

**ANSWER EXPLANATIONS  
PRACTICE 7**

1. **(A) the question of animal consciousness.** Although the topics in choices B, C, and D are discussed or alluded to in the passage, the primary focus is upon the question of whether or not animals are conscious. Choice E is inaccurate because, in reference to resisting the idea that humans are animals, the author says that “perhaps even some of our contemporaries” deny this kinship. Thus, “modern resistance” to the idea is rare and is not the topic of the passage.
2. **(C) objective.** The sentence is simply a straightforward explanation for the inaccuracies of Lochner’s depiction of the lion in his painting. The author notes that Lochner would have had only “scant information and anecdotal tales . . . available to him at the time.” In light of this, he would not be incredulous or exasperated about the fact that Lochner had never seen a lion; such attitudes would be reserved for anyone in contemporary society who failed to make use of “information that is as well documented as it is easily accessible.”
3. **(B) The article “Ethics and Natural Law” appears in the book *Moral Philosophy*, published in 1901.** The punctuation in the footnote, and the fact that the date 1901 immediately follows the title of the book, indicate that this is an accurate reading. It is the book *Animal Rights and Human Obligations* that was published by Prentice-Hall, and “p. 180” refers to a citation in that book, not to *Moral Philosophy*. The two men listed in choice E were co-editors, not co-writers, of *Animal Rights and Human Obligations*.
4. **(B) Descartes’ linking animals and clocks.** For the author, Lochner’s painting is symbolic of “humanity’s misconception of other animals.” Since the author obviously subscribes to the notion that animals are conscious beings, he would see Descartes’ analogy between animals and unconscious clocks as such a misconception. The author would see choices A and C as accurate and choice E as a logical way to refer to animals. As noted in the explanation for question 1, not many of his contemporaries would have the misconception that animals lack consciousness.
5. **(E) *ad hominem* attacks.** In this paragraph, the author does not attack another person’s character. He uses concrete examples (cats, dogs, elks, eagles), unequivocal assertions (“to question animal awareness is to question the veracity of common sense itself”), rhetorical questions (“What could be more obvious . . . ?”), and unusual personification (“The square root of 9 is angry,” “The Washington Monument is thirsty”).
6. **(A) “the role these well-established, relevant facts play in the dialogue.”** If the parenthetical material is removed from the sentence, the syntax is awkward, with an extra “though” following the parentheses. Choice A eliminates the unnecessary wordiness. Choices B, C, and E suggest a contrast that is not implied in the sentence. Choice D, with the use of the conjunction “and” does not clarify the author’s caution that the relevant facts cannot be weighed until both sides of the debate are examined. In other words, the emphasis of the main clause is changed.

**7. (D) the book *Animal Rights and Human Obligations* is a valuable resource for the author.** The author uses this book to access the early twentieth-century writing of Father Joseph Rickaby as well as the writing of the French philosopher Descartes. There is no evidence to support the other choices. While the citations of the very early sources (Plato and Descartes) are different from the standard citations to which modern readers are accustomed, there is nothing to support the inference that the writer “inadvertently omitted” data.