Sample test 2 KEY:

Question 1.

List all the words in the first sentence of Paragraph 1 which have a stressed back monophthong.
Transcribe phonemically three of them.

Words in the 1st sentence of Para 1 which have a stressed back monophthong:

evolution /ˌiː/evə'l(j)uː/ʃ(ə)n/   ruthless /'ruː/ʊθlə/ɪs/   forces /'fɔːsɪ/əz/

all /ɔːl/   costs /kɒsts/   beauty /'bjuːti/   evolve /ɪ'vɒlv/

(i)   Process is regularly pronounced with a diphthong in RP, but does have an alternative
        pronunciation   'prɒse/əs, and is regularly 'prɑːse/əs in General American; other
        GA variants: all, costs, evolve – with ɔː / ɑː

(ii)   *to* and *for*, which also have a stressed back monophthong in their citation forms, will
        not normally be stressed in a "neutral" spoken rendition of this sentence;

(iii)   Alternatives are separated by   /

Question 2.

List all non-finite verb forms in Paragraph 3 and classify them into groups, paying attention to
possible variation.

INFINITIVE: prefer, (to) die, (to) evolve, be, attract, (to) attract, produce, compensate.
PRESENT/-ING PARTICIPLE: being
[*striking* probably best treated as an adjective though!]
PAST/-ED PARTICIPLE: courted, known, passed

Question 3.

Identify and indicate the type of each morpheme in the morphological structure of *birdsong* (par. 3),
parenting (par.4) and *fussier* (par. 4).

birdsong   →   bird – free lexical root morpheme + song – free lexical root morpheme
parenting   →   parent – free lexical root morpheme + -ing – here it functions as a derivational
                suffix

fussier → fuss – free lexical root morpheme + -y – derivational suffix producing adjectives +
            -er – inflectional suffix marking the comparative degree of adjectives and adverbs

<u>MEDIUM</u>

Question 4.

Demonstrate the different types of grammatical cohesive chains in Paragraph 2. What is the
basis for their classification?

Grammatical   cohesive   chains:
*Darwin - He (proposed that one sex…) - Darwin one sex, often males, competes
for the attention of the other - this - this (competition) one sex - the other*

The type of chain is based on the type of grammatical expression of the cohesive semantic relation.
In the present cases, these are: personal pronouns and demonstratives (in the last case, ellipsis,
arguably, also present).

Question 5.

Point out the differences between the types of modal meanings expressed by the verb *can* in *a
colourful male who can dance* (par. 1) and *These traits can be detrimental at times* (par. 4). Give
arguments for your decision.

In *a colourful male who can dance,* the modal verb *can* expresses ability, which is an instance of root
modality. The 'ability' sense of *can* may be paraphrased by means of the *be able to* construction, e.g.
a colorful male who is able to dance. The subject noun is animate, which is compatible with the
feature of meaning 'ability'.
By contrast, in *These traits can be detrimental at times*, the verb *can* expresses the so called root or
intrinsic possibility. The root possibility meaning usually occurs with inanimate subjects, although
animate subjects allow such a reading too. The ambiguity is then decided by the immediate context.
In this case, the paraphrase *It is possible for these traits to be detrimental at times* is acceptable. It is
a special case of the 'possibility' meaning of the verb *can* since what is implied is that the
possibility of an action or situation is related to some skill, feature or capability on the part of the
subject referent. On the other hand, the so-called epistemic possibility concerns conditions external to
the link between subject and predicate.

Question 6.

Distinguish the syntactic functions performed by *much* in Paragraph 4 in connection with its position and function in the respective overarching phrases.

Much occurs twice in this paragraph and in both cases it functions as a dependent (or part/the head thereof) in the phrase that contains it. In [[how much]DP effort]NP, *how much* is a constituent of an NP, where it acts as a determiner of the head noun *effort*. The determiner is obligatory in an NP which is defined by a restrictive relative clause and in our example it provides information about amount/quantity. In turn, *much* is itself the head of *how much* and is modified by the question word/adverb *how*. In [much fussier [about picking the right partner]PP]AdjP, *much* is an optional degree modifier in an adjective phrase (in the comparative degree).

He realised it was all about how <u>much</u> effort animals put into parenting. If one parent has to put a lot of time and effort into rearing their young, they are likely to be <u>much</u> fussier about picking the right partner, compared to parents whose offspring need little attention.

<u>CHALLENGING</u>

Question 7.

Identify and describe the verb phrases marked for the Perfect in paragraphs 1 and 4. Explain the use of the Perfect phrases, taking into account the role of context clues. Give your own examples of two more known uses (meanings) of the English Present Perfect in other contexts and compare them to the use of their respective non-perfect forms.

In paragraph 1, the verb phrase marked for the Perfect is *may have had* and in par. 4 the phrase is *had not explained*. In *may have had*, the Perfect of a verb is combined with modality, i.e. the modal verb *may* is followed by the Perfect Infinitive of *have* (*an effect*) which marks a time reference different from that of the finite verb (anteriority). More precisely, while the present tense of the modal relates its possibility meaning to the present time, the Perfect Infinitive relates the meaning of *have* to the past: i.e. it is possible (NOW/STILL) that the preferences had a profound effect (IN THE PAST/THEN). Thus the meaning 'before the present moment' of the Perfect Infinitive in *may have had an effect* allows the addition of adjuncts/adverbials like *yesterday* while the non-modal *have had* does not.

The second verb phrase with a Perfect form, i.e. *had not explained*, also expresses anteriority, which is the general meaning of the category, i.e. the event or situation expressed by the Perfect is

rendered as being anterior to another one, present in the context. More specifically, one of the meanings of the Perfect presents an action or situation viewed in its **completeness**, from the outside, as anterior to another action or situation. The external perspective is here supported by the non-durative nature of the verb *explain*. In the specific example, the act of not explaining something took place earlier than other past events. However, the past events that serve as reference point, are not mentioned in the immediate context of the sentence *Darwin had not explained how mating preferences arose in the first place*. The reference point can be retrieved from the two previous sentences: *The idea that animals have some sense of beauty **did not fit with Victorian society's hierarchical attitudes**. People **thought** that the higher classes were superior to all other living things.*

In addition, the semantic scope of the Present Perfect includes the expression of:

- **general experience/indefinite past**, i.e. incompatible with specific past time reference, as in *I have never tasted sushi* or *My grandfather has never been ill*. (cf. the perfect, which is normally incompatible with specific past time reference: **Yesterday I have tasted sushi for the first time*, vs. the past simple: *Yesterday I tasted sushi for the first time*.)

- **pre-existing situation that continues** as in *This factory has been here since 2001*; (English is notable for using its Present Perfect in such cases, unlike languages such as Bulgarian, which use a non-perfect/simple present form *Фабриката **е/се намира** на това място от 2001 г.*). The contrast with the meaning of completeness, mentioned above, is due to the stative nature of the verbs used in the Present Perfect.

- **recently completed events**, often stressing their **current relevance** as in: *I have just finished doing my homework* (Here, there is variation in different varieties of English, some of which, esp. AmE, prefer the simple past: *I just finished…*); *My younger brother has learned karate* and *Five teachers have applied for the post of Lecturer in English*. Unlike the perfect, the Simple Past does not tend to stress current relevance.

Question 8.

Transcribe intonationally the last two sentences in paragraph 3. Explain your tonality, tonicity and tone choices.

For e ↘↗/↗ <u>xample</u> | a ‘long (‘)colourful ↘↗/↗<u>plume</u> | may a(‘)ttract ‘more ↘ <u>predators</u> ‖
But the a ↘↗/↗<u>bility</u> | to attract the ‘best (‘)possible ↘↗/↗<u>mate</u> | and pro(‘)duce ‘lots of ‘healthy ↘↗/↗<u>offsprings</u> | will ‘more than ↘<u>compensate</u> ‖

Alternatives are separated by / , optional stress and tone marks are given in brackets ( ). Wells's (2006) tone marks are perfectly acceptable instead of the arrow tone marks used above.

Tonic syllables in the above transcription are in their "default" position on the last lexical item in the respective

Intonation Phrase (IP).

Other possibilities must be accompanied by a relevant explanation of the shift of focus; these include: "But

the ability … possible mate" – a single IP; "best" instead of "mate" tonic;

"lots" or "healthy" tonic, instead of "offsprings", in the penultimate IP.

The choice of ↘↗or ↗ in the first IP is typical of initial phrases qualifying the whole sentence; such phrases also typically take a separate IP. The 2nd nd and 3rd IPs in the first sentence are made up of the subject and the predicate, and are characterised by the typical topic – comment (or theme – rheme) tone choice -↘↗or ↗ vs ↘ . The same is true of the tones in the last two IPs of the second sentence. The long subject of the second sentence can be split into 2 or 3 chunks, the first one of which will take a tone which signals non-finality, and the second one – a "listing" tone.

Question 9.

Comment in detail on the nature and structure of the underlined sentence in paragraph 4 in the context of all other types of sentences with similar form, giving examples of your own. Then contrast it with sentences containing concessive clauses.

The underlined sentence is an example of the so-called zero conditionals, which stand apart from all other conditionals, in that they do not state an actual condition, be it real or hypothetical, but just describe the cause-effect relationship between two events occurring consecutively on a regular basis.

If one parent has to put a lot of time and effort into rearing their young, they are likely to be much fussier about picking the right partner, compared to parents whose offspring need little attention.

In the sentence from paragraph 4 we have a non-prototypical use and meaning of conditional sentences. There is no time reference indicated either for the condition or for the result. Actually, the sentence does not express the standard dependence between a condtion whose fulfilment is a prerequisite for the occurrence of the event presented in the result clause. In the sentence only the form is conditional, not the meaning. It results from an authorial choice to phrase the correlation between two events in this way, not a content-licensed necessity. The sentence simply states in the form of a conditional a recurrent correlation between parent-child relations and parent-partner relations. The sentence is atypical in meaning, not in form.

Conditional sentences make a special group of sentences in English. They contain as a rule a subordinate adjunct/adverbial clause, which describes the condition, whereas the matrix clause containing it describes the result. There is a set of specalised subordinators or subordinating conjunctions which introduce the disjunct clause and indicate its syntactic dependency. Besides the zero conditional (which is illustrated in the sentence in paragraph 4), four more types are genreally recognised: first conditional, second conditional, third conditional and the mixed type.

The list of subordinating conjunctions introducing a conditional relation includes: *supposing, unless* (a special one involving negation), *provided (that), providing, in case, as long as*, etc. *Unless* means the

5

same as *if ... not*. It always refers to the conditional part of the sentence and not the result part of the sentence:

If he doesn't get here soon, we will have to start the meeting without him.
= *Unless he gets here soon, we will have to start the meeting without him.*

We often use *not + unless*, which means *only ... if*, when we want to emphasize a condition:

They will only sign the contract if we give them an additional discount.
= *They won't sign the contract unless we give them an additional discount.*

First conditional → It is possible and also very likely that the condition will be fulfilled.

Form: if + Simple Present, + will (Future Simple)

Example: *If I find her address, I'll send her an invitation.*

Conditional Sentences Type I refer to the future. An action in the future will only happen if a certain condition is fulfilled by that time. We don't know for sure whether the condition actually will be fulfilled or not, but the conditions seems rather realistic – so we think it is likely to happen.

In a sentence with an if-clause we can use the imperative, or modal verbs, instead of will + infinitive

If you hear from Susan today, tell her to ring me.

Second conditional → It is possible but very unlikely, that the condition will be fulfilled.

Form: if + Past Simple, would/could + Infinitive

Example: *If I found her address, I would send her an invitation.*

In IF Clauses Type II, we usually use ‚were' – even if the pronoun is I, he, she or it –.

Example: *If I were you, I would not do this.*

Conditional Sentences Type II refer to situations in the present. An action could happen if the present situation were different. I don't really expect the situation to change, however. I just imagine „what would happen if …"

Third conditional → It is impossible that the condition will be fulfilled because it refers to the past. Both the condition and the result are counterfactual or hypothetical.

Form: if + Past Perfect + would/could + Perfect Infinitive

Example: *If I had found her address, I would have sent her an invitation.*

Conditional Sentences Type III refer to situations in the past. An action could have happened in the past if a certain condition had been fulfilled, but in reality it didn't.

Mixed conditionals

In mixed conditionals the time reference of the condition and the result is different. If we talk about a past action and its result in the present we use if + past perfect and would not + infinitive:

If he hadn't done well on the training courses, he wouldn't be a Project leader now.

Sometimes Unreal Conditional sentences are mixed. This means that the time in the if-clause is not the same as the time in the result.

Examples:

If I had won the lottery, I would be rich.

If I were rich, I would have bought that Ferrari we saw yesterday.

Unlike conditional clauses, concessive clauses indicate that the situation in the matrix clause is contrary to expectation in the light of what is said in the concessive clause (A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language, 1985). Similar to conditional sentences, concessive sentences are complex ones, with the concession described in the subordinate clause.

Concessive subordinating conjunctions: *although, even though, even if*, etc.

Examples:

Although *she was broke, she took a suite at the Waldorf, and began strewing bad checks like confetti.*

No matter *how brilliantly an idea is stated, we will not really be moved unless we have already half thought of it ourselves*.