

Conform

1. This argument contains two counter-premise indicators—“however” and “but.” The author opens the argument implying that the violin cannot play the “same” music as the piano. Then the counter-premise indicator “however” introduces a qualification of this claim; namely that the violin can play recognizably the same music. “But” introduces a further qualification: the violinist should be “*guided by the nature and possibilities of the violin as well as by the original composition.*” This is the key to the question. By analogy the translator of poetry should be guided by (observe) the nature (spirit) of the original as well as the nature (qualities) of the language into which the original is translated. Hence the answer is (D). Note that (D) paraphrases the last clause of the argument.

(A) may be true but is irrelevant; it’s also baited with same language from the passage—“music.”

(B) is not stated in or implied by the passage.

(C) is second-best. The clause “[*the translator should*] not [*be concerned*] with transcribing its meaning exactly” is supported by the argument’s opening, “*The translator of poetry must realize that word-for-word equivalents do not exist across languages.*” But the author does not state that the translation should be “*primarily concerned with reproducing the rhythms and sound patterns of the original.*” Note the subtle use of the same language ploy: the analogy is to the translation of the meanings of words, not their

sound patterns or rhythm—i.e., musical qualities.

(E) sounds like an English professor wrote it. Most often such pretentious answer-choices can be summarily dismissed.

2. The argument claims that an action is morally good only if it meets *both* of the following criteria:

(1) It benefits another person.

(2) It is performed with that intent.

The argument also claims that an action that harms another person is morally bad if it meets *either one* of the following criteria:

(1) The harm was intended.

(2) Reasonable forethought would have shown that the action was likely to cause harm.

In choice (E), Jonathan should have realized that if he became engrossed in conversation, he would be neglecting his niece. This satisfies the second criteria for a morally bad action. Reasonable forethought would have shown Jonathan the error of his choice. The answer is (E).*

As to the other choices, (A) is second best. The first part of (A), “*Pamela wrote a letter attempting to cause trouble between Edward and his friend,*” certainly satisfies the first criterion for a morally bad action. But the remainder of the sentence doesn’t seem to relate to the second criterion.

* Remember: Only one of the statements in an *either-or* construction need be true for the whole structure to be true.

(B) satisfies the first criterion for a morally good action. However, it fails to meet the second criterion because Jeffrey's action was performed to benefit himself (by helping him secure a promotion), not to help others.

(C) does not meet either criteria for a morally bad action. Teresa left the ice on the steps accidentally. One could argue, however, that a reasonable person would double check her work. Nevertheless, choice (E) satisfies the second criterion for a morally bad action more directly.

(D) satisfies only the second criterion for a morally good action, and it does not satisfy either criteria for a morally bad action.

3. This is a suppressed premise question. To test whether an answer-choice is a suppressed premise, ask yourself whether it would make the argument more plausible. If so, then it is very likely a suppressed premise. All that we are told about the theft is that the items taken were not selected based on market value. From this the author concludes that the theft was done for a private collector. For the argument to be valid, we must assume that in some cases knowing the pattern of the items stolen can determine the purpose of the theft. The answer, therefore, is (C). Choice (A) is second-best. It uses the overstatement ploy. To make the argument valid, we don't need to know that the purpose of *any* art theft can be identified based on the

items stolen, only that *sometimes* this determination can be made. Beware of absolute words.

4. (A) No. The passage is about the effects that certain actions have on the environment, not on other people. Besides, the point of the passage is that consumers are unable to know these effects.
(B) Yes. The point of the passage is that consumers cannot know which products truly harm the environment and so are unable to choose to restrict their purchases to environmentally benign products.
(C) No. The passage concerns the morality of the choices consumers make, not the options offered to consumers.
(D) No. There is no discussion of the gradation of harm in the passage. Besides, the point of the passage is that consumers are unable to know these effects.
(E) No. The passage is minimizing the moral duty of consumers.