

- In the past several years, astronomers have detected more than 80 massive planets, most of them as large or larger than Jupiter, Which circle other stars.

A: most of them as large or larger than Jupiter, which circle

B: most of them as large or larger than Jupiter and circling

C: most of them at least as large as Jupiter, circling (Correct)

D: mostly at least as large as Jupiter, which circle

E: mostly as large or larger than Jupiter, circling

- How does the “Which” modifier work?
 1. It must modify a NOUN.
 2. This noun should precede the comma. (Sometimes you can have small intervening constructions)

In A&D, the “which” points to Jupiter. It can’t point all the way back to “massive planets” (It’s too far away). The “Which” modifier cannot jump over an entire modifier with commas!

...more than 80 massive planets, xxxx xxx xxx xxx, which (can’t jump over this intervening construction)

This modification is incorrect for 2 reasons: (remember not just analyzing grammars)

1. S-V agreement, “Jupiter” is singular and the verb “circle” is plural.
2. Wrong meaning, “Jupiter” isn’t circling the other stars.

In A&B&E, “as large or larger than” is incorrect. (The problem here is not wordy or redundant.)

If you have two parallel constructions take different idioms, then BOTH idioms MUST ACUTALLY APPEAR.

For instance:

- X is either bigger or smaller than Y. (This is actually correct)
The “bigger” or “smaller” both go with “than”, “than” works with both (bigger and smaller).
X is bigger than Y or smaller than Y.
- X is greater or equal to Y. (This is incorrect)
You don’t say greater to. The requisite idioms are “greater than” and “equal to”. So in this case, you need both. Those are not the same as each other. You can’t just say “than” and you can’t just say “to”. Because if you just put one of those in there, and the one you’re doing is unwillingly excluding the other one. You have to actually say X is greater than or equal to Y.

You need both idiomatic constructions: as large AS & larger THAN

*“As large or larger than” is not redundant because it’s kind of like saying greater than and equal to. They are not the same thing so including both of them is actually a meaning thing. If you say bigger or larger, then obviously that will be redundant.

- Is “and circling” correct?
 - Not really. It doesn’t really make sense. It’s grammatically fine, but if you put this in parallel with the statement about the size of these planets is weird, because these are not the same type of observation. So a parallel construction doesn’t make much sense. It makes more sense to make it a modifier.
 - The intended meaning of the sentence is that MOST of the planets are as big as the Jupiter, but all of them are circling other stars. If you say “most of them xxxxxxxx and circling other stars”, it is also a meaning error, because it suggests that the same group of planets that are larger than Jupiter are the ones that circle other stars.
- DO NOT WORRY ABOUT PRONOUN AMBIGUITY!
 - Pronoun ambiguity is only tested in 1 current official problem.
 - There are at least 20 current official problems whose “correct” answers have technically “ambiguous” pronouns.

- Now that so much data travels via lights—i.e., is carried in glass fiber rather than by electrical current—one goal of semiconductor research is to develop a silicon chip that can transmit and receive light signals directly, a development that may one day lead to smaller, faster semiconductors.
 - A: to develop a silicon chip that can transmit and receive light signals directly, a development that may one day lead (correct)
 - B: to develop a silicon chip with the capability of transmitting and receiving light signals directly, which may one day lead
 - C: the development of a silicon chip that has the capability of transmitting and receiving light signals directly, a development maybe one day leading
 - D: developing a silicon chip that can transmit and receive light signals directly, which may one day lead
 - E: developing a silicon chip with the ability to transmit and receive light signals directly, with this development maybe one day leading
- **INTENTION:** You always want to figure out what the sentence is trying to say before you dig in these grammar points. Everything always has to make sense! If something contradicts the intended meaning of the sentence, it’s wrong.
The meaning of the sentence is that semiconductor research is trying to make silicon chip that will do the direct light signals and if the development comes to the test then it will lead to smaller and faster semiconductors. It’s not the chip itself.

In B&D, the “which” modifiers are **INTENDED** to refer to the whole idea of developing this kind of silicon chip. The problem this whole idea is not a noun. (It’s how people talk. In written language you can’t use which like that. That’s not how the pronouns work.) In this sentence, there is no noun, to “which” which can refer. (Note that it’s a waste of time to debate which of these nouns it does refer to because it’s wrong regardless of the assignment.)

In C&E, “leading” is an ING modifier. The tense implication of ING modifier is that they take the tense of the surrounding text. They **ADOPT** the time frame of the **CLAUSE** to which they are attached. (Not verbs of the form “is/are+doing”, these are not modifiers)

For instance (all correct):

- Students writing papers 150 yrs ago used quill pen and bottle ink.
- Students writing papers in today’s schools use Microsoft Word.
- Students writing papers 20 yrs in the future will use dictation software.

*Modifiers do not have tenses. They are writing refer to 150 yrs ago, present and 20 yrs in the future.

The problem is that it’s not the same time thing so that you need a different verb. Even though you says “one day”, you can’t use “leading” with ING here. Because the implication of leading is that it’s happening right now but it’s NOT. The rest of these are in the present (one goal of the research is to ...). The use of this modifier is incorrect.

- **Comparative issue:** “With the capability of transmitting and receiving”, “with the ability to transmit and receive” & “can transmit and receive”

Wordiness is not kind of thing that you want to judge absolutely but **RELATIVELY**. When you look at wordiness, make sure that you don’t try to judge wordiness absolutely. Instead, only judge wordiness relative to other answer choices. In this case, “can transmit and receive” is obviously better than the other two choices.

- Emily Dickinson’s letters to Susan Huntington Dickinson were written over a period beginning a few years before Susan’s marriage to Emily’s brother and ending shortly before Emily’s death in 1886, outnumbering her letters to anyone else.
A: Dickinson were written over a period **beginning** a few years before Susan’s marriage to Emily’s brother and ending shortly before Emily’s death in 1886, **outnumbering**
B: Dickinson were written over a period that **begins** a few years before Susan’s marriage to Emily’s brother and **ended** shortly before Emily’s death in 1886, **outnumbering**
C: Dickinson, written over a period **beginning** a few years before Susan’s marriage to Emily’s brother and that **ends** shortly before Emily’s death in 1886 and **outnumbering**
D: Dickinson, which were written over a period **beginning** a few years before Susan’s marriage to Emily’s brother, **ending** shortly before Emily’s death in 1886, and **outnumbering**
E: Dickinson, which were written over a period **beginning** a few years before Susan’s marriage to Emily’s brother and ending shortly before Emily’s death in 1886, **outnumber**
(Correct)
 - There is a parallel construction of beginning and ending because these two things are about the same time period and they should be parallel. (sth with the parallel structure: beginning ...ending, or began...and...ended)

In B&C&D,

- “begins and ended” the present tense is kind of silly;
- “beginning xxx and that ends” is definitely not parallel;
- “beginning xxx, ending” the use of modifier here doesn’t make sense. You are supposed to make a parallel construction. It’s illogical here because it makes it sounds like “ending shortly” is a modifier of beginning a few years before her marriage. These are separate statement about different time period so they should be parallel.

A&E survived from the parallelism cut.

In choice A, “Dickinson were written over a period beginning a few years before Susan’s marriage to Emily’s brother and ending shortly before Emily’s death in 1886, **outnumbering**”

- ING modifier here is incorrect. When you have a comma in front of an ING modifier, it must have the intimate relationship to the clause that precedes it. It should be closely related to the preceding clause. The clause shows the period of time over which the letters were written. This has no direct relationship to the relative numbers of letters vs. letters written to other people. (Making up the whole relationship is not ok. It may not be true.)
For example,

- ❖ My brother took extra class every semester, graduating from three years.
(Correct, direct result of taking extra classes)
- ❖ My brother ate frozen food every night in college, graduating in three years.
(Incorrect, there’s no relationship. These are two separate observations about my brother,)

In choice E, “Dickinson, which were written over a period beginning a few years before Susan’s marriage to Emily’s brother and ending shortly before Emily’s death in 1886, outnumber”.

- “Which” here is modifying letters, not Dickinson.
- “Which” is allowed to refer to “noun + prep phrase”. It is allowed to jump over prepositional phrases *if* the context or grammar demands that it do so.
- **BUT IT CAN ONLY JUMP OVER THE PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE THAT ACUTALLY MODIFIERS THE INTENDED NOUN.**

For example,

- ❖ I took pictures ~~of my dog~~, which are so adorable that they make everyone smile.
(Correct, “of my dog” is actually talking about pictures, so we can jump it.)
- ❖ (I took pictures) (in 1995), which are so adorable that...
(Incorrect, “In 1995” does not modify pictures, it talks about when I took the picture. You can’t jump this kind of prepositional phrase.)

DON’T USE THIS AS AN ABSTRACT RULE. THE BEST WAY TO RECALL AND USE COMPLICATED THINGS LIKE THIS IS TO REMEMBER EXAMPLES AND

THINK BY ANALOGY. (Picture of my dog is really picture of my dog; (Took)Picture in 1995 is not picture in 1995.)

- To protect English manufactures of woolen goods both against American and Irish competition, England passed the Woolens Act of 1698, which prohibited the export of woolen cloth beyond a colony’s borders.
A: To protect English manufactures of woolen goods both against American and Irish competition, England passed the Woolens Act of 1698
B: In order to protect English manufactures of woolen goods against both American and Irish competition, England passed the Woolens Act of 1698 (Correct)
C: In order to protect English manufacturers of Woolen goods against American, as well as against Irish competition, the Woolens Act of 1698 was passed by England
D: For protecting English manufactures of woolen goods against American, as well as Irish, competition, England passed the Woolens Act of 1698
E: For the protection of English manufactures of woolen goods against both American and Irish competition, the Woolens Act of 1698, passed by England
- “Which” is not underlined, but it still follows the universal rules. This modifier should point to the Act. NOTE that “the Woolens Act of 1698” is actually a unit, so it’s fin to jump over “1698”.

In C&E, “Which” is NOT ok to modifier England.

In A&B, When you have a two part parallel signal (both...and..., not only...but also..., either...or...), the parts FOLLOWING these signals MUST MATCH.

For example,

- Both against American and Irish (Wrong, it’s not properly parallel.)
- Against both American and Irish (Correct, both American and Irish are both nationality and nationality.)
- “To protect” & “in order to protect” are both correct here, but “for protecting” is not correct in this kind of situation.

- The proliferation of so-called cybersquatters, people who register the Internet domain names of high-profile companies in hopes of reselling the rights to those names for a profit, led to passing the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act in 1999, allowing companies to seek up to \$100,000 in damages against those who register domain names with the sole intent of selling them later.
A: passing the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act in 1999, allowing companies to seek up to \$100,000 in damages against those who register domain names with the sole intent of selling
B: the passage of the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act in 1999, which allows companies to seek up to \$100,000 in damages against those who register domain names with the sole intent that they will sell
C: the passage in 1999 of the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, which allows companies to seek up to \$100,000 in damages against those who register domain names with the sole intent of selling (Correct)
D: the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, which was passed in 1999, and it allows companies to seek up to \$100,000 in damages against those who register domain names with the sole intent to sell
E: the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, passed in 1999 and allowing companies to seek up to \$100,000 in damages against those who register domain names with the sole intent of selling

In B, “Which” CANNOT refer to Act. “the passage of the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act in 1999” is not the Act in 1999. The prep phrase is a *separate* description, so you can’t jump it. The modifier here is not correct unless you want to modify 1999. (xxx 199, which is the last year I was in town.) B is a lot like “I took picture in 1995, which were...” in that regard.

In C, “Which” refers to the Act. What C does avoids the issue in B entirely. It is modifying the ACT like it supposed to.

“In 1999” is actually talking about the passage so it’s better to put it right after the passage.

In A, “let to passing” is not idiomatic. “COMMA+ING modifier” is not correct. It should modify the preceding action “led to the...”, that doesn’t make sense here,

In D&E, “led to the Act” does not work. You can’t “lead to” a concrete object.

For example,

- This breakthrough led to cell phones. (Incorrect.)
- It breakthrough led to the development of cell phones. (Correct, development is an abstraction.)

- When “and” is used as a connector, it should connect two separate and independent ideas.

For example,

- There was a ton of traffic on the freeway, and I was late to work. (This sentence implies that I was late for a reason **OTHER THAN** the traffic. “And” mean separate. If the sentence represents a causal relationship, you have to use either a modifier or other connectors here (e.g. and thus I was late). The intended meaning of this sentence is that there are two separate bad things, the bad traffic and I was late.)

Tips:

- Idiom: “intent to VERB” is not ok. “Intent of Verb.ing” is ok.
- If you have a dedicated **NOUN FORM** of an action, then that form is preferred to the “ing” form if you have a choice.

For example,

- The destroying of this building brought tears to the eyes of its former residents. (Relatively bad)
- The destruction of this building brought tears to the eyes of its former residents. (Relatively good)

If there is NO dedicated NOUN FORM, then the Verb.ing for is fine.

The rising of the moon is a religious event in some culture. (This is fine, there is no such thing as risage, risation, etc.)

Note that THIS IS COMPARATIVE!!!!

In addition to the lecture,

- **就近修饰就近修饰就近修饰**，重要的事情说三遍。
此原则必须在修饰部分能找到一个“主谓一致”的最近 Noun 作为其先行词。
For example,
 - Bill Gates donates many trucks to New York, which make the government of New York happy. (Correct)
 - Bill Gates donates a hundred million dollars to New York, which makes the government of New York happy. (“New york makes the government happy” doesn’t make sense.)
 - Bill Gates donates New York a hundred million dollars, which makes the government of New York happy. (“a hundred million dollars makes the government happy” is correct.)
- **就近修饰原则有一情况例外， VERB.ing modifier 修饰的为就近核心词。**
核心词为去掉这个 phrase 所有的修饰后的裸奔词，即表示核心意思的词。
For example,
 - The government of China, 核心词为 government.

- The intricate structure of the compound insect eye, having hundreds of miniature eyes, helps explain scientists’ assumption.
- The intricate structure of the compound insect eye, which has hundreds of miniature eyes, helps explain scientists’ assumption.

Only eyes can have miniature eyes. The second one is correct.

- 就近修饰动词

- Visitors to the park have often looked up into the leafy canopy and saw monkeys sleeping on the braches, with arms and legs hanging like socks on the clothesline.

-with- 修饰最近的 sleeping。所以它是 monkeys sleep on the branches 的状语。