

GRE写作argument全部官方范文分析(6)GRE考试 PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文

https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/644/2021_2022_GRE_E5_86_99_E4_BD_9Ca_c86_644560.htm GRE 写作argument全部官方范文分析：第二部分范文分析第四篇文章。第四篇文章

Six months ago the region of Forestville increased the speed limit for vehicles traveling on the regions highways by ten miles per hour. Since that change took effect, the number of automobile accidents in that region has increased by 15 percent. But the speed limit in Elmsford, a region neighboring Forestville, remained unchanged, and automobile accidents declined slightly during the same six-month period. Therefore, if the citizens of Forestville want to reduce the number of automobile accidents on the regions highways, they should campaign to reduce Forestvilles speed limit to what it was before the increase. 原题逻辑顺序：6月前F提高限速== F事故升高== E没提高限速反而事故略减少== F要想减少事故就不能提高限速 6分：The agrument is well-presented, but not thoroughly well-reasoned. 这一句话指出原文存在逻辑问题，这里用的语言很简单。而不是北美范文中有时堆砌了一堆放之四海皆为准的无关痛痒的话。很明显，官方的意思是说这样的客套话一定要说，但是一定要用最简洁的形式来说，而同时那些具体问题具体分析性的语言则要详细的说明白，说清楚。 By ** a comparison of the region of Forestville, the town with the higher speed limit and therefore automobile accidents, with the region of Elmsford, an area of a lower speed limit and subsequently fewer accidents, the argument for reducing Forestvilles speed limits

in order to decrease accidents seems logical.这个开头真的非常巧，因为他用一句话达到了两句话的效果，即同时复述题目并指出问题在哪，而没有像北美一样说结论是什么证据是什么证据再说不能支持结论。设想一下如果我们考官的话看到这样的一个开头得到了一个什么信息呢：此考生已经完全读懂题目了，并且他对原文的逻辑顺序也已经掌握了。深一点层次来说：aw考试考得是我们的分析能力，这是重点。虽然官方说明也曾经强调理解原文很重要，但是终归理解能力并不是考试的重点。所以比较好的做法是：分析题目的脉络，写出分析性的概括。这里没有必要单独再复述题目了因为在分析中已经暗含了原文的信息。这里还有一点值得注意：为什么要第二句话的最前面用comparison这个词呢，这是有讲究的！原文的论证核心就是比较，而这里将此词提到最前面一是说这是原文的逻辑关联，二是暗示我下面要做的就是围绕着此比较而进行的。有点类似于主题句的主干提前。这个词真的是令人发指的重要，看到后面你就知道了 However, the citizens of Forestville are failing to consider other possible alternatives to the increasing car accidents after the raise in speed limit. 这一段是质疑一个假设的前提。从前面的几个范文的分析我们可以看出来，正文body首段质疑的都是作者让步的前提，那么这里的让步在哪里呢，开头段并没有提到阿。确实没有在第一段提到让步。但是别着急，在最后一句的第一句，出现了让步(即since后面的两点理由)，这不就对应上了吗！让步说F这些市民可能是因为自己的利益或者保护自己的安全才建议取消限速的。那么这里的前提就是是F因为限速才使事故增加的。这一段将这个前提狠狠的质疑了一番。论证

方法为列举他因。Such alternatives may include the fact that there are less reliable cars traveling the roads in Forestville, or that the age bracket of those in Elmsford may be more conducive to driving safely. It is possible that there are more younger, inexperienced, or more elderly, unsafe drivers in Forestville than there are in Elmsford. In addition, the citizens have failed to consider the geographical and physical terrain of the two different areas. Perhaps Forestville's highway is in an area of more dangerous curves, sharp turns, or has many intersections or merging points where accidents are more likely to occur. 列举了三点他因，有两点值得注意：一是这里作者前两点都没有详细展开，但这是不是意味着对于比较常识性的例子不用展开呢，不是！同志们，展开并不只有三段论式展开才是展开，谁说这里没有展开呢？作者实际上已经通过定语同位语进行展开了！！比如younger, inexperienced, 和elderly, unsafe就是互相补充阿，所以说我们在给出常识性的例子时，要注意通过修饰语的方式进行暗中的展开。判断我们证明的是否严谨是否充足，可以这样：完全只是用我们提供的信息来推，能不能推出最后的结果。而最后一点展开的则较为充分，这里看来是因为最后一点有点过于宽泛，必须要进行详细具体解释才行。更深一层次的来说作者对于例子的安排也是有详有略，给人错落有致的感觉，美。另外一点值得注意的就是，这三个论证中无一例外的都进行了EF的比较，照应了开头给出的comparison这个词，作者兑现了自己在开头的暗示。 It appears reasonable, therefore, for the citizens to focus on these trouble spots than to reduce the speed in the entire area. 这里作者的论证向前进了一步：前面提出了很多的他因

，但光提出他因是不够的，我们心里一定要想着提出他因是干什么的。这里指出了他因究竟如何来利用，使得证明原文。即应该多考虑一下我所提出的他因，而不是限速。

Elmsford may be an area of easier driving conditions where accidents are less likely to occur regardless of the speed limit.这和上一句是相照应的，属于对比性的论证，刚才说F有了他因所以不是限速能解决，这里有说了E也许也是他因才使得情况稍好。整个段落是多么整齐的对仗阿!EF两地的对比无处不在，而又那么的工整!作者在开头第二句话的Comparison一词真的是统领全文的阿!正所谓指哪打哪。 A six-month period is not a particularly long time frame for the citizens to determine that speed limit has influenced the number of automobile accidents in the area.从这一段开始攻击原文逻辑链。本段有四个分论点，本来应该写四段的。(至于为什么没有写三段，我想是因为awintro中说我们可以随意的选择段落的数量，并不会影响最后的结果。但是，这样的话前提是阅卷人有足够的耐心。所以为了保险起见，让人看着更为清楚些，我还是建议大家分开写)这里第一个攻击的就是6个月时间够不够。 It is mentioned in the argument that Elmsford accidents decreased during the time period. 这一句话的目的在于复述原文条件，立起靶子。从这里开始攻击第二点，即天气的影响。 This may have been a time, such as during harsh weather conditions, when less people were driving on the road and therefore the number of accidents decreased. 对E的论证采用的是经典三段论，即天气差== 人不出去== 事故少。 However, Forestville citizens, perhaps coerced by employment or other requirements, were unable to avoid driving on the roads. 再次

进行了EF对比，通过coerced后面的从句进行推演，属于小展开。也足够充分。 Again, the demographics of the population are important. 这里对逻辑链的第三点进行了攻击。即人口数量的问题。 It is possible that Elmsford citizens do not have to travel far from work or work from their home, or do not work at all. 先说E的人可能少。论证方法是加条件后讨论。 Are there more people in Forestville than there were six months ago? If so, there may be an increased number of accidents due to more automobiles on the road, and not due to the increased speed limits. 再说F的人可能多。论证方法同要是加条件后讨论。 Also in reference to the activities of the population, 最后攻击逻辑链的第四点，即人们活动的时间。(品味一下本段四个逻辑错误的安排顺序，时间==)天气==)人数== 人的活动，看似无关，还是很有讲究的阿，这不正是从外在因素到内在因素吗)it is possible that Forestville inhabitants were traveling during less safe times of the day, such as early in the morning, or during twilight. Work or family habits may have encouraged citizens to drive during this time when Elmsford residents may not have been forced to do so. 第四点的论证同样也是采用了两者的对比。看来作者真是说到做到阿，竟然没有一次论证没有对比的!!论证方法为加条件后讨论。 Overall, the reasoning behind decreasing Forestville's speed limit back to its original seems logical as presented above since the citizens are acting in their own best interests and want to protect their safety. 原来让步在这呢!其实作者心里一直有数，只是没写出来。但是在正文body的第一段已经就其假设进行了讨论。我想我们不是作者这样的牛人，这样的让步还是很有必要在第一段体现出来

的。 However, before any final decisions are made about the reduction in speed limit, the citizens and officials of Forestville should evaluate all possible alternatives and causes for the increased number of accidents over the six-month period as compared to Elmsford.最后提出了建议。我们看到作者对于文章的立意把握得很好，要是换我们来写，可能会写限速怎么不好啊。而这文章中限速不管怎么说总是有好的一面，只是常识!所以作者的立意为：不是说限速不好，而是说要考虑全。引申一下，我们一定要对文章的立意有个把握。文章无非就三种立意，一种是好的(就像这样的为了安全的(比如skate范文))，一种就是不好不坏的(就像为了利益的为了利润(什么挣钱多啊))，一种是不好的(就像有个说不应该取消安全带规定，还有诋毁某人的)。这三种立意的写法可是完全不同的阿!对于第一种，切记要委婉!最好就是避而不谈，而说应该考虑更全面。对于后面两种，嘿嘿，就得狠点了，尤其是最后一种，就是谴责。后面的文章我会给出分析。 COMMENTARY This outstanding essay begins by noting that the argument "seems logical." It then proceeds to discuss possible alternative explanations for the increase in car accidents and provides an impressively full analysis. Alternatives mentioned are that -- the two regions might have drivers of different ages and experience. -- Forestvilles topography, geography, cars, and/or roads might contribute to accidents. -- six months might be an insufficient amount of time for determining that the speed limit is linked to the accident rate. -- demographics might play a role in auto accidents. -- population and auto density should be considered. and -- the times of day when drivers in the two

regions travel might be relevant. The points are cogently developed and are linked in such a way as to create a logically organized essay. Transitions together with interior connections create a smoothly integrated presentation. For the most part, the writer uses language correctly and well and provides excellent variety in syntax. The minor flaws (e.g., using "less" instead of "fewer") do not detract from the overall high quality of the critique. This is an impressive 6 paper.

相关推荐：[GRE写作之旅：先扩大词汇再狠抓作文](#)
[2011年GRE考试写作经典背诵句式整理](#) 为了能及时获取2011年gre考试相关信息，建议大家收藏[百考试题](#)
[gre考试频道](#) [点击收藏](#)，我们会第一时间发布相关信息。100Test 下载频道开通，各类考试题目直接下载。详细请访问 www.100test.com