

## **Extending the Circle of Compassion to Include Nonhuman Animals: The Case of the Use of *Who* in Dictionaries, Works on Grammar, and Publication Manuals, and by Newspapers and News Agencies**

*George Jacobs*  
*george@vegetarian-society.org*

This article proposes that readers consider the meaning of the use or non-use of the relative pronoun *who* with nonhuman animals. Language affects and is affected by humans' views of the world (Fairclough, 1992; Whorf, 1956). What does our use or non-use of *who* when referring to other animals say about our existing attitudes toward other animals? What attitudes toward nonhuman animals does it promote? The article suggests that using *who* with other animals might, in small measure, reflect and promote a greater level of concern for nonhuman animals, and that this concern fits with a larger global trend toward humans extending rights to and showing compassion for fellow humans and now other animals who formerly were without rights and received little compassion.

The article begins with a brief discussion of what triggered the author's interest in the issue of the use of *who* with reference to nonhuman animals. Next, the concept of a widening circle of compassion is explained. The two main sections of the article are a description of research methods that could be used to study the issue and a report of a small-scale study of how the issue is treated in dictionaries, grammar works, and publication manuals, and by newspapers and news agencies.

### **The use of *who* with chimpanzees**

In her 1990 book *Through a Window*, Jane Goodall ([www.janegoodall.org](http://www.janegoodall.org)) writes that although scientists have long accepted that humans and other animals share physical characteristics, acceptance by scientists and the general public of nonhuman animals as individual feeling, sentient beings has been slow and grudging. In the early 1960s, when Goodall started her research with chimpanzees in Africa, scientists in her field gave numbers, not names to the chimpanzees they were studying. When Goodall submitted her first scientific paper for publication, it was returned to her by the editor to be amended. In every place where she had written *he* or *she* to refer to chimpanzees, the words had been replaced with *it*. Similarly, every *who* had been replaced with *which*. In an effort to rescue the chimpanzees from 'thing-ness' and restore them to 'being-ness,' Goodall stubbornly changed the words back and, in the end, won a small battle in what was to be an ongoing struggle to tear down, one by one, some of the bricks in the wall of superiority that humans had built to separate themselves from other animals.

As an applied linguist, the author was struck by Goodall's account of her controversial use of *who* 40 years ago and wondered what contemporary experts said on the issue and what constituted normal present-day usage. I also had an activist rationale for my interest, feeling that nonhuman animals, such as those whose species are driven to extinction or whose flesh is served for dinner, are not treated in the appropriate manner.

## Circle of Compassion

The term “circle of compassion” appears to derive from the writings of two well-known social thinkers, Albert Schweitzer and Albert Einstein. Schweitzer, the 1952 Nobel Peace Prize winner, is best known for his medical work on behalf of the poor in Gabon. Einstein, best known for his work on physics for which he won a Nobel Prize in 1921, was also a frequent writer on social issues. Here are the two quotes, one from Schweitzer and the other from Einstein, which appear frequently in such places as websites on nonhuman animal issues:

Until he [sic] extends the circle of his compassion to all living things, man will not himself find peace. -- *Albert Schweitzer* -- *The Philosophy of Civilisation*, Tr. by C.T. Campion, New York, Macmillan Co., 1949.

Our task must be to free ourselves... by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature and its beauty. -- *Albert Einstein*, letter dated 1950, *Mathematical circles adieu: A fourth collection of mathematical stories and anecdotes* [compiled by] Howard W. Eves, Boston: Prindle, Weber & Schmidt, 1977.

The history of the world over the past 200 years shows an increase in the percentage of the human population who have moved toward full membership in society. For instance, the 19<sup>th</sup> century saw slavery outlawed in various countries, and the 20<sup>th</sup> century saw women win the right to vote, as well as other rights, in many countries. Great progress has been made in protecting humans with physical and mental challenges, and discrimination against humans who are elderly, homosexuals, or members of other minorities is slowly being reduced in some parts of the world. Of course, this movement toward greater rights for all humans has not been a straight line, and much progress remains to be made.

While the above examples of change deal only with humans, Schweitzer and Einstein wrote about extending this circle of compassion to nonhumans. This change too is taking place. For instance, movements have grown up against the use of nonhuman animals' fur in clothing (e.g., People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, retrieved August 18, 2004) and the use of nonhuman animals as food (Vegetarians International Voice for Animals, retrieved August 18, 2004). Laws have been passed mandating better treatment for other animals. For example, the European Union has enacted laws phasing out practices in which humans confine egg-laying hens in battery cages, calves in veal crates, and pregnant sows in gestation crates (Tomaselli, 2003).

That this greater concern for other animals has reached mainstream consciousness is suggested by these two excerpts from the Animal Welfare page of the McDonald's (yes, that McDonald's) website (retrieved August 18, 2004):

*McDonald's supports that animals should be free from cruelty, abuse and neglect while embracing the proper treatment of animals and addressing animal welfare issues.*

*McDonald's will lead our industry, working with our suppliers and industry experts to advance animal welfare practices and technology.*

Of course, readers will have to decide for themselves whether McDonald's management really believes what they say or whether their statements are merely a public relations ploy aimed at appearing concerned while McDonald's carries on ordering the killing of billions of nonhuman animals.

One purpose of the research agenda proposed in this article is to explore one small aspect of the intersection of these societal changes, on one hand, and the English language on the other hand. The other purpose is to attempt to see how language can be a vehicle for helping other animals enter human animals' circle of compassion.

### **Methods of Researching the Issue**

The next section of this article offers some ideas about how the issue of the use of *who* and *which* with nonhuman animals might be researched. Research methods discussed are grammatical judgment tests, multiple choice fill-in-the-blanks, samples of language use from a variety of sources, analysis of what reference works say on the matter, and questionnaires and interviews. Of course, combining a number of methods, sometimes known as triangulation (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003), often offers more complete, broader views of an issue. Similar advantages can be gained by using the same data collection methods with a wide variety of samples. Additionally, while language use in English is the focus here, this same general issue – to what extent humans are treated the same as or differently from other animals - is most likely relevant in all languages, although it may well take different forms. In the same vein, the use of *who* represents only one of many areas of English that reflects and promotes particular views of nonhuman animals.

#### Grammaticality Judgment Tests

A straightforward approach to researching humans' views and practices on an aspect of language is to use a grammaticality judgment test (Schutze, 1996). In such a test, participants complete an instrument consisting of a number of discrete sentences involving the grammatical element on which the research is focused. Participants rate each sentence as grammatical or not.

Here is an example from ([http://chss.montclair.edu/~sotillos/teaching\\_grammar.html](http://chss.montclair.edu/~sotillos/teaching_grammar.html))

#### **Grammaticality Judgment Test on Dative Alternation**

*Directions: Read the sentences. Decide if they are correct or incorrect. Write (0) if correct, or (X) if incorrect.*

1. \_\_\_\_\_ She asked the class a question.

2. \_\_\_\_\_ *She asked a question to the class.*
3. \_\_\_\_\_ *She reviewed the sentences for Mary.*
4. \_\_\_\_\_ *She reviewed Mary the sentences.*

For the issue of the use of *who*, examples of possible sentences for a grammaticality judgment test might be:

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Fluffy is the dog which lives in their house.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ Fluffy is the dog who lives in their house.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ The mosquito which bit the baby probably was born in a nearby puddle.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ The mosquito who bit the baby probably was born in a nearby puddle..

#### Multiple Choice Fill-in-the-Blank Instruments

Along the same lines as grammaticality judgment tests are multiple choice fill-in-the-blank instruments that call on respondents to supply a word or words to complete a particular sentence and provide a list of options for respondents to use. This type of instrument provides respondents with opportunities to offer slightly more input, as they are taking part in forming the sentences, rather than only judging already fully formed sentences.

Here is an excerpt from one such an instrument, [http://www.teagirl.arts.uwa.edu.au/online\\_survey](http://www.teagirl.arts.uwa.edu.au/online_survey)). This one investigates the issue of gender neutral language (Nilsen, 1987).

*In school time, a teacher is obliged to supervise (his, her, their, his or her) students.*

*A person's reaction to bad news often depends on (his, her, their, his or her) sense of inner strength.*

An example of items on a Multiple Choice Fill-in-the-Blank instrument on the issue of the use of *who* with nonhuman animals might be:

*Nonhuman apes (which/who) live in the forest are being studied by scientists from Belgium.*

A variation on this type of instrument would be to use fill-in-the-blank without supplying a range of options. The advantage of not supplying options would be that participants might suggest choices that the researchers had not thought of. On the other hand, supplying choices allows the researchers to focus the study more narrowly.

### Collection of language samples from individuals

One potential problem with grammaticality judgment instruments is that when using such instruments, respondents are telling the researchers what they would do; the researchers do not see what the respondents actually do in real life. A research method that addresses this concern involves collection of samples of language, either oral or written. Such samples provide a more naturalistic look at language choices.

Analysis of data produced in this matter can be very time-consuming, as it involves combing through large amount of data in search of what are probably only a few instances of the feature of interest. Also, oral data need to be transcribed after they are collected. Another problem with the collection of such data revolves around eliciting the grammar elements of interest. Therefore, careful topic selection and other forms of guidance may be necessary. For instance, to address the issue of the use of *who* with nonhuman animals, participants could be asked to write or talk about nonhuman animals in various contexts, such as pets, individual animals who are not pets, or particular species. Another idea would be to supply participants with a set of facts in point form (so as not to show any relative pronouns) and ask them to construct a text.

As relative pronouns are not used very often in the writing of young children learning English as a first language or in the writing of beginning level students learning English as an additional language, such individuals might not be the best participants for this study. In this regard, grammaticality judgment tests may be preferred, because such tests are capable of providing insight into participants' reactions to grammatical elements the participants are not yet producing. In all such elicitation tasks, context plays a crucial role, as language use varies according to context.

### Collection of language samples from print and electronic sources

Two other sources of language samples are print sources, such as newspapers and books, and electronic media, such as television, radio, and websites. Again, context plays a key role, e.g., the website of an animal rights organization might show language use different from that in a site hosted by a company in the meat/flesh industry. Similarly, the use of *who* with nonhuman animals in novels by authors who might be more sympathetic to animal rights might vary compared to that found in works of novelists who do not seem particularly sympathetic to the plight of nonhuman animals.

### Corpus Analysis

Rather than collecting language data themselves, researchers can access already existing language corpora (Sinclair, 1991). Such corpora normally have specific characteristics, e.g., they contain only spoken language. Also, they can be analysed via computer. The great strength of corpus analysis lies in the fact that the use of computers allows investigation of a much larger number of texts. One weakness is that computers may lack the interpretative power of humans. In the case of the proposed study, this weakness can be addressed by having someone look over the results to with an eye to whether the computer has correctly recognised the referent of *who*.

### Examination of Reference Works

Dictionaries and works on grammar have both descriptive and prescriptive functions, describing how language is used and providing guidance on how it should be used. These reference works, in both print and on-line versions can provide valuable insights. The next section of this paper presents a small-scale study of what dictionaries say about the use of *who* with nonhuman animals.

### Questionnaires and Interviews

Grammaticality judgment tests, multiple choice instruments, collection of naturalistic language samples can be supplemented by questionnaires and interviews. These latter research tools may provide insight into the reasons behind humans' language views and usage (Desimone & Le Floch, 2004). Because questionnaires and interviews provide user perspectives on the results of other types of data collection, they are often used as part of a triangulation process.

## **The Study**

### Dictionaries

This next section of the paper looks at what dictionaries, works on grammar, publication manuals, and newspapers and news agencies have said on the issue of the use of *who* with nonhuman animals. An investigation of 11 dictionaries found that a slight majority, six, discuss the limited use of *who* with nonhuman animals as a possibility. This was a convenience sample of either online dictionaries found at the website [www.onelook.com](http://www.onelook.com) or large hardcopy dictionaries found in the library of the SEAMEO (Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Organization) Regional Language Centre, in Singapore, combined with the author's knowledge as to which are well-known works in the field. Table 1 summarizes the data.

**Table 1. Information in dictionaries on the use of the relative pronoun *who* with nonhuman animals**

<b>Dictionary</b>	<b>Position on the Possible Use of <i>who</i> with Nonhuman Animals</b>
Wordsmyth English Dictionary-Thesaurus	No, people only: "in reference to a specified person or persons"
Encarta	No, people only: "used to introduce a relative clause giving information about a person or people"
Cambridge Advanced Learners Dictionary	No, people only: "It is used for people, not things"
Webster's Dictionary 1828	No, people only: "always referring to people"
Newbury House Dictionary of American English	Only mentions people: "used to give more information about a person or persons"

Infoplease Dictionary	Yes: “sometimes an animal or personified thing”
American Heritage Dictionary	Yes: “or one to whom personality is attributed”
Oxford English Dictionary	Yes: p. 290 “Used in reference to an animal or animals: usually with implication of personality.”  “Shakespeare, (1601) Julius Caesar, Act 1, Scene 3, ‘Against the Capitol I met a lion who glared at me, and went surly by.’  Dickens The Uncommercial Traveler 1860 ‘Two honest dogs...who perform in Punch’s shows.’  Phillips Brooks <i>New Starts in Life</i> ‘Even the lowest creature who floats on the pool’s surface... feels...some... half-conscious pleasure in the mere act of living.’
Wikipedia	Yes: “some animals perceived as sentient”
Webster’s Dictionary 1913	Yes
Merriam-Webster	Yes

#### Works on Grammar

Data on whether the use of *who* with nonhuman animals is mentioned as possible in works on grammar are displayed in Table 2. Thirteen works were reviewed based on a convenience sample of those available at the library of the SEAMEO (Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Organization) Regional Language Centre, in Singapore, combined with the author’s knowledge as to which are well-known works in the field. Only three of these works state that *who* is possible with nonhuman animals, with another (Eastwood, 1994) implying that it might be possible. Along the same lines, the grammar check – a tool meant for the general public - in the word processing software used to write this article, Microsoft Word (XP version), marks use of *who* after a nonhuman animal, such as “the cat who,” as incorrect.

**Table 2. Whether the use of *who* with nonhuman animals is mentioned in grammar books.**

<b>Grammar</b>	<b>Is Use of <i>Who</i> with Nonhuman Animals Mentioned as Possible?</b>
The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language, Cambridge, pp. 428, 498	Yes
The Oxford Guide to English Grammar, Oxford, pp. 236, 360	States that <i>who</i> is for people and <i>which</i> is for things, but says the distinction is the same as between <i>he/she</i> and <i>it</i> , and in the discussion of that point, the author says that <i>he</i> or <i>she</i> can be used with “animals” if we know the sex and interest or

	sympathy is felt
The Oxford English Grammar, Oxford, p. 108	Yes
Collins Cobuild English Grammar, Collins, pp. 39-40	No
English grammar: Word by Word, Nelson. p. 419	No
Grammar for English Language Teachers, Cambridge, p. 355	No
A New Approach to English grammar, on Semantic Principles, Clarendon, p. 27	No
The Student's Grammar of English, Blackwell, pp. 166-167	No
Understanding English Grammar: A Linguistic Approach, Blackwell, p. 14	No
A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language, Longman, pp. 317, 368, 1245	Yes
The Grammar Book (2 <sup>nd</sup> ed.), Heinle & Heinle, p. 582	No
Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English, Longman, p. 612	No
The University of Victoria's Hypertext Writer's Guide, <a href="http://web.uvic.ca/wguide/Pages/UsWho.html">http://web.uvic.ca/wguide/Pages/UsWho.html</a>	No

It should be noted that the works that are positive about possible use of *who* with other animals tend to be the longer, more scholarly works, whereas those that do not mention possible use of *who* with nonhuman animals tend to be shorter and to be addressed more to the general public and language students or teachers of such students. This was supported by one of the authors of a grammar book that does not discuss use of *who* with nonhuman animals (Biber, personal communication, 28 September 2004). He stated that:

We found that the construction Non-Human Noun + WHO occurred very rarely in our corpora, which is why we did not present any quantitative findings on that possibility. Quirk et al [one of the grammar works that did mention the possibility] is a much bigger book, and so they were able to address rare constructions like this.

Among those works that admit the possible use of *who* with nonhuman animals, criteria for such use include psychological closeness, e.g., in the case of pets (Dunayer, 2001, prefers “humans’ nonhuman companions,”) such as a dog, personality, i.e., perhaps ascribing human-like traits to nonhuman animals, sympathy or interest, and whether or not the animals were “higher” animals, i.e., closer to humans from a taxonomic perspective.



## Publication Manuals

Publication manuals are guides developed for people doing a specific type of writing, such as academic writing, or writing in a specific field, such as Biology. Nine manuals were reviewed based on a convenience sample of those available at the Central Library of the National University of Singapore, combined with the author's knowledge as to which are well-known works in the field. The data are presented in Table 3. Of these nine publication manuals, four do not say anything as to the referents of *who*, four say that *who* is only used with humans, and one discusses possible use of *who* with nonhuman animals.

**Table 3. Information in publication manuals on the use of the relative pronoun *who* with nonhuman animals**

Publication Manual	Position on the Possible Use of <i>who</i> with Nonhuman Animals
Science and Technical Writing: A Manual of Style	Not mentioned.
Scientific Style and Format: The CBE Manual for Authors, Editors, and Publishers	Not mentioned.
Microsoft Manual of Style for Technical Publications	Not mentioned, but does say, p. 294, that <i>who</i> is more polite than <i>that</i> for discussing people.
MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers	Not mentioned.
Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association	<p>No. p. 48 Use <i>who</i> for human beings; use <i>that</i> or <i>which</i> for animals and for things.</p> <p><b>Incorrect:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The rats who completed the task successfully were rewarded.</p> <p><b>Correct:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The rats that completed the task successfully were rewarded.</p> <p>(A workbook (Gelfand &amp; Walker, 1990) accompanying an earlier edition of the manual contains this example (pp. 50-51)</p> <p>Correct - The monkeys that showed right-paw dominance were</p>

	<p>trained to select with their left paws.</p> <p>Incorrect - The monkeys who showed right-paw dominance were trained to select with their left paws.</p>
The Chicago Manual of Style	No. p. 163 "... <i>who</i> refers only to a person ... . . . . <i>Which</i> refers to an animal or a thing."
Handbook of Technical Writing	No. p. 630 " <i>That</i> and <i>which</i> refer to animals and things; <i>who</i> refers to people."
Business Communications: Principles and Methods	No. p. 678 "Use <i>who</i> or <i>whom</i> to refer to persons; <i>which</i> to refer to things or animals; and <i>that</i> to refer to things, animals, or persons."
Reporting for the Media	Yes. p. 70 <i>That</i> and <i>which</i> introduce clauses that refer to ideas, inanimate objects or animals without names. <i>Who</i> and <i>whom</i> begin clauses that refer to people and animals with names.

Newspapers and News Agencies

Large circulation English-language newspapers and prominent news agencies were contacted by email and telephone to request information on their practices in regard to the use of *who* with nonhuman animals. A response rate of approximately 80% was obtained. In three cases, the Associated Press, the New York Times, and the Guardian, correspondence was not necessary, as the newspaper or news agency’s publicly available style guide was consulted.

Data from those newspapers and news agencies that replied or whose style guide was consulted are presented in Table 4. Of the 12 newspapers and news agencies for which data were obtained, one does not say anything as to the referents of *who*, three say that *who* is only used with humans, and eight state that limited use of *who* with nonhuman animals is possible.

**Table 4. The practices of newspapers and news services regarding the use of the relative pronoun *who* with nonhuman animals**

<b>Newspaper or News Agency</b>	<b>Position on the Possible Use of <i>who</i> with Nonhuman Animals</b>
Associated Press	Yes. Pp. 19-20 "Do not apply a personal pronoun to an animal unless its sex has been established or the animal has a name: <i>The cat, which was scared, ran to its basket. Susie the cat, who was scared, ran to her basket.</i> "
Chicago Tribune	Yes, for animals with names (CTC-PublicEditor, personal communication, December 9, 2004)
Dallas Morning News	Yes, if the animal has a name or its sex has been established (Joel Thornton, personal communication,

	December 9, 2004)
Guardian	Not mentioned in online style guide
Houston Chronicle	No. "would not refer to animals as 'who' and would probably not use 'which' or 'that' unless essential. Usually that can be left out entirely" (Jan Jordan, personal communication, December 9, 2004)
The Independent	Yes. "our style expert would advise that an animal with a name - e.g. a race horse, somebody's dog or Dolly the sheep - would be who. Animals without individual names - such as the squirrels in this example - would be that or which. (Martin King, personal communication, December 16, 2004)
Los Angeles Times	Yes, "if its sex is known or if it has been personalized with a name." (Kent Zelas, personal communication, December 14, 2004)
New York Times	Yes. p. 13 "Do not use a personal pronoun in referring to an animal unless its sex has been established or it has been personalized with a name: <i>The dog, which was lost, howled. Rover, who was lost, howled.</i>
Reuters	No. (Rodney Joyce, personal communication, December 20, 2004)
Straits Times (Singapore)	Yes. "Which, that, who, whom - Use which and that to refer to inanimate objects and to animals without a name: The dog that ran across the road caused the accident. Use who and whom to refer to people, and to animals with names: John Tan is the man who helped me most. Cleo is a cat who likes chicken pieces." (Andrew Patrick Duffy, personal communication, December 16, 2004)
The Times (London)	No. "We do not elevate animals to the level of humans with the use of 'who'. Always 'which'" (Richard Dixon, personal communication, December 20, 2004)
Wall Street Journal	Yes. "Apply a personal pronoun to an animal only if its sex has been established or it has a name: <i>The dog was frightened; it barked. Spot was frightened; he barked. The cat, which was frightened, ran away. Lady the cat, who was frightened, ran away. The bull lowers his head.</i> " (Paul Martin, Sr., personal communication, December 16, 2004)
Washington Post	Yes. "Non-pet animals without names are 'it' and 'which.' Pets and other animals with names can be 'he,' 'she' and 'who.'" (Bill Walsh, personal communication, October 18, 2004)

## Conclusion

## Summary

This article has advocated investigation of the use of *who* to refer to other animals. The small-scale study reported here of the information provided in dictionaries, grammar works, and publication manuals, and the reported practices of newspapers and news agencies suggests that use of *who* with nonhuman animals has received some endorsement but usually in limited contexts. Key criteria for whether or not to use *who* with nonhuman animals involve attitudes that humans have towards other animals.

This finding suggests that as humans expand our circle of compassion, greater use of *who* with nonhuman animals can be one means of reflecting and encouraging compassion towards them. However, the fact that so many of the works examined did not mention use of *who* with other animals or explicitly labelled it as non-standard suggests that speakers and writers who do use *who* to refer to animals other than humans should expect possible negative reaction to such usage.

Previously in this article, the thoughts of two well-known humanitarians, Schweitzer and Einstein, were cited as evidence that at least a small number of humans might be moving to more compassionate views of our fellow animals. Additionally, a similar sentiment has been expressed from a less expected source, *The Economist* magazine, which, as the use of *man+he* suggests, isn't exactly at the forefront of egalitarian language. An editorial in its 19 August 1995 issue stated:

Historically, man has expanded the reach of his ethical calculation, as ignorance and want have receded, first beyond family and tribe, later beyond religion, race, and nation. To bring other species more fully into the range of these decisions may seem unthinkable to moderate opinion now. One day, decades or centuries hence, it may seem no more than "civilized" behavior requires.

## Areas for future research

Vocabulary changes rapidly, with new words joining a language on a weekly if not daily basis, but grammatical change tends to be much slower. The move in the grammar of English away from the use of generic *man* and *he* to refer to all humans (as still used in the above quote from *The Economist*) is one recent example of change in grammar (Crystal, 1995). Perhaps, the use of pronouns with nonhuman animals may be one area of emerging change, at least in the English language. In addition to the *who/which* distinction discussed here, language items that might be investigated relative to human views of fellow animals include the following:

(1) indefinite pronouns, e.g., *anyone/anything* and *somebody/something*. Should *body* and *one* be used with fellow animals?

(2) *he/she/it*. If we do not know the sex of a nonhuman animal, and most humans are not very knowledgeable about how to distinguish other animals by sex, how can we use *she* or *he*. Perhaps for this same reason, sometimes *it* is used with babies. The use of the plural pronoun *they* is one alternative to the use of generic *he, s/he, he or she*, or other

possibilities, e.g., “a doctor should take care of their patients” or “doctors should take care of their patients,” instead of “a doctor should take care of his patients,” a doctor should take care of *her/his* patients,” or “a doctor should take care of *his* or *her* patients. Perhaps, *they* might also be used with nonhuman animals, especially when their sex is not known by the speaker/writer, not to mention the case of hermaphrodite animals (those having both female and male sexual characteristics and organs).

(3) singular/plural. Most examples of the use of *who* with nonhuman animals highlight individuals.

(4) *whose*. This pronoun, although so similar in spelling and pronunciation to *who*, can fairly readily be used with humans, other animals, or things. Does this provide a kind of precedent for a broader use of *who*?

(5) the use of *that* as a replacement for either *which* or *who*. Like *whose*, this is another case of a word able to be used with a broader range of referents.

(6) zero relative pronoun. When the relative pronoun does not function as the subject of the relative clause, the relative pronoun can be omitted. An example is “The hyena I saw yesterday was pregnant,” which could also be expressed as “The hyena *that/which/who* I saw yesterday was pregnant.”

These and, no doubt, other issues await linguistics and other interested parties who may wish to focus attention on the general theme of the interaction of language with humans’ views of our fellow animals.

## References

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Montclair State University. *Grammar Test*, retrieved 8 August, 2004 from [http://chss.montclair.edu/~sotillos/teaching\\_grammar.html](http://chss.montclair.edu/~sotillos/teaching_grammar.html).

Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Desimone, L. M., & Le Floch, K. C. (2004). Are we asking the right questions? Using cognitive interviews to improve surveys in education research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26(1), 1-22.

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

Fairclough, N. (ed.). (1992). *Critical language awareness*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Goodall, J. (1990). *Through a window: My thirty years with the chimpanzees of Gombe*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

McDonald's. Retrieved August 20, 2004, from [http://www.mcdonalds.ca/en/community/animal\\_principles.aspx](http://www.mcdonalds.ca/en/community/animal_principles.aspx)

Nilsen, A. P. (1987). Guidelines against sexist language: A case history." In J. Penfield (Ed.), *Women and language in transition* (pp. 37-64). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. (Retrieved 18 August, 2004). *Furisodead.com*. Available at <http://www.furisodead.com>.

Schütze, C. T. (1996). *The empirical base of linguistics: Grammaticality judgments and linguistic methodology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. TEaGIRL (Transcultural Englishes and Gender-Inclusive Reform of Language) Project. *TEaGIRL on-line survey*, retrieved 8 August, 2004 from [http://www.teagirl.arts.uwa.edu.au/online\\_survey](http://www.teagirl.arts.uwa.edu.au/online_survey).

Tomaselli, P. M. (2003). *Overview of international comparative animal cruelty laws*. Animal Legal and Historical Center, Place of Publication: Michigan State University-Detroit College of Law. Available at <http://www.animallaw.info/articles/ovusicacl.htm>.

Vegetarians International Voice for Animals. (retrieved 18 August, 2004). *Going veggie - Change your diet. Change the world*. Available at <http://www.viva.org.uk/goingveggie/index.html>.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. J. B. Carroll (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

### **Dictionaries cited**

American Heritage Dictionary. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from <http://www.bartleby.com/61/0/W0140000.html>

Cambridge Advanced Learners Dictionary. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=90407&dict=CALD>

Encarta. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from <http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?refid=1861713004>

Infoplease Dictionary. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from <http://www.infoplease.com/dictionary/who>

Merriam-Webster Online. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from <http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=who>

Newbury House Dictionary of American English. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from <http://nhd.heinle.com/Definition.aspx?word=who>

*Oxford English dictionary* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). (1989). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Webster's Dictionary 1828. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from [http://65.66.134.201/cgi-bin/webster/webster.exe?search\\_for\\_d:/inetpub/wwwroot/cgi-bin/webster/web1828=who](http://65.66.134.201/cgi-bin/webster/webster.exe?search_for_d:/inetpub/wwwroot/cgi-bin/webster/web1828=who)

Webster's Dictionary 1913. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from <http://machaut.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/WEBSTER.sh?WORD=who>

Wikipedia. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Who\\_%28pronoun%29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Who_%28pronoun%29)

Wordsmyth English Dictionary-Thesaurus. Retrieved August 1, 2004, from <http://www.wordsmyth.net>

### **Grammar works cited**

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

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Heinle & Heinle

Chalker, S. (1990). *English grammar: Word by word*. Walton-on-Thames, Surrey: Nelson.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1991). *A new approach to English grammar, on semantic principles*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Eastwood, J. (1994). *Oxford guide to English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greenbaum, S. (1996). *The Oxford English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parrott, M. (2000). *Grammar for English language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. New York: Longman.

Sinclair, J. (Ed.). (1990). *Collins Cobuild English grammar*. London: Collins.

The University of Victoria's Hypertext Writer's Guide, available at <http://web.uvic.ca/wguide>, retrieved 21 August, 2004.

van Ek, J. A., & Robot, N. J. (1984). *The student's grammar of English*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wardhaugh, R. (1995). *Understanding English grammar: A linguistic approach*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

### **Publication manuals cited**

Alred, G. J., Brusaw, C. T., & Oliu, W. E. (2002). *Handbook of technical writing* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, D. C.: Author.

Council of Biology Editors. (1994). *Scientific style and format: The CBE manual for authors, editors, and publishers* (6th ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Felder, F., Bender, J. R., Davenport, L., & Kostyu, P. E. (1997). *Reporting for the media* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Gelfand, H., & Walker, C. J. (1990). *Mastering APA style: Student's workbook and training guide*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Gibaldi, J. (2003). *MLA handbook for writers of research papers* (6th ed.). New York: Modern Language Association.

Himstreet, W. C., & Baty, W. M. (1990). *Business communications: Principles and methods* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: PWS-KENT Publishing.

Microsoft Corporation. (1998). *Microsoft manual of style for technical publications* (2nd ed.). Redmond, WA: Microsoft.

Rubens, P. (Ed.). (2001). *Science and technical writing: A manual of style* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.



The University of Chicago Press. (2003). *The Chicago manual of style* (15<sup>th</sup> ed.). Chicago: Author.

### **Newspaper and news service style guides consulted**

French, C. W., Powell, E. A., & Angione, H. (Eds.) (1984). *The Associated Press stylebook and libel manual*. New York: The Associated Press.

Jordan, L. (1976). *The New York Times manual of style and usage*. New York: The New York Times Company.

Marsh, D. (2004). *The Guardian stylebook*. London: Atlantic Books. Retrieved November 20, 2004, available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/styleguide/0,5817,184913,00.html>

*The author wishes to thank Arran Stibbe, Joan Dunayer, Anthea Fraser Gupta, Kumiko Fushino, and Rashmi Kumar for their insightful feedback, support, and other assistance.*