

# A Most Convenient Relationship: The Rise of the Cat as a Valued Companion Animal

**John. D. Blaisdell**  
Iowa State University



Of all the animals domesticated by humans the cat is one of the most unique. By nature a nocturnal animal—most other domesticates are diurnal—and socially solitary, cats appear to have been domesticated more for some metaphysical reason than for any practical advantage. But the feline's ability to catch and kill rodents made them a valuable asset to medieval farmers whose distinction between adequate food supplies and famine was often related to how much grain the rats and mice ate. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, though, a new attitude engulfed the relationship between the human and the domestic feline. The cat was no longer viewed strictly as a working animal but now was considered in some circles as a treasured companion. This attitude, reflected in epitaphs to these creatures from the period, suggest that cat may have been more beneficial as a support system than as a mousecatcher. While there is strong evidence that the cat was a favorite companion of the eighteenth-century intellectual elite, there is also good evidence that this creature was, along with the hunting dog, beginning to be accepted in a nonworking capacity by the middle class businessmen of the period. Finally, there is no question but that the move towards a new sensibility that was seen in the



late eighteenth century proved highly beneficial to the well-being of this animal.

The cat was probably first domesticated<sup>1</sup> in ancient Egypt. While some scholars believe the cat was domesticated as early as the old kingdom, circa 3100–2300 B.C., there are no written or artistic records of this animal being a constant companion of humans before 2000 B.C. By the 16th century B.C. there are numerous artistic representations of the cat engaging in a close relationship with humans.<sup>2</sup> By the fifth century B.C. when at least two Egyptian Gods: Bast and Sekmet, were portrayed as cats, this animal's popularity was at an all time high. Hundreds of these creatures were mummified and placed in special coffins for the journey into the afterlife. There were strong reactions if these animals were killed; one classical scholar noted it was a capital crime to kill a cat and at least once, during the reign of a Ptolemaic king, a Roman that accidentally killed a cat was himself almost killed by an Egyptian mob.<sup>3</sup>

It was in large part because of the interaction that Egypt had with Greece and Rome that this animal became popular in these lands. On the Greek mainland cats were kept from the archaic period onwards, though they were scarce and kept mainly as pets rather than as working animals. During the Roman Imperial period the cat was looked upon with affection in certain areas of society. As an example there is a depiction, that was



## HISTORY OF IDEAS

found at Mont Auxois, carved on a table leg of a boy cradling a cat with a collar and bell. Though the excavations at Pompeii produced no evidence of domestic cat bones, there is an illustration from that period of a cat attacking a partridge. It was supposedly through Roman conquests and colonization that the domestic cat found its way into Western Europe.<sup>4</sup>

If the cat found favor with the pagan Romans it was at best only grudgingly tolerated by the early Christians. There are no references to this animal in either the Old Testament or the New Testament. This is probably because the cat was not commonly known or kept as a companion animal in western Asia in the Biblical period.<sup>5</sup> There is a reference to the feline in the Apocryphal Books, specifically The Letters of Jeremiah; here the animal is included with bats and swallows as one of the animals that is found perched on false idols, hardly a flattering representation.<sup>6</sup> The lack of appreciation for this animal by the Christians may in part be because the Jewish population from whom the early Christians arose had a hatred of the Egyptians and everything they venerated as sacred.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the fact that the cult of Bast was still in existence in early Christian Egypt may have further complicated the relationship between the domestic feline and the early Christians. Whatever the reasons when Christianity became established in the western world the cat quickly fell from favor. The animal's nocturnal nature and solitary behavioral patterns combined with their association in pagan religious cults very quickly identified them with mysterious and evil ways; in time they were considered the favorite companion of witches and warlocks.

That cats survived at all in medieval European society was due to their reputation as walking mouse- and rat traps. As one modern author noted: "No animal save man has a better reputation as a rat catcher, merited or not, than that common cat."<sup>8</sup> Even though the Egyptians worshipped these animals that does not mean they overlooked their ability to deal effectively with rodents; cats were often trained to guard grain warehouses along the Nile. Moreover, when these felines died some were not only mummified but were also provided with a number of embalmed rats for their dining pleasure in the afterworld. In Rome the cat in time almost became an arm of the municipal sanitation system. Cats eventually became so renowned for their rodent catching abilities that folktales arose illustrating their cunning and craftiness with respect to this pursuit.

There is the legend from medieval times of the cat who rolls in red mud so that she looks as if she is covered with blood. Then she throws herself on the ground, holds her breath and waits for a rat to approach. The rat, observing that she is not breathing and that she seems covered with blood with her tongue hanging out, thinks she is dead and sits on her. The feline then grabs the rat, kills him and eats him.<sup>9</sup>

It was this reputation, legendary or not, that sustained the cat during the middle ages. From the rather scarce written evidence of the times it was obvious that the cat was considered first and foremost a mouse and rat catcher. Howel Dda, a tenth century Prince of south central Wales, issued a law for the protection of the domestic cat. He also established fixed prices for tame kittens. Before a kitten opened its eyes, it was valued at one penny. After it opened its eyes and until it caught its first mouse, it was worth two pence. Once the cat was established as a mouser it was worth fourpence. Moreover, anyone who stole or killed one of the cats that guarded the prince's granary had to forfeit a milch ewe with its fleece and lamb, or as much wheat as, when poured on the defunct cat suspended by its tail with its nose touching the ground, would cover him up to the tip of his tail. Further, if a married couple separated and there was a division of goods, including a single cat, it was the husband's prerogative to retain the cat.<sup>10</sup>

One author from the fourteenth century, William Langland, also wrote extensively on the cat's role as a rodent catcher. Interestingly, Langland wrote from the point of view of the rodents.

With that a horde of rats ran out all at once, with small mice among them, many a thousand. They gathered in council for the common profit, for a cat from the courtyard used to come as he pleased.

A rat highly respected, said he had worked out a scheme... Said the rat "It seems reasonable to buy a brass bell, or one of bright silver, tie it to a collar,...and hang it round the cat's neck; then we could hear when he is prowling..."

The whole rout of rats agreed to this reasoning. When the bell was bought, though,...no rat in the whole crowd dared clasp that bell round the cat's neck nor attach it to him—not for all England.<sup>11</sup>

The rat was not the only one who had respect for the cat's ability as a hunter—so did most of the medieval European population. Another author from this time made note of this animal's rodent-killing prowess. Bartholomew Anglicus also provided some insight into the life of the cat at this time—a life that could be long and comfortable or short, brutish and nasty.

Anglicus noted:

He (the cat) is a full lecherous beast in youth, swift, pliant, and merry, and leapeth and reseth on everything that is to fore him...and is a heavy beast in age and full sleppy, and lieth slyly in wait for mice; and is aware when they be more by smell than by sight, and hunteth and reseth on them in privy places: and when he taketh a mouse, he playeth therewith, and eateth him after the play... He maketh a ruthless noise... when he proffereth to fight another and unneth is hurt when he is thrown down off an high place. An when he hath a fair skin, he is as it were proud thereof, and goeth fast about... and is oft for his fair skin taken of the skinner, and slain and flayed.<sup>12</sup>

Bartholomew notes not only that the cat was a formidable rodent catcher but that he also had a tendency to play with his prey before he killed it, something Langland also noted. In fact it has been observed that cats often do extraordinary things with the rats and mice they kill, things that seem to make no sense. One cat, observed by a respected zoologist, killed an entire litter of half-grown rats he had found in an overgrown garden and then methodically carried each one to a clear space twenty feet away. The cat laid the dead rats in a neat row, where he let them rot, without eating them. Was this a case of overkill by the cat? Do cats purposely do acts like this to control the rat population as well as to feed upon them?<sup>13</sup> From personal experience this author is well aware of the fact that cats, no matter how well fed, will systematically catch and kill rodents and bring them to their master's door (as evidence of their usefulness).

The cat as a medieval mousecatcher was reflected not only in the literature of the times but also in much of the art and nonliterary remains. There is a fourteenth century carving in the Cathedral Church of Great Malvern illustrating the story of the rats hanging a cat. Also, at the church of Old Cleeve, Somerset, there is a

fifteenth-century tomb which as a man resting his feet on a cat who holds a mouse in her paws.<sup>14</sup> Additionally, at the Cathedral of Worcester there is the carving of a domestic winter scene which includes a cat basking in the warmth of the chimney.<sup>15</sup> Lastly, there are a number of illustrations of cats in medieval manuscripts; from the book of Kells there is an illustration of mice playing around cats<sup>16</sup> while a thirteenth-century manuscript in the Bodleian Library shows a cat and a mouse.<sup>17</sup>

There are also occasional references to cats being kept by the ordinary people of this period. For instance, Richard of Southwick, a Burgess of late thirteenth-century Southampton, was known to keep cats, mainly for their rat-catching abilities, but also as pets. There is additionally the reference to a cat eating a cheese in the thirteenth-century village of Cuxham in Oxfordshire.<sup>18</sup> There is also a most curious reference to the cat being employed in a somewhat commercial manner at this time. In Edward III's reign (1327–1377) it was required by law that every merchant vessel have a cat on board.<sup>19</sup> Because many, if not most, of the vessels were transporting raw materials such as wool, which went to Flanders, (modern day Belgium) and grain, which went from Germany to England, suggests that the feline association was done to control the rodent population that might damage these goods. As a result of this arrangement the cat became associated with the merchant community of the late middle ages. This practice is also reflected in the laws regarding shipwrecks. The perils of shipwreck were aggravated along the English coast by the common law which decreed that the cargo of a wrecked vessel was forfeited to any finders unless a member of the crew escaped alive. According to this law the crew included not only the men but also the cats who served on these vessels.<sup>20</sup> The best reflection of this relationship is the story of Dick Whittington and his cat.

The first evidence that could be possibly associated with this tale is of a nonliterary nature. There is a sculpture on the old Newgate, which Whittington rebuilt as an early example of prison reform, that shows a man with a cat at his feet. There is also a medieval carving of a boy and a cat at what is said to be the Whittington family home in Gloucester.<sup>21</sup> This particular tale, though, did not first appear in print until the late sixteenth century. The tale, which is still a favorite among children's stories,<sup>22</sup> seems to have first arisen from the pen of an Elizabethan writer named Richard Johnson. Johnson published this tale, in ballad form, in

a 1612 volume of verses entitled *The Crown Garland of Goulden Roses*.

The volume *Crown Garland of Goulden Roses* went through numerous editions in the seventeenth century. Equally importantly, though, this story first appeared in prose in 1640. In a very short time it had become one of the most popular titles in the flood of cheap literature that had appeared at this time. The work became popular not only in England but also in the American colonies. Despite the Puritan denouncement of reading romantic literature this particular work seems to have been popular among the early New Englanders, especially the merchants who were enchanted by the Whittington success story. In the records of a Boston bookseller there is evidence that it was more popular than tracts and sermons of famous Protestant ministers. The work continued to be popular in both England and the United States well into the nineteenth century.<sup>23</sup>

Before the seventeenth century whatever written references one sees to Whittington are generally devoid of any to his cat. After 1600, though, Whittington and his cat are inseparable. Moreover, Whittington's success is tied directly to this animal. In a work by Henry Parrott entitled *Springs for Woodcocks* there is seen the following reference: "Tis said that Whittington was raised of nought and by a cat hath divers wonders wrought."

Equally interesting, Dick Whittington and his cat lent their names to a number of commercial establishments in seventeenth-century London. There was 'Whittington's Cat,' a tavern in Long Lane that was established in 1657, as well as 'Whittington and Cat' a barbican in Golden Street that was established in 1668. Dick Whittington and his cat as advertisements for commercial establishments appear, like the writings about him, to have been popular well into the nineteenth century. The old nursery rhyme of the cat and the fiddle also contributed to advertisements for merchants shops in sixteenth and seventeenth-century London. Most appear to be tavern signs and generally they appear around the beginning of the sixteenth century.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, it can be said that by the beginning of the seventeenth century there is an association of the cat, in both literary and nonliterary forms, with the merchant class. Despite these ties the cat is still seen as a working animal and not as a treasured companion of the middle class. This is best reflected in the writings of Edward Topsell, a seventeenth-century English Scholar and naturalist.

Born at the end of the sixteenth century, Topsell graduated from Cambridge before he was twenty. From then until he died in 1635 Topsell served as minister in a number of parishes in both Sussex and Northhamptonshire.<sup>25</sup> In 1607 Topsell translated a work entitled *Historia Animalium*. Originally written in 1551 by a Swiss naturalist named Conrad Gesner it appears to have been the primary source for Topsell's comments on the domestic cat. From time to time though, Topsell adds what appear to be his own observations and insights into this creature's nature. For example, Topsell observed that the cat was a very territorial animal, writing:

The nature of this beast is, to love the place of her breeding, neither will she tary in any strange place, although carried far, being never willing to forsake the house, for the love of any man, and most contrary to the nature of a dog, who will travaile abroad with his master....<sup>26</sup>

(This territorial quality appears to be one of the reasons cats became popular in nineteenth-century England and America; unlike the dog the cat did not require much space and thus became, and still is, the perfect companion for the urban dweller.)

Topsell provided what may be a foretaste of the future, for he went into some detail on the relationship that often develops between cats and their human owners, a relationship that even then often had absolutely nothing to do with this animal's ability to control the size of the rodent population. He noted:

It is needless to spend any time about her (the cat's) loving nature to man, how she flattereth by rubbing her skin against one's legs, how she whurleth with her voice, having as many tunes as turnes, for she hath one voice to beg and to complain, another to testifie her delight and pleasure.... Therefore how she beggeth, playeth, leapeth, looketh, catcheth, tosseth with her foot, riseth up to strings held over her head, sometimes creeping, sometimes lying on the back, playing with one foot, sometime on the belly, snatching now with mouth, and anon with foot, apprehending greedily anything save the hand of man, with divers such gestical actions, it is needless to stand upon; in so much as Caelius (Celsus?)

was wont to say, that being free from his studies and more urgent weighty affairs he was not ashamed to play and sport himself with his cat, and verily it may well be called an idle man's pastime. As this beast hath been familiarly nourished of many, so have they payed dear for their love, being requitted with the losse of their health and sometime of their life for this friendship; and worthily, because they which love any beast in a high measure, have so much the lesse charity unto man.<sup>27</sup>



Topsell seems to suggest that enjoying the company of the domestic feline was not generally socially acceptable at this time. There is no question but that the cat in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was strongly identified with witchcraft, and that it was an association that was rather old. For example, there is a medieval carving from Munster church in the Islet of Thanet which shows an old woman, witchlike in appearance, in the company of two rather grotesque-looking cats.<sup>28</sup> Additionally, there are cases as demonic associates. There is a case of Elizabeth Francis, accused of witchcraft in Chelmsford, England in 1566, who had as familiar, or supporting demon, a white spotted cat capable of causing both animals and children to sicken

and die. There is also the case of Margaret and Philip Flower who was executed in London in 1618 for witchcraft. This couple, with the help of an imp who was in the form of a cat supposedly by supernatural means caused the liver of the young man to fail.<sup>29</sup> Somewhat later, in 1663, a lady named Jane Mulburn was supposedly bewitched by another woman named Dorothy Strangers who, it was claimed, had the ability to change herself into a cat.<sup>30</sup>

Finally, Topsell observed that not all beliefs associated with this animal were good. He spent a fair amount of time and ink noting the malevolent effects a cat can have on humans. He wrote:

It is most certain, that the breath and favour of cats consume the radical humour and destroy the lungs, and therefore they which keep their cats with them in their beds have their air corrupted, and fall into severall hecticks and consumptions.... And therefore also they are dangerous in the time of Pestilence, for they are not only apt to bring home venemous infection, but to poison a man with very looking upon him; wherefore there is in some men a natural dislike and abhorring of cats, their natures being so composed, that not only when they see them, but being near them and unseen, and hid of purpose, they fall into passions;....<sup>31</sup>

These beliefs, plus the strong association of the cat with witchcraft, often resulted in a less than warm feeling about this animal. An early Tudor textbook contains for translation into Latin the simple sentence: 'I hate cats' (*horreo aluros sive feles sive cattos*).<sup>32</sup> Moreover, well into the eighteenth century many people regarded cats as fair game for any and all forms of animal cruelty. On New Year's Day in 1638 in Ely Cathedral one William Smyth roasted a live cat on a spit in the presence of a large and boisterous crowd. During the English Civil War Parliamentary troopers used hounds to hunt cats up and down Lichfield Cathedral. (The last act may have been prompted in part because Archbishop William Laud, the hated head of the King's Star Chamber, had a fondness for cats.)<sup>33</sup> During Pope burning processions in the reign of Charles II it was a common practice to put live cats in the burning effigies so that their screams might add a dramatic effect.<sup>34</sup>

Additionally, at country fairs a popular sport was that of shooting at a cat suspended in a basket. Shakespeare in his play *Much Ado About Nothing* refers to a practice similar to this: "If I do, hang me in a bottle like a cat and shoot at me."<sup>35</sup> Interestingly, cats suspended in baskets evolved by the eighteenth century into the less violent practice of being merchants signs. This particular sign was popular with booths on the Thames when that river froze over in 1739/40 and in 1789 when the river froze over again.<sup>36</sup> Another popular pastime involved a cat being put in a barrel and the local folks essentially beating the life out of both the barrel and the cat with clubs. A description of such an act is available from the eighteenth century.

The poor timorous cat is put into a barrel partly stuffed with soot, and then hung between two high poles, upon a cross beam, below which they (the towns-people) ride in succession, one after another, besieging poor puss with their large clubs and wooden hammers. The barrel, after many a frantic blow, being broken, the wretched animal makes her reluctant appearance amidst a great concourse of spectators, who seem to enjoy much pleasure at the poor animal's shocking figure, and terminate her life and misery by barbarous cruelty.<sup>37</sup>

This form of cruelty was well illustrated by William Hogarth in his print "The First Stage of Cruelty."

Other cruelties were imposed upon these creatures. One of these was the purposeful walling up of cats as a sort of foundation sacrifice. At least two mummified cats have been found, dating from the seventeenth century, which were victims of this practice. One, found in 1950 during alterations to a house that was built in the Tower of London by Sir Christopher Wren between 1666 and 1723. The second appeared during Blitz repairs to the church of St. Michael Royal, College Hill, London. The animal in question was found in a sealed passage which runs under the roof. As the passage had not been opened since 1691 it was believed the animal was placed there by the masons when the church was built in 1687. The features of the cat suggest he, or she, was dead when placed there. Cats were also placed in the walls of buildings as vermin scares. This practice, which appears to have dated from the fourteenth century,

provides one of the most dramatic examples of mummified cats—a cat with two rats that was found beneath sixteenth-century woodwork in a house in Borough High Street, Southwark, London. The fact that all three animals were artificially arranged in their poses strongly suggests that, like the cat found in the church of St. Michael Royal, they were dead when placed there.<sup>38</sup>

Cats were also subjected to occasional exterminations, mainly because it was believed they carried the miasma<sup>39</sup> that caused the bubonic plague. Daniel Defoe noted about cats and dogs during the great plague of London:

Because as they were domestic animals, and apt to run from house to house and from street to street, so they are capable of carrying the effluvia or infectious streams of bodies, infected even in their furs and hair. Therefore it was that, in the beginning of the infection, an order was published by the Lord Mayor and by the Magistrates...that all cats and dogs should be immediately killed.<sup>40</sup>

Defoe's description was hardly exceptional for when plague broke out in Edinburgh in 1512 the city authorities immediately ordered that all stray dogs, cats, and pigs be summarily slaughtered without compensation.<sup>41</sup>

Daniel Defoe also noted that by 1665 there was hardly a home in urban London that did not have one cat and many had five or six.<sup>42</sup> These remarks, written at the beginning of the eighteenth century, reflect the beginnings of a change in attitude toward the cat. This change is well documented in a most interesting way—epitaphs for cats, written in the form of poems, that made their way into the magazines of the times. One of the earliest, from the 1733 edition of the *London Magazine*, was written by a poet lamenting the loss of his cat.

Oppressed with grief, In heavy strains I mourn  
The partner of my studies from me torn  
How shall I sing? What numbers shall I choose?  
For in my favorite cat I've lost my muse...  
In acts obscene she never took delight  
No catterwauls disturbed our sleep by night...  
She never thirsted for the chicken's blood;  
Her teeth she only used to chew her food;  
Harmless as satires which her master writes,  
A foe to scratching, and unused to bites.

She in the study was my constant mate;  
There we together many evenings sat.  
Whene'er I felt my towering fancy fail,  
I stroked her head, her ears, her back and tail;  
And, as I stroked, improved my dying song  
From the sweet notes of her melodious tongue.  
Her purrs and mews so evenly kept time,  
She purred in metre and she mewed in rhyme...  
My cat is gone, ah! Never to return  
Now in my study all the tedious night,  
Alone I sit, and unassisted write;  
Look often around (o greatest cause of pain)  
And view the numerous labors of my brain;  
Those quires of words arrayed in pompous rhyme,  
Which brav'd the jaws of all devouring time  
Now undefended and unwatched by cats,  
Are doomed a victim to the teeth of rats.<sup>43</sup>

Obviously the animal discussed in this lamentation was anything but a working animal. Equally obvious, the poet was deeply and profoundly attached to his cat, and found her a source of great emotional and psychological support. Another author noted in an epitaph-poem that his cat was anything but a working animal.

Here lies beneath this verdent hill  
Tom, a favorite cat  
Who when alive, did never spill  
The blood of mouse or rat,

Yet many a bird and many a nest  
His cruel claws befet  
The partridge too could find not rest,  
Nor escaped the Ievent.

For callow young he fought the filed,  
And often made a feast,  
While fluttering round, the dam beheld,  
And mourned the sad repast...

Ye pretty songsters, clap the wing,  
Let every partner know;  
Let every wood and valley ring,  
The death of Tom your foe.

Now build your nests, now hatch your young,  
And whistle to and fro;  
Let every hill and dale return  
The death of Tom your foe.

But mourn his death, ye vermin kind,  
And shriek, ye mice and rats,  
For such a friend ye ne'er shall find  
In all the race of cats.<sup>44</sup>

In the last epitaph the author engages in a play on words in praising his fellow feline.

Here lies entombed poor honest Blewet  
Poor honest Blewet, pray who's that  
Some tipling poet? No, a cat...  
It was a loving, lovely creature  
Compleat in every grace and feature.  
What gooseberry eyes, and what velvet fur!  
Ye gods what a melodious pur!...  
When on patrol about the house,  
What cat less pus-illanimous?  
But a description yet would suit his  
person, and parts, for subject new 'tis  
Requires, a cat-alogue of beauties.  
To tell in brief his worth and mien,  
But death, whose never erring dart  
makes dogs, and cats, and men to part,  
Our friend to realms of silence bore,  
And honest Blewet purs no more....  
In dismal discords all agree.  
To moan this sad cat-astrophe  
A cat whom merit thus indears,  
Demands a cat-aract of tears.<sup>45</sup>

There were a number of other epitaphs to domestic cats in the form of poems. Most, if not all, show that the attitude toward the cat had in England at least come a long way from the days of the Tudor Latin grammar book which had used as a standard sentence "I hate cats."<sup>46</sup>

The cat was becoming particularly popular among the academics and scholars of the times. There are numerous references to ministers, scholars and writers enjoying the company of cats. One of the earliest, Reverend Walter Stonehouse, was a rector in Yorkshire who was famous for his gardens. Alas, one garden became a resting place for more than plants; when his favorite cat, Delia, died during kitting he had her buried in the garden and even went so far as composing an epitaph to her in Latin.<sup>47</sup>

Delia it is said was invaded in her body by a storm  
He buried my cat under the earth, hiding her  
Lucina presided over the birth

But, alas, she was often called  
Yet was late while my cat died in labor  
Oh, what deed, Lucina, done badly!  
Oh, it was the characteristic grace of a Goddess  
Not to be mindful of her own protection.<sup>48</sup>

A somewhat later poet named Christopher Smart wrote a fair amount of verse on a cat named Geoffrey. (Unlike the earlier poems this does not appear to have been used as an epitaph.) Smart referred to this creature as the “servant of the living God, duly and daily serving him.”<sup>49</sup> Obviously Smart believed that cat provided a certain spiritual quality to anyone who owned one. Smart’s attitude towards this animal, while it may seem extreme, was hardly unusual for the times.

While at Cambridge Issac Newton had a cat named C.C. who supposedly grew very fat eating the food he, Newton, left on his dinner tray.<sup>50</sup> In the eighteenth century no less figures than Samuel Johnson and Jeremy Bentham had soft spots in their hearts for cats. Johnson, in particular, had a fondness for a cat named Hodge. As Boswell, his famous biographer, noted:

I never shall forget the indulgence with which he treated Hodge, his cat: for whom he himself used to go out and buy oysters, lest the servants having that trouble should take a dislike to the poor creature...I recollect him (Hodge) one day scrambling up Dr. Johnson’s breast, apparently with much satisfaction, while my friend smiling and half whistling, rubbed down his back, and pulled his tail; and when I observed he was a fine cat, saying, “why yes, sir, but I have had cats whom I liked better than this” and then as if perceiving Hodge to be out of countenance, adding “but he is a very fine cat, a very fine cat indeed.”<sup>51</sup>

Jeremy Bentham also had a fondness for cats. He had one particular cat about whom Bentham claimed “he had made a man out of him” and who he would invite to eat macaroni at his own table. In time the cat, or as Bentham called him “the puss” got knighted and went by the name of Sir John Langborn. Interestingly, this rise to nobility appears to have come through the church—the cat was originally called Reverend John Langborn; later after he earned a reputation for sanctity and learning a doctor’s degree was conferred upon him and he was called Reverend Doctor John Langborn. It

was soon after this remembered fondly his feline ‘knighthood’. Bentham in his writings remembered fondly his feline companions, as he noted:

I had a remarkably intellectual cat, who never failed to attend one of us when we went round the garden. He grew quite a tyrant, insisting on being fed, and on being noticed....His moral qualities were most despotic—his intellect extraordinary; but he was a universal nuisance.<sup>52</sup>

Finally, the famed antiquarian William Stukeley was fond of a cat named Tit, so much so that when he died Stukeley composed a eulogy that ranks high with the epitaphs in sentimentality and devotion.

The creature had a sense so far superior to her kind; had such inimitable ways of testifying her love to her master and mistress, that she was as a companion, especially so to me...From the admirable endowments of the cat I took a great liking to her, which gave me so much pleasure, without trouble. Her death I grieved for exceedingly.<sup>53</sup>

The intellectual elite may have first perceived the cat as a devoted pet but it was the middle class merchants and professionals who brought about the permanent change in the status of this animal. The popular tale of Dick Whittington, the quintessential middle class success story,<sup>54</sup> was representative in a large way of the ties of the domestic feline to the middle class. The animal, originally a working animal, ends his day as a cherished pet. The same happened to this animal in general in the eighteenth century; the cat, because of his limited demand for space, became the popular companion animal of the eighteenth and nineteenth urban middle class—the merchants, bankers and professionals.

There is little written in the eighteenth century that directly reflects this change in living arrangements for the cat but there is a fair amount of evidence that the other important animal—the dog—moved from an essentially rural working status to an urban, nonworking status. In the eighteenth century there are numerous advertisements in London newspapers for dogs. For instance, a notice in the *Morning Herald and Daily Advertiser* notes the sale of all forms of companion animals, from monkeys to Newfoundland dogs.<sup>55</sup> The

company, Martins, which advertised these animals is obviously some sort of primeval pet dealer. In addition, there are numerous notices in the same London newspapers for lost dogs, most of which appear to have been of the hunting dog variety. In particular, the spaniel appears to have been popular as a companion animal in eighteenth-century London; there are numerous lost and found advertisements for them.<sup>56</sup>

What is more interesting is these animals seem to elicit some emotional attachment, more than one would see with ordinary working animals. For example, in one case the animal had a leather collar with the owner's name and address—an urban London address. Moreover, the owner offered a two-guinea reward for the animal.<sup>57</sup> There is also the spaniel named Fido who was an old dog that had never been trained to hunt. Despite these liabilities the owner was still attached enough to him to offer a one guinea reward for his return.<sup>58</sup> Hunting dogs were not the only canines to climb the social ladder; the Newfoundland, a dog used originally on fishing and trading vessels as a living life preserver, also took that step. There are notices for their sale as well as advertisements for rewards for the return of a lost Newfoundland.<sup>59</sup> Despite their move up in the world some of these animals never lost their fascination with the sea; in at least one case a Newfoundland dove into the Thames and in a most professional manner saved the life of a man who had jumped off the Battersea bridge. Alas, the individual was not trying to commit suicide, rather he was attempting to swim up river against time and as a result of the animal's intervention ended up losing a five guinea wager.<sup>60</sup>

There is no question but that in the eighteenth century numerous working dogs were becoming cherished pets. This included a fair number of dogs, such as Newfoundlands, who served on commercial sailing vessels. If the working dog could make such a move, then the cat must not be far behind. In fact, there is some evidence that one of the very first established breeds of cat, the Maine Coon Cat, was a product of the seafaring tradition. This animal dominated the first cat show that was held in Maine in the 1860s and for most of the nineteenth century was a consistent winner at American cat shows.<sup>61</sup> If the later history of this animal are well documented, its origins are shrouded in mist. The legends are numerous: some say they were introduced by a Captain Coon in the eighteenth century; others believe they were originally the personal tabbys of Marie Antoinette, who, planning

to escape to Wiscasset, Maine, sent some of her personal possessions, including her cats, over by a Captain Stephen Clough.<sup>62</sup> This author, a Maine native, has also heard stories of the cat either being introduced by the Vikings or originating from a huge, vicious cat that was the companion of Blackbeard who when he visited Maine to deposit his ill-gotten loot, left the animal behind. (Since it is well established that Blackbeard never made it that far north, I am pretty sure the last story can be discounted.)<sup>63</sup> Lastly, it has been suggested that this animal is a cross between a now extinct small wildcat and a domestic cat.

In fact these animals appear to have come to Maine by way of most of its residents, on trading and colonizing vessels of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>64</sup> As one author has speculated:

Sea captains often included cats among their crews, counting on them to discourage rodents that scaled the docklines....As ships called at ports throughout Europe and Asia, feline adventurers of many local varieties climbed aboard. During the long voyage, the cats willingly mingled their genetic endowments and when they arrived on this side of the Atlantic the offspring of these shipboard romances already displayed traits that would become characteristic of coons. Among their possible progenitors were the Angora, the Russian Long Hair, and the English Short Haired tabby. Once these appealing cats arrived, they caught the eye and the affection of sea captain's wives who wrangled them away from their husbands ships.<sup>65</sup>

I doubt the Captain's wives were the only ones who were entranced by these animals; personal experience has indicated that more than a few of these old Yankee salts fell under the spell of these felines.

This hypothesis actually has some documentation to back it up, for in at least one case a ship's cat while on shore leave managed to have a litter of kittens. There is the documented story of a ship's cat who was accidentally left on shore when the vessel sailed from Aberdour, Fifeshire, in Scotland. The vessel was gone about a month and on her return, much to the surprise of the shipmaster, the cat came aboard with a month old kitten in her mouth and went directly to the cabin. Two others of her young were afterwards caught, quite

wild, in a neighboring wood, where she must have remained with them till the return of the vessel. The shipmaster did not allow her again to go on shore, otherwise it is probable she would have brought the whole litter on board.<sup>66</sup>

There are other references to cats in this period. For example, there was a court case involving a Lady who was summoned to pay the boarding fee of a cat for fourteen months at the rate of a half penny a day. The Lady swore this was not her cat and the case was dropped.<sup>67</sup> There was also the case of colonel Katterfelto who offered a display of natural history curiosities for the public, including his famous Solar Microscope. (telescope?) Among his assistants in the show was his famous black cat, evidence that in the eighteenth century the domestic feline was, like his human counterpart, already discovering the advantages of a career in advertisement.<sup>68</sup> Finally, there is excellent evidence that Angoras at least, were already well known in England and America by the end of the eighteenth century. A prominent eighteenth-century London surgeon named John Hunter had observed that in the Angora cat, the eyes were often of a different color.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, Thomas Jefferson, third president of the United States, arranged in 1790 for a pair of Angora cats to be brought from Paris to his residence in New York City.<sup>70</sup>

More and more among the middle class the cat was being accepted as the quintessential companion animal. It is particularly evident among the urban middle class which was becoming increasingly prevalent in England and America in the early nineteenth century as a result of the commercial and industrial revolutions. This acceptance is particularly well reflected in the portrait painting of these times. Before the nineteenth century only the wealthy could afford to have their portraits painted. As such for the most part the domestic animals represented in portrait art of the eighteenth century were the horse and the dog; they appear mainly in rural hunting scenes where they are accompanied by one or more of these local gentry. This is particularly evident in the work of William Hogarth and George Stubbs.<sup>71</sup> Interestingly, Hogarth provides one of the earliest portraits of a cat in a painting entitled "The Graham Children." While the children are the main subject of the painting Hogarth also included in the background a cat, of the English Shorthaired variety, going after a Goldfinch in a cage. For all its incidentalness, this painting is considered the best representation of a domestic feline for the period.<sup>72</sup>

By the nineteenth century, though, the urban middle class is being more and more represented in portrait art. The subjects of such art appear to be industrialists, merchants and professionals—bankers, lawyers, teachers and doctors—that rise to prominence in this period. Accompanying their rise to artistic prominence is the cat. This is probably best reflected in the work of an early nineteenth-century artist, Joseph Whiting Stock. Born in Springfield, Massachusetts in 1815 Stock was at an early age confined to a wheelchair. As therapy for the injuries that caused this confinement, Stock was encouraged to take up painting. He did so and in time became so accomplished that by the time he was twenty-five he was an established portrait painter.<sup>73</sup> Stock, much like the other artists of the times, often included animals and children in the same paintings. Interestingly, more than a few of the animals included in these portraits are cats. Since he also painted a number of portraits of children and dogs one must conclude that both animals were well established as companion animals among his clientele.



Associated with this change in status in the cat was the advent of a more compassionate, more humane attitude towards not only this animal but towards all living creatures. Arising in part from the Calvinist movement of the seventeenth century—the earliest legislation specifying that cruelty to animals fell outside the law came from Puritan Massachusetts in 1648<sup>74</sup>—the humane movement by the eighteenth century had become extremely widespread among English intellectual society. Writers and philosophers, such as Jeremy Bentham, argued that cruelty to animals was evidence of an uncivilized society. Bentham himself wrote:

The barbarous spectacles of gladiators no doubt contributed to give the Romans that ferocity which they displayed in their civil wars. A people accustomed to despise human life could not be expected to respect it amid the fury of their passions. It is proper for the same reason to forbid every kind of cruelty towards animals, whether by way of amusement, or to gratify gluttony... Why should the law refuse its protection to any sensitive being? The time will come when humanity will extend its mantle over everything which breathes.<sup>75</sup>

This attitude became well accepted not only in England but also in the early United States.<sup>76</sup>

Since this new spirit of sensibility encompassed all creatures, that cat more than once was envisioned as not the recipient so much as the perpetrator of cruelty. As noted earlier, in an epitaph to a cat named Tom, it was noted that he was a cruel despoiler of young birds, often while their mother looked on.<sup>77</sup> In an article in the "Tatler" it was observed that one particularly cruel child used to chase birds into "the jaws of a bloodthirsty cat." The cat's behavior, however, paled in comparison with that of the child for it was noted: "Some of the poor creatures he chased to death about the room; ...and even in his greatest acts of mercy, either clipped the wings, or singed the tails, of his innocent captives."<sup>78</sup> Fortunately, his younger brother "carried a universal benevolence towards everything that has life." The author, their father, found great solace in the behavior of the younger boy, but "the perverse temper of the older boy left him a very miserable man."<sup>79</sup>

The cat became one of the major recipients for this new sensibility, for there began to appear commentaries from individuals who attempt to prevent or at least make amends for cruelties imposed upon these animals. Once such case involved an individual who successfully resuscitated a cat that had nearly been drowned by three boys.<sup>80</sup> Additionally, there was a later article in the same journal discussing the practice of whipping the cat. The author mentioned that while traveling through Albrighton in Shropshire he noticed a sign of a public house called the Cat which he noted: "Represented a man whipping a cat".... The author found this process hard to believe, for he wrote: "As I can see no great diversion in the mere whipping of a cat, but a deal of cruelty and wantonness, I am unwilling to take it in its mere literal sense, but think there is more in it than

meets the eye."<sup>81</sup> Obviously the practice must have completely gone out of style in the more metropolitan areas of Great Britain, otherwise the author of this piece would not have been so shocked. There is also the nineteenth century author who noted that many of the problems involving cruelty to cats involved young boys. He observed of the cat: "Many foes hast thou—imps of mischief in short jackets and still shorter inexpressibles—fiends in the shape of boys." The author goes into great detail to describe the nineteenth-century version of cruelty to animals, again an indication that behavior towards this animal had come a long way.

Many a time and oft, too, has our heart bled for the hapless child of thy race (the kitten), whom some purile demon, despite her piteous moanings and despairing struggles, holds closely grasped between his unrelenting knees, till he has shod each velvet paw with a sandal of unyielding walnut-shell, and laughs to see her limp clattering away.<sup>82</sup>

Finally, the poet Christopher Smart noted that kindness to the cat could provide a valuable learning experience for children. He referred to this animal as "an instrument for the children to learn benevolence upon."<sup>83</sup> Obviously the new sensibility towards animals contributed to a new attitude towards the cat. Gone were the days when this creature was seen by the general populace as fair sport for all forms of mistreatments and abuses.

Gone also were the days when the cat was looked upon as strictly a working animal. As the eighteenth century passes into the nineteenth the owners of cats become more and more emotionally attached to these creatures. The attachment is seen not only among the intellectual elite who always seem to have appreciated the company of the cat, but increasingly among the urban upper middle class. This latter association, arising possibly from the use of cats in earlier times as rodent control on commercial shipping vessels, established that the animal would, as the nineteenth century dawned, become an integral part of the urban English household.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Please note: The term 'domesticated' refers to animals that were not only tamed but were also bred for characteristics advantageous to humans. Creatures such as dolphins, primates and certain exotic birds do not fit into this category.

<sup>2</sup> Frederick E. Zeuner, *A History of Domesticated Animals*, Harper and Row, New York, 1963, 390; Douglas English, *Friends of Man*, E.P., Dutton, New York, 1924, 247-251.

<sup>3</sup> Diodorus Siculus, *Diodorus on Egypt*, translated from ancient Greek by Edwin Murphy, Mcfarland and Company, Inc., Jefferson, North Carolina, 1985, 107-114; Luciano Canfora, *The Vanished Library*, Translated by Martin Ryle, University of California Press, Los Angeles, 1989, 59-60; John Brand, M.A., *Observations on The Popular Antiquities of Great Britain*, 3 vols., AMS Press, New York, 1970, Reprinted from the 1848-49 edition, London, vol. 3, 38.

<sup>4</sup> Finding remains of kittens at an Iron Age site of Gussage All Saints has suggested to many that the animal was being domesticated in Northern Europe at the same time it was introduced to Rome. Unfortunately, one cannot tell whether these creatures were truly domesticated or simply wild kittens that hung around the village. See: Rosemary Margeret Luft, *A Zooarchaeological Study of The Roman North Western Provinces*, BAR Informational Series, 1972, 137.

<sup>5</sup> The only evidence for this animal in Western Asia prior to Roman times is an isolated right lower carnassial tooth found at neolithic Jericho. The fact that the tooth is of a rather small size suggests that it probably came from a domesticated cat. Still in the evidence available strongly indicates that this animal was tolerated in the Middle East for a long time before it was domesticated. See: F.E. Zeuner, "Dog and Cat in The Neolithic of Jericho," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, January-June 1958, 54-55; F.E. Zeuner, "The Cat," *Oryx*, I, 1950/52, 67-8; F.E. Zeuner, "The Domestication of Animals," *Scientia*, 6, 1956, 50.

<sup>6</sup> W.S. McCullough, *The Interpreter's Dictionary of The Bible*, 4 vol., Abingdon Press, Nashville, vol.1, 542; *The Holy Bible: Containing The Old and New Testaments with The Apocryphal Deuterocanonical Books*, Oxford University Press, 1989, Letter of Jeremiah, 22.

<sup>7</sup> M. Oldfield Howey, *The Cat in Magic, Mythology and Religion*, Crescent Books, New York, 1989, 62.

<sup>8</sup> Robert Hendrickson, *More Cunning Than Man: A Social History of Rats and Men*, Dorset Press, New York, 1983, 100.

<sup>9</sup> Hendrickson, 101.

<sup>10</sup> English, 249-50; Zeuner, 397.

<sup>11</sup> William Langland, *Piers The Plowman*, Trans. Margaraet Williams, Random House, New York, 1971, 70-72.

<sup>12</sup> Bartholomew Anglicus, *Medieval Lore: An Epitome of The Science, Geography, Animal and Plant Folklore and Myth of The Middle Ages: Being Classified Gleanings From The Encyclopedia of Bartholomew Anglicus on The Properties of Things*, ed. Robert Steele, London, 1893, 134; Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of The Twelfth Century*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1927, 335-6.

<sup>13</sup> Hendrickson, 102.

<sup>14</sup> Nikolaus Pevsner, *South and West Somerset*, Penguin Books, 1958, 267.

<sup>15</sup> Thomas Wright, *Essays on Archaeological Subjects*, 2 vol., London, 1861, vol. II, 116-118.

<sup>16</sup> Francis Klingender, *Animals in Art and Thought*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, 1971, 111-112.

<sup>17</sup> David C. Linberg, ed., *Science in The Middle Ages*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1978, 439.

<sup>18</sup> Colin Platt, *Medieval Southampton*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973, 104; P.D.A. Harvey, *A Medieval Oxfordshire Village*, Oxford University Press, 1965, 63.

<sup>19</sup> Michael Packe, *King Edward III*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1983, 91.

<sup>20</sup> Morris Bishop, *The Middle Ages*, American Heritage Publishing Co., New York, 1968, 164. "The Statute of Westminster I, (3 Edw. I) 1275, c.4" in *English Historical Documents 1189-1327*, 3 vols., Harry Rothwell, ed., Oxford University Press, New York, 1975, vol. 3, 398.

<sup>21</sup> There is also a commemorative stone for Dick Whittington that shows a cat but this is from the early twentieth century. Elizabeth Hallam, *The Wars of The Roses*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, New York, 1988, 109.

<sup>22</sup> For a modern children's version see: *Dick Whittington and His Cat*, Scribner's, New York, 1950.

<sup>23</sup> Ray B. Browne, Marshall Fishwick and Michael T. Marsden eds., *Heroes of Popular Culture*, Bowling Green University Popular Press, Ohio, 1972, 54-56.

<sup>24</sup> Bryant Lilly White, *London Signs*, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1972, 656, 97.

<sup>25</sup> John D. Blaisdell, "Rabies in Shakespeare's England," *Historia Medicinae Veterinariae*, 16, 1991, 1-49.

<sup>26</sup> Edward Topsell, *The History of Four-Footed Beasts and Serpents and Insects*, 3 vols., De Capo Press, New York, 1967, vol. 1, 82.

<sup>27</sup> Topsell, 83.

<sup>28</sup> Wright, 118.

<sup>29</sup> Anony., "Concerning Cats," *Appleton's Magazine*, May 27, 1871, 613.

<sup>30</sup> Alan C. Kors and Edward Peters, *Witchcraft in Europe, 1100-1700*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1984, 229-235; Keith Thomas, *Religion and The Decline of Magic*, 556.

<sup>31</sup> What Topsell took to be 'passions' may in fact have been an allergic reaction to cat hair. See: Topsell, 83.

<sup>32</sup> Keith Thomas, *Man and The Natural World*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1983, 109; Christopher Hibbert, *The English: A Social History 1066-1945*, W.W. Norton and Co., New York, 1987, 209.

<sup>33</sup> Hibbert, 209.

<sup>34</sup> Thomas, 109.

<sup>35</sup> William Shakespeare, *Much Ado About Nothing*, Act I, Scene I, 4258-60.

<sup>36</sup> Jason Larwood, *The History of Signboards*, 5th Edition, London, 1866, 198.

<sup>37</sup> Interestingly, by the time the above book was written the practice had fallen into disfavor and was referred to as a 'cruel sport.' See: Brand, 39; W. Carew Hazlitt, *Faiths and Folklore of The British Isles*, 2 vol., Benjamin Blom, New York, 1965, vol. I, 96.

<sup>38</sup> Margaret M. Howard, "Dried Cats," *Man*, 51, November 1951, 149-51; *Illustrated London News*, December 18, 1948.

<sup>39</sup> Well into the nineteenth century it was common belief that diseases such as the bubonic plague were caused by a toxic gas known as a miasma. It was further believed that this miasma attached itself to clothes and to the fur of animals. See: Philip Ziegler, *The Black Death*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1969, 20-21.

<sup>40</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A Journal of The Plague Year*, ed. Anthony Burgess, Penguin Books, New York, 1983, 137.

<sup>41</sup> J.F.D. Shrewsbury, *A History of Bubonic Plague in The British Isles*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970, 165-6.

<sup>42</sup> Defoe, 136.

<sup>43</sup> Anony., "The Poet's Lamentation for The Loss of His Cat, Which He Used to Call His Muse," *London Magazine*, 2, 1733, 579.

<sup>44</sup> Anony., "An Epitaph," *Gentleman's Magazine*, 39, 1769, 48.

<sup>45</sup> Anony., "An Epitaph on A Favorite Cat Named Blewet," *London Magazine*, 47, 1775, 654-55.

<sup>46</sup> Anony., "Epitaph Inscribed on A Tomb in A Gentleman's Garden, in Northamptonshire, in Memory of A Favorite Cat," *Gentleman's Magazine*, 47, 1777, 40; Anony., "On The Death of A Lady's Cat," *Gentleman's Magazine*, 48, 1778, 40; footnote #42.

<sup>47</sup> R.F. Gunther, M.A., F.L.B., *Early English Botanists and Their Gardens*, Oxford University Press, 1922, 348-9.

<sup>48</sup> This author would like to thank Amy Gould Thomsen for her superb translation of a very difficult Latin.

<sup>49</sup> Norman Callan, ed., *The Collected Poems of Christopher Smart*, 2 vol., Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., London, 1949, vol. 1, 311-314.

<sup>50</sup> Richard S. Westfall, *Never at Rest, A Biography of Issac Newton*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1980, 103-4.

<sup>51</sup> George B. Hill, ed., *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, six vols., Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1934, vol.4, 197.

<sup>52</sup> Jeremy Bentham, *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, ed. John Bowring, London, 1843, 80.

<sup>53</sup> Interestingly when the animal died the gardener buried her under the mulberry tree in the garden without Stukeley's knowledge. When Stukeley found out he took an instant dislike to that part of the garden noting: "I never cared to come near that delightful place; nor so much as to look toward it." See: Stuart Piggott, *William Stukeley, An Eighteenth-Century Antiquary*, Thames and Hudson, New York, 1985, 124.

<sup>54</sup> Brown, Fishwick and Marsden, 55-59.

<sup>55</sup> (Interestingly, cats are not mentioned in this notice.) *Morning Herald and Daily Advertiser*, June 3, 1783.

<sup>56</sup> *Public Advertiser*, January 17, 1782; *Morning Herald*, April 18, 1783; Pointers were also popular. See: *Morning Herald*, April 22, 1783; June 9, 1783.

<sup>57</sup> *Morning Herald*, June 9, 1783.

<sup>58</sup> *Public Advertiser*, Jan. 17, 1782.

<sup>59</sup> *Morning Herald and Daily Advertiser*, Dec. 20, 1782; *Morning Herald*, March 11, 1783.

<sup>60</sup> *The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, August 20, 1782.

<sup>61</sup> *The Complete Cat Encyclopedia*, ed. Grace Pond, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, 1972, 78, 358.

<sup>62</sup> Mimi E.B. Steadman, "The Maine Coon Cat," *Down East*, October 1978, 62.

<sup>63</sup> See: Robert E. Lee, *Blackbeard The Pirate*, John F. Blair, pub., Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 1988.

<sup>64</sup> *The Complete Cat Encyclopedia*, 77, 358.

<sup>65</sup> Steadman, 62.

<sup>66</sup> *The Scotsman*, October 23, 1819; William Hone, *The Every Day Book or A Guide To The Year*, 2 vols., London, 1888, vol. 1, 552.

<sup>67</sup> Anony., *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. 53, 1783, 711.

<sup>68</sup> *Morning Herald*, May 2, 1783; *Morning Herald and Daily Advertiser*, August 1, 1782.

<sup>69</sup> John Hunter, *Observations on The Animal Economy*, London, 1792, 247; John Blaisdell, *John Hunter (1728-93)*

and *Veterinary Science*, Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, 1986, 77ff, 115.

<sup>70</sup> Silvio A. Bedini, *Thomas Jefferson Statesman of Science*, MacMillian Publishing, New York, 1990, 201.

<sup>71</sup> See: Mary Webster, *Hogarth*, Cassell Ltd., London 1979; Tate Gallery, George Stubbs 1724-1806, Tate Gallery Publications, London, 1984.

<sup>72</sup> Kenneth Clark, *Animals and Men*, Thames and Hudson, New York, 1977, 187.

<sup>73</sup> Juliette Tomlinson, *The Paintings and The Journal of Joseph Whiting Stock*, Wesleyan University Press, 1976, ix-x.

<sup>74</sup> John Blaisdell, "An Ordained Compassion: The New England Puritans and Their Laws against Cruelty to Animals," *Argos*, Speciale Uitgave, Zomer 1991. 11-17.

<sup>75</sup> Jeremy Bentham, *Principles of Penal Law*, chapter XVI, in *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, 11 vols., London, 1843; Henry S. Salt, *Animal Rights*, Society for Animal Rights inc., Clark Summit, Pa., 1980, 5-6.

<sup>76</sup> John Blaisdell, "Benjamin Rush (1745-1813) and The Humane Treatment of Animals," *Veterinary Heritage*, vol. 13, 1990, 14-30.

<sup>77</sup> See footnote #44.

<sup>78</sup> Small birds seemed to have come in for special cruelty during these times. It was noted that in Devon in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a favorite sport for young boys was something called "muzzling the sparrow." It was described in this manner: "A Boy had his hands tied together behind him, and the tip of one wing of a sparrow or other song bird was placed in his mouth. He then tried by the action of his teeth and lips gradually to draw the wing of the bird into his mouth and bite off its head, the bird in the meantime pecking at his cheeks and eyes and endeavoring to escape." See: David Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1989, 364.

<sup>79</sup> Richard Steele and Joseph Addison, *Selections from The Tatler and The Spectator*, Penguin Books, New York, 1988, 137-38.

<sup>80</sup> Anony., *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol, 17, 1747, 567.

<sup>81</sup> P.N., "Whipping The Cat," *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1807, 1192, 1193.

<sup>82</sup> Anony., "Cursory Cogitations Concerning Cats," *Blackwood's Magazine*, 46, 1839, 636.

<sup>83</sup> Callam, 311-314.

