

817 Archer St.

Millville, N. J.

Jun 20, 1948

Dear Hollis,

Your letter came this morning and since your struggle with "that" and "which" seems to bother a great many people, I thought I would sit down and try to recall what I used to know concerning the matter.

Even with rules in the head it isn't easy to remember which relative pronoun to use.

I have jotted down some rules I had nearly forgotten.

While I think of it "round" is used for the meaning I spoke about and "round" only when it makes for better rhythm, otherwise "around" if that is the word that expresses the thought.

over

In some way I do not care  
for Mr. Sims' criticisms.

I think he is "out of order"  
in objecting to (delicately scented)  
There is nothing grammatically  
wrong with it, and is much  
more poetic than "delicate-scented".

However that is correct also,  
so it comes to a matter of  
choice, but I'll take your  
criticisms any time in pref-  
erence to Sims'.

I have finished my narra-  
tive of "Joe Mulliner" but will  
not bother you with it until  
you have this assignment  
finished. It sounds very  
interesting although I imagine  
it is a lot of work.

I'll inclose these facts con-  
cerning relative pronouns  
though I know you are as  
familiar with them as I.

I'll write more fully later.

Sincerely  
Emma Moore

1  
A relative pronoun introducing an adjective clause not restrictive, should be "who" or "which".

The relative introducing a restrictive clause should be "that" if euphony allows.

Abbott says, "who," "which" etc introduce a new fact about the antecedent, whereas "that" introduces something without which the antecedent is incomplete or undefined.

If the antecedent is qualified by the adjective "that" then the relative pronoun must not be "that".

as they used to quote in High School: "That clock that I own

today is not that that you admire."

When "that" is separated from its antecedent and its verb, and made emphatic by its separation, "who" or "which" should be used instead.

Abbott illustrates this objectionable use of "that" by the sentence, "There are many persons that, though unscrupulous, are commonly good-tempered, and that, if not strongly incited by self-interest, are ready for the most part to think of the interest of their neighbors."

Since "that" applies to both persons and things, its use may be somewhat ambiguous when the antecedent does not express which is meant. This is the case with such

antecedents no "one" and "all",  
Now "who" instead of "that" would  
decide at once for persons;  
"which" for things.

P.S. Have you any ideas  
on "Kenzie" now? I mean  
no to the kind of verse.

I must get out your letter  
file and read what you  
have told me about him,  
and when you have time  
you might send any  
additional items you have.

Perhaps you want to handle  
this though. Let me know  
when you write again.

I haven't heard yet from  
Kay - it has been months.

On her Christmas card  
she wrote: "Will write soon" still  
I have received no letter.

I wonder if it was as cold at Green Bank yesterday as here. It was  $10^{\circ}$  below zero just before sunrise and did not rise above  $17^{\circ}$  all day. We are limited as to furnace oil and we have turned off the radiators in all the bedrooms.

I never do have heat in mine - just a little so the sheets will not be too cold and then closed off entirely when I put up the window and get into bed.

They will deliver only 100 gal. at a time and this weather takes so much oil, and it costs nearly three times as much as when I first installed an oil-burner.

Twenty years ago today the snow was up to the top of the 1st floor windows in drifts - a blizzard. I remember - Bill was born that day.

Best wishes,  
Emma More