

lors, *Beyond Ethnicity*, p. 77). On the idea of the American alma mater generally, see chapter 1.

149. Vovelle, *Revolution française* 4, 142. (For the Bastille, see 4, 143.)

150. Michelet, *Histoire* 1:6, 8, 9; 8:193, 194.

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.

153. Coleridge, *Notebooks*, no. 1637. See Coleridge's interpretation of *Romeo and Juliet*, in *Lectures and Notes*, ed. Ashe, pp. 110–13.

154. *Contarini Fleming*, pt. 1, chap. 1; cf. pt. 1, chap. 7. Disraeli himself was very close to his sister Sarah.

155. Coleridge, fearful of incest, dropped his utopian ideals and excepted his sister from the group of all human beings. See letters of September 20 and October 14 (in Robert Southey, *Life and Correspondence* 1:219, 227). Cf. Coleridge, *Notebooks*, no. 1637 (November 1803), on William Paley's approach to incest (*Principles*, bk. 3, chap. 5).

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.

158. See Speiser, "Wife-Sister Motif," pp. 15–18, and Seters, *Abraham*, pp. 72–75.

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.

9. Smart, “Of Geoffrey, His Cat,” *Collected Poems*, pp. 118–20.

10. *Talking to Animals*, p. 200; cf. Woodhouse’s movie, *Love Me, Love My Dog*, discussed in *Talking to Animals*, p. 190. The same theme runs current in Ruth Silverman, ed., *Dog Observed*.

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.

15. See Beck and Katcher, *Between Pets and People*, pp. 47, 49.

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. 136.

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 perforce?"

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.

20. *Pet-Love*, p. 16.

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 *cade* lamb." Synonymous terms are "cosset," "sock," "tiddle," and perhaps also "Anthony pig." There are few, if any, translational equivalents 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. 84–85). 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 familiaris* (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 domesticus*) 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 ultimately 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, "Zoophily 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 controversial, unless the animal serves only as a transitional object which automatically and in

