|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reading  （只需论点） | Listening  （尽量详尽） |
| 中心论点 | brach- = live in water | × |
| 分论点1 | brach- = legs × support weight → water | fossil: footprint (land),  4 feet in grou ps, young = run on hind legs, →catch adult |
| 分论点2 | water plants★ | feed on land plants√, physical ≈ giraffe, long front legs → neck↑×effort, long neck →ground plants√ |
| 分论点3 | brach- = submerge (nostril) | bone fossil: narrow feet →×water, large animal (hippo) = large broad feet (mud) |

In the lecture, the professor talks about Brachiosaurus' habitat. Disputing the passage's arguments that this particular dinosaur lived in water, she cites several pieces of evidence showing that it lived near water.

First, she claims there was fossil evidence of Brachiosaurus' footprints on land. The evidence shows that some sauropods walked on four feet in groups and youngsters may have to run on their hind legs to keep up with the adults. This evidence contradicts the claim in the passage that Brachiosaurus' legs could not support their massive weight and had to rely on water buoyancy.

Second, the professor states Brachiosaurus could easily feed on land plants and thus did not depend on water plants as passage argues. Physically similar to a giraffe, it had relatively long front legs, which allowed it to extend its neck upward with less effort. Moreover, even if it could only reach out its neck horizontally, there were plenty of plants at its body height. What's more, its long neck allowed it to cover a large ground area so it could easily take food.

Third, the professor dismisses the argument in the passage that Brachiosaurus lay submerged in water and used its nostrils to breathe. She cites the evidence of bone fossils indicating that these dinosaurs had narrow feet which were unfit for life in water. For a large animal to live in the lakes or swamps, the professor believes it needed to have broad feet like those of a hippos to walk on the muddy bottom.

**综合写作结构句型**

**答题可以直接套用**

In the lecture, the professor talks about \_\_主题\_\_. Disputing the passage's arguments that \_\_阅读中心论点\_\_, she cites several pieces of evidence showing that\_\_听力中心论点\_\_.

First, she claims\_\_听力论点-1\_. The evidence shows that \_\_听力细节-1\_. This evidence contradicts the claim in the passage that \_\_阅读论点-1\_.

Second, the professor states\_\_听力论点-2\_ and thus did not \_\_阅读论点-2\_ as passage argued. Moreover, \_\_听力细节-2\_. What's more, \_\_听力细节-2\_.

Third, the professor dismisses the argument in the passage that \_\_阅读论点-3\_. She cites \_\_听力论点-3\_. The professor believes \_\_听力细节-3\_.