eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

Anthea Fraser Gupta[1]

Foxes, Hounds, and Horses: Who or Which?

ABSTRACT

Writers of English can choose whether to mark a high level of sentience in a nonhuman animal by selecting the word *who* rather than *which.* An examination of texts relating to foxhunting on the world wide web showed that, in reference to the nonhuman animals involved in foxhunting, writers were most likely to use *who* in reference to foxes, and least likely to use it in reference to horses. Those who support foxhunting are more likely to recognize the sentience of the fox than those who oppose foxhunting. This may be because those who enjoy foxhunting present the fox as an active creator of the hunt, and as a worthy opponent.

A pronoun is a word that refers (usually back) to a nominal, which can be called the *referent* or *antecedent* of the pronoun. A nominal is normally a noun phrase (not just a noun), but can be other structures, especially a clause functioning like a noun phrase. In this paper, however, I deal only with structures in which the pronouns can be traced back to a single noun.

Animacy and humanity

In English, the referent of the neuter pronouns *it(s)*and *which*[2] cannot normally be human ("The hunt <u>ban</u> is here and this time <u>it</u>'s real."[3]). One of the gendered pronouns must be used to refer to singular humans in the third person, namely *he/him/his* (*HE*) or *she/her(s)* (*SHE*). And the relative pronoun *who/whom/whose* (*WHO*), must be used rather than the neuter pronoun, *which* ("The distressed <u>motorist</u> who struck the hound can be heard on film as <u>she</u> calls out"). The use of *IT* with an adult human antecedent is possible as an insult, and sometimes *IT* is used to refer to a very small baby, especially when the baby's gender is unknown to the speaker. Inanimate nouns are normally referred to by the neuter pronouns, although the gendered pronouns are conventionally used by some people to refer to some inanimate referents, especially ships and problematic machines ("She's fixed" might refer to a computer). In restrictive relative clauses only, a third relative pronoun, *that*, can be used with reference to any kind of antecedent ("the <u>girl</u> <u>that</u> I marry"; "the <u>house</u> <u>that</u> Jack built"), but this pronoun is not discussed in this paper.

When we refer to nonhuman animate entities (a definition assumed to exclude plants), we have a choice in English, as we can use both the human and gendered terms (*WHO*, *HE*, *SHE*) and the inanimate and ungendered terms (*which*, *IT*). Dictionaries and grammars are often quite explicit about the areas of choice between *HE/SHE* and *IT*. Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan (1999, pp. 317-18) refer to *he* and *she* as "personal reference," and to *it* as "non-personal." They indicate the main areas where the speaker has a choice (babies; "animals, especially pets"; countries, and ships). They also attribute meaning to the choice: "Personal reference expresses greater familiarity or involvement. Non-personal reference is more detached."

However, Jacobs (2004a, 2004b), building on some concepts from Dunayer (2001), has shown that most dictionaries, grammars, and style guides do not address the related choice of relative pronoun in English where the antecedent is a nonhuman animal. Biber et al. (1999, pp. 612-13), which was not one of the grammars that Jacobs analysed, is certainly confusing on this point, indicating that "[t]he relative pronoun *who* is distinctive in that it is used almost exclusively with an animate (human) head" and yet that "[a]t the other extreme, the relative pronoun *which* rarely occurs with an animate head."

Animate does not mean the same as *human*, either biologically or linguistically: Biber et al. (1999) are silent on the treatment of animate, but nonhuman, referents. When a group of us began to explore the use of *WHO* and *which* with animate nonhuman referents, it seemed to be the case that *WHO* was likely to be used "when a close relationship with the animal is suggested" (Gilquin, personal communication, 2004), making the choice of *WHO* versus *which* comparable to that between a gendered pronoun (*HE/SHE)* and a neuter one (*IT*).

Animacy is not a simple binary choice. The way in which we use these pronouns establishes a scale of animacy, the normal order of which places humans at the top; other animals second; moving machines (such as ships, trains and cars) third; and the plant and mineral world at the bottom. It may seem strange that moving machines rank higher in this scale than do living plants, but that is how English usage ranks them.

The notion of animacy also is linked to that of sentience. *New Scientist* (4 June 2005) devoted a substantial part of one issue to the relationship between humans and

other animals, with an emphasis on the emerging scientific acceptance of sentience in nonhuman animals. De Waal (2004, p. 48) drew a distinction between anthropomorphism ("the projection of human feelings onto animals") and what he called *anthropodenial* ("blindness to the human-like characteristics of other animals and to our own animal-like characteristics"). He saw both of these as problematic.

The scale of animacy affects the most likely entity to be chosen as a character in creative writing, especially in children's fiction, where nonhuman characters may speak and engage in behaviors associated with humans (*anthropomorphism* or *personalization*). Nonhuman animals are routinely personalized in children's stories. And although almost any inanimate entity can be personalized, moving machines are the most common: the very kind of machine most likely to be referred to as *she* in other contexts. When a nonhuman is personalized, the writer uses the human-associated pronouns (e.g. "The Little Engine Who Could") and attributes gender (usually male gender, despite the preference for *she* in non-anthropomorphized texts).

We can take it that this scale of animacy reflects (and perhaps also shapes) an attitude to the way the world is structured. We can assume that where there is a choice--whether with dogs or ships--a speaker's selection of one alternative or another is meaningful. Treating a nonhuman linguistically like a human raises the animacy status of the nonhuman, signals sentience, and situates the nonhuman closer to the human.

This paper reports an investigation of the world wide web to explore the extent to which writers use *WHO* or *which* in relative clauses where the antecedent is a nonhuman animal. The searches were made in October and November 2004, and all examples are taken from the data so generated. After a broad overview, I examine in more detail how *WHO* and *which* are used in the discourses of foxhunting, where emotions run high. In the final part of the paper, I examine in more detail two texts selected to illustrate some of the points in the quantitative section of the paper.

Googling

In several recent papers (including Gupta, 2006, forthcoming), I have explored the way in which Google searches can be used to gather statistical evidence on contemporary usage, using key word searches. Sociologists have developed methods of sampling populations and techniques for establishing how representative a sample may be, but we have never

had adequate ways of sampling written material. Large corpora (such as the British National Corpus, Cobuild, or International Corpus of English) made an effort to sample printed texts, but the sampling techniques--compared to methods of sampling human populations--were experimental. Furthermore, and inevitably, the texts are out of date by the time they become publicly available. Some corpora are "tagged," that is, supplied with codes that identify specific structures or forms, which allows more sophisticated searches to be made for specific structures. However, nothing compares to the size and range of the web.

Over the last ten years or so, the web has grown in size and in social and geographic spread. We have just begun to explore its possibilities as a source of data and are only beginning to establish sampling methods. Yet the web offers a real possibility for us to develop techniques that will allow us to sample written texts of astonishing variety with the same degree of statistical reliability that exists for sampling populations. Renouf, Kehoe, and Mezquiriz (2004) emphasize the unequaled importance of the web as a searchable resource for language, especially in the search for relatively rare citations. However, they also discuss some of the difficulties, and the requirement for the researcher to be aware of the nature of the web and the--often hidden--methods of functioning of the search engines (Lüdeling, Evert, & Baroni, forthcoming).

What is on the web changes every second, and is always up-to-date. It is not a fixed corpus of the sort that linguistic researchers have become accustomed to. The search engines also change the way they classify and order results. Despite the problems of using Google to search the web, a straightforward string search can usefully show the big picture of linguistic usage. However, in order to tease out the more precise information that I need in this paper (who has written the text? what are their political allegiances? what is their attitude to the animals?), I need to view the texts and, often, to explore the site. My aim in doing a search is to reduce the number of hits to a figure that is small enough for me to read and large enough for me to see some patterns.

This is a new way of creating a corpus, but we are dealing with a new source. Readers are invited to replicate my searches. The numbers will certainly have changed, and some sites that I used in late 2004 will no longer exist. I think it unlikely, however, that the proportions of the features compared will have changed very much. If the

proportions have changed, it is likely to be because there has been social change, such as change in how representative the web is, or in how animals are represented on it.

The Scale of Animacy

In this study, I first undertook a simple Google search for the strings "{noun} who" and "{noun} which" (e.g. "cat who"; "cat which"). Then I calculated the proportion of *WHO* to *which* hits for each noun (Table 1). The search generated *who*, *whom*, and *whose*, as all cases begin with *who-*. Most hits were on *who*, and *whom* is particularly rare. I chose nouns that I thought would illustrate the hierarchy of animacy/sentience and included all the animals involved in foxhunting (*hunter, dog, fox, hound, horse*). The target in all searches is a contextualised string in which *WHO* or *which* is a relative pronoun referring to the noun immediately preceding it.

Table 1 about here

The percentage of *who-* hits is undoubtedly meaningful, and we see something close to the predicted hierarchy of animacy here--from *man* to *brussel(s) sprouts*. Unexpectedly, *tomato* appears among the nonhuman animals, and *car* (a vehicle sometimes given a female gender) is lower than *house*. Such a crude search is not enough, and there are a number of obvious problems.

- Some strings are not the target structure of linked "{noun}{ relative pronoun}." *WHO* and *which* also can be interrogative pronouns (e.g. "Is your car who you are?"). Google was set up for content searches, not for linguistic ones, and so it ignores punctuation. In some hits, *who* begins a new sentence (e.g. "Have you got a rental car? who did you go with?"; "Abel Ferrara, the man. Who cares?"). The antecedent of the pronoun might not be the noun immediately before it (e.g. "We made a <u>vitamin</u> for man <u>which</u> contains all the vitamins, minerals and supplements which we knew to be beneficial for the typical male."). These non-target hits presumably inflate the figures for all categories equally, probably by not more than 20% (based on the proportion of non-target hits found in the more detailed search of hunting texts reported later).

- As predicted, many of the "{nonhuman noun} who" sites are from stories in which a nonhuman is anthropomorphized (e.g. Archy, Don Marquis's famous cockroach; Kipling's "cat who walks alone;" "The Fox Whose Stomach Had Swollen"; and even "a darling young tomato who falls off an organic produce truck and tries to find his way back to his friends at a natural foods store."

- Nouns are applied metaphorically to humans: this accounts for many of the "tomato who" examples. Some of these metaphorical uses are routine in sexual chatrooms (especially *tomato* and *chicken*). People also have names or pseudonyms that coincide with common nouns for other animals, vegetables, or inanimate objects (e.g. Fox and Hunter are common surnames).

- Because the web is a complex source of data, it includes texts in the English of earlier periods. Although some examples of "man which" are non-target, others are either quotations from the King James translation of the Bible, or Christian texts written in an archaic style, where *which* can be used in reference to *man* (e.g. "He is like a man which built an house"). The web contains texts written in a wide variety of styles of English, including the very informal. However, as I have argued elsewhere (Gupta, forthcoming), Standard English is dominant in the web. There was no evidence that the selection of any variety of English (other than seventeenth century) was relevant in the choice of *WHO* versus *which*. The choice does not seem to be an area in which the formal and informal varieties of English differ, for example.

    Even a crude count can show the big patterns:
    1. The use of *WHO* with nonhuman animals is common;
    2. Humans, other primates, and animals commonly used as companion animals are most likely to be followed by *WHO*; and
    3. Inanimate nouns, and animals commonly used as food are more likely to be followed by *which*.

Foxhunting in Britain

This very basic quantification would suggest that animals who are seen as highly sentient, or with whom humans see themselves as being genetically or emotionally linked, are more likely to attract *WHO*, although the horse seems to be anomalous in the

hierarchy, lower than might be expected. In order to understand more clearly the reasons why one writer might use *WHO* and another *which*, I decided to target texts that would be likely to reveal an attitude to the referent.

In October 2004, a bill to ban hunting with dogs, which had been progressing through the British parliament since 1998, was much in the news. Hunting foxes to the death with dogs became illegal from February 18, 2005. This is an issue with fierce partisanship on both sides and one in which the roles of four animals (hunters, dogs, horses, and foxes) are problematic.

Foxhunting in Britain involves highly organized communal hunts that are embedded into a social system in rural areas. Hunts are social institutions as well as highly ritualized sporting events. In some mountainous areas (such as the Lake District of northwest England), the seasonal hunting is on foot, but in most of Britain it is on horseback. Packs of highly trained hounds, bred centrally and maintained for the job, follow the trail of wild foxes. The dogs are followed by the hunt on horseback and also by assistants and hunt supporters in vehicles and on foot. Even before the ban, many hunts ended with no kill, and it was a matter for celebration when a fox was killed by a hunt. Since the 1950s, hunts have also been followed by groups of demonstrators, hunt observers, and hunt saboteurs, who represent various animal rights organizations and use different techniques to end hunting for pleasure. Since the ban, groups opposing foxhunting continue to attend the drag hunts that have replaced foxhunts and attempt to ensure that hunts do not pursue or kill foxes. The law is so complex that hunting is still flourishing (winter 2005-6) and hunts still kill foxes by means that exploit loopholes in the law, such as by using birds of prey. Foxes are not protected animals, and can still be killed by landowners.

Over the centuries, the hunts have been careful to maintain the habitat of the foxes, to ensure that foxes continue to be available to hunt. When, from 1750 to 1850, the common open fields of England were enclosed by hedges, landowners in the Midlands of England--where fox hunting already was well-developed in the eighteenth century--made provision for fox coverts, patches of woodland habitat for foxes (Hoskins, 1955, pp. 151-154). In 2000, foxes were deliberately and illegally introduced into the Australian state of Tasmania--to the great damage of the ecology--presumably in the hope that hunting foxes

could take place there (Weeds, Pests and Diseases, 2005). The hunt has ensured the survival of the fox in rural areas, despite the predatory habits of foxes, which make them a threat to farm birds.

Those who hunt have supported the maintenance of foxes, observed their habits, protected their habitat, and often express affection for them. Page's book on the "secret life of the fox" (1986) includes poems, declarations of love for the fox, and a frank discussion of hunting, which he sees as ironically "offer[ing] the wild country fox its greatest insurance against excessive persecution" (p. 123).

Hunting, especially for what is not eaten, is (like warfare) often seen as being validated by a worthy opponent. The more the opponent can be presented as dangerous, brave, clever, and active in the fight, the more the hunter (or soldier) can also be seen as brave and clever. Foxes undoubtedly are--since the loss of wild boar and wolves--the most prestigious prey available in Britain, although they are certainly not dangerous to humans, even when attacked. Foxes feature in many traditional stories, where they take up the role of a cunning and dangerous (mostly to hens) character. As we shall see, the attribution of character, intelligence, and bravery to the fox is part of the discourse of foxhunting.

There is little doubt that the notion of pleasure being obtained from the killing of an animal repels the majority of the population of Britain. People are less likely to be opposed to the killing of foxes by farmers to reduce their predation on stock, and there is more opposition to hunting than there is to the killing of animals for food. There is also more opposition to the killing of appealing animals than of unappealing ones. Foxes are familiar animals in urban Britain, where they are not hunted and where almost all residents take pleasure in observing them, and find them beautiful to look at. Foxes are shy, unaggressive and present no direct threat to humans. Therefore, those supporting foxhunting have had a number of challenges in putting forward their views. They have even resorted to accusing those opposed to hunting of being the cause of more cruelty with comments such as,

> By the time you read this column the anti-hunting brigade will have condemned thousands of mammals and birds to a slow, lingering death in the jaws of the fox whom they perceive as worthy of some sort of protection.

How do these allegiances translate into the choice of pronoun? On the one hand, one might expect that those with a concern for animal rights, people who want to extend to other animals the rights that humans have, would also extend the animate pronoun to other animals. However, the hunters also have an interest in personalizing the fox and also might see the hounds and horses as sharing with them the act of hunting, which would lead them to personalize all the animals involved in the hunt. Both sides have the kind of positive emotional involvement with the animals that is likely to lead to the use of the animate pronoun. Are they equally likely to use the animate pronoun? And are those who are not partisan in the hunting debate less likely to use the animate pronoun?

WHO **and** *Which* **in Foxhunting**

In using Google searches for linguistic research, one has to be creative. The basic search string that I used to generate Table 1 produces too many urls and too many irrelevant hits of one sort or another. To increase the proportion of relevant hits, a second search string is useful. As I wanted to generate texts that engaged in the hunting debate, I added to every search a second required string, "ban hunting," which is a phrase used by participants of all kinds in the debate. This virtually eliminated hits on urls relating stories with anthropomorphized characters, those in which words such as *fox* or *hunter* were surnames, names of pop groups, or names of specific kinds of sexual partners. I searched for both singular and plural nouns, which was most important for hounds, who are seldom identified as individuals. I did not restrict myself to sites in the .uk domain for two reasons: (a) sites that originate in Britain do not have necessarily a .uk domain; and (b) I was happy to include any non-British sites engaging in the discourse of hunting. In practice, the vast majority of sites were engaging in the issue of foxhunting in Britain.

My search, therefore, was "{animal(s)} who" and "{animal(s)} which", in sites that also had the string, "ban hunting." The animals were the four classes of participants in foxhunting with horses, which is the main type of hunting under discussion in the United Kingdom. These participants were fox(es), hound(s)/dog(s), horse(s), and hunter(s). *Hound* and *dog* are both used to refer to the dogs (foxhounds) used for foxhunting in Britain, so I searched for both (there seems to be little difference in the degree of personalization). Another type of dog, the terrier, is also used in foxhunting in Britain, to kill a fox who has gone underground. The killing of a fox in this way is seen as

peripheral to the sporting activity and seems to be little spoken about in the discourse of hunting. The target for *hunter(s)* is human. Although *hunter* can also be used to refer to a type of horse, this sense did not occur in my data. I recorded the crude numbers generated by the strings (Table 2) and examined in more detail the first 10 websites in each cell, which I read to establish the affiliation. Reading the context also enabled me to exclude the websites that did not use the target structure (Table 3).

Table 2 about here

Table 3 about here

This confirms the scale of animacy established in Table 1. Once again, unsurprisingly, the human hunters stand out with their high proportion of reference with *WHO*. All cases of "hunter(s) which" appear to be relative clauses where the antecedent is other than the noun immediately before the relative pronoun (e.g. "Easements for hunters which stretch over landowners' entire property"). Of the other animals, the fox is most likely to attract the animate relative pronoun and the horse, once again, the least likely. There are some differences between the treatment of the singular and plural that are hard to understand, with some animals apparently more likely to be treated as sentient in the plural than in the singular (hounds and horses) and others more likely to be treated as sentient in the singular (hunters, dogs, and foxes). Some of these findings are based on small figures, however, with hounds and horses being relatively seldom referred to in the singular.

It is far more time consuming to examine the partisanship of those discussing hunting, as this requires viewing of the full text (rather than just the extract supplied in the Google results) and examination of its context. Once the websites are read, it is relatively easy to establish the degree of partisanship expressed in the text. This is an issue on which passions are high and clearly expressed. I attributed direct quotations to those quoted and other content to those responsible for the web site. Non-partisan texts included contributions by some of the speakers in parliamentary debate, some official

documents, some newspaper reports, and some educational material. The smaller sample of non-partisan texts makes comparison of their usage less secure than the comparison of the two partisan groups (Table 3). The following, small scale analysis of a subsection of these websites suggests:

1. Humans are always personalized;
2. Of the other animals, the fox is most likely to be personalized, except by the non-partisan; and
3. Those who are pro-hunting are most likely to personalize foxes and dogs/hounds.

As the following examples show, personalizing an animal does not preclude hunting the animal and is not necessary for its defense.

Who

Before the law, the fit fox more often than not always got away and it was the infirm or old <u>fox</u> <u>who</u> was caught. [pro-hunting]

On reaching Redgills they found a dog <u>fox</u> <u>who</u> made for Arresgill. [pro-hunting]

It's not only <u>foxes</u> <u>who</u> are hurt and killed in bloodsports. [anti-hunting]

There is the example of <u>Copper the Fox</u>, <u>who</u> would have died, according to the vet who treated him, who took to ground, bleeding from his penis due to internal injuries after being chased by a pack of hounds.[anti-hunting]

The peace of a wildlife reserve near Linwood in the New Forest was violated (2 October) when hunting <u>dogs</u> of the New Forest Hounds, <u>who</u> were in the area hunting young foxes, trespassed in full cry into the wood. [anti-hunting]

A rescue <u>dog</u> <u>who</u> worked long hours at Ground Zero has some serious medical problems and needs care. [non-partisan]

Which

Consider a <u>fox</u>, <u>which</u> has had a natural life until its last day. [pro-hunting]

Reality is it is the <u>fox</u> <u>which</u> is the victim of hundreds of years of victimisation and persecution and of hundreds and thousands meeting horrendous cruel sickening deaths all because of a few people's bloodlust for here is the reality of all the myths a few enjoy the end result of a chase and bring shame against us all. [anti-hunting]

With around 98% of poultry confined in intensive farming systems, it must be a rare <u>fox</u> <u>which</u> ever gets the opportunity to taste chicken. [anti-hunting]

The horse, which was left in Queen's Road close to Brighton Station, had a stake driven through its chest, supporting a placard reading: "There will be more of this if you ban hunting." [anti-hunting]

Sentencing him, Sheriff Kevin Drummond told Scott: "The manner in which you acted resulted in cruelty to a fox which was not killed outright and took some time to die." [non-partisan]

I have supplied the percentage of use of *WHO* and *which* in each category in Table 3. We need to remember that the number of websites analyzed in this detail is very small, magnifying any anomalies. Although the majority of the population of the United Kingdom appears to be opposed to foxhunting, the pro-hunting lobby, currently very much on the defensive, has a larger presence on the web. It seems possible that the group most likely to use the animate pronoun with reference to the nonhuman animals involved in hunting are those who advocate hunting. The least likely to use the animate pronoun seem to be those who take a non-partisan stance. This would support the hypothesis that emotional and personalized engagement with an animal is predictive of an animate pronoun.

The Discourses of Foxhunting

I have selected two texts that illustrate how the personalization of the animals involved in foxhunting works in context. Both advocates and opponents of foxhunting write hunt narratives, which are accounts of the experiences of an individual day. All four animals commonly appear as individuals in these texts. I have underlined both the pronouns that refer to nonhuman animals and their antecedents.

Hunt Observer's Narrative: Anti-Hunting

Source: *Protect Our Wild Animals (POWA).* 2004. Press release: 18.02.04.

18.02.04: Heythrop Hunt causes accident on A429 shocking incident caught on film

POWA monitors capture shocking accident on film

At 3.30pm on Wednesday 18th February the Heythrop Hunt completely lost control of its pack of hounds, which ran straight out onto the A429, causing an accident in which a car collided heavily with a hound.

The hunt had found a fox just outside the village of Broadwell near Stow on the Wold. The baying hounds chased the fox across the fields in the direction of the A429 Fosse Way, leaving the mounted field well behind.

Totally unsupervised, the hounds ran out onto the busy road. One hound was struck by a car. The impact caused the <u>animal</u> to scream in pain and sent <u>it</u> somersaulting along the road.

POWA hunt monitors captured the horrifying incident on film. As a hunt official arrived on the scene, the distressed motorist who struck the hound can be heard on film as she calls out to him about the accident. Astonishingly, he does not even stop, but merely calls 'Sorry madam'.

The woman's anger and distress are obvious. The same huntsman's response to the POWA monitor who is urgently trying to alert him to the fact that a hound has been hit is 'Shut up, you'. A few moments later the <u>hound, who</u> is by now looking dazed and near to collapse, is picked up unceremoniously by a burly hunt supporter, and placed in the back of a Land Rover. He shouts obscenities to the POWA monitor filming the scene. POWA will be sending copies of their film to the police and the RSPCA.

POWA spokesperson Penny Little, who was one of the monitors who filmed the incident, said: 'We were deeply shocked by this incident, yet another in a long catalogue of chaos and havoc. It is a miracle no motorists were injured as there could easily have been a pile-up. The hunt are an absolute disgrace, and are not fit to be in charge of any animals. We think the police and the RSPCA will want to investigate the hunt's behaviour in respect of this incident. The film will be sent to the Government and we hope it hastens the completion of the bill to ban this horrible bloodsport once and for all'.

Note to editors: 2 years ago almost to the day POWA filmed a Hethrop hound being hit by a car on the A44 at Enstone. Most recent in the catalogue of Heythrop chaos is 24 Jan this year, when hounds ran through Chadlington, causing annoyance and distress to village residents.

This is an emotionally engaged text about a "shocking accident." There is extensive reference to humans (by *who*, *she*, and *he*). This text is of particular interest for its focus

on the hounds, who fulfil two roles in the narrative, reflected to some extent in the choice of pronouns:

They misbehave. They run on the road, causing danger, and causing distress to the motorist who inadvertently becomes the agent of injury to one of them. They run through a settlement causing annoyance and distress to residents (*which, it*).

They are victims. The hound who is hit is injured, and treated without tenderness by the hunt officials (*who*).

The real miscreants, however, are the humans of the hunt-- the hunters, hunt officials, and followers. It is they who are responsible for the loss of control and who fail to alleviate the distress of both the human and the hound, even to the extent of abusing the hunt observer who draws attention to the injury. Pronominal reference to the hounds is inconsistent. It is not surprising that when they are a "pack of hounds," reference is made with the impersonal *which*. The injured hound, however, is referred to both as *it* and *who*. This may be a way of indicating personalization without attributing gender, if the gender was unknown to the writer, or may just reflect the alternation that is possible in English.

Hunter's Narrative: Pro-Hunting

Source: *The New Forest Hounds*. 2003. Hunt Reports. Season 2002-3: February 12th 2003. <www.newforesthounds.co.uk>.

> ***SEASON 2002/3***
>
> February 12th 2003
>
> We had to change our meet from Tuesday 11th to Wednesday 12th February because many of us wanted to attend the funeral of Nick Smith. Nick being a valued committee member and much missed.
>
> Sadly this resulted in one of the smallest fields this season when about 25 people met at Cadmans Pool. Only sad because the day turned into one of the best ever in recent times for our hounds.
>
> Business began at Broomy Bottom when hounds accounted for a fox within about 3 minutes of being put in to draw. Huntsman then took his hounds into Holly Hatch Inclosure where they soon got on terms with a <u>fox</u> <u>which</u> ran out of the

Inclosure into Anses Wood and along Dockens Water to South and then North Bentley Inclosures, before going on to Mr. Winters fields at Fritham. Hounds got badly hampered here trying to get through sheep wire and the fox eventually had to be given best.

After the long hack back to Holly Hatch hounds where put in to draw again. They soon picked up another pilot - at 11.50am to be precise. Initially he took hounds along Dockens Water it seemed in the footsteps of the first fox, but when he reached South Bentley he turned up on to Fritham Plain. He crossed the Plain and when straight on into Eyeworth Wood and beyond up towards Bramshaw Telegraph. However before the Godshill Road he turned right handed down to Howen Bottom and on into Howen Bushes. He turned right handed again below the Royal Oak at Fritham and back up to Fritham Plain via Gorley Bushes. From here he turned down over Hiscocks Hill into Island Thorns up towards Studley Castle but before the top of the Inclosure he turned almost back on himself crossing the gravel track above Fritham Bridge. He clipped the corner of Amberwood Inclosure, crossed the driftway and straight up through Sloden . Here huntsman and 1st whipper-in did a flying change on to second horses and followed hounds down across Rakes Brakes Bottom and back to Holly Hatch. Hounds checked for the first time but soon got back on terms running up through the Inclosure into the open of Broomy Plain. After a wide circle on the outside he came back into Holly Hatch and eventually to ground. It was now 1.40pm, we were within a few hundred yards of where the hunt had begun. The 1hr 50 mins in between had been amazing. We've had more interesting hunts watching these hounds but it is a long time since we've had such a lengthy sustained fast pace. Hounds must have covered almost 12 miles with hardly a check. Most of the field had very tired horses and were ready to call it a day but we staggered on for another hour drawing Broomy Inclosure where a brace were roused. Hounds hunted one well before putting it to ground towards Hasley.

At 2.40 we did call end of day and the 45 minute hack back to the boxes gave everyone time to contemplate and wonder how much Nick Smith had to do with

such a memorable day in this his favourite part of our country. We'll give him the benefit of the doubt - nice one Nick.

MARTHA

This is a good example of a text that casts the fox in the role of worthy opponent. The way in which it allocates roles to foxes, hounds, horses, and hunters (in this text the hunters are *we)* also shows how it is that the horses are least likely to be personalized.

The text narrates, with considerable enthusiasm, and in a rather breathless style, what is seen as a good day's hunting. There are some misprints, including *where* for *were*. ("Hounds where put in to draw again") and *when* for *went* ("He... when straight on").

There are five foxes in this narrative, three of whom die, although this might not be apparent at first reading. The first fox gives little sport and is "accounted for" (killed) by the hounds "within about 3 minutes." The second fox escapes the hunt by going into fields through "sheep wire." This fox is referred to as *which* and "had to be given best" (got away).

The fourth and fifth foxes are together when "roused" (disturbed) and are referred to as a "brace." Two relevant meanings of *brace* are invoked here: *brace* can refer to a pair of dogs-- and remember that foxes are from the dog family--but *brace* also is used to refer to a pair "of other animals, esp.[ecially] certain kinds of game" (*Oxford English Dictionary*). One of the pair escapes, while the second, referred to as *it*, goes "to ground" (into the den). After the hunt has moved on, this fox is killed by terriers (the killing again is not narrated but is to be inferred).

The third fox, referred to as a "pilot," is the subject of the longest section of the narrative, which recounts the two-hour chase in detail. He also goes "eventually to ground" and is assumed to be killed outside the narrative. This fox is personalized extensively as *he* throughout (there are no relative clauses), and is the agent of 11 consecutive verbs in the fourth paragraph: he "took" [the hounds], "reached," "turned," "crossed," "when" (went), "turned" [4 times], "clipped," and "crossed." These verbs of movement portray the fox as the leader of the hunt, actively responsible for its quality, and the one who controls the movements of the hounds.

The hounds are presented as actively enjoying this hunt, "one of the best ever in recent times for our hounds." The hounds veer between being responsible for finding, trailing, and killing the fox, being led by the fox, and being under the control of the huntsman (they were "put in," the huntsman "took his hounds"). The huntsman, who is the professional in charge of the hounds and of the management of the hunt, has some control over the hounds. However, the hunt, the humans and the horses, are passive in this narrative: they follow the hounds who, in turn, are led by the fox. After the long chase of the third fox, they have "very tired horses." In the end, the main purpose of the day seems to have been "watching these hounds" and having a "lengthy sustained fast pace." The most personalized nonhuman animal is the third fox, who is hunted for two hours before he is killed.

Conclusion

Those who promote hunting do indeed have the greatest emotional involvement with the animals concerned. The hunters, horses, and hounds are members of the hunting team and of them it is the hounds who are especially responsible for a successful hunt. But it is the role of the fox that is especially interesting. The highly animate fox is presented in pro-hunting literature as the leader of the hunt, a worthy opponent, with skills of evasion. The fox is also the only participant in hunting who acts alone. The rhetoric of the hunter/hunted relationship in the pro-hunting literature is one of chivalry. The role of the horse is less personal: the horse acts under the direct command of a hunter and linguistically is treated as little more personal than a motorbike.

In the anti-hunting literature, foxes are the victims of immoral human behavior, a role that apparently is less likely to lead to personalization than is their role as active creators of a hunt. The lower animacy attributed to dogs and hounds by those against hunting may be a result of a rather ambivalent attitude to dogs. Dogs are, on the one hand, the agents of the fox's death and, on the other hand, can be cast as victims because humans breed them for this purpose and, without sentiment, discard them when their working life is over. The pro-hunting groups also engage in this rhetoric of victimhood, claiming that horses and dogs will lose their lives if hunting ends and they become redundant, and that foxes will be killed in worse ways. This is an appropriation of the argument from animal rights. It also relates to the central dilemma of the discourse of

foxhunting. Foxhunting involves physical cruelty to foxes, dogs, and horses; but it also maintains foxes in Britain, and is partly is responsible for aspects of the landscape that many people find attractive.

The appropriation of the styles of argument and protest of their opponents by the pro-hunting lobby has been a striking part of their highly organized campaigning. Appropriating the rhetoric of the anti-racist and gay rights lobbies, they have also begun to cast themselves as a minority group against which there is societal discrimination. Every week (even now, six months after the ban), I pass a Countryside Alliance billboard in a field next to a motorway that reads, "Fight discrimination. Fight the ban."

Those who advocate hunting with dogs have the harder argument to make, given the widespread repugnance in Britain about taking pleasure in killing. Perhaps as a result, however, writers from the pro-hunting lobby appear to have the greater rhetorical skills, The pro-hunting lobby's commoner use of *WHO*, especially in reference to the fox, signals the personalization of the prey, a respect for it, and emotional closeness to it. Animal rights advocates might like to consider that a consistent use of the personalized pronouns could help signal to the reader that the animals are sentient and could convey emotional closeness. This is particularly important where the argument most likely to succeed is based on an instinctive repugnance to the suffering of sentient beings.

* Anthea Fraser Gupta, University of Leeds

Notes

[1] Correspondence should be addressed to Anthea Fraser Gupta, School of English, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK.

[2] The pronouns have different forms depending on case (the way in which they are used in the grammar of a sentence). At the first mention of the pronoun, I list all the case forms; after that, I will use the common case form (also known as the nominative) in capital letters to stand for all of them, as is common practice in linguistics. So, *WHO* mean, "*who* and/or *whom* and/or *whose*". *Which* has only one form, so does not need to be capitalized in this way.

[3] Underlining added by me, in this and other examples when the two are not adjacent, in order to identify pronoun and referent.

References

Biber, D., Johansson, S. Leech., G. Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English.* London: Longman.

de Waal, F. (2005). Suspicious minds. *New Scientist, 186,* (2502), 48.

Dunayer, J. (2001). *Animal equality: Language and liberation.* Derwood, MD: Ryce.

Gupta, A. F. (2006). Singlish on the web. In Azirah Hashim & Norizah Hassan (Eds.), *Varieties of English in SouthEast Asia and beyond* (pp. 19-37). Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.

Gupta, A. F. (forthcoming). Standard English in the world. In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hoskins, W. G. (1955). *The making of the English landscape.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Jacobs, G. (2004a). Extending the circle of compassion to include non-human animals: The case of the use of who. (*The who which project*) Online from Centre for Language and Ecology <www.ecoling.net/> [accessed December 2004].

Jacobs, G. (2004b). Research on the use of who with non-human animals: An exploration. (*The who which project*) Online from Centre for Language and Ecology <www.ecoling.net/> [accessed December 2004].

Lüdeling, A., Evert, S., & Baroni, M. (forthcoming). Using web data for linguistic purposes. In M. Hundt, C. Biewer, & N. Nesselhauf (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics and the web.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Oxford English Dictionary. (2nd ed. 1989 (ed. J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner), Additions 1993-7 (ed. John Simpson and Edmund Weiner; Michael Proffitt), and 3rd ed. (in progress) Mar. 2000- (ed. John Simpson)). OED Online. Oxford University Press. <oed.com>.

Page, R.. (1986). *A fox's tale: The secret life of the fox.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Renouf, A., Kehoe, A., & Mezquiriz, D. (2004). The accidental corpus: Some issues in extracting linguistic information from the web. *Language and Computers, 49* (1), 403-419.

Weeds, Pests, and Diseases. (2005*). Department of primary industries, water and environment, Tasmania.* <www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/ThemeNodes/DREN-4VH82R?open> [accessed June 2005].

Table 1: Use of *WHO* and *Which* in {Noun}{Wh-} Strings

noun	approx. No. of hits before *who-*	approx. No. of hits before *which*	percentage of *who-*
man	8,220,000	332,000	96
hunter	113,000	9,240	92
cat	294,000	59,500	83
chimpanzee	2,600	737	78
dog	464,000	143,000	76
fox	118,000	41,700	74
tiger	24,600	12,300	67
tomato	14,400	8,930	62
hound	5,640	3,910	59
rat	14,500	14,500	50
cockroach	684	711	49
horse	51,400	73,700	41
cow	13,800	19,800	41
chicken	7,060	21,300	25
house	187,000	1,020,000	15
car	55,900	485,000	10
brussel(s) sprout	6	172	3

Table 2: Approximate Number of Google Hits on "ban hunting" with {Animal}{wh-}

Animal	*who-*	*which*	percentage *who-*	
Hunter	103	39	73	
Hunters	232	17	93	86
Fox	78	87	47	
Foxes	55	148	27	45
Hound	4	26	13	
Hounds	80	123	39	36
Dog	83	164	34	
Dogs	61	197	24	29
Horse	6	33	15	
Horses	15	39	28	23

Table 3: Use of *WHO* And *Which* by Attitude toward Hunting (First 10 Websites in Each Search Category)

	pro-hunting			anti-hunting			non-partisan		
	who-	*which*	*%age who-*	*who-*	*which*	*%age who-*	*who-*	*which*	*%age who-*
hunter	7		100	3		100			
hunters	4		100	4		100	2		100
fox	8	2	80	2	2	50		6	0
foxes	7	4	64	3	3	50		3	0
hound	3	4	43	1	5	17		1	0
hounds	5	6	45	4	3	57	1	1	50
dog	4	2	67	1	3	25	5	5	50
dogs	4	3	57	3	6	33	3	1	75
horse	3	5	38	3	3	50	1	2	33
horses	8	5	62	2	3	40		2	0
Total	**53**	**31**		**26**	**28**		**12**	**21**	
	84			**54**			**33**		