









# 产。智课网

下载智课 APP



官方网站: http://www.smartstudy.com₽

客服热线: 400-011-91914 新浪微博: @智课网4 微信公众号: 智课网4



# GRE 官方写作题库 Argument 170

The following appeared in a memo from the vice president of a company that builds shopping malls throughout the country:

"The surface of a section of Route 101, paved two years ago by Good Intentions Roadways, is now badly cracked and marred by dangerous potholes. In another part of the state, a section of Route 40, paved by Appian Roadways more than four years ago, is still in good condition. Appian Roadways has recently purchased state-of-the-art paving machinery, and it has hired a new quality-control manager. Because of its superior work and commitment to quality, we should contract with Appian Roadways rather than Good Intentions Roadways to construct the access roads for all our new shopping malls."

# 满分范文赏析

The vice president of a company that builds shopping malls argues here that the company should hire Appian rather than Good Intentions to build access roads for the company. To support this argument the vice president points out that a certain area of Route 101 that Good Intentions repaved two years ago has deteriorated significantly, while a certain stretch of Route 40 that Appian repaved four years ago remains in good condition. The vice president also points out that Appian recently acquired new state-of-the-art paving equipment and hired a new quality-control manager. The argument seems very convincing at first but does, in fact, require a closer look.

# 【此段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 开头段结构,即:C – E - F 的开头结构,首句概括原文的 Conclusion。接下两句话来概括原文为了支持他的结论,所引用两个的 Evidence,最后尾句中 给出开头段到正文段的过渡句,指出有一些逻辑上的 Flaw。

## 【此段功能】

本段作为 Argument 开头段,具体功能就在发起攻击。首先,概括原文的结论:公司副主席 认为应该让 Appian 而不是 Good Intentions 来给公司修路。接下来分别列举了原文为了支持这个结论引用的证据:一是 Appian 四年前修的一段路情况良好,而 Good intention 两年前修的一段路已经有很多的损坏,二是 Appian 公司最近有了新设备和新的质检经理,这些信息的归纳



都是用于铺垫出正文段的具体攻击。最后点出原文存在逻辑错误,引出后面的分析。

First of all, it is unfair to conclude, based solely on the comparison between the two stretches of highway, that Appian does better work than Good Intentions. The conclusion relies on the assumption that the comparative quality of two contractors' work, rather than some other phenomenon, was responsible for the comparative condition of the two stretches of pavement. Perhaps the stretch that Good Intentions repaved is located in an area whose extremes in climate or high traffic volume serve to erode and damage pavement very quickly. For that matter, perhaps soil or other geological conditions in that area were primarily responsible for deterioration of the pavement along that stretch. In short, without showing that all other conditions in the two areas have been essentially the same, the vice president should not make a determination about the quality of work.

# 【此段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构,即:概括第一个逻辑错误的错误类型和原文犯错位置,接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

# 【此段功能】

本段作为正文第一段,攻击文章犯的主要逻辑错误:错误类比,两条路不同的损坏程度是由两公司的 comparative quality 造成的,很可能是其他方面的原因(如,extreme climate 气候极端, high traffic volume 交通流量大)而不只工程质量导致道路损坏程度的差异。

Secondly, it is unfair to conclude based on Appian's recent equipment acquisition and personnel decision that Appian will do a better job than Good Intentions. Perhaps Good Intentions has also acquired the same type of equipment. Moreover, perhaps Good Intentions' quality-control manager is far more experienced than Appian's new manager, and as a result Good Intentions' product is likely to be better than Appian's. Besides, equipment and on-site management are only two of many factors affecting the quality of work. There are more factors to consider: the experience and competence of other workers, paving material used and so on. Without showing that the two firms are similar in these and other respects, the vice president cannot justify his recommendation of Appian over Good Intentions.



# 【此段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构,即:概括第二个逻辑错误的错误类型和原文犯错位置,接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

## 【此段功能】

本段作为正文第三段,攻击文章犯的第二个重要逻辑错误:因果类错误和忽略他因。首先,Appian 公司新的 equipment 和 personnel 并不意味着他会比 Good Intention 做的好,也许 Good Intention 的仪器和经理要 far more experienced。其次,equipment 和 Good intention 只是两个方面,还有一些其他因素(experience, worker, material...),如果没有在其他因素都相同的条件下只比较两个方面,那么得到结论是靠不住的。

Finally, the vice president's recommendation rests on the unlikely assumption that the company has only two alternatives—Good Intentions and Appian. In all likelihood there are many more competitors, some of whom might be able to offer more competitively priced products of equal or greater quality. So, in this argument, the recommendation isn't just over Good Intentions but over all other companies.

#### 【此段结构】

本段是文章的第三段,是论证的第三个层次。采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构,即:概括逻辑错误的错误类型和原文犯错位置,接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

## 【此段功能】

本段作为正文第三段,攻击文章犯的第三个重要逻辑错误:忽略他因。作者只给出了 Appian 和 Good intention 这两家公司的情况,而没有提到当地其他公司与这两家公司相比又怎样的情况,因此,应该比较 Appian 公司和所有其他公司的情况,而不是单单与 Good Intention 比较。

In sum, the vice president has not convincingly argued that the company should hire Appian. To strengthen the argument the vice president must provide clear evidence linking quality of work to each company. The vice president must also provide better evidence that Appian's new equipment



and new manager will enhance, or at least maintain, the quality of Appian's overall work at a higher level than Good Intentions' overall work. Finally, to better assess the argument an audience would need to know what other paving contractors the company could hire, the quality of those contractors' work and the overall cost in comparison to the two companies mentioned above.

# 【此段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 结尾段结构,即:C – S 的结尾结构,首先再次重申原文的站不住脚的 Conclusion,接下来给出给合理建议 Suggestion。

# 【此段功能】

本段作为 Argument 结尾段,具体功能就总结归纳+建议措施,首先再次重申 vice president 的观点的建议不合理,接下来给出合理的建议:同时,他必须另外提供证据说明 A 公司的新设备新经理使得 A 公司与 Good Intention 相比具有 higher level。最后 vice president 还要说明其他公司与这两家公司相比较是怎样的情况。结尾段的三条建议非常规整的隐射前面的三个错误,前后呼应,文章有力结尾,浑然一体。

# 【满分因素剖析】

# 【语言表达】

本文的语言使用规范、清晰,词汇也用得准确地道,并使用多变的句式让考官读起来津津有味,这些都是 GRE 写作官方的语言要求。同时,文章的结构型语言和内容型语言相得益彰,结构是骨架,内容是血肉,二者完美结合。

- 1. The vice president of ... argues here that ... (标志性的 argument 开头段引出原文的 conclusion) should ... rather than... (标志性的连词短语 rather than, , 涉及两个事物的选择或比较). To support this argument the vice president points out that ... (标志性 argument 开头段引出原文支持论点的 Evidence). The argument seems very convincing at first but does, in fact, require a closer look. (标志性的第一段结尾,承接上面的 conclusion 和 Evidence , 提出 Flaw , 引出下文)
- 2. First of all, it is unfair to conclude... The conclusion relies on the assumption that the comparative quality of two contractors' work, rather than some other phenomenon, was responsible for...(标志



性的论证分析语句,点出错误类比的地方) Perhaps ...(标志性的语句,提出其他可能性) For that matter, perhaps... In short, without showing..., the vice president should not ...(标志性的论证段结尾,再次重申错误)

3. Secondly, it is unfair to conclude based on ...(标志性的论证段开头,点出错误所在) Appian will ... Perhaps Good Intentions ... . Moreover, perhaps ... and as a result ...(标志性的因果分析,提出其他可能性)

# (标志性的因果类错误)

4. In sum, the vice president has not convincingly argued that. ..(标志性的全文总结句,即"原文观点不可信") To strengthen the argument the vice president must provide ... The vice president must also ... Finally, to better ..., audience would ..(标志性的 argument 结尾,提出两条或两条以上的合理化建议).

标志性的 argument 结尾,总结全文,并提出合理化建议

# 【逻辑结构】

本文是非常严谨的开头段-正文段 1-正文段 2--正文段 3-结尾段的的五段论逻辑体系。开头段按照 C-E-F 的逻辑结构,顺利引出后文的分析。论证段中,从提出错误,到分析错误,到给出可能性,最后总结错误,层次清晰,衔接自然。结尾段总结全文,重申错误,给出合理化建议。这样一篇文章从开头到结尾逻辑严谨,内容清晰,圆满的完成了论证的作用。美中不足就是三个论证段之间,以及第二个论证段中的两个错误是完全并列的,缺乏让步和递进关系,这样的文章看起来比较平淡,没有给人层层深入的感觉。在第二个论证段中间,我们可以将Besides, equipment and on-site management are only two of many factors affecting the quality of work.改成 Even if Appian's new equipment and new manager are much better than Good Intention, it's still unfair to conclude Appian's work is better than Good Intention simply considering these two factors.这样的让步结构,使得文章论证层层深入,更有说服力。



