

Note#2

As we have seen above, these *present participial* phrases that appear at the *end* of the clause modify the *subject* of the preceding clause. In addition, the participial phrase should be a *result / description* of this clause. In other words, the *action* depicted by the participial phrase should:

- Be attributable to the *subject* of the immediate preceding clause, and
- Be *concurrent* with the action of the preceding clause or *describe* the action of the preceding clause

For example, following would be an *incorrect* sentence:

Michael has prepared hard for the exam, now planning to appear in the exam.

The issue is that *preparation* has already been done (one *discrete* event) and Michael's plan to appear in the exam is *another* discrete event. So, *continuum/concurrency* is *missing*, making this sentence incorrect. We fix this as:

Michael, having prepared hard for the exam, is now planning to appear in the exam.

Let's take a similar sentence based on Official question (*Neuroscientists, having amassed a wealth of knowledge...*), where present participial is *incorrectly* used:

Researchers have made significant advances over the past decade in understanding the causes of "growth hormone" deficiency, now developing more accurate ways of curing growth hormone deficiency.

Analysis: The *present participial* phrase *now developing more accurate ways of curing growth hormone deficiency* appears at the *end* of the clause, and is preceded by a comma. So, *grammatically*, this participial phrase modifies *researchers*, the *subject* of the preceding clause *researchers have made significant advances over the past decade in understanding the causes of growth hormone deficiency*. Logically also, the *researchers* are now developing more accurate ways. However, the reason why this sentence is still *incorrect* is because the action specified in the present participial phrase (*now developing more accurate ways*) is not *concurrent* with the event in the main clause (*Researchers have made significant advances over the past decade*). So, *continuum/concurrency* is *missing*, making this sentence incorrect. We fix the sentence as:

Researchers, having made significant advances over the past decade in understanding the causes of "growth hormone" deficiency, are now developing more accurate ways of curing growth hormone deficiency.

Another sentence based on official question (*Emily Dickinson's letters to Susan Huntington...*), where present participial is *incorrectly* used:

The 22 Oscars won by Walt Disney were awarded to him between 1932 and 1969, outnumbering the number of Oscars ever awarded to anyone else in the Oscar history.

Analysis: The *present participial* phrase *outnumbering the number of Oscars ever awarded to anyone else in the Oscar history* appears at the *end* of the clause in the sentence, and is preceded by a comma. So, *grammatically*, this *participial* phrase modifies *22 Oscars*, the *subject* of the preceding clause *The 22 Oscars won by Walt Disney were awarded to him between 1932 and 1969*. Logically also, *22 Oscars* outnumber the number of Oscars ever awarded to anyone else in the Oscar history. However, the reason why this sentence is still *incorrect* is because the action specified in the present participial phrase (*outnumbering the number of Oscars ever awarded to anyone else in the Oscar history*) is not *directly* attributable to the event in the main clause. In other words, the fact that *22 Oscars* were awarded to Walt Disney *between 1932 and 1969* is not the *reason* why the *22 Oscars* outnumber the Oscars awarded to anyone else in the Oscar history. We fix the sentence by articulating it as follows:

The 22 Oscars won by Walt Disney, which were awarded to him between 1932 and 1969, outnumber the number of Oscars ever awarded to anyone else in the Oscar history.