

ANSWER KEY — 11 OCTOBER 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
B	D	A	C	D	A	C	B	D	A
Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
C	B	A	C	B	D	A	C	D	B
Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24						
C	A	D	B						

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B Main idea HARD

The passage moves from local solar time, through railway time, to the 1906 proposal and Bombay's refusal, and then tells the reader how to read that refusal. The fourth paragraph rejects the idea that it was 'mere attachment to habit' and says 'the quarrel over a few minutes was a quarrel over who had the authority to define an ordinary day'. The last paragraph repeats the point: the victory was not 'the simple triumph of efficiency over sentiment' but 'the settlement of a dispute about whose clock a city should keep'. The option describing a contest over authority rather than habit against efficiency states exactly this. The option about weakening Bombay's merchants invents an official motive the passage never gives. The accuracy option is unsupported: the author says both clocks 'were correct'. The railway-companies option misreads the second paragraph, where companies used railway time for their own trains, while the government proposed the national standard.

Examiner's note — the trap: The railway-companies option attracts because the second paragraph dwells on railway time, but the national standard came from the government in 1906, and the passage's point concerns authority, not who first used a single time.

Q2 D Purpose of a detail HARD

The first paragraph explains that each town's noon differed, and then says that 'for people who travelled at the pace of a bullock cart, the difference was invisible', because a slow traveller simply adjusted 'to each town's noon as he arrived'. The second paragraph opens with the contrast: 'The railway made the difference visible and then intolerable.' The detail therefore sets up why local time caused no difficulty until fast travel exposed it, which is the correct option. The passage says nothing about the cost or danger of travel, so that option imports facts. The tolerance option turns a point about speed into a claim about character; the traveller adjusted because the difference was too gradual to notice, not because he was more broad-minded. The option about delays contrasts reliability, a subject the author never raises, and actually reverses the logic, since the railway's problem was precise timetables, not lateness.

Examiner's note — the trap: The tolerance option is attractive because the traveller 'adjusted' as he did to water and dialect, but the author's point is that slow travel hid the difference, not that travellers were more accepting.

Q3 A Inference - figurative meaning HARD

The second paragraph says the railway companies ran 'their trains on a single railway time while the towns around the stations kept their own'. A passenger could therefore find the station clock and the market-tower clock 'disagreed by half an hour, and both were correct'. Both were correct because each was accurately keeping a different standard: the station clock kept railway time and the tower clock kept the town's local solar time. That is the correct option. The mechanical-soundness option misreads 'correct' as a remark about machinery and adds an untested claim about checking against the sun. The option calling half an hour too small to matter contradicts the passage, which says the railway made the difference 'intolerable'. The option saying each side believed wrongly that its own clock alone was accurate reverses the author's statement that both clocks were in fact correct, each by its own standard.

Examiner's note — the trap: The mechanical-soundness option tempts readers who take 'correct' literally, but the paradox is resolved by the two different standards of time, not by the condition of the clocks.

Q4 C Author's attitude HARD

The final paragraph says that the victory of standard time 'was not the simple triumph of efficiency over sentiment that later accounts describe'. The author thus names the later accounts only to correct them: they flatten the episode into efficiency versus sentiment, whereas the author has argued that it was 'a dispute about whose clock a city should keep', that is, about authority. That is a critical attitude, aimed at the oversimplification, which matches the correct option. The admiring option fails because the author agrees only that standard time was likely to win, not with the accounts' explanation of the episode. The indifferent option reverses the passage, whose whole fourth paragraph is about causes and motives. The hostile option overstates: the author accuses the accounts of simplifying, not of deliberate concealment, and nothing suggests they hide Bombay's role.

Examiner's note — the trap: The hostile option attracts because the author clearly disagrees, but disagreement about an interpretation is criticism; nothing in the passage accuses the later accounts of deliberately hiding facts.

Q5 D Meaning in context MED

The final paragraph reads: 'It was the settlement of a dispute about whose clock a city should keep, and the losers understood very well what they were losing.' The word is attached to 'a dispute', and the sentence goes on to speak of 'losers', so 'settlement' here means the resolution of a disagreement, one in which a side prevailed. That matches the correct option. The option about a place where people come to live gives a real meaning of 'settlement', but a dispute is not resolved by a village. The option about a sum paid to close a legal claim is a narrower legal sense; nothing in the passage involves money or private parties. The option about ground sinking beneath a building is an engineering sense with no connection to the sentence. In each case the test is which meaning fits the phrase 'settlement of a dispute', and only the resolution meaning does.

Examiner's note — the trap: The money-paid-to-close-a-claim option is attractive to law aspirants who know that legal sense, but no payment or private litigation is involved; the dispute was settled by one side winning.

Q6 A Strengthen - RC (Stretch) ELITE

The author's reading, in the fourth paragraph, is that Bombay's resistance was not 'mere attachment to habit' but a claim that the working day should be set 'by the sun over their own harbour rather than by an order issued from elsewhere', a quarrel 'over who had the authority to define an ordinary day'. Evidence that the city's critics argued in print against a time fixed by a distant government directly confirms that their motive concerned authority. The two-watches option shows that residents coped with both times; it says nothing about why they resisted. The option about other cities adopting the standard quickly describes the rest of the country, which the passage already reports, and does not bear on Bombay's motive. The option about the size of Bombay's time difference actually suggests a practical reason for resistance, a larger disruption to daily life, and so offers a rival explanation rather than support for the author's.

Examiner's note — the trap: The larger-difference option is the trap: it seems relevant to Bombay, but it supplies a practical motive that competes with, rather than supports, the author's reading about authority.

Q7 C Main idea HARD

The passage first shows that concert silence is enforced as though it were 'as old as the music', then says 'They are not' and dates the silent hall to 'the later nineteenth century'. The third paragraph grants 'real gains': long, quiet works became possible. The fourth turns to the cost: rules that must be learned 'sort an audience', and the newcomer learns 'that the hall belongs to others'. The final paragraph concludes that each convention 'admits some listeners more easily than others'. The option combining a recent convention, real gains and exclusion captures all three moves. The option calling the silent hall an old tradition contradicts the second paragraph. The Hindustani option takes a contrast offered as illustration and turns it into a ranking the author refuses, since 'Neither convention is natural'. The option recommending that applause be discouraged reverses the author's sympathy for the newcomer.

Examiner's note — the trap: The Hindustani option attracts because the last paragraph praises responsive listening, but the author says neither convention is natural and does not rank one above the other.

Q8 B Purpose of a detail HARD

The second paragraph opens by denying that the rules are 'as old as the music', and then supplies evidence: eighteenth-century audiences 'clapped whenever something pleased them', and a composer 'boasted' that his audience applauded mid-symphony 'at a passage he had written expressly to win it'. The detail shows that applause during a work was once not merely tolerated but welcomed, even sought, by composers, which is the correct option. The option that composers valued applause over quality is a sweeping judgment the passage never makes; one composer's pleasure in applause does not show he neglected quality. The option about Paris being less disciplined than other cities fails because the author treats the habit as general across 'much of the eighteenth century', not as Parisian. The option about long, quiet passages belongs to the third paragraph and describes what became possible only after the silent hall arose.

Examiner's note — the trap: The composers-cared-more-for-applause option is tempting because the composer 'boasted', but the author uses the anecdote as evidence about past audience conduct, not to judge composers' priorities.

Q9 D Inference HARD

The fourth paragraph states that the newcomer who claps between movements 'has not harmed the music'; he has merely revealed that he did not grow up with it', and that 'every glare he receives teaches him that the hall belongs to others'. The reaction to him is therefore about what his conduct reveals, his unfamiliarity, rather than any damage to the performance, which is the correct option. The option saying he damages the performance contradicts the explicit 'has not harmed the music'; the 'thread of sound' language belongs to the third paragraph's account of quiet works, not to clapping between movements. The option about performers correcting him contradicts the first paragraph, which says correction comes 'by a glare' or 'a helpful neighbour'. The Hindustani option is unsupported: the last paragraph describes a tradition that welcomes audible response, so nothing suggests he would be out of place there.

Examiner's note — the trap: The damage option borrows the third paragraph's 'thread of sound' to sound plausible, but the author states plainly that the newcomer 'has not harmed the music'.

Q10 A Paragraph function HARD

The third paragraph begins 'The change brought real gains' and explains that long, quiet works and passages of near silence became possible to perform and hear. The fourth paragraph then opens 'But the new manners did something else as well' and turns to the exclusion of newcomers. The third paragraph thus concedes a genuine benefit before the author develops the cost, which is the correct option. The option calling it the main evidence for the nineteenth-century dating misplaces that evidence, which is in the second paragraph. The rebuttal option reverses the structure: the third paragraph does not dispute that audiences once applauded freely; it accepts the change and weighs its benefits. The Hindustani option belongs to the final paragraph, which is the only place the passage discusses Hindustani concerts. Recognising concession-then-turn structures, signalled here by 'real gains' and 'But', is the key skill tested.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'main evidence' option attracts because the paragraph concerns the silent hall, but the dating evidence is the eighteenth-century conduct described in the second paragraph.

Q11 C Tone MED

The author neither mourns the eighteenth-century hall nor celebrates the modern one. The passage records the change, grants 'real gains' in the third paragraph, names the cost in the fourth, and ends with a balanced judgment: 'Neither convention is natural. Each is a choice about what listening is for, and each choice admits some listeners more easily than others.' That even-handed weighing of what a convention achieves against whom it excludes is analytical, the correct option. The nostalgic option fails because the author nowhere wishes for talking and eating audiences to return. The scornful option overstates: the author describes the glare and its effect but does not mock those who give it. The celebratory option ignores the fourth paragraph's criticism. Tone questions reward attention to the passage's final sentences, where an author usually shows whether the stance is partisan or balanced.

Examiner's note — the trap: The scornful option attracts because the author sympathises with the newcomer, but sympathy expressed through analysis is not mockery of the listeners who glare.

Q12 B Application - RC (Stretch) ELITE

The fourth paragraph's point is specific: 'Rules that must be learned before one can follow them sort an audience into those who know them and those who do not', and breaches are punished socially ('every glare') in a way that tells outsiders 'the hall belongs to others'. The analogue must therefore involve an unwritten code that marks insiders off from outsiders and leads to quiet exclusion. A club's unwritten dress code that lets members spot and cold-shoulder outside guests has exactly that structure, so it is the correct option. The museum option involves a rule protecting an object from physical harm, which is the opposite of the newcomer case, where no harm is done. The library and theatre options are rules that serve concentration, which corresponds to the 'real gains' of the third paragraph rather than to the sorting effect the question asks about.

Examiner's note — the trap: The library option is the trap: it shares the surface feature of silence, but it mirrors the benefit in the third paragraph, not the insider-outsider sorting in the fourth.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q13 A Main conclusion - CR HARD

The argument opens with the critics' fear that translation into English is 'a kind of slow theft' and then answers it. The final paragraph draws the conclusion explicitly: 'It follows that the fear of translation has things backwards. Translation into English does not drain readers away from the literatures it draws on' and is 'one of the few means by which those literatures can recover the readers they have already lost'. The option stating that translation helps those literatures rather than draining them is the conclusion. The option about prizes teaching young writers to turn to English is the critics' view, which the fourth paragraph rejects. The advertising option is a premise from the third paragraph explaining why the prize's attention matters. The sales-rise option is the evidence offered in the second paragraph. Distinguish the claim the author argues for from the evidence and premises used to reach it.

Examiner's note — the trap: The sales-rise option attracts because it is the passage's most concrete claim, but it is evidence offered for the conclusion, not the conclusion itself.

Q14 C Assumption - CR (Stretch) ELITE

The third paragraph reasons that the English buyers are 'for the most part, not readers who would otherwise have bought it in the original; many of them cannot read the original at all', and concludes that the translation 'takes little from the original's market'. The fact that many buyers cannot read the original covers only some readers. For the conclusion to follow, the remaining readers, those who could read the original, must not be switching to the translation in large numbers. That is the necessary assumption in the correct option; negate it, so that bilingual readers regularly choose the English edition, and the translation does take sales from the original. The option about buyers being writers is irrelevant. The advertising option is a separate premise used for the 'attention' point. The option about translations appearing first is unsupported and does not bear on lost sales.

Examiner's note — the trap: The advertising option is tempting because it is in the same paragraph, but it supports the attention point; the 'takes little' claim depends on bilingual readers not switching.

Q15 B Weaken - CR HARD

The conclusion is general: translation does not drain readers from Indian-language literatures and helps them 'recover the readers they have already lost'. The evidence is that sales of the prize-winning original rise. If the gains go to the winning title alone while overall sales in that language keep falling, then the observed rise is a narrow effect that leaves the literature as a whole still losing readers, which strikes directly at the conclusion. That is the correct option. The bestseller option, about some winners already selling well, does not show that the post-prize rise failed to occur. The option about translators' pay is irrelevant to readership. The option that English-

translation readers also read English originals is consistent with the author's point that they are mostly not buyers of the original-language edition, and so it does not undermine it.

Examiner's note — the trap: The already-best-sellers option attracts because it seems to explain away the sales rise, but it concerns only some winners and does not show that the literature as a whole loses readers.

Q16 D Strengthen - CR **HARD**

The argument's mechanism is attention: readers at home 'discover that one of its writers is being discussed abroad, and they go looking for the writer at home', and 'a prize abroad does that work for free'. Evidence that most buyers of reprinted originals first heard of the author through coverage of the prize confirms that the prize, rather than some other cause, produced the rise in original-language sales. That is the correct option. The option about more Indian-language novels being translated shows only that translation is growing, which the critics also accept. The translators-as-children option is irrelevant to whether readers return to the originals. The option about young writers studying English literature, if anything, supports the critics' worry that the young are drawn towards English, and so does not help the author.

Examiner's note — the trap: The more-translations option attracts because it sounds favourable to translation, but growth in translation is common ground; it does not show that translation sends readers back to the originals.

Q17 A Role of a statement - CR **HARD**

The third paragraph says the English buyers are mostly not readers who would otherwise have bought the original, adding that 'many of them cannot read the original at all'. The next sentence draws an intermediate conclusion: 'The translation therefore takes little from the original's market.' The statement thus supports the claim that the translation takes few sales away from the original, which is the correct option. It is not the main conclusion, which comes in the final paragraph and concerns translation not draining the literatures. Nor is it the critics' view; the critics' fear, stated in the first paragraph, is that each English reader is 'lost' to the original language. The option that it explains the rise in original sales mislocates its role: the rise is explained by attention and the prize, not by English readers' inability to read the original.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'explains the rise in sales' option attracts because both ideas are about sales, but the statement explains why little is lost, not why original sales grow.

Q18 C Flaw - CR (Stretch) **ELITE**

The only evidence offered concerns what happens 'when a translated novel wins a major international prize'. The conclusion, however, is about translation into English as such: it 'does not drain readers away' and is among the means by which literatures 'recover the readers they have already lost'. Most translations win no prize, and the mechanism the author relies on, attention generated by a prize abroad, is absent for them. Drawing a general conclusion about translation from the unusual prize-winning cases is the flaw, which is the correct option. The option about critics having no personal stake is unsupported; the argument never relies on the critics' motives. The option about relying on publishers' word fails because the author cites sales and reprints, not publishers' testimony. The option about treating a rise in original sales as a fall in translation sales misstates the argument.

Examiner's note — the trap: The publishers'-testimony option is the trap: it sounds like a standard source-bias flaw, but the argument rests on sales figures, not on what publishers say.

Q19 D Main conclusion - CR **HARD**

The final paragraph states the conclusion: the rule 'standing alone, moves the choice without changing the incentive that corrupts it', and 'Unless it is paired with limits on trade margins, or with a public list of approved low-cost products', it will 'change the name of the person who profits from the patient's ignorance and little else'. The option saying that, without margin limits or a low-cost list, the rule merely shifts who profits states this. The option calling generic prescribing a mistake is denied explicitly: 'None of this means that generic prescribing is a mistake.' The gifts-ban option is never proposed; the author predicts redirected persuasion but recommends margin limits and a list instead. The option about patients not knowing which products contain the molecule is a premise from the second paragraph that supports the conclusion.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'generic prescribing is a mistake' option attracts readers who see the argument as an attack on the rule, but the author expressly limits the criticism to the rule standing alone.

Q20 B Assumption - CR (Stretch) **ELITE**

The argument moves from 'the chemist chooses' to the prediction that 'The patient will face the same high price'. That step requires that patients will not protect themselves, for example by insisting on the cheapest version or by comparing prices across shops. If many patients did, chemists could not steer them to high-margin products and prices would fall. The correct option states this necessary assumption; negating it destroys the prediction. The option that doctors are always swayed by gifts is too strong; the argument needs only that companies court doctors, not that every doctor yields. The quality option is not needed: the argument concerns price and margin, not whether branded generics are inferior. The option that chemists earn more from prescriptions than from anything else is irrelevant; the argument compares margins across versions of the same medicine, not across product lines.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'doctors always swayed' option attracts because the passage mentions gifts and conferences, but the argument needs no claim about every doctor; it needs patients who will not shop around.

Q21 C Weaken - CR **HARD**

The argument predicts that under the rule 'the patient will face the same high price, now recommended by a different person', because the patient asks the chemist and the chemist picks the high-margin product. Evidence that where such a rule was tried most patients asked for the cheapest version, and prices paid fell, contradicts the predicted outcome and undercuts the key premise that patients defer to the chemist. That is the correct option. The option that some doctors already prescribe generically does not show what happens to prices under the rule. The option about company spending on doctors versus research is irrelevant to whether persuasion will shift to chemists. The city-and-village stocking option concerns the range on offer; a wider range does not show that patients will get the cheapest version, and may even increase the chemist's room to choose.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'doctors already prescribe generically' option seems to show the rule is harmless, but it tells us nothing about the prices patients actually pay at the chemist's counter.

Q22 **A** Strengthen - CR **HARD**

The author's prediction is that companies will 'redirect' persuasion 'from the doctor's clinic to the chemist's counter' and that the chemist 'has every reason to choose the product that costs the patient most'. Evidence that, where generic prescribing began, chemists' sales shifted towards high-margin branded generics confirms that the choice and its corrupting incentive moved to the chemist, exactly as argued. That is the correct option. The option that patients trust doctors more than chemists, if anything, suggests patients might resist chemists' recommendations, which cuts against the argument. The same-factories option suggests branded generics are of good quality, which is irrelevant to the price argument. The medical associations' opposition on quality grounds introduces a different objection to the rule; the author's objection concerns margins and price, so this does not support it.

Examiner's note — the trap: The medical-associations option attracts because it also opposes the rule, but on quality grounds; the author's argument is about margins, so it gains nothing from that objection.

Q23 **D** Role of a statement - CR **HARD**

After four paragraphs criticising the rule, the author writes, 'None of this means that generic prescribing is a mistake. It means that the rule, standing alone, moves the choice without changing the incentive that corrupts it.' The first sentence heads off a misreading: the target is not generic prescribing as an idea but the rule without accompanying safeguards. It narrows the conclusion, which is the correct option. It is not the main conclusion; that is the claim that the rule alone 'will change the name of the person who profits' unless paired with margin limits or a list. It does not present the supporters' view, which appears in the first paragraph. It introduces no evidence about lowered prices; indeed the passage offers none. Statements beginning 'None of this means' typically limit the scope of an argument rather than advance it.

Examiner's note — the trap: The main-conclusion option tempts because the sentence opens the final paragraph, but it qualifies the conclusion rather than stating it; the conclusion follows in the next sentences.

Q24 **B** Parallel reasoning - CR (Stretch) **ELITE**

The author's reasoning has a precise shape: a rule removes a choice from one interested party (the doctor); because the consumer cannot choose unaided, the choice passes to another party (the chemist) who faces the same corrupting incentive; so the rule changes only who profits. The insurer option matches: barring insurers from naming garages does not cut bills, because owners turn to surveyors, who are paid by costly garages. The choice moves to another interested party and the incentive survives. The sugary-drinks option is about consumers evading a ban by buying elsewhere, not about a choice passing to a new adviser. The driving-test option argues that a change misses the real cause of bribery, low pay. The hospital-prices option shares the theme of consumer ignorance but makes no claim that a choice moves to another party with a bad incentive.

Examiner's note — the trap: The hospital-prices option is the trap: it shares the 'patients cannot judge' premise, but lacks the core structure of a choice shifting to a second interested party.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

- Before the railways, whose time did each Indian town keep? — **Its own local time**
- How was noon defined in a town before standard time? — **When the sun stood highest over it**
- Why did Calcutta's clocks run ahead of Bombay's? — **The sun peaks earlier in the east**
- To whom was the local-time difference invisible? — **Those travelling at bullock-cart pace**
- Name one thing besides noon a slow traveller adjusted to. — **A town's water or its dialect**
- What made the time difference 'visible and then intolerable'? — **The railway**
- What does the author call a timetable? — **A promise that a train will be at a station at an hour**
- What did railway companies run their trains on? — **A single 'railway time'**
- By how much could a station clock and market clock differ? — **Half an hour**

- Where stood the town clock that disagreed with the station's? — **On the market tower**
- In which year was a single standard time proposed? — **1906**
- How far ahead of Greenwich was the proposed standard time? — **Five and a half hours**
- How did officials present the change to standard time? — **As plain convenience**
- Which city refused standard time? — **Bombay**
- Name one group in Bombay that insisted on local time. — **Merchants, newspapers or municipal opinion**
- For how long did Bombay run on two clocks? — **Nearly half a century**
- What reading of Bombay's resistance does the author call tempting? — **Mere attachment to habit**
- For critics, local time meant the day was set by what? — **The sun over their own harbour**
- The quarrel over minutes was really a quarrel over what? — **Who could define an ordinary day**

20. What do 'later accounts' call standard time's victory? — **A triumph of efficiency over sentiment**

21. What does the author call the victory instead? — **The settlement of a dispute over whose clock to keep**

22. Did Bombay's losers understand their loss, per the author? — **Yes, very well**

23. What follows a cough in a quiet concert passage? — **A look, i.e. a glare**

24. When may a Western concert audience applaud? — **Only when the whole work has ended**

25. Name one way an early clapper is corrected. — **A glare or a helpful neighbour**

26. What do most listeners assume about concert rules? — **That they are as old as the music**

27. Name one thing 18th-century audiences did mid-performance. — **Talked, ate, came and went, or clapped**

28. From which city did the composer write home? — **Paris**

29. Where did the Paris audience applaud? — **In the middle of his symphony**

30. Why had the composer written that passage? — **Expressly to win applause**

31. Until when did applause between movements stay ordinary? — **Well into the following century**

32. When was the silent hall largely created? — **The later nineteenth century**

33. Who began treating instrumental music as near-sacred? — **Critics and concert promoters**

34. How was music to be received in the new hall? — **In reverent attention**

35. What did the change in manners bring, per the author? — **Real gains**

36. Which works became possible to perform and hear? — **Long, quiet works**

37. What must a listener hold across many minutes? — **A thread of sound**

38. What could a composer now expect of near silence? — **That it would be heard as such**

39. What do rules that must be learned do to an audience? — **Sort it into those who know and those who don't**

40. Has the early clapper harmed the music? — **No**

41. What has the early clapper revealed? — **That he did not grow up with the music**

42. What does each glare teach the newcomer? — **That the hall belongs to others**

43. In which tradition is murmured approval part of the concert? — **Hindustani classical music**

44. How might Hindustani performers feel without responses? — **As a failure**

45. Is either concert convention natural, per the author? — **No**