

## 6.2.5 Phrases and clauses are not “grammatically similar”

*Phrases* cannot be considered *grammatically similar* to *clauses* and vice-versa. For example:

*The flower was resplendent red, radiant and it also had fragrance.*

- From the *meaning* of the sentence, it is clear that flower had *three* attributes. Hence we deconstruct the sentence as: *The flower was X, Y and Z.* Hence, X, Y and Z are *logically similar* parts of the sentence, where:

X: *resplendent red*

Y: *radiant*

Z: *it also had fragrance*

These logically similar elements have the following grammatical structure:

- i. resplendent red: *Adjective Phrase*
- ii. radiant: *Adjective Phrase*
- iii. it also had fragrance: *Clause* (since this has a *subject* “it” and *verb* “had”)!)

So, two of the three *logically similar* elements are *phrases*, while the third element is a *clause*. Hence, this is not a valid sentence. Let’s also apply the *litmus test* (refer to section **Error! Reference source not found.**). The *common* portion outside the XYZ structure is *the flower was*. This *common* portion should make sense *individually* with X, with Y, and with Z:

(i) The flower was resplendent red – *makes sense*

(ii) The flower was radiant – *makes sense*

(iii) The flower was it also had fragrance – *does not makes sense*

Hence, this sentence *fails* the litmus test, and is invalid sentence from parallelism point of view.

The correct sentence is:

*The flower was resplendent red, radiant and fragrant.*

A sentence based on official question (#134, OG 12: *Recently implemented “shift-work equations” ...*):

*After it was administered to a sample population, garlic, the wonder drug, cured infections, skin problems, and diabetes was cured, while improving blood circulation.*

**Analysis:** In the above sentence, *logically similar* elements are *infections, skin problems, and diabetes was cured*. These logically similar elements have the following *grammatical structure*:

- i. infections: *Noun phrase*
- ii. skin problems: *Noun phrase*
- iii. diabetes was cured: *Clause* (since this has a *subject* “diabetes” and *verb* “was”)!)

So, two of the three *logically similar* elements are *phrases*, while the third element is a *clause*. Hence, this is not a valid sentence. Let’s also apply the *litmus test* (refer to section **Error! Reference source not found.**). The *common* portion outside the XYZ structure is *after it was administered to a sample population, garlic, the wonder drug, cured... while improving blood circulation*. This *common* portion should make sense *individually* with X, with Y, and with Z:

(i) After it was administered to a sample population, garlic, the wonder drug, cured infections, while improving blood circulation – *makes sense*

(ii) After it was administered to a sample population, garlic, the wonder drug, cured skin problems, while improving blood circulation – *makes sense*

(iii) After it was administered to a sample population, garlic, the wonder drug, cured diabetes was cured, while improving blood circulation – *does not makes sense (...garlic, the wonder drug, cured diabetes was cured..is clearly incorrect)*

Hence, this sentence *fails* the litmus test, and is invalid sentence from parallelism point of view.

The correct sentence is:

After it was administered to a sample population, garlic, the wonder drug, cured infections, skin problems, and diabetes, while improving blood circulation.

Another sentence based on official question (# 1, Verbal Supplement 2nd Edition: *Like ants, termites have an elaborate social..*), where parallelism between *clauses* and *phrases* is tested:

Like John, Peter also has a supportive family in which the family members *support each other by caring for each other, helping the family members financially and they also assist the family members in illness.*

**Analysis:** In the above sentence, *Logically similar* elements are *caring for each other, helping the family members financially and they also assist the family members in illness* (by deconstructing the sentence as: *Like John, Peter also has a supportive family in which the family members support each other by X, Y and Z*). These logically similar elements have the following *grammatical structure*:

- i. caring for each other: *Phrase*
- ii. helping the family members financially: *Phrase*
- iii. they also assist the family members in illness: *Clause!* (Since this has a *subject* “they” and *verb* “assist”)!)

So, two of the three *logically similar* elements are *phrases*, while the third element is a *clause*. Hence, this is not a valid sentence. Let’s also apply the *litmus test* (refer to section **Error! Reference source not found.**). The *common* portion outside the XYZ structure is *Like John, Peter also has a supportive family in which the family members support each other by*. This *common* portion should make sense *individually* with X, with Y, and with Z:

(i) Like John, Peter also has a supportive family in which the family members support each other by caring for each other – *makes sense*

(ii) Like John, Peter also has a supportive family in which the family members support each other by helping the family members financially – *makes sense*

(iii) Like John, Peter also has a supportive family in which the family members support each other by they also assist the family members in illness – *does not makes sense (...family members support each other by they also assist the family members in illness ..is clearly incorrect)*

Hence, this sentence *fails* the litmus test, and is invalid sentence from parallelism point of view.

The correct sentence is:

*Like John, Peter also has a supportive family in which the family members support each other by caring for each other, helping the family members financially and also assisting the family members in illness.*