. The good essayist walks between them, using the small and particular, a childhood kitchen, a quarrel, a habit, as a window onto something larger that the reader recognises. The paradox of the form is that the more precisely a writer describes her own peculiar experience, the more widely it seems to speak. We do not see ourselves in vague generalities; we see ourselves in someone else's exact and unashamed detail.

That may be why the personal essay feels newly needed in a distracted age. Amid the shouting of opinion, where everyone is certain and no one is listening, the essay offers a rarer thing: a voice thinking aloud, unsure, willing to change its mind. It asks for a slower kind of attention and repays it with a strange intimacy, the sense of having met a real person on the page rather than a performance. To write honestly about one's own life, without vanity and without disguise, turns out to be not a retreat from the world but one of the braver ways of facing it.

- Q19.** Which of the following best states the main idea of the passage?
- (A) The personal essay is an embarrassing form that deserves to be mocked.
 - (B) Montaigne was the greatest writer who ever lived.
 - (C) Novels are always superior to essays.
 - (D) The personal essay, though it seems self-exposing, endures because its honest, particular voice speaks widely and feels newly valuable today.
- Q20.** It can be inferred from the passage that, in Montaigne's original sense, an essay:
- (A) need not arrive at a settled conclusion, valuing the process of thinking itself.
 - (B) must always prove a single clear thesis.



- (C) should avoid any mention of the writer's own life.
- (D) is meant chiefly to display the author's learning.

Q21. The author's attitude toward the personal essay is best described as:

- (A) dismissive and impatient.
- (B) admiring while alert to its pitfalls.
- (C) coldly analytical and detached.
- (D) openly hostile.

Q22. According to the passage, the good essayist makes personal experience speak widely by:

- (A) avoiding all specific detail in favour of grand general statements.
- (B) writing only about famous historical events.
- (C) describing small, particular experiences precisely as a window onto something larger.
- (D) hiding entirely behind invented characters.

Q23. As used in the passage, the word "marshalled" ("an argument marshalled to a conclusion") most nearly means:

- (A) scattered at random.
- (B) loudly proclaimed.
- (C) quietly abandoned.
- (D) organised and directed toward.

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

- (A) Montaigne: A Biography.
- (B) The Personal Essay: Honest Attempts That Speak to Us All.
- (C) Why the Novel Beats the Essay.
- (D) The Death of Serious Writing.



Detailed Solutions

Q1.

Solution

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

Passage support: Doses “flow instead to the countries that can pay,” the result is called “a moral failure on a planetary scale,” the practice is judged “self-defeating,” and yet “the choice is not simply between a cruel market and no vaccines at all.” So the passage both condemns the gap and insists it can be reformed.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The author grants that profit “produced the vaccines so quickly,” so does not ban selling for profit.
- Option B: Speed is conceded, but the system is called unjust, not working “well for everyone.”
- Option D: The passage blames commerce and geography, never the poor countries.

Final Answer: Vaccines reach the rich first for commercial reasons, unjust and self-defeating yet reformable ⇒ C

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

Q2.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Read the stated fact and draw the point it is meant to make.

Passage support: Wealthy nations ordered “enough to inoculate every citizen several times over, while poorer countries waited.” So the rich locked up far more than they needed, leaving less for everyone else.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: The excess reflects over-ordering, not weak vaccines.
- Option C: The poorer countries “waited”; they did not refuse.
- Option D: Rich buyers, not the makers, drove the shortage elsewhere.

Final Answer: Rich countries secured far more doses than they needed ⇒ A



Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q2](#)

Q3.

Solution

Concept — Tone / attitude: Weigh the author’s criticism against any allowance made for the other side.

Passage support: The author calls the outcome “a moral failure” yet admits “there is force in” the defenders’ case and proposes workable fixes such as “advance-purchase funds pooled by many nations.” Sharp about the unfairness but realistic about incentives is critical yet pragmatic.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Approving” ignores the strong moral criticism.
- Option C: The author is plainly engaged, not indifferent.
- Option D: Concrete remedies rule out “despairing.”

Final Answer: Critical yet pragmatic ⇒ B

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q3](#)

Q4.

Solution

Concept — Argument / detail: Read the defenders’ stated case exactly.

Passage support: Defenders say “it was private investment, spurred by the promise of profit, that produced the vaccines so quickly,” warning that without the reward “the next vaccine may arrive too late.” That is precisely the incentive argument.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage calls vaccines “expensive to develop and manufacture.”
- Option B: Storage infrastructure is never the defenders’ argument.
- Option C: The quality of vaccines is not their point.

Final Answer: Profit produced the vaccines quickly, and removing it could delay the next ⇒ D

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



Q5.

Solution

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

Passage support: The rich have “hoarded” the vaccines and built “walls” around themselves while others wait. So “hoarded” means accumulated and kept from others.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: “Freely distributed” is the opposite of hoarding.
- Option C: Testing is a different idea altogether.
- Option D: Hoarding is withholding, not using up.

Final Answer: Accumulated and kept from others ⇒

[Go Back to Q5](#)

Q6.

Solution

Concept — Summary / best title: Choose the title that captures the whole thrust, not one strand.

Passage support: The passage argues the gap is a “moral failure,” is “self-defeating,” and is not fixed forever, since reforms “could all widen access without destroying the incentive.” That is unjust, unsafe, and avoidable.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Rapid development is background, not the theme.
- Option B: The passage never claims markets always fail.
- Option D: It partly defends firms’ role, so it is not a blanket attack.

Final Answer: Vaccine Inequity: Unjust, Unsafe, and Not Inevitable ⇒

[Go Back to Q6](#)



Q7.

Solution

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

Passage support: “Every serious constitution tries . . . to wall the judiciary off,” the assault on courts is subtle rather than open, and independence is defended as the people’s “trustee across time.” That is exactly independence, its apparent undemocratic character, and the need to guard it.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage warns against courts that “please those in power.”
- Option C: It admits judges “can be timid, biased, or wrong.”
- Option D: The real danger is subtle, since abolishing courts “would be too obvious.”

Final Answer: An independent judiciary is essential to the rule of law and must be guarded ⇒

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

Q8.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Draw the implied point from the author’s test of the rule of law.

Passage support: Health shows “not when the courts agree with the government, which proves nothing, but when they do not, and their rulings are still obeyed.” So a court that always sides with the government tells us nothing about its independence.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Agreement “proves nothing,” so it is not proof of health.
- Option B: Efficiency is not the measure being discussed.
- Option C: Constant agreement is not evidence of resisting pressure.

Final Answer: It reveals nothing about whether the court is truly independent ⇒

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



Q9.

Solution

Concept — Tone: Read the emotional colour of the warning about attacks on courts.

Passage support: Each attack “can be dressed up as reform,” and independence takes “generations to build and only a few careless years to squander.” A serious, warning voice is earnest and cautionary.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Nothing is light-hearted about the warning.
- Option B: The strong defence goes beyond neutral description.
- Option D: There is no sarcasm in the measured argument.

Final Answer: Earnest and cautionary ⇒

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

Q10.

Solution

Concept — Argument / detail: Locate the critics’ precise objection.

Passage support: Independence “is, in a sense, undemocratic: it lets a handful of appointed officials overrule the elected representatives of the people,” and “critics ask why they should have such power at all.”

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: Slow, costly trials are not the objection raised here.
- Option C: Easy removal is the opposite of the secure tenure judges are given.
- Option D: Pleasing the government is what independence is meant to prevent.

Final Answer: It lets appointed officials overrule the elected representatives ⇒

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



Q11.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Fit the meaning to “a few careless years to squander.”

Passage support: The shared conviction “takes generations to build and only a few careless years to squander.” Built slowly, then lost carelessly, so “squander” means waste or throw away.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Strengthen” is the opposite of the loss described.
- Option B: “Preserve” is also the opposite.
- Option C: “Celebrate” has nothing to do with losing something.

Final Answer: Waste or throw away ⇒ D

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

Q12.

Solution

Concept — Summary: Pick the option that matches the passage’s final judgement.

Passage support: Obedience to courts “rests, finally, on a shared conviction that the law binds even those who make it, a conviction that takes generations to build.” That is the closing claim.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The author denies that judges are infallible.
- Option C: Courts matter most when they disagree, not when they agree.
- Option D: A written text alone “cannot be written into any document,” so it is not enough.

Final Answer: The rule of law rests on a shared conviction, slow to build and easy to destroy ⇒ B

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



Q13.

Solution

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

Passage support: The land is “tired,” a single “miracle” is doubted, farms should “marry old wisdom to new tools,” and the future belongs to those who “start treating [land] as a system to be kept alive.” So it argues for restorative farming that blends old and new.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: It never calls for halting population growth.
- Option C: The green revolution “did feed billions, and deserves the credit.”
- Option D: “Precision, not brute force” pairs technology with old practices, not technology alone.

Final Answer: Feed a growing population by farming that restores the land, old plus new ⇒

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

Q14.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Unpack the contrast between “rebuild” and “borrow.”

Passage support: Old techniques “rebuild fertility that chemicals only borrow.” To borrow is to take for a time and owe back, so chemicals lift yields temporarily without truly restoring the soil.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Completely useless” is too strong; the green revolution did feed billions.
- Option B: Relative cost is never the point being made.
- Option D: Never using any fertiliser is not implied.

Final Answer: Chemicals boost yields only temporarily, without restoring the soil ⇒

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



Q15.

Solution

Concept — Tone / attitude: Balance the author’s alarm against the hopeful thrust.

Passage support: The author warns the land is “tired” yet insists “healthier soil and higher long-term yields need not be enemies.” Concern joined to practical hope is concerned yet constructive.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Carefree” ignores the clear alarm.
- Option C: The offered remedies rule out “hopeless.”
- Option D: The tone is measured, not angry and accusatory.

Final Answer: Concerned yet constructive ⇒ **B**

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

Q16.

Solution

Concept — Argument / detail: Read the stated political obstacle.

Passage support: “Subsidies still reward farmers for the volume they produce rather than the soil they preserve.” That is a policy pulling the wrong way.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: A blanket refusal to learn is not stated.
- Option B: “Too cheap to be profitable” is not mentioned.
- Option C: Scientific disagreement over crops is not raised.

Final Answer: Subsidies reward volume rather than soil preservation ⇒ **D**

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



Q17.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Read “exhausting the ground” beside the images of depletion.

Passage support: Nearby the methods “stripped soils of nutrients” and “drained aquifers,” so exhausting the ground means draining and using it up.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Tiring out physically” misses the sense of depletion.
- Option B: “Cleaning” is unrelated to using up.
- Option D: “Enriching” is the opposite of what is happening.

Final Answer: Draining and using up ⇒

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

Q18.

Solution

Concept — Summary / best title: Choose the title that captures the passage’s hopeful, restorative theme.

Passage support: The essay is about feeding ten billion by farming wisely, with “precision, not brute force,” and treating the land “as a system to be kept alive.”

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: “The End of Agriculture” is the opposite of the hopeful message.
- Option C: Stopping population growth is not the theme.
- Option D: The passage marries machines to the soil rather than setting them against it.

Final Answer: Farming’s Future: Feeding More by Working the Land Wisely ⇒

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



Q19.

Solution

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

Passage support: The form is “the most exposed,” yet “has survived for centuries,” its “apparent weakness is also its secret strength,” and it “feels newly needed in a distracted age.” Option D states exactly that.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: This is the view the passage sets out to overturn.
- Option B: Calling Montaigne the greatest ever overstates one detail.
- Option C: The superiority of novels is never claimed.

Final Answer: The self-exposing essay endures because its honest, particular voice speaks widely ⇒ D

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

Q20.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Draw the implied meaning of the word “essais.”

Passage support: “Essais” means “attempts or trials,” and an essay is “a mind caught in the act of thinking . . . honest enough to admit when it leads nowhere.” So it need not reach a settled conclusion; the thinking itself is the point.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: It is “not a finished argument,” so it need not prove a single thesis.
- Option C: The form draws directly on the writer's own life.
- Option D: Displaying learning is not named as its aim.

Final Answer: It need not settle a conclusion, valuing the process of thinking ⇒ A

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



Q21.

Solution

Concept — Tone / attitude: Judge how warmly the author writes, and whether any caution is voiced.

Passage support: The author calls honest essay-writing “one of the braver ways of facing” the world, yet names its dangers, “self-absorption” and “false universality.” Warm praise alert to the pitfalls is admiring while aware of them.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Dismissive” contradicts the clear admiration.
- Option C: The tone is warm, not coldly detached.
- Option D: There is no hostility toward the form.

Final Answer: Admiring while alert to its pitfalls ⇒ B

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q21](#)

Q22.

Solution

Concept — Argument / detail: Read the stated method of the good essayist.

Passage support: The good essayist uses “the small and particular . . . as a window onto something larger,” and “the more precisely a writer describes her own peculiar experience, the more widely it seems to speak.”

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Grand generalities are the “false universality” the passage warns against.
- Option B: Famous historical events are not required.
- Option D: Hiding behind invented characters is what the novelist does, not the essayist.

Final Answer: By describing small, particular experiences as a window onto something larger ⇒ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q22](#)



Q23.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Fit the meaning to “an argument marshalled to a conclusion.”

Passage support: An essay is contrasted with “a finished argument marshalled to a conclusion,” that is, one arranged and steered toward its end. So “marshalled” means organised and directed toward.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Scattered” is the opposite of ordered.
- Option B: “Proclaimed” captures loudness, not arrangement.
- Option C: “Abandoned” is the reverse of driving toward a conclusion.

Final Answer: Organised and directed toward ⇒ D

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

Q24.

Solution

Concept — Summary / best title: Pick the title that names both the form and its appeal.

Passage support: Essais are honest “attempts,” the paradox is that exact personal detail “speak[s]” to everyone, and the essay is a real voice “thinking aloud.” That is honest attempts that speak to us all.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Montaigne is one example, not the whole subject.
- Option C: The passage does not pit the novel against the essay.
- Option D: “The Death of Serious Writing” is the opposite of the hopeful close.

Final Answer: The Personal Essay: Honest Attempts That Speak to Us All ⇒ B

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



Answer Key

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

