149. Vovelle, *Revolution française* 4, 142. (For the Bastille, see 4, 143.)
151. Revolutionary thinkers generally attacked the Catholic orders themselves, including the Cistercian houses, finding transcendent spiritual incest by participation in the Holy Family repressive and teleologically genocidal. They charged that even sincere monks and nuns, including those in the Jansenist tradition, were unable to sublimate their desires, and that most religious celibates were, in any case, insincere. (See Diderot’s *La Religieuse* and other texts discussed in Ponton, *La Religieuse.*) They confiscated the property of the orders and executed their members. Francis Poulenc reminds us of the result, however, in his opera *Dialogues of the Carmelites*: The central scene of the *Dialogues* involves a sister’s decision to become a Sister against the will of her brother; the last scene depicts a series of triumphantly sacrificial decapitations of the Carmelite Sisters, with the last to lose her head being the sister. (On monachism and the French Revolution generally, see Estève, “‘Le Théâtre ‘Monacal.’” The sister in the *Dialogues* is twice victimized, first in the name of the Christian family, when she dies “to the world,” and then in the name of the nation, when she is decapitated.

152. De Quincey, *Autobiographical Sketch*, in *Collected Writings*, v, chap. i.
154. Contarini Fleming, pt. 1, chap. 1; cf. pt. 1, chap. 7. Disraeli himself was very close to his sister Sarah.

156. Byron, *Selected . . . Works*, p. 35. Shelley’s “Revolt of Islam” is, in part, an attempt to revive these ideas in the sphere of poetry.

157. As Chinese couples are compelled to have no more than one child and so were pressured into giving up or even selling any extras, so Romanian couples under the tyrannical Ceaușescu were compelled to have so many children that they had to abandon some and donate others to national hospices where they were raised, if at all, as equal brothers and sisters. Perhaps, if these children had been raised in decent living conditions—under the watchful eyes of consanguineous parents, as on Israeli kibbutzim, for example—such hospices might have encouraged the sort of liberal equality and communalist fraternity that Rousseau pretended to have in mind instead of abetting the death by AIDS that now faces so many Romanian children.

159. See Arthur Wolf, “Adopt a Daughter-in-law.”

### Chapter 7

1. The average cost of keeping a pet suggests the importance pets have to their owners. In 1986 a ten-pound cat cost about $3957 during its lifetime. (This figure does not include the cost of “extras” such as licensing and grooming) An eighty-pound dog cost $8353.
2. Each of these benefits has been studied separately. For protection and security, for example, see Sebkova, “Anxiety Levels.” For companionship, see Beck and Katcher, *Between Pets and People*; consider also the advertising literature distributed by marketers of
"companion pets" to old age homes such as the Bide-a-Wee Association and the Pet-a-Pet Program.

3. See Erika Friedmann et al., "Pet Ownership and Coronary Heart Disease." For a general overview of the positive health consequences of pet ownership, see Erika Friedmann et al., "Health Consequences of Pet Ownership." Several recent essays in The American Journal of Public Health suggest that the health benefits of pet ownership have been much overstated.

4. On the use of pets to facilitate interactions among residents of homes for the aged, see Corson et al., "Socializing Role of Pet Animals."

5. Gomperz adds that one can also learn constancy in conjugal affections from some species of fowl (Moral Inquiries, pp. 20, 21).

6. The death of a pet is generally the American child's first experience of death, and widows and widowers often make pets their surrogate spouses. See esp. Kay et al., Pet Loss.

7. Some psychotherapists suggest that pet ownership may be particularly useful in cases of disturbed children. See Levinson, Pet-Oriented Child Psychotherapy, Link, "Helping Emotionally Disturbed Children" and "Pets and Personality Development." Cf. Mugford and M'Comiskey, "Value of Cage Birds With Old People," Arkow, Pet Therapy, and Rynearson, "Humans and Pets and Attachment." In the academic press, the "positive" benefits of pet ownership are stressed by various North American academic and veterinary institutions; see, for example, Canadian Veterinary Medical Association, Proceedings.

8. Time ("The Great American Petmania") reminds us that pets, if they are not considered "as cherished companions worthy of love and protection," can be considered only as "representing the more trivial part of our consumer-oriented society" (cf. Beck, "Population Aspects," p. 47, in Kay et al., Pet Loss). In a similar vein, Aillaud writes that "the practice of keeping pets... is part of that universal but personal withdrawal into the private small family unit, decorated or furnished with mementos from the outside world, which is such a distinguishing feature of consumer societies" ("Looking at Animals," p. 12). Tuan, in The Making of Pets, says that "the making of and maintenance of pets is, after all, a relatively innocuous occupation" yet focuses generally on the largely unacknowledged cruelty to animals that accompanies the institution of pethood.


11. Rynearson, "Pets as Family Members."

12. OED 7:745.

13. P. 246. Cf. Woodhouse's description of her relation to her new puppy Juno: "I called my new puppy Juno, and all the love for dogs I possessed now went to Juno, who from about ten weeks old became almost a human being to me—just as if the spirit of Jyntee (her recently deceased dog) had passed into her" (Talking to Animals, p. 164). Vicki Hearne, "How to Say 'Fetch!'" p. 12, writes of her relationship to her dog Salty that "love, of course, is getting into things," but does not define the precise quality of her love as trainer; see too Hearne's "Moral Transformation of the Dog," also written from the trainer's viewpoint.

14. The ordinary definition of pet as animal assumes not only that the pet is a nonhuman animal but also that the pet owner is a human being. In some cases, however, the pet owner may think of himself as a nonhuman animal or may actually be a nonhuman animal. Consider here the example of the gorilla "Koko" and her pet kitten "All Ball." The psychologist Francine Patterson (Koko's Kitten) says that Koko "asked for" and received a pet kitten subsequently named "All Ball." (Patterson claims that Koko used sign language to make this request and to indicate such humanoid emotions as love and grief.) The human being Pat-
terson assumed a super-special kinship between herself and the gorilla Koko; by the same
token, Koko supposedly assumed a kinship between herself and the kitten All Ball.
16. See Horn and Meer, "Pleasure of Their Company."
17. See Meer, "Pet Theories." See also "Undertaker for Pets" (anon.). On the ancient
custom of burying pets as though they were human kin, see Pollard, *Birds in Greek Life*, p.
18. *Odyssey* 10.432-35: "Why are you so enamoured of these woes, as to go down to
the house of Circe, who will change us all to swine, or wolves, or lions, so that we may guard
her great house perchance?"
19. *OED* 7:745, The relationship between man and dog has been of special interest for
the photographer—see, for example, the famous work of William Wegman and Man Ray.
21. According to Johnson's *Dictionary* (1775) a "pet" is archetypally "a lamb, or a kid,
taken into the house and brought up by hand, a *cadc* lamb." Synonymous terms are "cosset,"
"sock," "riddle," and perhaps also "Anthony pig." There are few, if any, translational equival-
ents into other languages.
22. On pets as children, see Cain, "Study of Pets in the Family System," and Beck and
Katcher, *Between Pets and People*, esp. p. 73. On pets as grandchildren, see D. Taylor,
"Grandchildren Versus Other Semi-Domesticated Animals." On pets as idealized mothers,
see the anthropologist Constance Perin (discussed in Beck and Katcher, *Between Pets and
People*, pp. 84-83). And on the general function of pets as surrogate relatives, see Wessels,
"Family Psychotherapy Methodology," Keddie, "Pathological Mourning," and Rynearson,
"Humans and Pets and Attachment."
23. In a recent survey, a broad spectrum of Americans were "asked to rate several
aspects of their lives in order of how important they were." "Five out of six respondents
naturally named their immediate families as number one. But so many put pets second and
third that, combining the top three ratings, pets ranked right behind friends and relatives,
and ahead of the job" (Horn and Meer, "PT Survey," p. 54).
24. The example of the dog's relationship to humankind may be instructive. *Canis fa-
miliaris* (literally "familiar dog") is Linnaeus' "scientific" name for the group of dogs suitable
for human domestication (i.e., able somehow to join a family or household or, if you want,
able to domesticate man). Linnaeus' choice of name (in *Animal Kingdom*) suggests that he
was classifying animals by their human family or by their familiarity to humans. He thus
distinguished the familiar, faithful dog (*Canis familiaris*) from the wolf and the wild dog, and
subdivided the category of the faithful dog into varieties such as the sheepdog (*Canis domes-
ticus*) and the turnspit.
25. Beck and Katcher (*Between Pets and People*, p. 73) write that "since the pet has the
status of a favored child in the family, sexual exploitation of pets is a kind of incest," and
they claim that "zoophilia can be a kind of incest" (p. 77). Yet Beck and Katcher seek ulti-
mately to distinguish the one taboo from the other, insisting, for example, that the taboo on
bestiality is more "effective" than that on incest and ignoring the logical connections
between species and family boundaries that make both taboos parts of an ideological or
political whole.
26. Concerning pets as transitional objects, consider the view of Rappaport, "Zoophilia
and Zooerasty," 565-66: "The assumption that animal pets . . . allow children to maintain
a healthy skepticism in separateness from the universe [an assumption made by Searles in
*Non-Human Environment*] and prepares them for future interpersonal relationships is con-
troversial, unless the animal serves only as a transitional object which automatically and in
time becomes decathected before a too intensive identification with the animal has been established." (On the transitional object in the sense in which Rappaport here uses the term, see Winnicott, "Transitional Object and Transitional Phenomena.") The view that animals can play an important role in the transference of affection is not a specifically twentieth-century one; thus Richard Steele, in one of his essays (1710; no. 266), writes of a woman's "transfer[ring] the amorous Passions of her first Years to the Love of Cronies, Pets, and Favourites [a dog, monkey, squirrel, and parrot]."

27. In Totem and Taboo (1912-13), Freud observed the similarities between the reactions of children and of primitive men to animals. Among both there is no trace of the common 'adult' arrogance towards animals; the child regards the animal as its equal and feels more akin to the animal in its uninhibited awareness of its needs" (Heiman, "Relationship Between Man and Dog," pp. 582-83). Heiman writes that "the dog may be considered a descendant from a totem animal used by man in his development and useful to him in the process of civilization. . . . The domesticated animal, in particular the dog, is for civilized man what the totem animal was for the primitive" (p. 584).

28. OED 8:1610.

29. For an instance of this meaning, see Caruthers, Kentuckians in New York 1,175: "Oh! it is nothing more than puppy love." And for "puppy" as an asexual human plaything, see Besant and Rice, Chaplain of the Fleet 1,10: "I was once the pet and plaything of ladies, a sort of lapdog."

30. OED 8:1610; emphasis mine. According to the dictionary, toy dogs are small dogs "of little value or importance" (OED), "value" being used here in the sense in which we say that nonworking animals lack it. The breeding of toy dogs marks a new beginning in the history of the interspecies relationship between man and dog.

31. For the links between puppy, poupee, and puppet, see OED 8:1610.

32. An accurate counterpart to puppy lover, which suggests a relationship that is at once bestial and not bestial, is kissin' cousin, which suggests the possibility of a relationship that is at once both incestuous and nonincestuous.


34. "Who will know a generation hence that a snugglepup is a young man who attends petting parties, and that a petting party is a party devoted to [mere] hugging?" (Krapp, English Language in America 1,117).

35. Playboy's word choice may be especially appropriate: An older word for "rabbit" is the English coney, from the Latin cuniculus. Leach ("Animal Category and Verbal Abuse," p. 50) writes that "the eighteenth-century rabbit was a cunny, awkwardly close to cunt, and he draws a parallel between a Playboy Bunny Club and a London eighteenth-century cunny house. Cf. the National Lampoon parody magazine, Pethouse, which includes sexy animal photographs.

36. Such doubt is one gist of an article in the Chicago Tribune, February 24, 1948, III.1/2.

37. OED 7:745.


39. The double-entendre becomes more explicit, perhaps, in the case of the lap-dog. The breeding of lap-dogs (cf. the German Schosshundchen) might make for a special chapter in sexual and cultural history. "The smaller dogs they be," writes John Caius, "the more pleasure they provoke, as more meet playfellows for mincing mistresses to bear in their bosoms, to keep them company withal in their chambers, to succour with sleep in bed, and nourish with meat at board, to lay in their laps and lick their lips as they ride in wagons"
40. The Athenaeum of April 27, 1889 (no. 534) contains a fine instance of this use of the term. "His fatherly affection for his children . . . takes the form of unreasonable petting."


42. For Freud, see his "Analysis of a Phobia in a Five Year Old Boy" (1909) and "From the History of an Infantile Neurosis" (1918). For Deutsch, see her "A Case of Hen Phobia." For Ferenczi, see his "Little Chanticleer," in Sex in Psychoanalysis.

43. Other relevant psychological literature includes Schneck, "Zooerasty and Incest Fantasy," and Beryl, "A Patient and Her Cats."

44. French writes of Cobbe, the pet-loving leader of the anti-vivisectionist movement in the 1870s, thus: "Her dog and her cat are a great deal to her, and it is the idea of their suffering which excites her. . . . She is not defending a right inherent in sentient things as such; she is doing a special pleading for some of them for which she has a special liking" (French, Antivivisection, p. 375; for Cobbe, see Cobbe, Italics, pp. 443-44 [emphasis mine]).

45. The title of a book by Boone that is popular among pet lovers. Concerning the kinship with all life that some pet owners feel, see also M.W. Fox, Soul of the Wolf.

46. Canterbury Tales, General Prologue, II. 144-49.

47. Smart, Collected Poems 1, 227.

48. The Persian Artaxerxes shared his throne with a real bitch (Schochet, Animal Life, p. 141). For an early discussion and condemnation of marriage contracts between human beings and animals, see Genesis Rabba 26:5.

49. Perrault’s influential collection of folk tales (1697) lacks a “Beauty and the Beast.” That tale did not appear in its nineteenth-century version until its publication in the collection of Madame Leprince de Beaumont (1756). But Perrault did include "Peau d’Âne," with its similar concern with liberty and incest; see Dournes, "L’Inceste préférentiel." The first volume of the Grimm brothers’ collection was published in 1812.

50. For an example of this rational or Enlightenment view of the story, see the interpretation of Robert Graves (cited in Opie, Classic Fairy Tales, pp. 182-95).

51. See, for example, Bettelheim, The Uses of Enchantment, and Barchilon, "Beauty and the Beast."

52. See Mintz, "Meaning of the Rose."

53. In this context, "Beauty and the Beast" is a defining fulfillment of the literary form called the "animal groom story." The term "groom" both names and skirts the quandary involving the all-important distinction in the tale between legitimate and illegitimate sexual intercourse. "Groom, as bridegroom, means a man both just before his marriage and just after it. However, we are less concerned here with whether the union of the groom with his bride is premarital or marital than with whether, as one who attends on horses, his union with his counterpart is bestial, or intraspecies.

The genre includes movie fantasies such as King Kong (the ape loves Fay Wray), The Fly (who has a wife), and Paul Anka’s "Puppy Love." In the folk tale, Beast is both in tune with Beauty’s family and species and not in tune with them; he is, in this sense, a "toon," at once human and animal, as in the recent feature-length part-cartoon movie Who Framed Roger Rabbit?, in which Roger the talking rabbit is married interspecifically not to a human woman, but to a 'toon of woman. (For a more genre-oriented treatment of the topos of the animal groom in folk tales, see Lutz Röhrich, Märchen und Wirklichkeit.)

In most "beast fables" other than "Beauty and the Beast" the talking animal is a thinly disguised human being and the "moral" is moralistic, or, as Rousseau would have it,
immoral. Authors of "beast fables," which originated with Aesop during the Age of the Tyrants, disguise their men as animals because they fear the political persecution that would ensue from their speaking outright (it is safer for a slave such as Aesop to argue for animal than for human liberation) or because they find it easier to depict a fox that is really a sly man in bestial disguise than to depict a sly man. (See my analysis of Rousseau's and Locke's interpretation of Aesop's "The Fox and the Crow" and "The Fox and the Hedgehog" in The Economy of Literature, pp. 113–28.) "Beauty and the Beast" goes beyond the simple characterization of human traits by means of exaggerated and disfiguring cartoon-like masks, to the point where it might demarcate those species and family boundaries between beast and human that themselves ground and help explain the perennial popularity and aesthetic force of the beast fable, the animal caricature, and the twentieth-century cinematic animal cartoon.

54. The version of the story told by Madame Leprince de Beaumont includes three brothers as well as a father and sisters. The 1761 English translation of de Beaumont's version is included in Opie, Classic Fairy Tales, pp. 182–95. In Cocteau's movie, Beauty has an apparently exogamous suitor (Avenant) who dies and/or is transformed into a dead beast at the moment that Beast himself is transformed into a handsome man.

55. History of Human Marriage 2.37–47.

56. So described by Cocteau in Diary, October 2 (p. 52).

57. "I'll never leave you," says Beauty to her father in Cocteau's film. And insofar as her father is Beast she never does leave him.

58. Psyche's jealous sisters tell her that, though she did not realize it, she was spending her nights with a great serpent (cf. Opie, Classic Fairy Tales, pp. 180–81; Rouse, preface to Apuleius' Cupid and Psyche, pp. xxiv–xxvii; and Neumann, Amor and Psyche, p. 11). In "Cupid and Psyche" the oracle's awful pronouncement is: "Nec spes generum mortali stripe creatum / Sed saevum atque ferum malum."

59. Yet there are hints of incest in Apuleius' tale. In his "Cupid and Psychic," the sea mew speaks thus to Venus/ Psyche: "And so there has been no pleasure, no joy, no merriment anywhere, but all things lie in rude unkempt neglect; wedlock and true friendship and parents' love for their children have vanished from the earth; there is one vast disorder, one hateful loathing and foul disregard of all bonds of love" (cited in Neumann, Amor and Psyche, p. 31).

60. On the two realms of the amphibian groom as land and water, see Heuschner, Psychiatric Study of Myths and Fairy Tales, p. 213. For centuries many people believed that tadpoles and frogs were two separate animal species, the individuals of one species somehow transforming themselves into those of the other (cf. Bettelheim, Uses of Enchantment, p. 290).

61. See 1 Pet. 5:14; for Paul, see Rom. 1:16, 1 Cor. 16:20, and 1 Thess. 5:26. See also Crawley, Mystic Rose, 344ff., and Perella, Kiss, esp. pp. 12–50.

62. The doctrine that "All ye are brethren" is acted out by Christians at Christmas festivities, where celebrants are masked, no one can tell who is a consanguineous kin and who is not, and everyone is enjoined to kiss everyone else equally, much as in the "original" Saturnalia of libertine Rome on which Christmas is partly based. In his essay on the Roman carnival, or Saturnalia, Goethe claims that "though it postponed the festival of the Saturnalia with its liberties for a few weeks, the birth of Christ (Christmas) did not succeed in abolishing it" ("Roman Carnival," in Italian Journey, p. 446). Not only can a son pass for his father or a father for his son—resulting in liberty of the kind Goethe witnessed in the celebration of the Saturnalia at Rome—but one's sister can pass for a woman who is not one's kin, resulting in incest. "In the world of the carnival," writes Bakhtin, "all hierarchies are canceled. All castes and ages are canceled. During the fire festival a young boy blows out his father's candle, crying out . . . 'Death to your father, sir!'" (Rabelais, p. 251). For details of the festival as it pertains to animals, see Frazer (Golden Bough 11, 291n).
63. Bettelheim, *Uses of Enchantment*, p. 199, writes that Beauty, the maiden, “transfers her attachment from father to lover.” Bettelheim argues in the same way that “only marriage made sex permissible, changed it from something animal-like into a bond sanctified by the sacrament of marriage” (*Uses of Enchantment*, p. 283).

64. Opie, ed., p. 195.

65. The blend of human with beast does not require a male “‘animal’”; female counterparts to the animal father/animal groom are common in the literature. So too are animal nursemaids, or wet nurses, who transmit kinship (and species kind) through their “milk” just as an animal mother or father transmits kinship through the “blood.” Milk kinship as such, according to the regulations of many societies, resulted in the same diriment impediments to marriage as blood kinship. In the eighteenth century, the social institution of the nursemaid was widespread; there were many historical and literary accounts of foundling and orphan children fostered by animals in the forest. What did this mean for the child fostered by bears or wolves? It made sexual intercourse between them incestuous (they and their lupine foster siblings were of the same milk) just as it made intercourse with other human beings bestial (they were now human wolves, or werewolves).

66. The Cathars, renounced by the Church for their Albigensian heresy, refused to recognize the distinction between kin and nonkin, and so renounced procreation, just as they refused to recognize any difference between men and animals, and so became vegetarians. See Lea, *Inquisition* 1,97.

67. On the specific taboo against marriage between milk siblings—people who received the “milk of human kindness” from the same nurse—see Crawley, *Mystic Rose* 2,230. On the Virgin Mary as nurse mother, see Warner’s “The Milk of Paradise” in her *Alone of All Her Sex.* On Queen Elizabeth and Moses as nurse parents, see chap. 4, nn. 257–58, in the present volume.


69. For Feuerbach’s aphorism, see Barth’s introductory essay in Feuerbach, *Essence of Christianity*, p. xiv; and Feuerbach, *Die Philosophie der Zukunft*, pp. 89–90.


72. When England and Scandinavia adopted the widespread use of cow’s milk, many people were similarly concerned about long-term “animalizing” effects on the culture. For further references, see Meyer, “Illegitimates and foundlings in pre-industrial France,” in Laslett et al., eds., *Bastardy*, pp. 249–63.

73. In 1802 William Paley wrote that “the experiment of transfusion proves that the blood of one animal will serve for another” (*Natural Theology*, p. 484). The history of blood transfusion proper begins in the latter half of the seventeenth century, when scientists conducted successful experiments transfusing the blood of one animal “into another [animal] of the same or a different species” (*Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* [1666], 353).

74. The term *vaccination* was taken from the name of the eruptive disease of cattle called *vaccinia,* or cowpox.

75. In 1796 he wrote, “Will you try to look out for a fit servant for us . . . scientific in vaccimulgence? That last word is a new one” (*Biographica Literaria*, cited in OED 7:5).

76. 1.2.62; 1.2.30.

77. 1.21–24.

78. Cf. the comparison in *Merchant of Venice* between Laban’s breeding of lambs (which Christians call natural) and Shylock’s breeding of money (which Christians call unnatural or perversely artful). On the relationship between the offspring of sexual and monetary gen-
eration—both are indicated by the Greek term tokos—see my Money, Language, and Thought, pp. 48–55.

79. 4.4.82,98; cf. OED 1:695.

80. Cf. p. 33: "We practice . . . all Conclusions of Grafting and Inoculating, as well of Wilde-Trees as Fruit Trees."

81. Definitions from OED, 5:317.

82. Inoculation was already controversial in 1722, when Nettleton (Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society 32, 214) wrote about people who had died after having been inoculated with the smallpox. See OED 5:317.

83. "Inoculation with the virus of syphilis, as a means of cure or prevention" (OED 10:389).


86. Moseley, Medical Tracts, pp. 182–83.


88. Squirrel, Observations.

89. Stern, Factors, pp. 56–57.

90. Stern, Should We Be Vaccinated?, p. 22.

91. The Minotaur had the body of a man and the head of a bull. His, or its, half-sister was the incestuous Phaedra, who married the minotaur-fighting Theseus—as Racine reminds us in his Phèdre (cf. Euripides, Hippolytus, esp. 1.337). Seneca's Phaedra compares such incestuous desires as Phaedra's for her (step-)son Hippolytus with such bestiality as Pasiphae's; Theseus says that "even the beast abhors forbidden union, instinct teaches proper respect for laws of generation" (Four Tragedies, p. 134). See chapter 2 for a discussion of the historical and conceptual connections of the Spanish bullfight with the Minotaur.


94. Stern, Should We Be Vaccinated?, p. 82. Cow maniacs argued with some reason that most objections to vaccination came from the merely literary or philosophically inclined. (There were also economic interests at work: many of the cow-phobic doctors had lucrative practices to protect. And certainly the cow-maniac scientists' methodology and cleanliness were not always above reproach.) Dr. Jenner, who first popularized vaccination in the last years of the eighteenth century, recognized this "philosophical" tack of his detractors when he criticized the well known German Dr. John Ingenhousz. (Dr. Ingenhousz had tried inoculation in 1768, when he had vaccinated some members of the imperial family at Vienna, but by 1799 he was arguing vociferously against it; Stern, Should We Be Vaccinated?, p. 10.) "This very man Ingenhousz," wrote Dr. Jenner, "knows no more the real nature of the cow-pox than Master Selwyn does of Greek. Yet he is among the philosophers what Johnson was among the literati" (Stern, Should We Be Vaccinated?, p. 11, citing John Baron, Jenner, p. 296). And in trying to defend himself against the cow-phobic Dr. John Sims, President of the London Medical Society, Jenner wrote of him as "the philosophic and medical critic" (Jenner, Medical and Physical Journal, vol. 1, p. 11; cited in Stern, Should We Be Vaccinated?, p. 12).

95. Adams, Answers, p. 29.

96. Minutes of the Third Festival of the Royal Jennerian Society in 1805.

97. Dr. Stromeyer of Hanover stated in 1800 that Herz's position was the norm: "Most of our physicians here exclaim against the vaccine inoculation" (Stromeyer, letter to the Medical and Physical Journal, vol. 3, p. 471). Among a few physicians the reception was more generous. Dr. I. Faust of Buckenburg, Professors Juncker and Sprengler of Halle, and Dr. Hufeland of Jena soon adopted Jenner's views, and his book was soon translated. For the German background, see Ring, Treatise on Cow Pox.
98. De Quincey, *Last Days*. For this and some of the following references, I am indebted to Feuer, *Lawless Sensations*.


100. See Jewish Ency. 6:368. Dr. De Carro, of Vienna, a chief proponent of vaccination, mentions Herz as an important opponent. Throughout the nineteenth century, there continued to be so much "hysterical" German opposition to vaccination—especially to its being compulsory, as the German Emperor wanted it to be—that Bismarck convened the Imperial Vaccination Commission in 1884.

101. We might observe here the linkage between biological and social tolerance. Biological tolerance involves an organism's willingness or ability to survive *despite* infection with a parasite or otherwise discomforting organism, much as religious or social toleration involves an individual's or a group's putting up with the discomfort of having strangers around. Jenner's description of immunological vaccination involves an organism's surviving *because* of infection: his patients survived smallpox thanks to the tolerance they gained from cowpox. The dangerous analogy here between medical terminology's "pathogenic organism" and sociological terminology's "stranger among us" is common since at least sixteenth-century Spain.


103. I am not concerned here with working out all implications of this historically controversial model—that Christianity has itself idealized and accepted the doctrine is enough for us. However, the central fact about the Christian approach to kinship—that it substitutes an apparently extraordinary kinship for an ordinary one—still needs clarification, insofar as social anthropologists have generally failed to note the primary role it plays. They ignore, for instance, the Christian debate about kinship in the New Testament, and neglect to consider the kinship practices of Christian society as suggested by the Catholic orders (Brothers and Sisters all), the subgroup comprising the clergy and laity (Parents and Children), and even the bond of kinship between Jesus and both his female progenitor (Mary, the sister, wife, child, and mother of God) and his male Progenitor (the father who is also the son).

104. This representation may be inaccurate in two ways at least. First, Christianity, however much it idealizes itself as universalist ("All men are my brothers"), becomes emphatically particularistic in practice ("Only my brothers are men"). Indeed, the extremism of the claim to universalism would seem to ensure particularism in practice. Second, the connection between universalism and particularism in Judaism is more complex than the ordinary Christian view of Judaism would allow. On the one hand, Judaism certainly does enjoin several particularistic legal doctrines, the most famous such enjoining Jews to distinguish between brothers and others when making monetary loans: "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother. . . . Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury" (Deut. 23:19–20, cf. Deut. 28:12 and Lev. 25:35–37, and for further discussion, see my discussion of the connection between monetary and sexual generation in *Money, Language, and Thought*, chap. 3). But, on the other hand, Judaism also has a powerful universalist tendency in both doctrine and practice (on which see chap. 8, esp. nn. 92–95, in the present volume).

105. White, "Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis."


108. Although "stable" or "manger" is probably an inaccurate translation of the Greek
word in the New Testament, Christians throughout the world persist in depicting the place and singing about it as such (fabulous crèche scenes are good examples).

109. The quotations are taken from the well-known Christmas carol “Away in a Manger.”

110. Woodhouse, Talking to Animals, p. 11.

111. In the Christian story of God’s earthly birth, the human Mary is filled by the spirit of God and subsequently delivers the godman. The tale of her literal “enthusiasm” was often compared to similar tales about interspecies generation by human mothers. One example would be the well-known and often credited eighteenth-century report of Mary Toft’s giving birth to bunnies. The British Journal commented, “A fine Story—Credat Judaeus Apella” (December 3, 1726), and A Letter from a Male-Physician in the Country to the Author of the Female Physician at London argued that “it is impossible for women to generate rabbits or other animals” (cited by Paulson, Hogarth 1, 169). William Hogarth, mocking the Methodist John Wesley and the English “Enthusiasts” who generally believed in the productive ability of interspecies generation, represented the report in his engravings entitled “Cunicularii” (1726), “Enthusiasm Delineated” (1760), and “A Medley—Credulity, Superstition, and Fanaticism” (1762). See Paulson, Hogarth 2, 170, 299, 354; and The Journal of the History of Medicine 28, 3 (July 1973): 282-83.

112. “The animal was sometimes dressed in clothes and tied in a sitting position during the trial. In 1386, a pig in Falaise, Normandy, that had torn the face and arm of a small child was dressed in clothes and sentenced to be maimed in the same manner as the child. In 1685, a wolf in Austria that had killed several people was dressed in clothes, wig, and beard. His snout was cut off and a human mask tied over it during the trial. He was sentenced to be hanged.” Sometimes the punishment was kinder: “An Austrian dog that bit a man was sentenced to only a year in jail in 1712.” In many courts all animals—including insects—were allowed to have lawyers. (Mannix, Torture, cited by Schochet, Animal Life, pp. 141-42.)

113. This point is developed by Thomas, Man and the Natural World, pp. 17-24. There are, of course, factors other than religious doctrine to help explain the particular kind of exploitation of animals that one finds in Christendom.

114. Luke 8:33. “They were about two thousand,” writes Saint Mark (Mark 5:13).

115. Augustine, Catholic and Manichean Ways of Life, p. 102; emphasis mine; cited in Schochet, Animal Life, p. 274. The ellipses here represent references to the Parable of the Withered Fig Tree (Luke 13).


117. See God’s statement to Noah (Gen. 9:8-10): “Behold I establish My covenant with you... and with every living creature that is with you, the fowl and the cattle and every beast of the earth with you.”

118. Schopenhauer wrote that the “revolting, gross, and barbarous, view, peculiar to the West... that our conduct in regard to animals has nothing to do with morals or that we have no duties towards animals... has its roots in Judaism” (quoted in Unna, Tierschutz, p. 6). He was wrong about Judaism, but since he was attributing to Judaism what he did not like about Christianity, his argument was influential among millennialist “pro-animal” and “anti-Semitic” propagandists such as Richard Wagner, Adolf Hitler, and Heinrich Himmler. Himmler linked the vegetarian world to come with the extermination of the Jews. The millennium would soon arrive, he said, promising a definitive defeat of Great Britain and the United States. And with the coming of that millennium, insisted the great vegetarian—even as he oversaw the shipping of meat to members of the Gestapo and the slaughter of millions of human beings in the death camps—all animal-killing would be punished as a capital crime for the very reason that it is really homicide. Felix Kersten reports that during the war Himmler told him: “After the war I will issue the most rigorous laws for the protection of animals. In schools the children will be systematically taught to love animals, and I will give special
police authority to the societies for the protection of animals" (quoted in Syberberg, Hitler, p. 207).

120. Exod. 23:12.
122. Prov. 12:10. Other relevant biblical texts are Num. 22:28, Deut. 22:7, Isa. 1:11, and Jon. 4:11. The passage from the Book of Jonah reads: "And should I [God] not pity Niniveh, that great city, in which there are more than a hundred and twenty thousand persons who do not know their right hand from their left, and also much cattle?"

123. For examples, see Thomas, Man and the Natural World, p. 358, n. 7. On pets in general in the ancient and early Christian world, see Clutton-Brock, Domesticated Animals from Early Times.

124. "For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God care for the oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt" (1 Cor. 9:9–10).
125. Gen. 1:26 is a key biblical text in this area: "Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.'" See also Thomas, Man and the Natural World, pp. 17–24.

126. Pococke, Commentary on the Prophecy of Hosea, pp. 95, 97.
127. Thomas Aquinas, Summa contra gentiles 3, 113. Cf. the different context of the argument of Maimonides that we should be kind to animals so that cruelty will not become a habit (Moreh Nebukhim 3,17, 3,48). "Since nature makes nothing purposeless or in vain it is undeniably true that she has made all animals for the sake of man."


129. In Judaism special emphasis is given to the tza’ar and to the argument of Moses Nachmanides (1194–1270) and others concerned with the disappearance of a whole species (Nachmanides, Commentary to Deut. 22:6; Sefer haHinnukh, Mitzvah 294, 545; and the Kol Bo [late thirteenth century], chap 3). Cf. Schochet, Animal Life, p. 216.

130. There are some interesting exceptions: The Franciscan document Dives and Pauper (1410), for example, allows flesh-eating, yet outlaws cruelty, much as the Jewish law codes do (see Priscilla Barnum, ed., Treatise on the Ten Commandments).

131. Thomas, Man and the Natural World, writes that "the opponents of animal cruelty drew primarily on the doctrine, which they found to be latent in the Old Testament, of man’s stewardship over creation" (p. 154).

132. Thomas (Man and the Natural World), whose historical scholarship is otherwise quite excellent, is one of those who adopt, unquestioningly, the sentimentalist Christian view of the Jewish understanding of kindness and cruelty to animals.

133. Consider here the Fruitarian movement, whose members claim that humans should eat only fruit without seeds. The commercially successful fad for buying and caring for stuffed animals and pet rocks (pet rocks were sold in the hundreds of thousands during the mid-1970s) suggests how the institution of pethood might enable us to toe the line not only between human and animal beings but also between animate and nonanimate beings.

134. Fox, Returning to Eden: Animal Rights and Human Responsibility, presents a typical sentimentalist and idealist attack on "the usual motivational and cognitive approach of scientific inquiry" into the question of animal welfare; Fox criticizes that inquiry for being "based upon Baconian utopianism, Cartesianism, dominionism, and hubris" (M. W. Fox, "Pet Animals and Human Well-being").


136. One rule that interpreters sometimes use to illustrate the connection of kindness
Notes to pages 168-71

(ortarget) to animals with Kashrut is that one must not boil a kid in its mother's milk (Exod. 23:19 and 34:26; Deut. 14:21). To do so would be "unseemly." Such unseemliness is said to be one basis of the Jewish prohibition against mixing milk with meat.

137. I do not mean that all people who are Christians are omnivorous, only that the Christianity they profess allows them to be so. Thus a Christian Englishman, when he refuses to eat dog meat, does not do so because of a Christian injunction; a Jewish Englishman, however, when he refuses to eat pork, does so because of a religious injunction. The Christian might say that the flesh he refuses to eat is not food, so he will not eat it; the Jew might say that the flesh he refuses to eat is food, but he will not eat it. (Cf. Leach, "Animal Category and Verbal Abuse," p. 32.)

138. Fox, "Pet Animals" (in Kay et al., eds., Pet Loss, p. 16), writes that "for the British, eating dog is akin perhaps to cannibalism." Lyttelton, Dialogues of the Dead (1795) (cited in Thomas, Man and the Natural World, p. 55), writes that "Montstuart Elphinstone, in the 1840s, reacted with horror to the Italian habit of cooking robins [which were kept as pets in England]. "What! Robins! Our household birds! I would as soon eat a child"" (emphasis mine). "Yet in the Elizabethan age 'robin red-breasts' had been 'esteemed a light and good meat'" (cited in Thomas, Man and the Natural World, p. 116). Cf. the punishment in Kashmir of vassicide (cow-killing) as if it were homicide (human-killing). For a general discussion of symbolic aspects of "spiritual cannibalism," see my Money, Language, and Thought, ch. 2, and Art & Money, ch. 2.

139. Among the sources here are the regulations set down for the religious celibates of the medieval era. On the ban on pets in the monasteries and nunneries, see Power, Nunneries, pp. 305-7; and Platt, Southampton, p. 104.

140. In some French societies it is still taboo to give human names to dogs (Lévi-Strauss, "Religion, langue, et histoire"). We English-speaking humans are sometimes offended when our fellows give "Christian" names to animals; see, for example, Taylor, Wit and Mirth (1630), in Carew, ed. Shakespeare's Jest Book, p. 35.


144. By the same token, as I have argued, there are people for whom all intercourse with human beings is condemned outright as a kind of incest, as in the regulations of the Catholic orders.

145. Similarly, for some people, all meat-eating is forbidden as cannibalism.


147. See Teppe, Chamfort, p. 53; see also chap. 8, n. 122, in the present volume.

148. Rogers, Horrible Secte... the Famille de Love (1578), sig. l.vii.

149. Cf. the thesis of Des Pres, Survivor, that the Germans tried to turn the Jews into animals in order to make killing them morally acceptable.

150. By "to pet" I here mean "to treat a human being as an animal." On the controversial view that Nazism is a kind of millennialist Christian sect, see Cohn, Pursuit of the Millennium, esp. pp. 285-86.

151. One of the first measures that Heinrich Himmler often passed upon conquering neighboring countries was to ban shehitah as inhumane. (The Nazi invasion of Belgium is an example; see Steinberg, Question juive.) In this way he won praise from the SPCA for ending the butchering of animals in a supposedly inhumane way. In the same millennialist spirit, he frequently announced that, when the war ended, anyone who killed any animal would be prosecuted for murder. Cf. Hitler's saying that "the Jews are undoubtedly a race, but they
are not human," which is quoted as Spiegelman’s epigraph to his comic book *Maus*, where the Nazis are cats and the Jews are mice.

152. See Gomperz, *Moral Inquiries on the Situation of Man and of Brutes*. It is worth noting here the opinion that it was a Jewish scholar and teacher, Sherira ben Hananiah, Gaon of Pumbedita (c. A.D. 906–1006), who wrote the first "defense of animal rights" (Rosenberg, ed., *Jewish Cat Book*, p. iii).

153. *Complete Poetical Works* 1, 74–75.
155. *Complete Poetical Works* 1, 74.

157. In his poem "On the Prospect of Establishing a Pantisocracy in America," Coleridge looks forward to dwelling as an absolute equal with "kindred minds." Although here these "collegial" minds are those of human brothers and sisters, in "To a Young Ass" they are presumed to be animal.

158. Despite such "spiritualization," the incestuous and bestial implication of Francis’s thought helps to explain why the Franciscan Spirituals, who were the most literal-minded followers of Saint Francis, were massacred under the direction of several Roman Catholic popes as "heretics": Though the official church liked the idea that we are all siblings ("All ye are brethren"), it disliked the corollary sexual and familial implications of this idea. These implications have been virtually forgotten today, with the result that it was really meaningless, if pleasant, for the Pope in 1980 to have named Francis the patron saint of "ecology."

159. *Complete Poetical Works* 1, 75.
160. Note in Coleridge, *Complete Poetical Works* 1, 75.

162. See the Protestant hymn with the refrain, "All God’s creatures / Have a place in the Choir, / Some sing lower, / Some sing higher."


164. Some researchers might argue in this context that we should delve into the neurotic sexual condition not only of pet owners but also of the pets themselves. See, for example, Leigh, "Psychology of the Pet Owner," p. 518; and for an overall view of animal neuroses, see Brion and Ey, eds., *Psychiatrie Animale*.

165. Just as one can apparently flee incestuous petting or the fear of it through pet-love, so one can flee cannibalism or the fear of it by eating the family pet. Just as fondling the familiar (animal) is a means to transcend the incest taboo, so eating the familiar (animal) is a means of transcending the cannibalism taboo.

166. Those who share this ideology dislike the institution of *Playboy* "Bunnies" and *Penthouse* "Pets" not so much because it reduces human beings (both male and female) and animals to "mere" things—which would be the radical position—but because it reduces female human beings to "mere" animals. See, for example, Cantor, "The Club, the Yoke, and the Leash," *Ms. Magazine*.

167. This essay is not about animals. It is about pethood—a human and social institution in which animals happen to play a part. Therefore one does not need to be an expert in animal physiology, psychology, and sociology to begin to consider the role that a particular group of animals (or even things)—the ones we call "pets"—play for us humans in our needful attempt to define or express the familial and species boundaries of the world in which we live. Even the question about what animals are "in themselves"—a question whose answer clearly requires expertise in animal physiology, psychology, and sociology—pertains to human institutions and language.

168. "Living things" is Aristotle’s term in his *Politics* for slaves.

169. The incorporation of a chimpanzee into the human scientist’s family as part of a
scientific experiment is one subject of Temerlin's *Lucy: Growing Up Human*. Desmond, *Ape's Reflection*, calls Lucy "a chimpanzee who lives literally as one of the family. She is analyzed according to Freud, but not treated according to Darwin, by which I mean that whenever possible she is interpreted as a primal human." In the book a photograph of Lucy shows her and her human "foster mother" looking at an issue of *Playgirl* magazine with expressions of enjoyment. Cf. Sperling, *Animal Liberators*, p. 171. Humans joining troops of apes—as opposed to animals joining families of humans—enjoy a special prominence in the popular imagination, as in the scientific experience of Jane Goodall and fictional tales about Tarzan. In Hugh Hudson's film version of the Burroughs novel, *Greystoke: The Legend of Tarzan, Lord of the Apes*, Tarzan grieves in Edwardian England over the dead body of the old ape who raised him as a son in the jungle ("He was my father"). Then he decides to leave his biological father's civilized land and return to the jungle. Jane, a little like Beauty, loves the half-Beastly Tarzan well enough, but she is cowed by the taboo on bestiality and does not follow Tarzan to the Land of the Apes. Much less would she kiss a gorilla. Jane would marry one of her own kind—or is it kin?—preferring the apparent other to the real brother.

170. William Blackstone (*Commentaries on the Laws of England*, bk. 4, chap. 23), says that the Forest and Game Laws were founded on the "unreasonable" notion of permanent property in wild creatures. On the other hand, Adam Smith (*Lectures on Jurisprudence*, p. 15) says that nonwild living things—crops and herds—were the earliest form of private property. There is a longstanding debate about whether animals that are neither wild nor useful can be property (Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, p. 112), that is, whether pets can be private property.

**Chapter 8**

1. P. 238. Compare Freud's discussion of Saint Francis and the ideal of universal sibling love (*Civilization and Its Discontents*, pp. 49, 56, cf. p. 59). "Love on the hippie scene," writes Yablonsky in his *Hippie Trip*, p. 309, "tends to be egocentric and onanistic in practice—even though vast feelings of love are felt in a general way. In the psychedelic drug reverie the individual is loaded with oceanic feelings of love and compassion; but in action, aside from a casual embrace or a sexual act, little concretely is done.... Very little action is unselfishly taken for another or others.... To feel love for everyone and everything is to love nothing."


3. In the fifth book of the *Republic* one Platonic doctrine concerning enemies and foes arises in considering the connection between the doctrine of the national autochthonously generated family, whose existence is the gist of the "noble lie," with the practice of incest. Wondering when it is proper for a man to be kissed by a person he likes—whether male or female and whether kin or nonkin—Socrates remarks that "when Greeks fight with barbarians and barbarians with Greeks we'll assert they are at war and are enemies by nature and this hatred must be called war. While when Greeks do any such thing to Greeks we will say they are by nature friends, but in this case Greece is sick and factious and this kind of hatred must be called faction" (*Republic* 470c, trans. Bloom).


6. See Heidegger's ambiguous letter to Schmitt (April 22, 1933). Heidegger, who had once entered a Jesuit novitiate and would seem to have intended to become a Catholic Brother, wrote at least two essays praising Brother Abraham a Sancta Clara, the barefooted Augustinian of the second half of the seventeenth century who claimed Messkirch as his native ground (like Heidegger) and was a well-known German nationalist and influential anti-Semite: Brother Abraham wrote propaganda that was both anti-Jewish (Jews are the