

## What Would a Global History of Pets Look Like?

Philip Howell

Department of Geography, Downing Place, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 3EN,  
UK

Translated by Chien-hui Li and published as 一個「全球的」寵物史會是甚麼模樣？ in

*Cheng Kung Historical Journal* 58, 1 (2020): 1-20

[http://www.his.ncku.edu.tw/chinese/index.php?option=com\\_fabrik&c=form&view=details&Itemid=82&fabrik=3&tableid=3&rowid=531](http://www.his.ncku.edu.tw/chinese/index.php?option=com_fabrik&c=form&view=details&Itemid=82&fabrik=3&tableid=3&rowid=531)

### Abstract

Although the history of pets or companion animals has been a major topic for scholars in recent years, there remain major gaps in our understanding. At present, scholars have approached the topic from different directions, and the difficulty of reconciling work in evolutionary biology, anthrozoology, and social and cultural history is a major challenge. Some academic accounts universalise pet keeping, seeing this as a very ancient phenomenon, the product of hardwired human instincts. Popular histories of pet keeping also tend to stress the longevity of the bond between humans and other animals. Other work portrays the culture of pet keeping as a much more recent, and sees the modern conception of pets as primarily a Western development. A truly global history of pets will need to confront these contemporary problems. We need to know much more about non-Western cultures, regions, and traditions, and the ways in which Western forms of pet keeping supplanted or supplemented other kinds of relationship with animal companions. This process is likely to involve a certain ‘decolonisation’ of animal studies, and to steer us away from assumptions about the homogeneity of the human species.

**Keywords:** pets, companion animals, petkeeping, pet love, global history

*I*

Having been neglected for so long, pet history seems to have undergone a rapid renaissance. A host of books and articles have appeared in recent years, considering the history of pets and pet keeping from the perspective of evolutionary biology, anthrozoology, and social and cultural history. We still don't really know all that much about the global history of pets, however, and it is here where the difficulty of reconciling the various approaches is most keenly felt.<sup>1</sup> The intractable historiographical problems include the temptation to universalize pet-keeping, which threatens to rob the historian of her or his focus on the particular and the specific, as well as on the processes of change. We are also far too knowledgeable about the modern West, at the expense of other regions, cultures, and traditions. We are also notably ignorant about the ways in which Western forms of pet keeping have encountered, expropriated, and coexisted with alternative animal-human relationships. We are, moreover, hampered by the legacy of the humanities, and the tendency to speak of human beings in the collective and the abstract, instead of questioning the history of pets as it pertains to the complex conception of "humanity." Here, a different kind of history might tell us much more about ourselves as well as our pets. In these brief remarks, I reflect on where we are with regard to the history of pets, and where we might be going.

*II*

As someone who has written about companion animals, specifically dogs, I am frequently asked whether I own a pet myself. The answer always seems to surprise and disappoint. The assumption is that if you write about pets, you must have a pet. My flippant response is that I have only written two books: one on prostitutes, the other on dogs - and I don't have a dog or other animal companion. To an academic audience, I might reference Cary Wolfe's argument that scholars in the field of animal studies don't even have to *like* animals to write about them - though I would quickly add that I do actually like animals, dogs especially.<sup>2</sup> The silent implication of Wolfe's statement seems to be that liking other animals makes it harder to think about them critically, even that love for animals precludes scholars from the fullest understanding of the meaning of pets and pet keeping. Cary Wolfe is too dedicated a student of critical theory to talk naively of objectivity, but I sense the air of

disparagement of fond and foolish animal lovers all the same. There are other high theorists whose disdain for sentimentality towards nonhuman animals is patently obvious, which only makes it harder to admit to actually liking or loving other animals. There are exceptions, for sure: Donna Haraway and Marjorie Garber, for instance, have managed to write of their love for their animal companions without compromising their academic credentials, and indeed by training their gaze on their own close relationships they tell us rather more about our curious entanglement with other animals than their more sniffily high-minded colleagues.<sup>3</sup> I am with them. No-one should imagine that liking and loving animals is a bad thing, for an academic or otherwise. All the same, the love some of us feel for pets is not a matter of individual sentiment, merely a consumer choice or quirk of psychology. The contemporary significance of what has been called “pet-love” is far more important than that.<sup>4</sup> We should recognize that “pet-love” is an academic problem of the first importance, and we need to understand how and why and when human beings, or groups of them, began to invest their emotional and affective energies in individuals of other species. What is the nature of this “invisible, emotional bond between the human and animal,” and where did it come from?<sup>5</sup> How did we reach the point, in the present day, when this affection for domestic animals becomes the basis for the enormous commercial enterprise of the pet industry, seemingly expanding fast from its Western homelands into new territories around the globe?

It is here that love for animals, pets in particular, might well get in the way of understanding the *history* of pets and pet keeping. It is certainly the case that popular histories of animals, even good ones, tend to overdose on the special *bonds* we have, as humans, with other species. No doubt we can find examples of this kind of literature much earlier, but I might mention Roger Caras’s *A Perfect Harmony: The Intertwining Lives of Animals and Humans Throughout History*, which whilst not a history of pets does foreground the emotional attachment between humans and animals. The dog, for instance, is spoken of as “the animal that changed forever the emotions of man.”<sup>6</sup> A more recent general history of human and animal attachment is Brian Fagan’s *The Intimate Bond: How Animals Shaped Human History*, where the title tells you almost all you need to know.<sup>7</sup> These are not bad books, but it is odd, given that our overwhelming relationship to other animals is as their killers, that the sentimental note should sound so loudly. We can argue that killing of animals does not preclude intimacy with them, and there is a vast amount of work on the history of animal-human relations to support this view, but to see this as consistent with or continuous with contemporary animal agriculture requires us to suspend our critical judgement completely. Writers in this genre typically note the complexities of our historical relationship

with animal species, but opt out of any clear narrative or specific conclusions.

Historically, we are likely in such general narratives to emphasize the longevity of our affectionate relationships with animals.<sup>8</sup> Stress on the “intimate bond” seems to take us into prehistory, or out of conventional history altogether. One recent account taps into a chronology stretching back to the beginnings of humanity itself - to the Chauvet caves in France, for instance, with the tracks of a boy and a dog evidence for this ancient companionship, or to the burials of human beings with other animals, in situations that suggest the existence of “pets” thousands and thousands of years before the present.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, Jacky Colliss Harvey’s subtitle, perhaps the work of the publisher, speaks of a “26,000-Year-Old Love Story” between people and pets. This is an appealing and insightful book, but the stress on this long-term love for pets is not very helpful when it comes to historical particularity. Sometimes the effect is just comical, as in a recent news story on “the secret history of pets,” which provides a timeline running from c.10,000 BC, the earliest known burial of a dog with a human, to 2011, and a rather less impressive landmark, the birth of Lupo, the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge’s cocker spaniel.<sup>10</sup> This sort of approach is perfectly understandable, but misleading all the same. As far as the ancient past is concerned, we simply do not know enough about how individual humans felt about these individual animals to say that the latter approximate to what we would now call “pets.” The evidence of zooarchaeology is suggestive rather than conclusive, and caution is very much the order of the day.<sup>11</sup>

If we replace the continuity of pet keeping with more effective *longue durée* histories, we might turn to accounts informed by natural selection, though the evolution of pet keeping behaviour is similarly contentious. An interest in animals from a less straightforwardly material or instrumental basis, what Richard Bulliet calls “affective uses,” is still rather neglected in the extensive discussion of domestication, and, whilst widely promoted, “biophilia” and its elaborations remains simply the most compelling general hypothesis.<sup>12</sup> We might argue that pet keeping is biologically hard-wired into humanity, “a fundamental and ancient attribute of our species,” probably a derivative or redirection of human nurturing behaviour, and something that helps explain the rather more recent development of a concern for animal welfare. But “The question still remains as to whether such behaviour was maladaptive but not sufficiently so to cause selection against it, or whether it was sufficiently adaptive to have been positively selected for.”<sup>13</sup> Other uses of evolutionary arguments in historical accounts of our relationships with animals might consider very much more recent developments, over the timescale of hundreds rather than thousands of years, but once again

it is hard to be precise, especially where affectionate attitudes are concerned: pet-love is still very difficult to articulate in terms of natural or artificial selection.<sup>14</sup> Briefly stated, “biologically-based theories, in themselves, cannot adequately explain the evolution of pet-keeping.”<sup>15</sup>

Popular accounts tend to stress the idea that pets are good for us, but the empirical evidence is unclear. One obvious response is to keep our distance from the seemingly sentimental business of love and affection, and turning our scholarly attention to “pet-love” as an historical phenomenon proper. So, for instance, Erica Fudge’s excellent introductory text on *Pets* distinguishes between the affective/personal significance of pets and their larger philosophical/theoretical meaning.<sup>16</sup> This is sensible, and there is no better brief academic account, even if this text is rather abstract and even somewhat aloof about its subjects, animal and human. It is important to stress that the history of pets must be more than about our love for other animals. We cannot understand the history of love for animals without understanding the history of antipathy towards them. Some of the recent contemporary work on pets has rightly emphasized the need to consider pet keeping’s “analytical ‘outside’: the many people, for instance, who do not like pets or other animals, who even now may be considered cranks for *not* liking them.”<sup>17</sup> Half of humanity *today* doesn’t live with companion animals, and even those that do might not fulfil the ideal of pets that we have in the West. What would a history of “pet-love” be worth if it did not consider people who are indifferent to other animals, or even hate them? There is rather too little historical research on, for instance, the fear and hatred of animals, and the violence dispensed to domestic animals or pets.<sup>18</sup> The same can be said for the complex mixture of sentiments involved in loving pets. The cultural geographer Yi-Fu Tuan famously argued that pet keeping is not necessarily about animals at all, and also that our feelings involve both love for and power over our pets: dominance *and* affection.<sup>19</sup> The history of pets has to consider these less comfortingly familiar ways of loving animals.

More generally, we might argue that pet keeping is an unusual phenomenon, not just in the long evolution of the human species but also in the historical era. “Pet-love” might then be recognized as the strange thing that it has become. Richard Bulliet has divided our relationship with animals into three stages: “predomestic,” which in terms of human history is clearly predominant, stretching even to hundreds of thousands of years; a “domestic” era, only a few tens of thousands of years old, in which human beings understood the advantages of sharing living space and resources with other animals; and a “postdomestic” period barely a few decades old.<sup>20</sup> Bulliet says relatively little about pets *per se*, but in many ways the

contemporary culture of pet keeping is presumably to be counted amongst Bulliet's "fantasies" of the postdomestic era, alongside such recent phenomena as antipathy towards hunting, elective vegetarianism and veganism, "humane" concerns for animal welfare and the animal rights movement. In other words, pet keeping as most of us know it, is an historically unprecedented, perhaps unique, phenomenon. Small wonder that such accounts steer clear of our evolutionary inheritance, and focus on the conditions under which affection, love for individual pets became more widespread and general, more accepted and appropriate. My own research, on Britain, has explored the ways in which an "age of the pet" is announced in the last couple of centuries, no more: pet keeping as we would now understand it, is an extremely recent "invention."<sup>21</sup> We might still be asked: why did this come about, why then and there did a love for pets become a *culture* of pet keeping? There is a tendency always to invoke abstractions like urbanization, industrialization, modernity, moving from nonhuman animals themselves to the supposed loss of the natural world, or at least its closeness to immediate experience. This still feels like avoiding these perfectly reasonable questions. Personally, I feel wholly unsatisfied by such 'structural' explanations, however much they are persuasive in part. These are narratives of declension, after all, with lack and loss taking the place of explanation, and what is novel - the rise of pet keeping, animal welfarism, and animal rights - seemingly shrugged aside as subjects of historical research. No doubt this will change, is already changing - but there is a very long way to go.<sup>22</sup>

### III

Perhaps more important at this juncture, however, is to accept how seriously limited our historical knowledge is of the world beyond the West. This is frequently noted, but it is surprising that there is so little written of substance about pet keeping in a global or cross-cultural perspective.<sup>23</sup> In what is still the only systematic survey of pet-keeping, Peter Gray and Sharon Young have noted the very wide range of species kept as pets, with dogs (for instance) not having any special priority, given little in the way of privilege, and often beaten or otherwise mistreated; Gray and Young make a point of stating that many aspects of the contemporary culture of indulgence towards pets is unprecedented.<sup>24</sup> We know that pet keeping takes and has taken many different forms, many so very different from what scholars in the modern, Western world understand by the term "pets" that we might hesitate to consider them the same phenomenon at all. There is no question that pet keeping is

widespread, but what this means and why it happens is no easy question. James Serpell is largely sympathetic to the view that pet keeping is ubiquitous, and can be found nearly everywhere in societies based on hunter-gathering or relatively simple horticulture, but he stresses the challenge to our understanding of “pets” and the reasons for keeping them.<sup>25</sup> In the most capacious, least critical definition, as animals treated with indulgence and fondness, kept for non-utilitarian reasons, we can clearly find all sorts of “pets,” all over the world, but these appear in forms far removed from the familiar cats and dogs.<sup>26</sup> In numbers alone, fish are the world’s most popular pet, and probably since ancient Egypt, Rome, and China they have supplemented or supplanted their role as a ready food resource. Other ‘exotic’ pets (to use the modern parlance) are far fewer in number, but again their history can be traced back thousands of years: insects in Japan and China are instructive contrasts, for instance.<sup>27</sup> All of these animals fulfil, in part, the modern notion of a pet, but they also depart from some of the stricter definitions that have been offered in discussions of pet keeping. Moreover, in historical accounts and in contemporary societies, “pets” may work and they may even be eaten, however much this challenges the modern Western conception. All of this implies that we should be prepared to give up on some of the more enthusiastic universalizing explanations, favouring the more modest returns based on analysis of particular species and particular societies and cultures. We can agree that animals and people have co-evolved, but “it is the specifics of our relationships with animals that vary across cultures,” and any global history of pets will need to attend to the matter of culture rather than of nature.<sup>28</sup>

A great deal of information is presumably locked in specialist publications, or at least ones neglected by monoglot Anglophones like myself. There are some standout histories of certain national cultures, to be sure, which offer themselves as exemplars.<sup>29</sup> But the general historical surveys have extremely limited purchase on non-Western cultures. Work on the ancient world is preoccupied with Greece and Rome, albeit Egypt, China and some other cultures are not entirely neglected.<sup>30</sup> Work on the medieval world focuses overwhelmingly on Western Europe and the high medieval period with no great sense of a global Middle Ages when it comes to pets and other domestic animals.<sup>31</sup> Scholarship on the early modern period, taking in as it does the era of European colonialism and the version of globalization it presaged, is more promising.<sup>32</sup> But when we get to more recent modernity, our studies become more microhistorical, more parochial in their focus on European and Western societies.<sup>33</sup> I include my own work in this criticism, where attention is not only trained on Britain, but on London and the world of the middle classes and the bourgeoisie, to the obvious neglect of the pets of working people.<sup>34</sup> Only to a limited extent do I indicate the

need to contextualize this nineteenth-century history of pet keeping within a global context, to underline just how *strange* the Victorians were, and the world they created. There are very different ways of caring for companion animals, very many different kinds of “petkeeping.”<sup>35</sup>

None of this means that we should ignore the role of the West. Far from it. In very important ways, a Western culture of pet keeping - of animal-human relations generally - was exported to much of the rest of the world, colliding with other types of animal-human relations, and generating friction as it did so. We see this, even within Europe, in the ways that ideals of animal welfare, including the proper treatment of pets, were motivated by “orientalist” discourses about other, less progressive or civilized societies. Outside of Europe, European condescension could take even more critical form. In the Ottoman Empire, for instance, European elites brought with them their version of pet culture, something that only spread to indigenous elites in the late nineteenth century, with local practices towards street dogs became more “humane,” or at least more discreet.<sup>36</sup> In Southern Africa, affection for pet dogs and a concern for animal welfare amongst the white colonial class had similar consequences for street dogs and strays, mongrel dogs, and also for the practices of natives and “underclass” towards their pet animals.<sup>37</sup> Shuk-Wah Poon has written for instance of how European standards of animal welfare bore down on the practice of eating dogs in colonial Hong Kong, with notable support from native elites who were not prepared to tie the practice to cultural and ethnic identity.<sup>38</sup> Elsewhere, where eating dogs was more closely tied to questions of cultural and ethnic identity, without compromising a flourishing pet culture, European and local standards were set on a collision course.<sup>39</sup>

Such agonistic situations remind us that pet histories appear in the plural, and that the empirical and the ethical inform each other without being reducible to each other. We should not of course rush to think that animal companionship and a concern for animal welfare was born in the West and exported to the rest of the world: similar practices and sympathetic attitudes have developed elsewhere, in specific conditions and cultures.<sup>40</sup> Reassuring narratives of “progress” are moreover likely only to reproduce Western norms and attitudes. The need to ‘decolonize’ animal studies surely extends to the histories of pet keeping.<sup>41</sup> A global history of pets cannot be simply the sum of local and regional specifics. It will also need to accept the differentiation of “humanity” and to contest the privileges that have accrued to a favoured few, then and now. So, for instance, we know quite a lot, at least in the West, about the power of the middle-classes and the elite as they are revealed in the development of pet keeping regimes. Women, subordinate to men in general terms, are nevertheless prominent both as keepers of pets and as proponents of animal welfare



campaigns, both nationally and internationally. White Europeans, men and women alike, were able to export the new ideals of animal welfare in which their culture of pet keeping was embedded, often at the expense of others, coded as racially or culturally inferior.

All this leaves us with a particular problem, given that pet histories tend to emphasize human relations with these favoured animals. It is not just that pet keeping must be as much about humans, the animal's companion, rather than the nonhuman animals themselves.<sup>42</sup> More insistently, it seems to speak to the condition of human beings as a species. As John Bradshaw puts it, if pet keeping is something that stretches back 30,000 or even 50,000 years before the present, it is "an intrinsic part of what it is to be human."<sup>43</sup> But we cannot allow the argument that close relationships with animals are a "universal trait of mankind" to crowd out our analysis of the ways in which love for animals was a means of differentiating *between* human beings.<sup>44</sup> The history of pets needs to foreground the history of Western hegemony and colonialism, the history of race and racism and white privilege. Those who suggest that love for pets is an "historical constant" and something that transcends barriers of race and class are far too idealistic: the history of "petropolis" and "zoopolis" will not show that love for pets automatically pointed the way for more progressive politics.<sup>45</sup> We are likely to find, instead, that the more we focus on the history of pets, the less persuasive is our emphasis on human beings as an homogeneous abstraction. It is sometimes said that pets bring people together.<sup>46</sup> But the history of pets and companion animals is all too likely to show us how fraught are our connections with our fellow human beings. We should expect to hear stories not only of love, indifference, and hatred for nonhuman animals, but also love, indifference, and hatred for different kinds of humans.

#### IV

I was recently asked, by consultants working, I understood, for a major pet food corporation, to offer my thoughts on the future of pets. Why they thought that a historian of pets would make a good futurologist was beyond me. My imagination simply did not stretch to what pet keeping might look like in a hundred or two hundred years, and I could only extrapolate very modestly in the short term: things like the spread of Western norms of pet keeping to countries like China and Brazil, the difficulties of reconciling the needs of companion animals in an increasingly crowded and urbanizing world, with its growing ecological stresses, and the role of technology in attending to the needs of our pets. If I had

been asked about the future of animal history, particularly when it came to the history of pets and animal companions, I think I would have been rather more confident. Most importantly, I hope that we will be able to look back, in time, on the development of a truly global history of pets, one that will build on the work that has already been accomplished, but which will be significantly different in substance and approach from the kind of work that I and others have produced.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Even the dog, *canis lupus familiaris*, might claim to be neglected by historians, perhaps as a result of this familiarity. See Marie Fox, "Taking dogs seriously?," *Law, Culture and the Humanities* 6, no. 1 (2010): 37-55, 40-41; Donna Haraway, *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008, 45. For general discussion, see Anthony L. Podberscek, Elizabeth S. Paul, and James A. Serpell. eds. *Companion Animals and Us: Exploring the Relationship Between People and Pets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

<sup>2</sup> Cary Wolfe, "Human, all too human: 'animal studies' and the humanities," *PMLA* 124, no. 2 (2009): 564-575, 567.

<sup>3</sup> Donna Haraway, *When Species Meet*; Marjorie Garber, *Dog Love*, New York: Touchstone, 1997.

<sup>4</sup> Heidi J. Nast, "Loving ... whatever: alienation, neoliberalism, and pet-love in the twenty-first century," *ACME : An International Journal of E-Geographies* 5, no. 2 (2006): 300-327; Heidi J. Nast, "Critical pet studies," *Antipode* 38, no. 5 (2006): 894-906.

<sup>5</sup> Kathleen Walker-Meikle, *Medieval Pets*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012, 108.

<sup>6</sup> Roger Caras, *A Perfect Harmony: The Intertwining Lives of Animals and Humans Throughout History*, West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1996.

<sup>7</sup> Brian Fagan, *The Intimate Bond: How Animals Shaped Human History*, New York: Bloomsbury, 2015.

<sup>8</sup> See my argument in Philip Howell, “When did pets become animals?” In *Historical Animal Geographies*, edited by Stephanie Rutherford and Sharon Wilcox, Abingdon: Routledge, 2018, 11-22.

<sup>9</sup> Harvey, Jacky Colliss. *The Animal's Companion: People and their Pets, a 26,000-Year-Old Love Story*, London: Allen & Unwin, 2019.

<sup>10</sup> See “A secret history of pets: why humans have kept animals as pets since ancient times”, *Express*, July 25 2013, <https://www.express.co.uk/news/weird/417324/A-secret-history-of-pets-Why-humans-have-kept-animals-as-pets-since-ancient-times>, last accessed 24 July 2019.

<sup>11</sup> For general discussion, see Naomi Sykes, *Beastly Questions: Animal Answers to Archeological Issues*, London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

<sup>12</sup> Richard W. Bulliet, *Hunters, Herders, and Hamburgers: The Past and Future of Human-Animal Relationships*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2005, 101. For an introduction see Margaret Sery Young, “The evolution of domestic pets and companion animals,” *The*

*Veterinary Clinics of North America* 15, no. 2 (1985): 297-309.

<sup>13</sup> J. W. S. Bradshaw and E. S. Paul. “Could empathy for animals have been an adaptation in the evolution of *Homo sapiens*?,” *Animal Welfare* 19 (2010): 107-112, 111.

<sup>14</sup> See for instance the approach of Edmund Russell, *Greyhound Nation: A Coevolutionary History of England, 1200-1900*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

<sup>15</sup> Harold A. Herzog, “Biology, culture, and the origins of pet-keeping,” *Animal Behavior and Cognition* 1, no. 3 (2014): 296-308, 304.

<sup>16</sup> Erica Fudge, *Pets*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2008. See also Marc Shell, “The family pet,” *Representations* 15 (1986): 121-153.

<sup>17</sup> Nast, “Critical pet studies,” 896.

<sup>18</sup> For animal harm and abuse see the discussions in Christine Overall, ed. *Pets and People: The Ethics of Our Relationship with Companion Animals*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

<sup>19</sup> Yi-Fu Tuan, *Dominance and Affection: The Making of Pets*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

<sup>20</sup> Bulliet, *Hunters, Herders, and Hamburgers*.

<sup>21</sup> Howell, “When did pets become animals?” See Philip Howell, *At Home and Astray: The Domestic Dog in Victorian Britain*, Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015. For this kind of argument about modernity, see also Michael Worboys, Julie-Marie Strange, and Neil Pemberton, *The Invention of the Modern Dog: Breed and Blood in Victorian Britain*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018.

<sup>22</sup> But see the pioneering work of Chien-hui Li, *Mobilizing Traditions in the First Wave of the British Animal Defense Movement*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

<sup>23</sup> See Samantha Hurn, *Humans and Other Animals: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Human-Animal Interactions*, London: Pluto Press, 2012, 98-111.

<sup>24</sup> Peter B. Gray and Sharon M. Young. “Human–pet dynamics in cross-cultural perspective,” *Anthrozoös* 24, no. 1 (2011): 17-30.

<sup>25</sup> James Serpell, James. “Pet-keeping in non-Western societies: some popular misconceptions,” *Anthrozoös* 1, no. 3 (1987): 166-174.

<sup>26</sup> James Serpell and Elizabeth Paul. “Pets and the emergence of positive attitudes to animals.” In *Animals and Human Society: Changing Perspectives*, edited by Aubrey Manning and James Serpell, London: Routledge, 1994, 127-144, 133.

<sup>27</sup> Erick L. Laurent, “Children, ‘insects’ and play in Japan.” In *Companion Animals and Us: Exploring the Relationship Between People and Pets*, edited by Anthony L. Podberscek, Elizabeth S. Paul, and James A. Serpell, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 61-

89; Lisa Gail Ryan, *Insect Musicians and Cricket Champions: A Cultural History of Singing Insects in China and Japan*, San Francisco: China Books & Periodicals, 1996.

<sup>28</sup> Catherine Amiot, Brock Bastian, and Pim Martens. “People and companion animals: it takes two to tango,” *Bioscience* 66, no. 7 (2016): 552-560, 553.

<sup>29</sup> See for instance Katherine C. Grier, *Pets in America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006, or Ingrid H. Tague, *Animal Companions: Pets and Social Change in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.

<sup>30</sup> Michael MacKinnon, “Pets.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, edited by Gordon Lindsay Campbell, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, 269-281, 279.

<sup>31</sup> Walker-Meikle, *Medieval Pets*. Joyce E. Salisbury, *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages*, London: Routledge, 1994.

<sup>32</sup> Consider, for instance, the dogs of the Spanish conquistadors, who were comrades as well as companions, in addition to the many more conventional pets of the Spanish; these animals coexisted with indigenous pets. See Abel A. Alves, *The Animals of Spain: An Introduction to Imperial Perceptions and Human Interaction with Other Animals, 1492-1826*, Leiden: Brill, 2011.

<sup>33</sup> For two classics of modern pet history in the West, see Kathleen Kete, *The Beast in the Boudoir: Petkeeping in Nineteenth-Century Paris*, Berkeley: University of California Press,

1994; Harriet Ritvo, *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.

<sup>34</sup> Howell, *At Home and Astray*.

<sup>35</sup> Consider for instance the collective care of animals. In the documentary film *Kedi* (dir. Ceyda Torun, Termite Films, 2016) on the stray cats of Istanbul, these animals are not “pets” in the conventional sense, yet does this kind of care approximate to “pet keeping”?

<sup>36</sup> Brummett, Palmira. “Dogs, women, cholera, and other menaces in the streets: cartoon satire in the Ottoman revolutionary press, 1908-11,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 27, no. 4 (1995): 433-460. See also Alan Mikhail, “A dog-eat-dog empire: violence and affection on the streets of Ottoman Cairo,” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 35, no. 1 (2015): 76-95.

<sup>37</sup> Lance Van Sittert and Sandra Swart. “Canis familiaris: a dog history of South Africa,” *South African Historical Journal* 48, no. 1 (2003): 138-173; Kirsten Mckenzie, “Dogs and the public sphere: the ordering of social space in early nineteenth-century Cape Town,” *South African Historical Journal* 48, no. 1 (2003): 235-251.

<sup>38</sup> Shuk-Wah Poon, “Dogs and British colonialism: the contested ban on eating dogs in colonial Hong Kong,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 42, no. 2 (2014): 302-328. See also Anthony L. Podberscek, “Good to pet and eat: the keeping and consuming of dogs and cats in South Korea,” *Journal of Social Issues* 65, no. 3 (2009): 615-632.

<sup>39</sup> Minjoo Oh and Jeffrey Jackson, “Animal rights vs. cultural rights: exploring the dog meat debate in South Korea from a world polity perspective,” *Journal of International Studies* 32, no. 1 (2011): 31-56.

<sup>40</sup> For China see Dagmar Schäfer, Martina Siebert, and Roel Sterckx. “Knowing animals in China’s history: an introduction.” In *Animals Through Chinese History*, edited by Roel Sterckz, Martina Siebert, and Dagmar Schäfer, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018, 1-19, 15-16.

<sup>41</sup> See Roger Geroux, ed. “Decolonizing animal studies,” special issue of *Humanimalia* 10, no. 2 (2019).

<sup>42</sup> Harvey, *The Animal’s Companion*, 2.

<sup>43</sup> John Bradshaw, *The Animals Among Us: The New Science of Anthropology*. London: Penguin, 2017, 23.

<sup>44</sup> Bradshaw, *The Animals Among Us*, 20.

<sup>45</sup> Roberta J. M. Olson and Kathleen Hulser. “Petropolis: a social history of urban animal companions,” *Visual Studies* 18, no. 2 (2003): 133-143, 133. For “zoopolis,” see Jennifer Wolch, “Anima urbis.” *Progress in Human Geography*, 26 (2002): 721-742.

<sup>46</sup> For an argument that pets are vital for social capital, and thus bring people together, see Lisa Wood, Billie Giles-Corti, and Max Bulsara, “More than a furry companion: the ripple



effect of companion animals on neighborhood interactions and sense of community,” *Social Science & Medicine* 61 (2005): 1159-1173, and Lisa Wood, Billie Giles-Corti, and Max Bulsara. “The pet connection: pets as a conduit for social capital?,” *Society and Animals* 15 (2007): 43-56.

## References

Alves, Abel A. *The Animals of Spain: An Introduction to Imperial Perceptions and Human Interaction with Other Animals, 1492-1826*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Amiot, Catherine, Brock Bastian, and Pim Martens. “People and companion animals: it takes two to tango,” *Bioscience* 66, no. 7 (2016): 552-560.

Bradshaw, J. W. S., and E. S. Paul. “Could empathy for animals have been an adaptation in the evolution of *Homo sapiens*?” *Animal Welfare* 19 (2010): 107-112.

Bradshaw, John. *The Animals Among Us: The New Science of Anthropology*. London: Penguin, 2017.

Brummett, Palmira. “Dogs, women, cholera, and other menaces in the streets: cartoon satire in the Ottoman revolutionary press, 1908-11,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 27, no. 4 (1995): 433-460.

Bulliet, Richard W. *Hunters, Herders, and Hamburgers: The Past and Future of Human-Animal Relationships*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Caras, Roger A. *A Perfect Harmony: The Intertwining Lives of Animals and Humans Throughout History*, West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1996.

Fagan, Brian. *The Intimate Bond: How Animals Shaped Human History*. New York:

Bloomsbury, 2015.

Fox, Marie. "Taking dogs seriously?," *Law, Culture and the Humanities* 6, no. 1 (2010): 37-55.

Fudge, Erica. *Pets*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2008.

Garber, Marjorie. *Dog Love*. New York: Touchstone, 1997.

Geroux, Roger, ed. "Decolonizing animal studies," special issue of *Humanimalia* 10, no. 2 (2019).

Gray, Peter B., and Sharon M. Young. "Human–pet dynamics in cross-cultural perspective," *Anthrozoös* 24, no. 1 (2011): 17-30.

Grier, Katherine C. *Pets in America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Haraway, Donna J. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Harvey, Jacky Colliss. *The Animal's Companion: People and their Pets, a 26,000-Year-Old Love Story*. London: Allen & Unwin, 2019.

Herzog, Harold A. "Biology, culture, and the origins of pet-keeping," *Animal Behavior and Cognition* 1, no. 3 (2014): 296-308.

Howell, Philip. *At Home and Astray: The Domestic Dog in Victorian Britain*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015.

Howell, Philip. "When did pets become animals?" In *Historical Animal Geographies*, edited by Stephanie Rutherford and Sharon Wilcox, 11-22. Abingdon: Routledge, 2018.

Hurn, Samantha. *Humans and Other Animals: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Human-Animal Interactions*. London: Pluto Press, 2012.

- Kete, Kathleen. *The Beast in the Boudoir: Petkeeping in Nineteenth-Century Paris*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Laurent, Erick L. "Children, 'insects' and play in Japan." In *Companion Animals and Us: Exploring the Relationship Between People and Pets*, edited by Anthony L. Podberscek, Elizabeth S. Paul, and James A. Serpell, 61-89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Li, Chien-hui. *Mobilizing Traditions in the First Wave of the British Animal Defense Movement*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Mckenzie, Kirsten. "Dogs and the public sphere: the ordering of social space in early nineteenth-century Cape Town," *South African Historical Journal* 48, no. 1 (2003): 235-251.
- MacKinnon, Michael. "Pets." In *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*, edited by Gordon Lindsay Campbell, 269-281. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Mikhail, Alan. "A dog-eat-dog empire: violence and affection on the streets of Ottoman Cairo," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 35, no. 1 (2015): 76-95.
- Nast, Heidi J. "Loving ... whatever: alienation, neoliberalism, and pet-love in the twenty-first century," *ACME : An International Journal of E-Geographies* 5, no. 2 (2006): 300-327.
- Nast, Heidi J. "Critical pet studies," *Antipode* 38, no. 5 (2006): 894-906.
- Oh, Minjoo, and Jeffrey Jackson. "Animal rights vs. cultural rights: exploring the dog meat debate in South Korea from a world polity perspective," *Journal of International Studies* 32, no. 1 (2011): 31-56.
- Olson, Roberta J. M., and Kathleen Hulser. "Petropolis: a social history of urban animal

companions.” *Visual Studies* 18, no. 2 (2003): 133-143.

Overall, Christine, ed. *Pets and People: The Ethics of Our Relationship with Companion Animals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Podberscek, Anthony L. “Good to pet and eat: the keeping and consuming of dogs and cats in South Korea,” *Journal of Social Issues* 65, no. 3 (2009): 615-632.

Podberscek, Anthony L., Elizabeth S. Paul, and James A. Serpell. eds. *Companion Animals and Us: Exploring the Relationship Between People and Pets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Poon, Shuk-Wah. “Dogs and British colonialism: the contested ban on eating dogs in colonial Hong Kong,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 42, no. 2 (2014): 302-328.

Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Russell, Edmund. *Greyhound Nation: A Coevolutionary History of England, 1200-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Ryan, Lisa Gail. *Insect Musicians and Cricket Champions: A Cultural History of Singing Insects in China and Japan*. San Francisco: China Books & Periodicals, 1996.

Salisbury, Joyce E. *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages*. London: Routledge, 2011.

Schäfer, Dagmar, Martina Siebert, and Roel Sterckx. “Knowing animals in China’s history: an introduction.” In *Animals Through Chinese History*, edited by Roel Sterckz, Martina Siebert, and Dagmar Schäfer, 1-19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Serpell, James. “Pet-keeping in non-Western societies: some popular misconceptions,” *Anthrozōos* 1, no. 3 (1987): 166-174.

Serpell, James and Elizabeth Paul. "Pets and the emergence of positive attitudes to animals." In *Animals and human society: Changing perspectives*, edited by Aubrey Manning and James Serpell, 127-144. London: Routledge, 1994.

Shell, Marc. "The family pet," *Representations* 15 (1986): 121-153.

Sykes, Naomi. *Beastly Questions: Animal Answers to Archeological Issues*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Tague, Ingrid H. *Animal Companions: Pets and Social Change in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.

Torun, Ceyda. *Kedi*. Termite Films, 2016.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Dominance and Affection: The Making of Pets*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

Van Sittert, Lance, and Sandra Swart. "Canis familiaris: a dog history of South Africa," *South African Historical Journal* 48, no. 1 (2003): 138-173.

Walker-Meikle, Kathleen. *Medieval Pets*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012.

Wolch, Jennifer. "Anima urbis." *Progress in Human Geography*, 26 (2002): 721-742.

Wood, Lisa, Billie Giles-Corti, and Max Bulsara. "More than a furry companion: the ripple effect of companion animals on neighborhood interactions and sense of community," *Social Science & Medicine* 61 (2005): 1159-1173.

Wood, Lisa, Billie Giles-Corti, and Max Bulsara. "The pet connection: pets as a conduit for social capital?," *Society and Animals* 15 (2007): 43-56.

Worboys, Michael, Julie-Marie Strange, and Neil Pemberton, *The Invention of the Modern Dog: Breed and Blood in Victorian Britain*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University

Press, 2018.

Young, Margaret Sery. "The evolution of domestic pets and companion animals," *The Veterinary Clinics of North America* 15, no. 2 (1985): 297-309.